



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 18

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush*

Thursday

[Preliminary Transcript]

5 April 1990

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):  
Order, please!

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

I would like to ask the House of Assembly today if we could send a message of condolences to the family of Mr. Earle White from Stephenville. Mr. Earle White was the Municipal Town Clerk in the Town of Stephenville for many years and recently passed away. He was part of the Municipal Administrative Association of the Province. I would like to ask the hon. House to send a letter of condolences to his family.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The Chair will acquiesce to the request from the hon. Member.

#### Statements by Ministers

PREMIER WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the House that upon careful review of the Report of the Auditor General submitted to my colleague, the President of Treasury Board, in January of this year, Government has determined that it is appropriate and necessary to order a Public Enquiry pursuant to the

terms of The Public Enquiries Act into Government's involvement with Newfoundland Enviroponics Limited and its associated companies.

Between May of 1987 when the original heads of agreement were approved by Government and June of 1989 when the assets of Newfoundland Enviroponics Limited were sold, the Province of Newfoundland expended sums in excess of \$20 million in furtherance of the proposal of Mr. Philip Sprung. The Auditor General has reviewed the transactions and provided a report to Government which expresses deep concern about agreements entered into, advances of monies, conduct of business and possible breaches of provincial statutes.

In light of these very serious concerns and the Auditor General's inability to obtain portions of critical records, and here I disown the word 'my', Mr. Speaker, in the printed text, it is not 'my' Government, Government has concluded that only a properly constituted Public Enquiry will answer the many questions concerning Government's involvement with these companies.

I have requested the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of the Province to confer with the Chief Justice of the Trial Division of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland to nominate a Trial Division Judge to undertake the Enquiry. When arrangements have been finalized, I will table a copy of the Commission in this House. However, I can now advise you that the Terms of Reference will direct the Commissioner to hold an enquiry into the following matters: To enquire into the involvement of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and any

of its agencies or corporations with Sprung Sales Limited, Sprung Environmental Space Enclosures Limited, or Newfoundland Envirponics Limited and in particular to determine (a) whether the expenditure of and accounting for, Government financial and other assistance was in all respects proper, and properly managed and accounted for; (b) whether any Acts and Regulations of the Province of Newfoundland were not complied with; (c) whether or not there were breaches of any of the arrangements or agreements between the Government and any of the companies; (d) whether there was any other aspect of governmental involvement in the matter that should be brought to the attention of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I have said before on behalf of my colleagues in the official Opposition that should the Auditor General's Report to the Government warrant any further investigation by way of an enquiry, charges to be laid, or whatever, then whatever would come out of the Auditor General's Report should be pursued according to the appropriate laws of this Province by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador on behalf of the people of this Province. I do not know, obviously, what the Auditor General's Report says, I do not

have a copy of it, so I cannot comment from that perspective. I can only accept the word of the Premier that there are discrepancies that ought to be further investigated so therefore, Mr. Speaker, consistent to our previous positions, we concur with the judicial enquiry established by the Government. Let it get on with its work and if any further action is required following the judicial report we will concur with that being gotten on with as well. We have no hesitation in supporting that and saying categorically that if there was any wrongdoing let the wrongdoing be found out, and if there was not let that be found out as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When this Government took office last May, it was decided that a thorough reassessment should be made of the existing practice of providing both an official residence and official entertaining facilities for the Premier of the Province with a view to reducing costs and developing a more efficient program to provide these services.

This reassessment has now been completed, and I wish to inform the House of the decisions reached by Cabinet.

Ever since Confederation, an

official residence has been provided for the Premier, and for the past 25 years or so the facilities of a private dining room for official VIP entertainment have been provided. This dining room is located on the first floor of Confederation Building. It has not been used for this purpose since this Government took office last May. Instead, the room has been made available to the Official Opposition for temporary use as a caucus room.

During the term of office of Premier Frank Moores, the property known as Mount Scio House was acquired and renovated for use as the official Premier's residence. Premier Peckford also lived in Mount Scio House for a number of years until changes in his personal circumstances made it more appropriate to reside in a town house. The rental for this town house unit was paid by Government, and amounted to \$19,959.11 in the last year of Mr. Peckford's occupancy.

Mount Scio House and the Premier's town house were equipped with furniture, appliances and other household items at Government expense. In addition, the upkeep of Mount Scio House included gardening and grounds keeping, general repairs and maintenance, snow-clearing and security.

Since Mr. Peckford moved out of Mount Scio House it has been used as government offices, occupied by employees of the Department of Justice. To restore the building and its surroundings to a private residence would cost well over \$100,000, and our study showed that it would cost an additional \$50,000 or more per year to operate and maintain.

In addition to the cost of Mount Scio House, the Premier's private dining room cost government \$74,711 in the last year of its operation.

These were the factors which had to be considered by a special Cabinet Committee consisting of the President of Treasury Board, the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, and the Minister of Development. The report of this Committee has been considered by Cabinet, and the following recommendations have been approved:

1. Mount Scio House will not be used as Premier's residence because of the prohibitive cost of refurbishing and maintenance. This property will be turned over to the Pippy Park Commission for appropriate public use, probably as Park Headquarters.

2. The Premier's private dining room in Confederation Building will be closed permanently, and the area will be utilized for other government space requirements.

For the past 11 months, the Premier has conducted entertainment and meetings at his home, augmented by the use of hotel facilities for large groups and special functions, and this system has proven to be both adequate for government business and cost effective.

In place of both an official residence such as Mount Scio House and the official entertaining facilities of the private dining room, the Premier will be paid an annual allowance and will continue to use his home in place of the dining room for official entertainment.



This allowance has been established as \$20,000 per year, and will result in a savings to Government of the cost of refurbishing Mount Scio House, maintaining the property at more than \$50,000 a year, and operating the private dining room at approximately \$75,000 a year. The Premier's allowance is, in fact, consistent with the housing cost benefit provided the former Premier Peckford in the rental and operation of the town house.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the Minister for providing me with a copy of his statement in advance. I must say at the outset there is not much newsy in this, the fact they are announcing the closing of the dining room, I think that actually occurred a year ago or last May sometime, so that is not very newsy, that aspect of it.

I might say at the outset there are those in the Province, I guess, who do not disagree with the option of the Premier of the Province having an official residence. There are lots of people who believe that maybe that should be allocated to a Premier. I do not think there is any big argument or disagreement about that. The problem has been that particular issue has always been focused on by the press or by Oppositions in the past or whatever. And I think that is what distorted the whole issue.

Having said that, the issue of the Premier conducting entertainment and meetings in his home augmented by the use of hotel facilities for larger groups and so on has proved to be adequate. My only question on that particular point would be: does the expenses for those kinds of things come out of the \$20,000. If so, it would appear to me that \$20,000 is not very much. So some of that must be paid for elsewhere as well. If you were to book a facility at a hotel for a large function obviously that could not come out of your \$20,000. But maybe sometime you will get a chance to clarify it.

Secondly, the Mount Scio House as I understand the statement will continue to be maintained by somebody. Presumably Pippy Park or whichever organization takes it over, so there will still be maintenance costs of whatever it is, estimated at \$50,000 a year. Somebody will have to pay that and that somebody, no matter who uses the facility, will be the taxpayer. So I do not know if it is much of a savings to the Government, although the President of Treasury Board likes to indicate that it will be big savings.

It is very interesting to note that the final sentence in the Minister's statement says the Premier's allowance is consistent with the housing cost benefit provided to the former Premier in the rental and operation of the town house.

That is very interesting. They are now saying that it is consistent or similar to what the former Premier had in that respect, even though, the then opposition, I think quite

frequently used to berate the former Premier for having a town house and a number of pictures in the paper and all the rest of it. Some Members in particular are sitting on that side of the House in the front benches very close to the Premier, and were well known for that kind of thing.

But, Mr. Speaker, suffice it to say, unlike other oppositions, we do not intend to be picky over this particular issue about the Premier's need to entertain and to be properly reimbursed for entertaining on official Government business, and they are the Government, if that is the way they want to do it, that is fine, we have no big argument with it. The only thing I will say in closing, Mr. Speaker, is that it may suit this particular Premier, it may be possible for this particular Premier to entertain in his own home and so on, maybe the house is large enough for that, but, I would point out that obviously some future premier may be in a different set of circumstances, may have a large family at home and this kind of accommodation might not be acceptable in those circumstance, so I would just point that out, because one of these days we expect to have a premier, very soon, who will fit into that particular category. Somebody with a large family, with three or four children at home, and not as large a house (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Thanks Gentlemen. Mr. Speaker, recently many vehicle owners in the Province will notice they are receiving their 1990 renewal notices for periods of less than a year, usually six months. This re-staggering of licence renewals from the heavy volume spring and summer months to the less busy months of fall and winter, will equalize the number of renewals in each month of the year. The re-staggering process places vehicle owners into a new expiry month. Prior to the expiry of the new assigned registration period, these vehicle owners will receive another renewal which will then be for one year. Motor vehicle buying patterns show the spring months are the heaviest purchasing months, while the autumn months show a decreasing number of purchases. Re-staggering of the licence renewal will distribute renewal work throughout the year equally. This will alleviate the long line-ups experienced at Motor Registration Division at the end of these busy months. I would like to remind vehicle owners that it is simple to avoid renewal line-ups. Using the mail eliminates the need to visit the Motor Registration office in person. Those who do visit the office are encouraged to renew early in the month before the last minute rush to renew at the end of each and every month.

Renewal applications received by mail by the 22 of the month can generally be processed and returned to the vehicle owners by the end of the month.

Consideration is now been given to permitting licence renewal fees to be paid at chartered banks. This will enable this service to be avail at all chartered bank

branches.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Let me start at the end of this statement: first the chartered bank option is a good one and is going to be helpful to people in this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the people in Eagle River have to many chartered banks. And I am sure the people in Torngat Mountains do not have very many chartered banks, Mr. Speaker, and the south coast of the Province do not have very many chartered banks so it is not going to help them very much. But if it is more convenient for the public, Mr. Speaker, maybe it is worth being considered. But during the Estimates hearings a couple of days ago, when the Minister's Estimates were up for scrutiny, I asked the Minister how many of his existing staff would now be fired because of this, and he has no idea what effect this privatization of motor vehicle licences will have on his staff, Mr. Speaker.

There is one other thing. I did ask before why the \$2 million increase in vehicle and driver's licence renewals or from the general revenue in the Budget, why there would be a \$2 million increase this year, Mr. Speaker? And I did not get an answer from

the Minister in his Estimates hearings because he did not know, Mr. Speaker. But I did get a call from some of his staff yesterday or today saying that this is natural growth. Mr. Speaker, this is a double taxation on the people of the Province which has been announced today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

The people of this Province will pay double, Mr. Speaker, for the registration of their vehicles for six months into this year because of another tax grab by this Government which will result in almost \$2 million more taken, stolen, robbed from the pockets of the people of this Province and everyone who owns a car will have to pay extra monies this year just to get them registered. Mr. Speaker, we will see what happens with the -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Highway robbery.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

It is too bad, Mr. Speaker. We will deal with it at a later time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Highway robbery!

### Oral Questions

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. Would the Minister tell the House whether or not he has received instructions from the Premier ordering him to investigate circumstances leading to the hiring of all staff in the Minister's Department to determine whether or not any of that staff are personal friends of other public employees, former political appointees, and/or friends or relatives of the previous Administration?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, no.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That was a very categoric answer I am sure Hansard will record. Mr. Speaker, I have the same question for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. Would the Minister tell the House whether or not he has received any instructions from the Premier ordering him to investigate circumstances leading to the hiring of all staff in his Department to determine, again, whether any of that staff may have personal friends in other areas of the Public Service, may have been political appointees, or were friends or relatives of the former Administration?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry

and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:

The answer is a categorical no, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that Hansard, again, will record that that was a very categoric answer.

I would like to pose the same question to the Minister of Finance. I do not think he needs me to repeat it. If he does, I will certainly repeat it. The Minister has heard the question. Can the Minister tell the House whether or not he has received similar instructions from the Premier regarding investigating staff in the Minister's Department to determine whether they came there by having friends in the Public Service, whether they came because they were political friends of the previous Administration, or, in fact, political appointees?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, I find the question a very strange one. It is somewhat similar to some of the other questions they have been asking lately, and I am wondering if they are demented.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Finance, true to form, did not answer the question, but I think Hansard will record the answers that were received from Ministers, two noes and a maybe.

I have a question for the Premier. I refer the Premier to a memorandum to all Cabinet Ministers dated July 26, 1989. I will read the first paragraph for the Premier. It is this: 'Since taking office on May 5, this Administration has been practicing a strict policy of fairness and balance,' - those sound like words the Premier would write, Mr. Speaker - 'in hiring procedures and contractual relationships. We have implemented the policies which we advocated while we were in Opposition, and we have done much to rid this Province of the blatant patronage system which plagued our past' - and we commend the Premier for that. 'I want to commend all Ministers for their efforts in this respect.'

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Premier, in view of the fact that the Public Service Commission is mandated to do all hiring for Government, with the exception of Deputy Ministers, Assistant Deputy Ministers, Political support staff, I guess, and so on, can the Premier tell the House what new hiring procedures different from those which were in place through the Public Service Commission, which he has referred to in this memo, what new procedures have been implemented since the Government came to power in terms of hiring through the Public Service Commission?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to enlighten the Leader of the Opposition on the matter. I do not have the full memorandum in front of me, but my recollection of it is simply this:

When we took office, Mr. Speaker, we followed a very strict policy of making appointments on a fair and balanced and proper basis. Now, in recent days and weeks they have contended that some Liberals have been appointed. Does that not provide some balance? Do they think everybody in this Province are Tory's? Obviously not. So it is inevitable that some people appointed by the Government will have a background as Liberals. But Mr. Speaker, we put this system into effect to eliminate this unfair system that was there before.

And it is not only appointment by the Public Service Commission. What the former Administration used to do, we have found, was get around the Public Service Commission by appointing people on a temporary basis. Then, after they got their friends in there on a temporary basis, they would call for appointment to fill the position on a permanent basis and the person who was there temporarily, of course, had the inside track. We thought this was very unfair and we were concerned about this.

The next paragraph, which the hon. the Leader of the Opposition did not read, what we discovered was happening - if I could have the noise stop, people would hear the answer.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

We know the answer already. It is political patronage.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER WELLS:  
What we found was happening, Mr. Speaker, in our effort to get fairness and balance back into the system and eliminate the political prejudice that had been there, the civil servants started to put the civil servants' prejudice in and appoint their friends and neighbors and connections, so this letter was written.

The next paragraph says this, and let me quote from the letter: 'However, there are disturbing indications that our commitment to fairness and balance and our policy of non-interference in hiring practices may have been abused within the Public Service and, indeed, may have inadvertently supported a patronage network at a different level. A steady stream of reports have come to this office complaining of public servants hiring personal friends, former political appointees and friends and relatives of previous Administrations, while equally qualified people of known affiliation with this Government have been ignored. If such a situation exists -

MR. SIMMS:  
(Inaudible) with that that line?

PREMIER WELLS:  
I will read it again. 'A steady stream of reports have come to this office complaining of public servants hiring personal friends, former political appointees, and friends or relatives of the previous Administration, while equally qualified people of known

affiliation with this Government have been ignored.' Now, that was the steady stream of complaints.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER WELLS:  
'If such a situation exists in reality, it is totally unfair and unacceptable and must be dealt with quickly and severely. No public servant must be permitted to abuse -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I have not done this, but I ought to have. I remind hon. Members of our Oral Questions, page 11, Standing Order 31 section (d) which says, "Oral questions must not be prefaced by the reading of letters, telegrams, newspaper extracts or preambles of any kind." Hon. gentleman can see the reason for that. This is not a reading clinic, it is a Question Period. Although we have allowed that, hon. gentlemen should refer to the document more rather than be quoting from it. The Leader of the Opposition did that, and, of course, the Premier is likewise responding. I believe the Premier has answered the question.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:  
With respect, Mr. Speaker, there are two more sentences that make the answer complete, and then I will sit down.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I will allow the Premier to read the two sentences.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

'No public servant must be permitted to abuse our principles either for his or her own gain, or for the benefit of any political entity. Before taking remedial action, however, we must ensure that reports are thoroughly substantiated and are more than rumors or perceived injustices.' And that is what prompted the examination, fundamental fairness and balance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Fundamental paranoia, that is what it is, and pressure from your Liberal buddies.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Paranoia, Mr. Speaker, brought on by supporters of the Premier's own Party is what led to this particular letter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Right on! Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that two out of three Ministers are on the public record as having denied this scurrilous memo, that two denied, Mr. Speaker, 'No', and I will get to it -

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not a memo.

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is not a a memo? 'Memorandum to Cabinet Ministers.' That is not a memo? Mr. Speaker, in view of the very serious charges the Premier makes against public servants, bordering on corruption, or maybe even criminal activity, for blackmail, and in view of what the Premier says is a steady stream of reports and complaints coming to his office, could the Premier tell the House the source of those complaints that were so bad as to induce the Premier to make serious charges against every public servant employed by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Let me correct a couple of misstatements in the Leader of the Opposition's preamble.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER WELLS:

I would like to correct a couple of misstatements in the hon. Leader of the Opposition's preamble, Mr. Speaker. First, the Ministers did not deny the existence of this memorandum.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They said 'no'!

PREMIER WELLS:

They denied the total misrepresentation and distortion of it by the Leader of the Opposition. That is denied.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it was last June and July. I will go back and see if I can find any references or notations anywhere. For the most part, my recollection is that they

were verbal, if not totally verbal complaints. I will go back in the files and go -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The Chair is having great difficulty concentrating on the answer being given by the Premier because of interruptions from my right. The Chair has made several rulings on interruptions during Question Period so the Chair can listen to the answers.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker, I will go back through the records and see if there was any notation of individual instances, if there are, if I can find any, or find any recollection from any of my staff. I do not remember the details. I certainly remember the incidence of it and the substantial number of them from a variety of sources. That is why I wrote -

MR. SIMMS:  
Rumours.

PREMIER WELLS:  
If it is, it should be substantiated. If it is rumor, it should not be acted upon. But there was so much of it, that it was necessary for me to do this. I think I should probably be able to point out some specific incidents. One, I believe, was where a senior public servant hired his boss's daughter. That was one I remember, one specific incident that I remember. He hired his boss's daughter or son. I remember that specific one

occurred.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
You do not mean his political boss?

PREMIER WELLS:  
No, his public servant boss. His superior's son or daughter. I remember that incident. I do not know the name or where or who, but I remember such an incident having occurred.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that in my first question I asked a number of Ministers whether or not they had been instructed to investigate circumstances surrounding the hiring of staff and they said, 'no', the Premier stopped before he got to the next sentence which says the following: 'I would ask that each Minister carefully investigate this situation as it applies to his or her own Department.' The Premier goes on then to ask those Ministers to report back to him.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier, would the Premier inform the House now of the results of those Ministerial investigations that he, in fact, ordered in this particular memorandum last July, and would the Premier table it?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:  
I will see, Mr. Speaker, if there is any formal record of incidents, but my recollection is there were some references back to confirm that this kind of abuse was,



indeed, taking place, and instructions were issued to the Public Service to ensure that it would not continue. And I should say, Mr. Speaker, in the final solution to ensure absolute fairness, my recollection is that sometime after this we provided that in the case of all temporary employees, instead of being appointed by the Minister, as it was before, or by the civil servant and result in this kind of abuse, what we put in place was, we believe, the ultimate solution: the public servants would name three or four or five or however many were qualified for the position and the Minister would make the appointment, and that way we could prevent abuse by either.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

PREMIER WELLS:  
Yes, I believe the memo was written by the President of the Council sometime later to deal with the abuse we found, in order to avoid that occurring.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Table the reply.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Premier has now confirmed that he did, in fact, - and these are his words again in his letter: 'I would ask that each Minister carefully investigate this situation as it applies to his or her own department' - I want to

again ask the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture whether, in fact, he has complied with the Premier's memo of July 26th -

MR. SIMMS:  
He said no.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
- and if, in fact, he received it, because he is already on the public record as saying no. Has he complied with it? First of all, does he want to change his answer and say he has received it, has complied with it and has made a report back to the Premier?

MR. SIMMS:  
A good question!

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker, first of all, I do not want to -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I have not recognized the Minister yet.

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:  
First of all, I do not want to change my answer.

MR. SIMMS:  
You do not want to change your answer?

MR. FLIGHT:  
I do not want to change my answer. Secondly, I remember the memo the Premier read and referred to. Inasfar as it applied to me -

MR. RIDEOUT:  
We will probably get a straight answer yet.

MR. FLIGHT:

I remember now, having refreshed my memory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:

As we all would.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I remind hon. Members to my right that there is a procedure for asking questions. They have asked the question. Now, they should let the hon. the Minister of Forestry answer the question.

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I remember to the extent that I can recall - I have dealt with a lot of memos since that particular one - my reaction, as Minister of Forestry, was to look at the memo, determine whether it applied to my Department and, if it was necessary, report back to the Premier. In my case, there was no such problem identified in the Department of Forestry, and I am not sure, I may have verbally mentioned it to the Premier but I surely did not reply by way of memo.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that is a fine dance for somebody who denied receiving the memo in the beginning.

MR. SIMMS:

And the instructions.

MR. RIDEOUT:

And the instructions. The Minister had better be careful, Mr. Speaker. I might table his response to the Premier before the next few weeks are over.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Premier went on in his memo to say the following to his Ministers, 'If any public servant is found to be engaging in such obvious political or friendship patronage activity, he or she is subject to instant dismissal for cause, regardless of the level of office held.'

Mr. Speaker, could the Premier tell the House whether or not, before issuing this categorical instruction to his Ministers if they found any evidence of what he asked them to look for, whether or not the Premier had any discussions with the union representing Government employees? Because for Government to take such unilateral action against employees who are protected by a collective bargaining unit, a collective agreement, certainly, I do not believe, would meet with the approval of the union concerned.

Could the Premier tell the House whether or not he had any discussions before issuing those instructions, and whether or not he received the approval of the representatives of the Government employee's to take this drastic action he is ordering Ministers to take?

MR. SIMMS:

Of course not. Of course not! He is the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

No, Mr. Speaker, there were no discussions, and there were no discussions for two very valid reasons. One, any civil servant who breaches the laws or the rules under which Government operates is subject to dismissal without regard to what the union wishes. We have no intention of breaking any collective agreement provisions, and anybody who is protected by a collective agreement provision would be protected in this circumstance.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the simple fact is that my experience with the unions is that they would find this kind of approach by civil servants as unacceptable as we would, and they would give us a good loud pat on the back for taking this kind of step to correct these unacceptable practices.

MR. SIMMS:

I would not use your experience with unions as -

MR. MURPHY:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. John's (Mr. Murphy), now that all collective agreements have expired, would probably be better off keeping quiet.

MR. SIMMS:

The mouth from the south.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Premier. Can the Premier tell the House whether or not any civil servant has been

fired as a result of the investigations he asked Ministers to carry out in this particular memo, dated last July 26?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

My recollection is no. There was one civil servant who was relieved of his responsibilities shortly after the Government took office who was involved in a matter referred to in this memorandum. This was the matter of, I believe, the Leader of the Opposition's press secretary. Before the change of Government took place or in the interim, he sent this press secretary down and had him squirrelled away in the Department of Fisheries. We only discovered it several weeks later, and I think that is referred to in the memorandum, and the Deputy Minister of Fisheries who was then Deputy Minister, obviously must have done that. But it was not because of that incident. My recollection is that only came to light some time after that particular deputy minister was relieved. So I cannot say that it was done as a result of what is in this memo, but that matter that is referred to there, I think, reflected that kind of improper behaviour by that particular deputy minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, obviously, if you can judge from what the Premier was saying, there was no foundation for any of those rumours he took such drastic action on, it was just a witch-hunt by the Government. That is exactly what

it was.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me come to the next series of questions which were raised by the Premier as a result of Paragraph No. 5, I believe it was, in his particular memo. He has identified the Department, he has identified the past minister; the person was a press secretary, so everybody knows we are talking about Mr. Robert Cahill who used to be press secretary to me as Minister of Fisheries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Premier is the Premier aware that the gentleman he mentioned in Paragraph No. 5 came to the Public Service of Newfoundland and Labrador as a result of public competition and was recommended by the Public Service Commission to be hired as a public information officer in the Petroleum Directorate and was, in fact, hired as a public information officer by the Petroleum Directorate?

MR. SIMMS:

Through the Public Service.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

He may at some time in his past have been so hired, Mr. Speaker, I do not know. I am not aware of it. I will check it, if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition wants it. But at the time he was a political appointee serving the Leader of the Opposition as a political appointee and, as such, ceased to be a civil servant in that category. So this is the action that was taken prior to the change of Government. But I will check and see if that is the way he originally came into the Public

Service, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, to quote briefly the Premier's letter again, in referring to this gentleman and this incident, he says, 'Without ever having gone through the competitive process.' I would assume one checks information before one writes categorical statements like this.

Mr. Speaker, is the Premier aware that the same gentleman referred to in paragraph 5 in this memo won internal competition conducted by the Public Service Commission for the position of Public Information Officer in the Department of Fisheries, a union position in the Department of Fisheries, and was recommended by the Public Service Commission as candidate number one on the basis of merit, and was hired by the Department of Fisheries as Public Information Officer, and that, in fact, that gentleman got his position in the Department of Fisheries as a result of public competition?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I will make full inquiry into the entire record and position and make available to this House full details, not just selected details. It will be done.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

It is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to close the barn door when the horse is gone. Mr. Speaker, is the Premier not aware that the gentleman again referred to in paragraph No.5, whom he treated so unfairly and wrongly and has since been fired by this Government, that that gentleman committed one error. His work was good enough that I, at the time, as Minister of Fisheries, noticed it and asked him if he would consider being seconded as Press Secretary to the Minister.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not right.

MR. SIMMS:

That is right. Precisely.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Right? Okay? Is the Premier not aware that since the position of Public Information Officer in the Department of Fisheries and in every other Department, as far as I know, is a bargaining unit position, the gentleman, in fact, had a right to return to that protected position if he so wished, within a prescribed time frame - within a prescribed time frame - written in the collective agreement? And in view of that, Mr. Speaker, did not the Deputy Minister at the time conform with the collective agreement and give the person back his position to which he was entitled under the collective agreement signed with NAPE by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

You see, Mr. Speaker, there is a problem when Governments change from one political party to

another.

MS VERGE:

Not that kind of problem, though.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Take your foot out of your mouth.

PREMIER WELLS:

I will produce the records. There is a problem. When a new political Government takes office, you cannot leave in place, and that is recognized by everybody, the political servants of the former Government, and the Leader of the Opposition says, he agrees with that. Now this particular individual was the political servant, and accepted appointment as the political servant and ceased to be a public servant - accepted appointment as the political servant of the then Premier. Now! Now!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

He was not Premier, he was Minister of Fisheries.

PREMIER WELLS:

The then Minister of Fisheries, and had that position. Now, Mr. Speaker, the new Government comes in and takes office and it has to operate on a basis of confidentiality and be able to work in confidence, and the public servant normally provides that and recognizes that and are loyal to whichever Government is in power. The political servants are not. They are loyal to their political masters, whether they are in power or not. Now that is the normal reason for the change, and I should not have to explain that to the Leader of the Opposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the mere fact

that they have this indicates that there are still some political moles in the place. All it really indicates, Mr. Speaker, is that we were unduly considerate and we did not do as thorough a changing job as we ought to have done. We were unduly accommodating, and perhaps we will live to regret it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

If there was ever any doubt about the paranoia inherent in this particular memo, Mr. Speaker, the Premier, with his use of the word 'mole', just proved it beyond any doubt. Because, Mr. Speaker, is not the Premier aware that this particular memo, sent by him to his Ministers, was copied and sent by his competent Ministers to their Deputy Ministers, attached? Is he not aware that it was copied by Deputy Ministers and sent to their Assistant Deputy Ministers, copy attached?

Is he not aware that it was copied by Assistant Deputy Ministers and sent to Directors?

MR. SIMMS:

Sent to Directors, and there are 1,000 of them.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Is he not aware that Directors were forced down into the bowels of Confederation Building to try to find the political moles left over from the last Administration? Is the Premier not now willing to tell this House that this was nothing but a

witch-hunt to try to get at people in the bowels of the bureaucracy of this Government who have no political connections whatsoever, but you want to get them out to make room for your Liberal friends? Is that not exactly what it is?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

To answer the several questions that were asked to the extent that I remember them, was I not aware that it was copied and sent to Deputy Ministers? Yes, because I expected it to be. Was I not aware it was copied and sent to Assistant Deputy Ministers? No, because I did not expect it to be. I did not expect it to be copied and sent to anybody else, I expected the Ministers and the Deputy Ministers to do their jobs in a proper --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I remind hon. gentlemen again to my right my recollection was that when the Leader of the Opposition asked his series of questions there was not one interruption from the left. We are getting continuous interruptions, so I ask hon. Members to my right to please allow the Premier the same courtesy that was extended the Leader of the Opposition.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just say again, Mr. Speaker, I would have been aware,

or I would have assumed - I do not know whether I was aware, but I certainly would have assumed that it would have been copied and sent to the Deputy Ministers and I would have expected the Deputy Ministers to act on it. I certainly would not have expected them to copy and send it to Assistants, and copy and send it to Directors and so on. This was a letter sent to Ministers which I would have expected to be passed on to the Deputies to be handled in a proper way.

There were a variety of other questions which did not make much sense, they were mostly political statements, but if there are any that I have not answered, I will get Hansard and answer them. The one I do remember was, is this not a letter that was aimed at ferreting people out of the Public Service to make room for political friends, a witch-hunt or something? Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to let the letter stand exactly as it is written, and to allow it to be judged exactly as it is written, to be myself judged exactly as it is written, and to fully endorse and support today every word that is in it with a great deal of pride and satisfaction at the desire of this Government to achieve fairness and balance, and to issue instructions to the Ministers, and through the Ministers to their Deputies, to ensure that there is fairness and balance in the running of Government in this Province.

I greatly regret, Mr. Speaker, that hon. Members opposite are so unfamiliar with the principles of fairness and balance that they have great difficulty understanding it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Question Period has expired.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mole, mole, mole, everywhere a mole.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:  
When there is some order restored I will proceed to the next item of business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

### Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to present for the information of the House the following Standing and Special Reports of Committees. A report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council financial statements March 1989; The report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Advisory Council annual report 1988; The Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador financial statements March 1988; Annual report 1988-1989 of the Provincial Public Libraries Board; And the report of the Canada Games Park Commission financial statements of

March 1988.

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, I wish to table the annual report 1989 of the Workers Compensation Commission of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to table the annual report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Public Service Commission for the year 1988-1989.

### Petitions

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

MR. A. SNOW:  
Mr. Speaker, the petition I am presenting to this House today has over 1700 names.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
1700?

MR. A. SNOW:  
Over 1700 names of residents of the District of Menihek.

I have mixed emotions in presenting this petition, in that I am disappointed that this

Government is not aware and cognizant of the problems associated with travel in and out of Labrador. But I am proud to have the right, the honor and yes, the responsibility of presenting a petition to make the Government more aware of the problems associated with travel in Labrador.

There were two programs put in place by previous Administrations. One administered by the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation called the Labrador Air Subsidy Program. His reasoning behind discontinuing that particular program was the fact that there was a lack of use, and the high cost of administration.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the prayer of the petition for the record.

To the Hon. House of Assembly of Newfoundland in Legislative Session convened, the petition of the undersigned residents of Labrador City and Wabush that we are concerned that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador have cut the air travel subsidy for cultural and sports groups by \$100,000 and has thereby unacceptably increased the burden of transportation cost on the residents of this Province who live in Labrador.

WHEREFORE your petitioners urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to reconsider its decisions and reinstate the Labrador travel program to its original levels.

AS IN DUTY BOUND your petitioners will ever pray.

In continuing to speak to the prayer of the petition, the



Minister of Works, Services and Transportation stated that his reasoning was the high cost of administration. I vehemently disagree with that and also, of course, I disagree with the attitude and statement that he made that it did not effect many people, the use of it was going down. Over 6,000 people had applied for grants or subsidies from Labrador to make use of this particular program.

Another program, administered by the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, the Labrador Travel Subsidy Program, that particular Minister suggested that the reason for cutting it was lack of funds and for budgetary reasons. I submit to this House that this Government has a \$10 million surplus, so lack of funds is not an excuse. It is not a reason. The real reason for cutting this particular program, and the Minister of Finance can shake his head, but it is in the record that the Minister of Finance responded to my question in this House that his reason for cutting the program was the fact that there was a program in place through a tax benefit package given by the Federal Government, and that is why this Government administered or cut these programs. It is a claw back suggestion by this Government to claw back these benefits that were given by the Federal Government.

I also submit to this House that the real reason is a lack of understanding of the problems associated with travel in and out of Labrador.

It is the lack of understanding because this subsidy was put in place to make it more equal for the people of Labrador to

participate in travel to the Island and back to Labrador, to be able to participate for many, many reasons. The previous Administrations recognized this. So we could call it an equalizer. If you were to travel from Port aux Basques to St. John's return it is about \$150 by road. We do not have the advantage of travelling from the Labrador portion of this Province to the Island portion of the Province by road because of geography. But I submit to you with an understanding Government we should be able to get a subsidy from Government comparable to what this Government articulates as it's policy with regard to transportation, vis-a-vis road and water.

They have already announced three subsidies, reductions, if you want to call it that, in fare reduction on water ferries, and thus if they were to use a similar type of policy in applying it to the Labrador portion of the Province there should be a subsidy to bring down the high cost of air travel. The air travel should be considered in a similar fashion as the water travel and the ground transportation travel. This Government should do this, and I believe that the Committee struck by Cabinet -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I remind the hon. gentleman is time is up.

MR. A. SNOW:  
May I just have ten seconds to conclude, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Okay.

MR. A. SNOW:

I would recommend to the Special Committee of Cabinet that both programs be immediately reinstated and that the Government commission a select committee of the House to study the improvement and enhancement of both these programs.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of the petition so ably presented by my colleague from Menihek. It is most interesting, Mr. Speaker, only just a few days ago I had the opportunity of being approached by some 200 students in Labrador West concerning a petition on this air subsidy program and also of the cut in the sports and recreation grants. And, Mr. Speaker, it was noted by one name on that petition, it is very interesting, is the niece of the Premier. The niece of the Premier signed that petition showing that she is upset with this Government -

AN HON. MEMBER:

She has the right.

MR. WARREN:

Exactly, Mr. Speaker, she has a right. And naturally, Mr. Speaker, she is concerned because this Government has given the people in Labrador a kick in the face. This Government has given the people of Labrador a real kick

in the face. And Mr. Speaker, one other thing worth noting is, the Premier was in Labrador West on the 6th and the 7th of March, and he flew out from Labrador West to St. John's by other means than by commercial, and the next day was Budget Day, and knowing then that this Government was going to kick it to the Labrador people in the amount of \$600,000 to \$700,000 this year. That is how much money you are taking away from the people in Labrador this year alone. Mr. Speaker, just let me explain to the hon. President of Treasury Board this measure is going to stop a lot of people in sports and recreation from travelling throughout Newfoundland and Labrador. And by doing this, Mr. Speaker, you are taking away indirectly monies that people would be spending in Labrador. So, Mr. Speaker, once you start adding it all up it is going to be about \$700,000 difference to the people in Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Environment and Lands was proud to be instrumental in setting up a committee to look after those programs. And I say to my hon. colleagues opposite and to the President of Treasury Board that the word is out in Labrador from L'Anse-au-Clair to Nain, from Nain to Wild Bight, from Wabush to Red Bay, every community in Labrador, what this Government has done. Since 1949, if you put all the negatives together, there has never been such a slap in the face to the people of Labrador than what was done in this Budget.

I give fair warning to the Government that if they do not reinstate this program this Government has seen the last of two Government Members in Labrador. I say to hon.

gentlemen, not only that, you are also affecting the people going from the Island to Labrador, so you are also going to get negative feeling throughout the Province. I say to the hon. Minister, and whoever is going to speak in support of this petition, surely goodness they will announce today that they are going to reinstate the two programs, the Air Subsidy Program and also the one for sports and culture.

I say, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would hope that the Minister responsible for culture and sports will support this petition because he has correspondence, and I have copies of it, from very, very irritated people in Newfoundland and Labrador, especially from the Sports Federation and groups such as that. I say for the sake of why this program was in place first, why it was put in place twenty-four years ago, fifteen years ago, ten years ago, and last year, that the Minister would do today what needs to be done and that is to reinstate that program immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that a petition has come in to the hon. Member. We of course, will have a good, long look at the petition, look at the addresses of the various people, the locations that are identified, and the concerns expressed in the petition.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I do not think a Government has ever acted as quickly as this one in

responding to the people. I believe it has only been three days. We have had a Committee set up now well in advance of the petition. We have, of course, responded quickly to the concerns expressed and the Committee is active. We have a Committee of five Ministers. We have had several meetings and we are looking at the various programs involved in the Department of Works, Services and Transportation and in Municipal and Provincial Affairs. We want to be sure, of course, that we examine the various programs that have been identified in the Budget, Mr. Speaker. We in fact are doing just that and we will be reporting shortly to the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have actually two petitions to present.

AN HON. MEMBER:

On the same prayer?

MR. SIMMS:

No, they are two different issues.

MR. SPEAKER:

You cannot do that.

MR. SIMMS:

I just want to advise, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:

You just wanted to book the time.

MR. SIMMS:

I think the Speaker is trying hard to get covered on radio. I think he is trying to make some quips and it is not fair. We should let him.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I have a very serious petition here which contains 1810 names which is really a phenomenal number because the organization, the Board of Directors of the group involved here, told me the petition itself was circulated in just a twenty-four hour period, so for that group of people to work as hard as they did to obtain 1810 names in a twenty-four hour period is phenomenal, and I think it expresses their real concern about a decision taken by the Government with respect to the Youth Diversion Program out in Central Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I only have five minutes and I have a bunch of points I want to try and make.

These are the names of people from three electoral Districts, not one, not Grand Falls, it is Central Newfoundland Youth Diversion Program, and the names of the people involved are contained on the petition from the Town of Windsor -

MS VERGE:

Which District is that in?

MR. SIMMS:

- and some from the Town of Badger, communities, both of which are in the District of Windsor - Buchans. A number of names on the petition are from the Towns of Bishop's Falls, Botwood, Point Leamington, Peterview, Point of Bay, all five communities in the District of Exploits. And, of course, there are a number of names on the petition from the District of Grand Falls; so, three electoral Districts, 1,810 names.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the issue is this: The Minister of Social Services unfortunately advised

this group, which runs the Youth Diversion Program out there, a volunteer board of directors, five days before the end of the fiscal year, that the funding it was receiving to run this very important program was cut off. Now, five days, that in itself, I think, is not very courteous and the Minister should, I think, know a little bit better than that.

He also tries to give the impression that the funding given to the Central Newfoundland program of \$76,000, I believe it was last year, or whatever it was, was the same kind of funding given to other programs in the Province; St. John's, in particular, is one that he compared it to.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he is wrong, because the fact of the matter is, the Grand Falls program runs, not only an informal Youth Diversion Program, but it runs a formal Diversion Program. The other programs in the Province do not run the informal program as he well knows, or should well know, as the Minister, by now.

One of the difficulties with cutting off this program and the funding for this program - and I know the Member for Windsor - Buchans is quite concerned about this, as well, because I have talked to him about it. The problem with cutting off the funding and stopping this program is that the group out there received, I think, somewhere in the area of \$200,000 last year to run, from federal funding sources, an informal program.

The problem with this program now being cut off and cancelled, is that that \$200,000 funding will be lost, because the Department of Social Services, I can assure the

Minister when he checks it out, will not be able to obtain the same kind of funding from the Federal Government, directly for their programs.

MR. FLIGHT:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:  
Well, if that is not so, let the Minister of Forestry come out to Grand Falls tomorrow with me and sit down with the board of directors, as I am going to do, and tell them to their faces it is not so, because they have told me it is so.

Now, if the Minister of Forestry, the Member for Windsor - Buchans has nothing more to add than that, then he probably would be better off out in the common room having a cup of coffee.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Let him say no again and not tell the truth to the Legislature.

MR. SIMMS:  
So that is the kind of concern of this group and this organization. These 1,810 people are not talking through their hats.

There are all kinds of other problems, as well, Mr. Speaker, associated with the decision. The Minister knows a lot of this, because he met with the four members of the committee a week ago who, by the way, I might say, were quite discouraged by the Minister's responses, did not think he knew much about what he was saying. I have to say that to him. They were not impressed at all.

MR. FLIGHT:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:  
I am telling the truth. I spoke to the people involved yesterday. Mr. Speaker, the Minister can get up and say what he wants. They were not impressed with what the Minister had to say and they did not think he knew what he was talking about. Now that is true. I can only tell you what they told me.

Mr. Speaker, let me just give him this example. What does he think of this? Earlier today, this very day, April 5th, the executive director of that program in Grand Falls, received a call from the Minister's Department in Grand Falls, asking them if they would come up and pick up two files on two young offenders. They do not even know themselves out there that the program has been cancelled by his own Department. His Department phoned them to come up and pick up files to deal with two young offenders. So there is obviously something wrong with it.

My whole point in this, Mr. Speaker, is that there are a lot of questions, a lot of concerns, and Members opposite should be concerned about it. And I ask the Minister, the Premier, the Government, since it was willing to set up a small Cabinet committee to review the cutbacks in the Labrador travel fund, would they consider similar actions to review this decision? Because, I can assure you, your decision is wrong.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. SIMMS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:

Do you want to get up first?

MR. SIMMS:

No, you go ahead.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have never heard so much political rhetoric and garbage come out of anybody's mouth as just came out of the Member for Grand Falls mouth. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I might point out, while he emphasizes the magnitude of the 1800 names on a petition, that was one half of my majority in the last election, so it is not a large number of names, but, let me say very clearly to the -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:

I will speak to his concerns if he will sit and listen, as I did to yours. Okay. First of all, let me talk about the Youth Diversion Program and its origin in the District of Grand Falls. The Member himself knows the political role he played when he started out with funding on this particular program. Why it reached the stage of where there are twelve other programs in this Province similar to the one in Grand Falls. What is happening in St. John's is even more elaborate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. Members to my right will give the Minister the opportunity to respond to the petition.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, \$78,000 was used last year to fund the Youth Diversion Program in Grand Falls. We have eleven other similar programs across the Province and one in St. John's which put through its program last year, 500 children, 500 boys and girls compared to 52 on the formal program in Grand Falls. In St. John's, we funded \$2,700 for the Youth Diversion Program in St. John's. In Grand Falls, we funded an expenditure of \$78,000, and this year they were asking for \$85,000 dollars. What was happening here, Mr. Speaker, was a lot of political interference. But I want to emphasize the value of the volunteers in Grand Falls. The value of all the volunteers all across Newfoundland and Labrador, no way did we make a decision that did not recognize the value of the volunteers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, have we cancelled the Youth Diversion Program in Grand Falls? Absolutely not. What we have done Mr. Speaker, is cancelled the amount of funding that they are receiving. In doing that, we have sent a social worker to Grand Falls, specifically for a six month period to put together a program identical to what is here in St. John's, and if at the end of the day that social worker reports back to the Department of Social Services and tells us they need access to a co-ordinator from the Regional or District Office in the Department of Social Services in Grand Falls, then, as happens here in St. John's, then they can access that co-ordinator.

Just think, a co-ordinator in St. John's for 500 children. Three people working in Grand Falls, full time, for 52 people. The

ratio is absolutely unbelievable. If one co-ordinator can do it in St. John's for 500, why do we need three in Grand Falls for 52? It is basically simple mathematics, the ratio is absolutely unbelievable. We know the Youth Diversion Program in the Exploits region is definitely needed, we know they were doing an excellent job, but we believe they can do it much more effectively and efficiently with less financial costs. We had a choice to make. We had a choice to give all the alternative major programs in the Province that amount of money, or, to cut back on funding for Grand Falls. We checked with the other people, we checked with the other alternative measure programs in Corner Brook, in Gander, in Clarendville, in my own District of Bay Roberts, in St. John's and right across the Island. It had nothing to do with the politics of what is happening. In Clarendville, we gave them \$1,500 for a twelve month period. In my own District of Port de Grave, we gave them \$500 for a twelve month period. \$500 to put through an alternative measures program.

They are based in Clarendville and they do the whole Bonavista Coast right down to Bonavista on a volunteer basis, and very, very successful, a formal and an informal program.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time has elapsed.

MR. EFFORD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I again point out to hon. Members that questions for this particular

period are just five minutes. It would give hon. Members the benefit of the time if we had fewer interruptions. The Minister, was interrupted quite a few times going through there and I ask please that that not happen.

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I must say I find it rather offensive that the Minister of Social Services would stand in this House after my colleague from Grand Falls presented a petition based on this Youth Diversification Program. A Program that saw 250 people in Grand Falls last year referred to it. My colleague presented a petition on behalf of 1800 people and the Minister stood up and said it was garbage.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Minister of Social Services that the people who are volunteering their time, the 250 people that needed to be referred to that program and indeed the 1800 people from Central Newfoundland who signed the petition did not think it was garbage, Sir.

For a Member, Mr. Speaker, who spent the last two or three years crawling around youth centers, it is somewhat unbelievable. It is somewhat unbelievable that he would stand in this House today and refer to the presentation of a petition on behalf of these people who need the program, as garbage. I think, Mr. Speaker, it speaks for the type of direction that the Minister is giving the Department of Social Services when he stood by and saw funding cut to

such a valuable program as the Youth Diversion Program.

Mr. Speaker, I know how valuable they are. I met with most of the people who were on the Executive Boards when I was Minister of Social Services.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, indeed I did. And I did not cut the funding to Youth Diversification Programs either, Mr. Speaker. We did not cut any funding like the Minister of Social Services has done. We saw the budget of the Department of Social Services, the Youth Program cut last year. The matter of fact is, Mr. Speaker, that when the people from Grand Falls said the Minister of Social Services did not know what he was talking about, they were right. And anyone else who had any dealings or feelings with the Minister of Social Services knows exactly what the people of Grand Falls have stated is true. He does not know what he is talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Windsor, well okay but the people who were in to see him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is incumbent, and the Minister can talk about the one in St. John's and what they referred to and the numbers of people, but the Minister refused to state that there is a social worker who is attached to one of the offices here in St. John's, Mr. Speaker, what about that salary, Mr. Speaker? What about the salary for that person? What about the

office expenses for that person, the secretary for that person? What about the rent for that person? It is all paid for by the Department. So the Minister, Mr. Speaker, should not try to deny Central Newfoundland or any other part of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, the right to this type of a program because for some reason it does not cost as much in St. John's.

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister does not understand it, things are different in rural Newfoundland in most cases than in St. John's. They are different, Mr. Speaker. We do not have as many people to draw from in terms of getting involved with the type of group that is needed to become involved in this.

For you Mr. Minister to rob the people of Central Newfoundland, to deny the youth of Central Newfoundland, to deny the people who depend upon this program the right to have a youth diversification program, is terrible. It is disgraceful.

The Premier referred to the Minister of Social Services once as my Minister, Mr. Speaker, with a big heart or something. Well, Mr. Premier, I submit to you that when you get a petition of 1800 people in 24 hours from Central Newfoundland because the actions of this Minister warrants that there be reconsideration given to the funding of this program. I honestly believe and I beg on behalf of my colleagues and the people of Central Newfoundland, I beg the Government to reconsider that decision.

It is not a lot of money, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister and the Government have to understand,



must understand the importance of such a program to the youth of this Province. I believe that it is a wrong decision, it is a terrible decision, it is a bad decision, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave, by leave.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
The Minister of Finance should keep quiet.

MR. SIMMS:  
As I indicated to Your Honour at the outset, I did have two petitions I wanted to present. Since I did not have much luck with the first one, which really dissappoints me and I am sure it will dissappoint people out in the Central Newfoundland area, I would like to present another one on behalf of the people from the District of Windsor - Buchans, the district of Exploits, and the District of Grand Falls. Once again, three electoral Districts including, I might say, the brother, I believe, of the Member for Exploits who signed this particular petition, the brother of the Member for Exploits.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Where is he?

MR. SIMMS:  
And this is a petition, Mr. Speaker, from the people in those

areas containing fifty odd names - fifty-one I think it is - which asks the Government to live up to the commitment of the previous Administration with respect to providing funding to the Exploits Valley regional recreation facility. The Minister for Municipal Affairs responsible for recreation in this Province would be fully aware of this issue and how important it is to the people of that Central Newfoundland area. And we your petitioners urge The Government of Newfoundland to honour the commitment of the previous Government to provide funding for a recreation facility in Grand Falls, Windsor and Bishop Falls.

Now, Mr. Speaker, and as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray. With only three or four minutes to try to explain this, I will try to do my best and hopefully the Minister can give some indication. This came about as a result of a program introduced by the previous Government on the advice of officials in the recreation division of his Department. And Mr. Speaker, the program was called the Regional Recreation Facilities Program.

There were hearings held around the Province by a recreation group of people who listened to the needs presented to them all over the Province. There was a presentation made by a combined committee out in the central Newfoundland area, not just from Grand Falls but from Windsor and Bishop Falls, who made a submission on the need for a major recreation facility out there. They had some ideas of tying it in with the community college - the campus out there for the community college. They had a major

commitment from abitibi price of somewhere in the area of \$1.5 million, and they had other commitments or offers of commitment from the business community. The previous Administration provided a commitment of \$1 million towards construction of that facility. The recreation officials in the Minister's Department did an assessment of all those proposals they had received as a result of this public hearing process, and the Minister's officials who are there today, the very same people, recommended at the time, the top proposal was the proposal by the Exploits Valley group which included the people, as I say, from all three electoral Districts.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:  
Let me just explain to the Minister now. The number one proposal was that. Then there were three recreational facilities next on the list for stadiums, and they were for Fogo, Bonavista North and the Connaigre Peninsula. And the Government of the day approved and committed, in fact issued the cheques as I recollect, for the three stadium projects which this Government cancelled, of course, and held back, and made a commitment that the Exploits Valley project which had been approved and recommended by the Minister's officials would be receiving funding in the following fiscal year. That is the way it worked.

So I say to the Minister, he is aware that this project that was proposed is a fine example of a regional recreation complex. I would assume he has looked through it. I would assume he has talked

to his officials about it. I would assume they have told him that it is a fine proposal, in fact it was the best proposal that came forth in the whole process.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they were not asking for the entire cost of the project, they were asking for a commitment from the Government so that it could take that commitment, and the commitment it had of \$1.5 million from Abitibi Price and so on, to go out and do some fund raising to provide the funding to get this regional facility to serve the three electoral Districts and perhaps hopefully tie it in with the university program that has been ongoing out there now for the last three years with full time professors and everything - everything there but a building that is all that is missing on that university program.

They thought that this would be a great way to tie it in. So I have a petition here from these people, including the Member for Exploits (Mr. Grimes) own brother who supports it strongly, he is a great recreation enthusiast as the Member for Exploits is. And I would hope the Minister will give some serious consideration to this request and to these petitioner's wish and ask the Government to consider this particular application as soon as possible.

Is my time up yet, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Yes, your time is up.

MR. SIMMS:  
Shame!

MR. GULLAGE:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of course the people in the Exploits region are very interested in reactivating their application for a regional recreation facility in the area. As a matter of fact, just last week the Grand Falls and the Windsor Councils were both in to see me and that was the point on both of their agendas which we discussed thoroughly.

If I might go back for a moment to the point where we took Government, and we are looking at the programs that were in place. There were, in fact, three cheques issued as the Member mentioned, and we felt though in our wisdom that it was wise to review the program. The fact that civil servants had worked on it previously is rather beside the point. I think they have a hand in most major programs of Government whether it be in my Department or any other, usually civil servants certainly at the deputy minister or director level are consulted and they work hand in hand with the Minister on particular programs, in this case it was probably no different.

But the point that has to be made, Mr. Speaker, that as the Minister responsible I immediately flagged some points of concern and expressed them to the Government. The fact that the councils in most cases with the applications that we reviewed there were some ten locations for regional facilities, recreational facilities identified where applications had been submitted to the previous Government. And in reviewing these applications and speaking

with the councils, as the Minister responsible I discovered that councils in almost every region did not have agreements in place between one another to maintain and operate these facilities. Indeed fundraising had taken place in many cases because almost every region, of course, was anticipating and hoping that they would get approval and had done some fundraising. But agreements were non-existent. There may have been one or two in existence, but really were non-existent in the sense that a firm agreement obligating the councils involved for their share of the maintenance and operating expenses, of course, which is the big problem with any facility when you are talking in the \$1 million range, \$1.5 million. Facilities of that size, of course, have large operating expenses and maintenance expenses, and my concern as the Minister was whether or not the councils involved in any particular area could maintain and operate these facilities.

So indeed we did withdraw the problem and the Government agreed with my recommendation that we would revisit the program and bring in criteria to do it properly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GULLAGE:

Councils did not disagree with that. In fact, they agreed with the concerns that I had expressed that, in fact, they did not have agreements in place.

The other point of concern was the one of financing, the fact that they would have access to other means of financing, perhaps have other means of financing looked at

by the Government. And indeed we did that. We examined the various options and, of course, the options are many. The obvious one is to simply require that the council involved come up with the cash for their share. And indeed many of them were prepared to do that over a period of time and hopefully would raise the funds necessary.

So we also provided in the newly announced program which I announced just recently the option for a council to access the Municipal Financing Corporation and, in fact, put their portion of their 20 per cent obligation over a reasonable period of time by way of a debenture over a period of up to twenty years. Now I am not suggesting that in every case they are going to access that because many of the groups have already raised in excess of \$100,000 in a couple of cases. So they may want to use their own funds for a portion of it and access the Financing Corporation for another portion. So we have applied the flexibility to do that, Mr. Speaker, and that has been well received by the councils involved, and I believe that this program will be very successful. We have asked the previously submitted applicants to review their applications and submit any revisions they would like.

In fact they have the opportunity to that, including the Exploit's application. I told the councils of Windsor and Grand Falls because, of course, they are partners to that particular application.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
And Bishop's Falls.

MR. GULLAGE:

And Bishop's Falls. To revisit their application and see if in fact they want to make any changes before we prioritize the grouping previously submitted. We have done that, we are in the process of going back to the various applicants right now and asking them to do that. We do have some fine applications in. In fact feasibility reports have been done in the past on a lot of these locations and indeed I think the councils are very pleased with the new program. I see us making a recommendation very soon, prioritizing the various applications, and getting on with the program, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
What was it Frank Moores said? The time has come and it will not be long now, Mr. Speaker.

I am very pleased to have an opportunity to speak in support, unlike the Minister, to speak in support of the petition so ably presented by my colleague on behalf of residents of Central Newfoundland, the Exploits Valley in particular, who have no other option, Mr. Speaker, but to come to this House of Assembly through the method of petition and try to get this vindictive Government to change its mind. It is terrible that a Minister of the Crown would stand in his place today and mislead the House, and provide false information to the House. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who is breaking the rules by interrupting would have done better had he had the intestinal fortitude to get to his feet and support the petition that his brother signed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is when you can measure the integrity and the fortitude of a person, when he gets to his feet, and not when he stands in his seat and just shoots across the House and interrupts, when he gets to his feet like a person of honour and integrity and speaks for a number of his constituents who signed this particular thing.

It is terrible that this Minister continues to mislead this House, and the public of Newfoundland and Labrador, on this particular matter. It is really unfortunate. I would use stronger language but it is not parliamentary so to do. The Minister knows the difference. In this particular case there were agreements in place between the various municipalities in the Exploits Valley. In this particular case fund raising had been completed by the various municipalities and recreational groups in the Exploits Valley, as was the case in Fogo. The municipalities on Fogo Island had complied, had an agreement in writing that they would maintain that particular facility. They had their money raised, Mr. Speaker. All they did wrong was they voted wrong in the election. That is all that happened. The same thing happened down on the Connaigre Peninsula. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that might soon be corrected but the same thing happened down on the Connaigre Peninsula.

The fact of the matter was officials in the Department, the same officials that are presently serving this Minister, the officials that the Premier tried

to say today are loyal to whoever their political masters happen to be, the same officials that gave advice to us as a Government, Mr. Speaker, the same officials that went out and carried out the feasibility studies that said that the Exploits Valley recreational facility was feasible and ought to be proceeded with, recommended that it be proceeded with, that said that Fogo was feasible, ought to be proceeded with and should be proceeded with, that said that Harbour Breton was feasible and that it ought to be proceeded with and should be approved, those same officials. Do you think they gave different advice to that Minister unless he asked them to give him reasons why he could not approve it, Mr. Speaker? That is the bottom line here, Mr. Speaker. When this Minister went into that Department he asked the officials to 'give me reasons why I cannot go ahead with this program.' His officials do not even have a copy of his program, but in those particular cases, the ones we are referring here, the one that is the prayer of this petition from Exploits, the Minister went to his officials, or had his Deputy go to them and say: 'Give me reasons why I cannot let this program proceed.' And the Minister succeeded, Mr. Speaker, and he does not have the integrity - I have seen Ministers hide behind Officials, but that particular Minister -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That particular Gentleman sins the most, I say to the Minister, and I will sit down when I feel like it.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a couple of petitions I would like to present.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HEARN:

So as not to confuse you or the House, I will do them individually, certainly. The first one concerns the number of accidents on our highways involving Moose, and the prayer of the petition is: 'The petition of the undersigned residents pray that the number of accidents on our highway involving moose is unacceptably high and the number of moose licences issued to persons in this Province has not increased in proportion to the increase in the moose population wherefore your petitioners urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to take immediate steps to increase the number of moose licences available to the people of this Province.

There are a number of factors here: 1. The main request is that the number of licences be increased so that the great moose population which we have will be brought under control. There are some other concerns, side concerns here that might play a part, other

ways of controlling the number of accidents, which is the major concern in relation to the petition, and a lot of residents are concerned about the lack of clearing the brush along the highways, especially away from the Trans-Canada. When you get onto the side roads of the Province, the brush is very, very close to the road and moose, especially in spring and summer, have a tendency to rush out into the path of oncoming traffic, and people, especially those who are not used to the number of moose on our roads and on our highways might be very much unaware and, consequently, we have a number of very, very serious accidents.

We would also suggest that the Minister of Social Services, for instance, in looking at ways to employ some of the people who receive social assistance - we have seen some very successful programs initiated through his Department, through the different local offices - hire recipients for clearing brush along the highways, which helps keep the visibility problem down considerably.

Also, in Newfoundland, of course, in the wintertime, we use a lot of salt on our roads. As snow is shoved off and melts on the side of the road, undoubtedly the salt stays there to some degree and apparently this encourages moose to come to the side of the road for the salt licks, as all animals tend to do. Once again, if the side of the road is relatively clear, then motorists can pick up the moose some distance away. If brush is growing right to the side of the road, then it makes it much more difficult to spot moose.

The other Section of the petition,

asking that the licences be increased, would also be of benefit in enhancing our tourism industry, which has grown in leaps and bounds in recent years. Hunting in Newfoundland generally, whether it is moose or deer - I should not say deer, I should say caribou or bear - has become known world-wide and we have people coming here from all over. One of the problems they are having is finding enough big game licences. A lot of the outfitters in the Province, in fact, have been asking over the years that the number of moose licences be increased, and that the different outfitters be given more of these because they do cater to people who come in from other countries, not to say other parts of our own country, and spend considerable dollars round the Province, wherever they stay, in the small communities as well as in the larger areas. So by increasing the number of moose licences, we are doing three things: One, We are cutting down on the moose population which is becoming dangerously high; secondly, we are giving local residents, and probably that is the most important reason, we are giving local residents a chance to obtain a moose licence where many are not successful every year, especially in light of the changes recently made by this Government in the moose licencing procedure; and thirdly, it gives the opportunity to bring more people into the Province to hunt big game and, consequently, put more dollars into the coffers of the small communities around.

Some years ago I remember, when you would go moose hunting you would tend to go to the Millertown area, or to Terra Nova or to Central Newfoundland. Now, of

course, moose hunting is big in practically every area of the Province. So, instead of concentrating our efforts and our dollars in certain sections of the Province, now hunting brings in revenues to every small nook and cranny scattered throughout the whole Province. So, Mr. Speaker, we hope that Government will listen to the prayer of the residents concerned, and that they will increase the number of licences in the Province for all the right reasons.

MR. WINSOR:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WINSOR:  
Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to speak on behalf of the petition so ably put forth by my friend from St. Mary's - The Capes. I come from an area of Newfoundland where moose -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
There are lots of moose on Fogo Island?

MR. WINSOR:  
There are no moose on Fogo Island. Lots of caribou though.

MR. EFFORD:  
Overseas.

MR. WINSOR:  
Overseas.

Moose accidents have been quite numerous along the Gander Bay Road. I do not know if the Minister of Social Services is aware, but his Department undertook a very good project in that area this year and I would encourage the Minister to this summer, not wait until next fall.

MR. EFFORD:  
In your district?

MR. WINSOR:  
In my District, Sir.

MR. EFFORD:  
No, I will not do it.

MR. WINSOR:  
The Minister will not do it. After today, fairness and balance just went out the window. Got exposed today, and fairness and balance went out the window. But the Minister's officials had the good sense to undertake a brush cutting program, going back about fifty to sixty feet - the Minister is not aware of the project, obviously - from the side of the road, and besides improving the look of the countryside, making it better for the Minister of Transportation and his officials for snow clearing. It greatly increases the chance of a motorist avoiding hitting a moose, because you have a fair amount of time to see them before they come out of the brush. I compliment the Minister for having the forethought to listen to his officials and to put that program in place, and I would encourage him starting in May month to begin again and cut the entire section of road, all the way back to Gander and points beyond. The Minister nods his head. I am sure that means we will have approval next week.

In recent years, because of good management by the previous Administration, the number of moose in this Province has increased dramatically. A good conservation program the PC Government put in place has resulted in the moose population practically doubling over the last number of years. The only thing

that has happened is the number of licences have not increased proportionately. The number of licences now given could be substantially increased in many areas, and that could mean a significant reduction in the number of accidents that occur from moose being along the roadside.

The Minister of Transportation should also become involved and see if there is some kind of a correlation or statistic that can be arranged on certain areas of the Province where there seems to be more moose accidents than in other parts - the Terra Nova National Park comes to mind. Now, while I realize that the National Park is the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, it is not uncommon to drive in on an early Monday morning and see fifteen or twenty moose in the park area, if you arrive before daylight, Twenty-seven a friend of mine saw, coming from Gander to the end of the Park, twenty-seven moose on a Monday morning.

In addition to that, of course, the tourism potential of moose hunters, big game hunters is a great asset to the Province, because every tourist dollar has a great multiplier effect. It brings people to our Province to hunt big game and, of course, that might entice them to come back another season. So I have no difficulty in supporting the prayer of this petition so ably presented.

I think the Minister for Wildlife, while my friend for St. Mary's - the Capes -

You missed him. A splendid presentation.



AN HON. MEMBER:  
I was outside.

MR. WINSOR:  
Yes. There was a fair bit of noise on the other side, too. The Members were over there mumbling, and it was difficult to hear in the House at the time. Anyway, I support the petition and hope that somebody on the other side will respond accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the opportunity to say a few words pass, since the Minister of Environment and Lands is not in his seat today, for personal reasons. As Minister of Social Services and as a citizen of the Province, we should certainly take this very seriously. We are not talking about something minor. A number of lives have been lost in accidents on the Trans Canada and all the highways, and there has been a lot of personal injury and, as well, great financial cost to people because of damage to cars.

I do not know if the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes mentioned it, but I know in my area, in the District of Port de Grave, a number of local farmers have had a tremendous problem with roaming moose destroying crops, costing tens of thousands of dollars.

The one thing I have to pass comment on is the fact that the Department of Social Services has been doing so much in the Member's District, in Fogo. Now, I have to take a second look at that. We cannot have too much of that going on, we have other Districts around the Province, and if all the money

is being spent down in that area, Mr. Speaker, then I have to be sure that other Districts in the Province get equal representation. So I assure the Member I will be taking a very, very serious look at that to make sure we -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:  
Well, we will certainly have to take a very serious look.

Speaking about the farmers out in my District, I will probably have to increase the number of projects out there this year, because we had several farmers last year who lost an awful lot of money, an awful lot of money because of their crops being destroyed by moose. It is not only the fact that they eat and tear up some, but they trample them and everything else.

Then there are the fences. In fact, one farmer went to the expense of putting an electric fence around his property. That was very expensive. Again, the good people of Port de Grave very, very seldom come to Government looking for assistance, they did it on their own and we compliment those people for that. With it would be my very, good clear thinking to help the people out in my own District for that reason alone.

For the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes, a very good friend of mine, I will certainly take a very good look at what we can do up there this year to alleviate some of the problems by assisting and brush cutting. I know there is a lot of brush up in that area.

We certainly support the prayer of the petition and the concerns expressed by both Members. I do not very often in this life support what an opposition, especially the Tory Opposition would have to say anywhere, especially in the House of Assembly, but I must say the concern is for the well-being and the safety of the citizens of the Province. And I must say it is not very often I hear something sensible coming from the Opposition side. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I mentioned that I had a second petition. This one concerns the middle distance, one which will also interest the Minister of Social Services because it relates directly to his fishery. I am sure he is going to stand once again, if the Minister of Fisheries is not back, and support the prayer of this petition which says: We are concerned that the Provincial Government has decided to sell the vessels of our middle distance fleet, even though it has been proven that the technology of these vessels allows for more selective harvesting of fish and helps to conserve our fish stocks; and

Two: The catch from our middle distance fleet has enabled many of our plants to remain viable through the Resource Short-Plant Program. We, therefore, petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to reconsider its decision to sell the vessels of our middle distance fleet.

Sometime ago, the former Government introduced the middle distance fleet, as we presently know it, into the Province, but, more importantly, they received from the Department of Federal Fisheries an allocation for these boats. This, in turn, helped build up, I suppose, what we would call an independent quota, which gave the Province control over harvesting a certain amount of fish which they could allocate wherever they so wished.

As it happened, a number of plants which were having bad years or bad periods during any one year, received fish from the Resource Short-Plant Program, from the middle distance effort, and enabled a tremendous amount of workers to obtain employment and qualify for UIC and whatever. Before the change of Government, we received a tremendous amount of criticism from the people who are opposite now, concerning the middle distance fleet. In fact, upon coming into power they immediately decided to get rid of the middle distance effort. It is sort of peculiar now to notice that the tide seems to be changing and that the true value of these boats and the quotas that were there until they were cut recently, mainly because the cuts were supported by the Government, they realize the importance of this right now, especially in the smaller communities around the Province.

Plants close as fewer areas have access to the resource. The allocation we had and the boats that were there to harvest this resource are of extreme importance. I still think that by the Government having control, by owning these middle distance boats, which are perhaps the best

boats in the Province today, which have the technology to fish in practically any section of the ocean where we would catch fish, whether it be in the North, up in 2G and 2H, and for a different number of species, which gives us a tremendous amount of variety and, in our capability to catch and land to any part of the Province, a resource that could provide employment for our people. If we let those boats go, then undoubtedly we are losing a chance, as I say, to harvest certain resources that could not be harvested without this technology, and we are depriving a lot of our people of employment opportunities.

I understand the Minister has now had a change of heart and he is asking the Federal Government to reinstate the quota that was there for the middle distance fleet, perhaps, and I may only be suspicious here, but perhaps because his own plant in Twillingate is in dire need of fish, and the owner has made it very clear that he is very interested in receiving, or obtaining, the boats and certainly the resource the boats could bring in. Maybe that is what it took to wake the Minister up, because he does see the value of the middle distance fleet. Consequently, I hope the Government does hold onto the fleet. In light of what is happening, as I say, with plant closures -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

But, hopefully they will hold onto the boats and then they can use them for the benefit of the many

Newfoundlanders out there who need such help these days.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. Member for Grand Bank, I want to read out the questions for the Late Show. The first one is from the hon. the Leader of the Opposition saying: 'I am dissatisfied with answers given me by the Minister of Finance to questions asked by me today re educational financing.'

The second one is submitted by the Member for St. John's East stating dissatisfaction with an answer given to a question asked the Minister of Finance concerning the net cost benefit to the economy of the Province with the recent influx of refugees.

The third one is submitted by the hon. the Member for Mount Pearl. He says, 'I wish to give notice that I am dissatisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs to my question relating to the establishment of the Mount Pearl Fire Department.' These are the three questions.

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank:

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I take pleasure today in rising on this occasion to support the petition put forward so ably by my colleague from St. Mary's - The Capes in support of the middle distance fishing effort, and particularly the middle distance fleet, the boats which are owned by the Province.

With the existing crisis in the fishery, if there ever was a time when the Province should be holding onto those particular

vessels it is now, unless what we have heard over the last few months has just been lip service to the effect and the point of view that has been expressed by many, not only in the Province, but in Atlantic Canada and, as well, by some Ministers in the Federal Government about underutilized species. Now, in order to reduce some of the very serious impacts that we will see over the next year or so with regards to the fisheries crisis, these vessels could be, certainly, utilized and harvesting capability put in place to harvest some of these species that have been talked about now for a number of years but nothing has ever been done about.

I as well have a very deep interest in this particular Middle Distance Fleet. Not only because the fleet was put into existence and build when we were in Government, but because a large number of people from the Burin Peninsula were crewing those particular boats. And, of course, as a consequence of the action of the quota being taken away these people, some of them or a large number of them, have become unemployed. They have had difficulties with Federal fish in that they wanted to go to different sized boats and they have had serious problems being allowed to do that.

Only a few days ago I had a conversation with the Member for Placentia who had gone through a very similar situation with one or two of his fishermen out there, not because of moving from the middle distance to other boats, but because they wanted to move from one size to the other, so it has been a very complex problem. And I think the Province - and I

have said publicly over the last few months - are making a very serious mistake in selling off those Middle Distance boats. Now I see a sort of reversal or a turn in the opinion of the Provincial Government that we have heard over the last few weeks, and we have seen a Member on the other side rise and present a resolution, actually, calling for the Middle Distance effort to be maintained by the Province.

So, as the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes said, these boats are well built. They have more selective harvesting than a lot of vessels that fish, and consequently they were able to harvest a larger, bigger fish. And, of course, that was good, there is more selective harvesting because with all the cries these days that, again, we have heard about the attack on the deep sea fishery, particularly the trawlers, that one of the biggest criticisms that we have seen coming particularly from the inshore sector is that the trawlers are doing severe damage, not only to the fish during the spawning season, but as well to the fishing grounds.

So boats that have more selective harvesting such as these Middle Distance boats were equipped to do, I really feel it is the way for the future in this Province and I think it is a sad reflection upon this A ministrations foresight or lack of foresight in looking at the fishery of the future to get rid of these boats.

So, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure this afternoon in rising in the House to support this petition put forward by my colleague from St. Mary's - The Capes calling upon the Government

to not do away with those boats, to stop the sale of these boats. There certainly, God, must be some way that boats that are so well constructed can be utilized for the -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. - for the benefit of the fishery in this Province in looking at the crisis we are going through now.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Fisheries I want to take just a couple of minutes to speak about this because I think if anyone other than the Minister of Fisheries is being involved with the Middle Distance Fleet and the knowledge around it over the past four or five years, I would like it to be known that I have been involved and I am quite concerned about the Middle Distance Fleet.

Back in 1985 being on the Opposition when this first came about, the former Minister of Fisheries - now the Leader of the Opposition - talked about the Middle Distance Fleet. I think we expressed, as an Opposition at that time, the concerns that we had with that particular fleet of boats, the capability that particular fleet of boats would have in earning a profit and being able to catch fish and earn a profit and to be able to substantially replace the boats

that are in St. John's. I contended and I said very clearly at that time that we already had a number of Middle Distance boats equal and capable of what those fleets of boats were doing in the Province. And it was proven out in a very, very quick term that we proved that the sixty four foot eleven and a half inch boats that were fishing on the Grand Banks side by side with those expensive operation boats that could not catch any more fish in a season than could the sixty-four foot eleven and a half inch boats.

Those supposedly small boats of the then Premier, the hon. Brian Peckford, said that they could not do it, that they could not go out to the Grand Banks, that it was too far, that they could not make a profit and they could not catch the fish. Now we have proven since, Mr. Speaker, that it is proven that those boats: 1. Takes less of a crew, less costly to operate, and less costly to build and they can catch an equal amount of fish in the same type of weather.

2. When those boats were first brought to Newfoundland, they were brought here for a new type of fishery, the hook and line fishery. They came, they went out on the Grand Banks and they could not catch enough fish with the hook and line process to make a profit. They consequently ended up out around the Virgin Rocks, fishing the same places that the inshore fishing boats had to go, gillnetting side by side with those boats. That is what happened.

Now, what is the point of taking X number of millions of dollars and subsidizing those types of boats, when the same amount of fish can

be caught in a less expensive way by the 64-foot, 11-1/2 inch boats?

Last year the otter trawlers fished one month out of twelve and were tied up the rest of the year. Why are we going to put millions of dollars into bring more boats into the Province when we do not have the resource or the quotas for these boats to catch?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:  
That is another problem. The 64 foot, 11-1/2 inch boats land fish up around the Member's District, Fermeuse and Ferryland, and they have supplied a lot of fish. And they fish at least nine to ten months of the year. They only give up in December, January and February, and some of them will even go out that time of year. What about the Nova Scotia Boats? That is another issue. But I am talking about the boats we have already in Newfoundland, with very, very capable, very industrious fishermen all around the Coast of Newfoundland; they have proven through the years that they are very capable. All they need is a fair chance to catch fish.

Now, the quota. What happened to the quota for the middle distance fleet? It was taken from the middle distance and given to FPI. It was not given to the fishermen who can go out there and catch their fish and earn a good profit and make it a viable operation. They took those fishermen and placed them to the inshore allocation. Now we have the otter trawlers with a quota this year to fish about one month again. I mean, where is the logic in that? If we had surplus stocks out there

and those boats could make a profit, I would have no problem with boats like the middle distance fleet or all the boats you could manufacture. But the resource is limited, capability is limited, and the fact that it takes thirteen men to crew that boat, versus six men on the 65-foot boat and they cannot catch more fish and make more profit, so where is the practicality? I am not saying there is nothing those boats can do, and I am sure the Minister of Fisheries and the officials of his Department, in their wisdom, will look at what is the best option for those middle distance boats. But keep in mind that we have the boats and they will supply all those plants you are talking about, and rightly so, they should keep those resource-short plants and the small plants going around the coast going. And if there is any extra fish to catch and extra quotas can be had from Ottawa, I suggest we first give it to the boats all around the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador and if they are capable of going out there and catching the fish, as they have done over the past four or five years, and making money, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. EFFORD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

- I cannot see any reason why we cannot continue with that program.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I take this occasion to once again rise this afternoon to present a petition to this hon. House of Assembly on behalf of residents of the Burin Peninsula, particularly the communities of Grand Bank and Fortune, who are very, very concerned about the Provincial Government's White Paper on post-secondary education and the inference or reference in the White Paper with the proposal by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to move the headquarters of Eastern Community College from Salt Pond, Burin to Clarenville. They are very, very concerned about the impact such a decision will have on an already suffering Burin Peninsula local economy.

It goes on to say, 'Wherefore, your petitioners urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to reconsider this decision and to retain the headquarters of Eastern Community College in Burin. As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago, my colleague from Burin - Placentia West presented a petition from the residents of the Burin - Marystown area, pertaining to this same issue, and there is grave concern on the Burin Peninsula about this particular proposal in the White Paper on Post-secondary Education to relocate the headquarters of Eastern Community College.

I guess today in presenting this petition I must repeat some of the things that I said just a few short days ago on this issue. The headquarters of the Eastern Community College is located at

Salt Pond in very good accommodations. New office facilities really, and with a lease that has just recently been signed for five years. So it just makes sense that if you are going to relocate that headquarters for that community college region then it is going to cost the Board of Governors money to do that. Consequently, of course, the money that the Boards of Governors get are from the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador by way of a grant in aid. So it is going to cost money to relocate the headquarters of Eastern Community College. One that is already well established and working very well.

And the major and main point that I made a few days ago, and as well my colleague for Burin - Placentia West made, was if there is any educational value that is going to be attached to moving the headquarters of Eastern Community College then I or my colleague would not be able to oppose such a move. Because we all want better educational value for the people of our Province, particularly our young people, we want our dollars to get the best bang for the buck in education throughout the Province. So if that was the case then I could not honestly stand in this House or anywhere else in this Province and oppose such a move. But having said that, Mr. Speaker, there is no educational benefit whatsoever attached to relocating the headquarters of Eastern Community College.

The issue here with leaving the headquarters where it is or relocating it is merely, in my opinion, politically motivated.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What doe the Member for Trinity North say?

MR. MATTHEWS:

I do not know what the Member for Trinity North - the Member for Trinity North is very capable of expressing his own opinions in this House. We have heard him do it before. I am just trying to outline, Mr. Speaker, that there is no educational benefit to relocating the headquarters. It is going to cost the Government money to relocate the headquarters. It does not matter where the headquarters of Eastern Community College is located. You have four other campuses, if there are meetings going to be held at four of the five campuses the representatives of the five campuses will have to travel to get to the other one. So I take great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in rising this afternoon to present this petition, very strongly opposing the suggestion in the White Paper on post secondary education to relocate that headquarters. I consequently table this petition for reference to the appropriate Department.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Member's time is up.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I understand fully the hon. Member's comments and the feelings of his constituents in this regard. I guess we started, Mr. Speaker, to look at the whole system in the Province. And our conclusion was that in order to provide greater equality of opportunity to improve the excellence in programs and to

provide for greater efficiency the post-secondary system had to be restructured. We started from that perspective.

The second decision we made was to change some of the boundaries of the colleges and it became obvious after we started to examine the whole system that the Eastern Community college, was a relatively small college that Avalon perhaps needed some changes and we concluded that we should combine Eastern and a portion of Avalon to provide a larger community college comparable to Central, comparable to Western, larger than Labrador and as a result we put together a proposal that Eastern and the Campus in Placentia and the Campus in Carbonear would make up a new community college. That was the first educational decision we made.

Secondly we started looking to headquarters, we could have left the headquarters in Salt Pond. We could have left the headquarters in Carbonear. But being for fairness and balance we did not look at it politically, we looked at it educationally. And there is no doubt from every perspective that the logical centre for the new college was Clarendville, for economic reasons and other reasons.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

DR. WARREN:

Of course, my friends from Conception Bay feel very strongly, and I respect their views, and I will meet with their people that the centre, the college headquarters should be in Carbonear. And from the Burin Peninsula they argue that it should be left in Salt Pond. We understand that. But we concluded



that the best educational decision was to put the headquarters in Clarendville and we received overwhelming support from the whole region. The hon. Member from the area is nodding. Thousands of people and even people from the Burin Peninsula and from Conception Bay admit that with the new college the logical location is to put it in Clarendville.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he raises one or two other good points. What about the space? What about the contracts? What about the people? I can assure you if after we consider all of these options at the end of April, if we conclude that what we propose in the White Paper is the correct way to go, I assure the hon. Members that we will consider the sensitivity of staff and the needs of staff in making any changes. We are not going to up-root everybody immediately. As far as space is concerned, Mr. Speaker, our hope is that with new programs, expanded programs, we will need that space. We will in the process of implementing our plans be sensitive to economic reasons and to staffing needs.

I assure the hon. Member of that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to have the opportunity once again to participate in the discussion on the movement of the headquarters from Salt Pond to Clarendville.

Mr. Speaker, let me say from the

outset -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do you have another petition?

MR. TOBIN:

Yes. I do. I have another petition that I will be presenting later, as it relates to the same issue, Mr. Speaker.

Let me say from the outset, Mr. Speaker, I will probably wait until tomorrow to present it, that there is no one on the Burin Peninsula who opposes any headquarters or any other organization, going to Clarendville. I am sure I can speak for my colleague from Carbonear, I would not expect there is anyone in Carbonear who opposes development in Clarendville. But, Mr. Speaker, what we have hear is a case of a headquarters being established -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, two. Okay, two. Sure, you were not here the other day when my colleague from Carbonear quite eloquently put forth the argument for the people in Carbonear, as myself and my colleague from Grand Bank did. And so he should, and he did a good job, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me say that what is going on here today is something that will see twenty-five people lose their jobs in Burin - is the Minister saying that nobody in Burin or nobody in Carbonear will lose their positions? Are you saying there is no one in Burin or no one in Carbonear who would lose their position?

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying here

today is that there is a headquarters established in Burin, the headquarters for the Eastern Community College is put in Burin for all of the right reasons, and there is no reason, Mr. Speaker, to remove it. There is no reason except, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the Member who is behind taking the headquarters from Burin is the Member for Bellevue, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:  
I suspect -

MR. BARRETT:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
You are for putting it in Clarendville and taking it from Burin and also taking it from Carbonear.

I would suspect that the Member for Bellevue is the monkey in the woodpile when it comes to taking things from the Burin Peninsula. I asked him for his support on a couple of issues on the Burin Peninsula. Did he say yes, like the Member for Placentia said, no indeed he did not. That is the man who has taken the headquarters from Burin and Carbonear and is responsible for convincing his colleagues to put it in Clarendville so he hopefully can get some constituency jobs. Now Mr. Speaker, probably that is the right reason for him to do it but in my opinion Mr. Speaker, it is the wrong reason for it to be done. I believe it should stay in Burin, Mr. Speaker, there is a group of people very active right now throughout the Burin Peninsula drawing up petitions Mr. Speaker. Forwarding petitions getting the

word out, that is the right location. There is no educational benefit and the Minister of Education can say what he likes Mr. Speaker. There is no educational benefit whatsoever to rob the headquarters and twenty five jobs from the people of Salt Pond. None Mr. Speaker and it is time the Minister of Education and his colleague the Minister of Finance Mr. Speaker, who I understand will become famous in the next few hours. There is, Mr. Speaker, no reason whatsoever for the Minister of Education to rob twenty five jobs from the Burin Peninsula. This government, Mr. Speaker, has been cruel enough in terms of robbing jobs from the Burin Peninsula, they have been cruel in every aspect of it. Over two hundred people have left the Marystown-Burin area in the last number of months, gone to the Mainland Mr. Speaker, some of them moving their families because this government has failed to support the Burin Peninsula the way it should.

Now we turn around today and we see this action by the Minister of Education. I recognize quite clearly that it is a White Paper, I know that, and I am hoping that the presentations that my colleague from Grand Bank and myself have made in this House, yesterday, day before yesterday and again today, Mr. Speaker, probably later on this evening or tomorrow or next week. We will be further arguing our case, because this issue has to be brought to the forefront. No Minister has a right after one year, after one year of trying a program. You have tried a program. We have put it in place -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. Gentleman's time is up.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I will have time to get back to it again.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition Mr. Speaker signed by forty-five people in the community of Williams Harbour. I did speak to the Member for Eagle River earlier today, and, in fact, knowing how we co-operate with each other, I suggested to the Member that I would give him the petition to present on behalf of forty-five residents in the fishing community of Williams Harbour, in fact, I would think it would include all of the voters in Williams Harbour. I think that is the complete 100 per cent of the voters in Williams Harbour, but, the Member, for some reason did not want to present the petition. No, Mr. Speaker, the Member would not present the petition and the answer the hon. Gentleman made was that if they wanted him to present the petition, they would have sent it to him. These names on the petition, Mr. Speaker, I could read right on through them, the Russells, the Campbells, the Burdens and the Sooleys and the Larkins - I think there are only five surnames and the Penneys. The prayer of the petition is : And the Minister of Health, referred to a letter a while ago, that I wrote to communities, I think he mentioned Peggy Twine, down in Pinsent Arm, whom I wrote and asked her would she sign a petition - Yes, Mr. Speaker, I sure did, and I wrote to Williams Harbour also, and said, look, if you are concerned about Health

Care, sign this petition and send it in to me and I will present it. I wrote to Pinsents Arm, I wrote to Paradise River, I wrote to Davis Inlet - Mr. Speaker, I have seventeen more petitions here yet, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to present everyone of them, because the people in those communities are concerned about Health Care. I read with interest today an excerpt from the Labradorian, a Robinson Blackmore Paper which is published in Happy Valley, Goose Bay, and, Mr. Speaker, I will table it because there is a column concerning Health Care. I will read, Sir, and I quote: 'First, there is the issue of the Melville Hospital. The Government had promised \$100,000 last year to at least plan for a new hospital. There was not even any mention of the money, this year. No indication of the Government even as a notion to replace the pitiful shack at Goose Bay. The reason is clear, no NATO, no hospital'. Mr. Speaker, this Government has now taken the stand. Because of the comments of the Prime Minister in Nova Scotia, a month or so ago, this Government has now taken a stand that unless NATO goes into Goose Bay, the patients, the people from the Labrador Coast, the people from Happy Valley, Goose Bay, will have to put up with going to get attention from the pitiful shack. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note what else was said. They said, Mr. Decker, and I assume they are referring to the Minister of Health. Mr. Decker, led us to believe hospital planning would go ahead whether or not NATO came to Goose Bay. Plans would have to be delayed until it was known how large a facility we need. What tripe? Just as soon as there are rumblings from the Prime Minister

in the Toronto Star that the base would go to Turkey our Government abandoned the whole idea of a new hospital. It is as if the Government's attitude toward a new hospital hinged upon the kind of tax revenue they could garner from NATO investment.

Here they are putting the investment they were going to get from foreign countries before the health and well-being of people from Labrador. I think it is incumbent upon the Minister of Health to make sure there is money provided for a new hospital in Goose Bay and for the Minister of Health not to treat the people in Labrador as second class citizens as the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs is doing, and as the Minister of Transportation is doing. The least thing one Minister in this Government can do is show compassion to the people in Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to say a few words of support on the petition so ably presented by my colleague the Member for Torngat Mountains on behalf of forty-five residents of Williams Harbour. I am surprised that the Member for the District who was given the occasion to present this petition on behalf of his constituents refused to present it, Mr. Speaker. Knowing that Member I am sure he had some reason for not presenting it but I do not think, certainly I hope not anyway, that the Member would not present it only because the Member for Torngat Mountains, who is being criticized for doing his job as an MHA.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It is now 4:30.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Too, bad, Mr. Speaker.

### Late Show

MR. SPEAKER:

We will move to the first question on the Late Show. It is presented by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition who states his dissatisfaction with an answer given by the Minister of Finance.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, it is not very difficult to be dissatisfied with an answer given by the Minister of Finance. The most amazing thing, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, as we have come to see in this House over the last twenty-something days, since the Budget was brought down, is that you in fact get an answer from the Minister of Finance at all. The Minister spends most of the time glued to his seat. I do not know if he is going to put an extra tax on crazy glue because the Minister cannot get out of his seat most of the time to answer a question. When he does get up, Mr. Speaker, it is only to make a fool of himself and make a fool of the Government. If I had to put forward any proof, Mr. Speaker, witness what the Minister had to say in debate in this House last Tuesday night that is causing a kerfuffle around this country like you would not believe, Mr. Speaker, and right here in our own Province.

But Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister of Finance to explain how he could have the gall to try to get people in this province to believe that his budget was a progressive step forward, Mr. Speaker, in terms of educational financing in Newfoundland and Labrador. Now at the time I asked that question, Mr. Speaker, I didn't have the benefit of the analysis that we had carried out. We had carried out our own analysis but I didn't have the benefit of the observations and the analysis of professionals who are involved in the education system of this province.

Since I asked the question, Mr. Speaker, some groups have now come forward with their own analysis. For example the School Trustees Association, Mr. Speaker, and they have - I don't know who the president is, I know who the Executive Director is, but I don't know the president, I don't know the president at all but I do know who the Executive Director is. I believe he is an old buddy of the mad doctor too Mr. Speaker if the Minister of Finance was to be honest.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, suffice to say what I said in this House this week was correct. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, - Is there anything in Beauchesne that can be used to cool down the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker? I have to save a little bit of voice for some time after 12:00 tonight, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that despite the announcement in the budget that there was to be a sizable increase in the per pupil grant to school boards, the fact of the matter is

that it will only amount, if I remember correctly, to an increase of about 0.7 or 0.8 per cent simply because the Government knows there are declining enrollments.

The number of students in our school system in this Province is declining each year, so you have to take that into account. The Government also knows, Mr. Speaker, that there is such a thing as inflation which the Minister in his budget is predicting to run at about four per cent this year, so that will wipe out any increase in the per pupil operating grant that school boards get, Mr. Speaker, now confirmed by the School Trustees Association. And on top of that is the Minister of Finance, who after twenty something days after bringing down his budget still has not made it know to education institutions, to school boards, to hospitals, to the universities, to the community colleges whether or not they are going to be forced to pay this payroll tax, Mr. Speaker.

Now if school boards are, in fact - and we can only say, if, because the Minister has not said aye or nay, he has not said yes or no. He has had glue-itis and he cannot get out of his seat. But Mr. Speaker, if in fact the school boards have to pay the Goods and Services Tax the school boards will, in fact, receive less money for operating this year than they received last year, Mr. Speaker. So therefore this Government in its great pronouncement in the budget was a fraud in Education just as it was a fraud in a dozen and one areas, Mr. Speaker, that we brought out day after day in this House since the Minister brought down that fraudulent document called the budget, Mr.

Speaker.

DR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, let me repeat something I said earlier. I believe in the context of these difficult times the Education Budget was a good budget this year, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

DR. WARREN:  
Just wait. Just hold it now and I will give you the answer, and I will give it to you in estimates again if you want it the next time.

Mr. Speaker the total increase for Education this year was seven per cent over last years expenditure. Mr. Speaker, not only did we increase expenditures by seven per cent, but we increased the proportion of the total budget. Under the Tory's the budget in Education went down from about twenty-seven per cent about ten years ago to about twenty-four per cent last year. We picked it up. We increased the share of the pie slightly this year under these very difficult circumstances. That is the first point.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, last year this Government increased school tax equalization by \$5.5 million. The Tory's in 1986 put \$2 million into school tax equalization. In 1987 they put \$2.5 million in. In 1988 they put \$4.5 million in. What did we do last year? We went to \$10 million in one year and we have maintained that this year.

Let me tell you one other thing, Mr. Speaker. For five years the Tory's put \$20 million into capital costs. We, last year, the first year in office we increased that from \$20 million to \$27 million, and we guaranteed it for this year and for the next year - \$27 million. So we increased very substantially last year the amount of money for school tax equalization and for capital construction.

Now, just a little bit about this year. Here is what we did this year. We increased the operational grants by four per cent from 265 to 275. Yes, enrollment is going down. 3000 fewer students. 2500 to 3000 fewer students every year. The enrollments have gone down from 162,000 in 1971 down to 130,000 now, and it is going down to 100,000 at the turn of the century. 100,000 and still this Government is going to keep on increasing the expenditures in education.

Let me tell you about scholarships, we increased the funding for scholarships. We increased teachers salaries. The budget for teacher salaries is up by 9.3 per cent. We have computers in schools, and what a response I have gotten from that initiative. \$1.5 million this year for computers. 'It is not enough,' Dr. Vokey says, or Mr. Hounsell says. It is not enough, but over the next five years we are going to increase providing computers in the schools.

DR. WARREN:  
Instructional materials came to a half million this year. We are increasing funding for distance education, for extra materials for other purposes in the schools,

tremendous, and I assure the hon. Member that we will continue to insure that this Province has the best possible education system so that our people can compete with the world.

Now as to the second question he raised, this question about the payroll tax, let me inform the hon. Member that in a very short period of time the Minister of Finance will make quite clear the position of everybody with respect to the payroll tax and let me repeat what he said to you. I am just repeating what the hon. Minister said, my friend said a few weeks ago to school boards, "Do not worry, he said,, you got nothing to worry about" he said, now I do not know what percisely that means, but I can gather what it means, he said also to the University, " you will not be hurt" he said that in this House. So that is all I am going to say about the Minister, because he, my very confident friend is going to outline everything in due course and the whole province will understand, thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for St. John's East.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and I am rising to re-address the question that was asked, an economic question on the net cost benefit to the Province of the influx of refugees, directed to the Minister

of Finance, because it is in fact an economic question. I re-addressed the question on Wednesday and I did receive a documentation from the Minister of Finance which I have read, and I think it shows that the Minister in fact was already thinking along the same lines and had begun to do some analysis. It is not complete, and there are some problems with it.

Under the document tabled, the Minister has identified there would be sixteen million dollars in Provincial support payments required based on 23 hundred refugees a month over a 12 month period, now we have no way of knowing whether that in fact will follow through, but that is based on the peak we have now continuing for twelve months, and it shows that there is a two million dollar benefit in RST payments from Federal money and a 3.5 million dollar general tax gain from the economic multiplier effect, I presume he has used the multiplier before, but I am not sure because there is no details. It does not include what I would have to feel would be an equivalent effect from RST from the Provincial revenue, which will be 2 million dollars, now there may be arguments for that in accounting practice, but in point of fact, if a million dollars in Provincial money is spent, and on every cent that is spent there is an RST tax back, it should be the same RST tax, either you are giving refugees an 88 cent dollar or you are getting 12 per cent back, one way or the other you have to take it.

Now what is also not calculated in here is the effect of job creation, and I have just used the 33 million dollar total figure identified under CAP and the

Provincial support as the over all money that is being spent, and assuming that 30 per cent of that is spent in salaries, that would lead to 10 million dollar being spent in wages and benefits. If you take an average salary of-

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please, order please. I do not know if the hon. Member is having difficulty speaking, but I am certainly having difficulty hearing. The hon. Member for St. John's East.

MS DUFF:

There would be five hundred and twenty six new jobs created over that period using the 30 percent salaries on ten million dollars of wages and (inaudible). These people are not on U.I or on welfare, if they were they would be being paid out of the public purse, which should show if you look at it, \$12,000.00 a year being the average payment for a family of two on social assistance, approximately 6.3 million dollars we are not paying out because new jobs have been created.

That, to me, leaves a net cost of \$1.7 million. So if we can get 526 new jobs created for \$1.7 million dollars or \$3,200 dollars a job, that is a very good bang for the buck. It is twenty-five cent dollars, for which we are getting a tremendous boost to our hospitality industry at a very, very down time.

Now, the other question I asked, which is not answered in this, relates to the fact, what are we trying to do to encourage some of these highly qualified people to stay in the Province? This paper says that while history has shown that in long-range terms these

refugees become productive citizens and contribute to the economic well-being of the country, they do so in major mainland cities but not here locally, because this province is a mere gateway. The Minister has indicated that nobody is being forced to leave. I asked, what are we doing to encourage some of these people to stay so that we can get the long-term benefit of their productivity? I understand nothing is being done. From talking to the refugees, they have had very little positive contact that is encouraging them to do anything else but go to Toronto as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in the few months that I have been in the job down there, I have heard and read a great many proposals for starting new industries, a great many proposals. The Member opposite is suggesting that we set up a refugee industry whereby we bring in refugees and keep them here and get some federal dollars for it, and that, then, will enhance our economy. Before I get into exposing the economic analysis of that proposal let me say this: The people in Newfoundland welcome refugees. We are very pleased to extend our hospitality to refugees. This province is noted for its hospitality, and quite properly so, and we will do everything we can for any refugee who comes to our shores, to accommodate them, to make them at home here, if we can at all. We are a poor province. But most refugees come here on the way somewhere else. They are on their



way to Ontario and other places, because there they have their friends and other reasons.

We are not inhospitable. We want to do what we can, but the Member's basic proposal here is that this become a new industry, and that we somehow take the \$1,100 a month that it costs per refugee, and that we somehow get an economic benefit. According to the analysis that has been prepared by officials in my department, we do get a bit of tax on it and there is a small multiplier effect, but when you subtract that from the cost to the Province, the 50 per cent of the cost of their board and lodging at \$40 a day total, you come to a net loss per refugee, per year, of \$5,600.

So, Mr. Speaker, this as an industry cannot work. It cannot work. It is almost as foolish as the other proposal they are so famous for opposite, namely, the Sprung proposal. As an economic benefit, it will not work. But, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we are very pleased to extend our hospitality to the refugees, and as long as our money holds out, they are welcome to be here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The third question is by the hon Member for Mount Pearl, expressing his dissatisfaction with an answer given by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

The hon the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have seen another demonstration

of the Minister of Finance's incompetence again this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, dealing with the fire department for the City of Mount Pearl. This is a very serious issue, Mr. Speaker. The City of Mount Pearl, as I mentioned yesterday in my question, has a responsibility to provide fire protection services. The city council also has the responsibility and the right to decide what is in the best interests of the people of Mount Pearl; how best can they provide fire protection services and which is the most efficient method of providing those services. Successive studies, Mr. Speaker, have shown very clearly that the City of Mount Pearl is not now adequately serviced by fire protection services - it is not now adequately serviced. The former Fire Chief and the Fire Commissioner will certainly confirm that, and they have confirmed that in writing.

MR. WALSH:  
Why did they not accept the offer last fall?

Mr. WINDSOR:  
The offer of what?

MR. WALSH:  
The offer to man the fire station.

MR. WINDSOR:  
The offer to man the fire station. I say to the hon. the Member for Mount Scio, Mr. Speaker - I said it yesterday. He obviously was not listening. I will say it again - because the City of Mount Pearl has signed an agreement with the Canadian Union of Public employees, which is the union the City of Mount Pearl

deals with, a five year contract to provide fire fighting services to 1994. They legally cannot enter into a contract with any other union, nor can they allow another union to go into that fire hall and provide services. They cannot do it Mr. Speaker. The hon. Minister may well come back with that argument, so I have answered his argument before he makes it. Legal advice to the City of Mount Pearl is that they cannot do it, they will be in conflict of the agreement they have signed with their own union.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, the City of Mount Pearl is now being serviced by the Brookfield Fire Station. There is no fire station in Mount Pearl, the only city of 25,000 people in Canada, in North America, which does not have a fire station within that city, the only one, and the City of Mount Pearl is paying almost \$2 million a year to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador for that service.

Studies done by Professor Gar Pynn and by Woods Gordon indicate that the City of Mount Pearl can provide a far superior service at a saving of \$600,000 dollars a year. What this government is doing, Mr. Speaker, is forcing the Council of Mount Pearl to spend \$600,000 a year more than they need to for a substandard, unsatisfactory service. Now I do not know how the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who also represents part of that city, can justify that to his constituents and to mine.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, is should the City of Mount Pearl amalgamate under the Minister's new proposal, should they even expand in accordance with the

proposal of the City of Mount Pearl, which is to simply take in Paradise and surrounding areas, because of what the people in those areas are paying, which is about \$40 per household versus \$220 in Mount Pearl and in St. John's, the City of Mount Pearl, then, would pay an extra \$400,000 a year for fire protection services over and above what those people are paying now, because those people would now be in the city. So that is another way for the Minister's amalgamation to grab \$400,000 out of the pockets of the taxpayers of Mount Pearl.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that the city has a right; they have established a fire department, they have built a fire department with the permission, with the cooperation of the previous administration. We had two fire trucks delivered almost a year ago now which are sitting there, state of the art fire trucks, as good as any in this Province, which are sitting there in that depot, which have never moved, and other equipment. An order was placed a couple of days ago, I understand, for an emergency response vehicle, which the Premier tried to block, or rather which some Minister tried to block, tried to keep federal funding from going into Mount Pearl. So it was bought now through the cooperation of the Lions Club and the City Council. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the city is ready to move ahead. They have done interviews; they have six hundred applications on file.

The Fire Commissioner, who is the chief advisor to Government on fire protection services, with the permission of the Minister went to Halifax with the City of Mount

Pearl and conducted interviews for a fire chief. The Fire Commissioner, in his report, I say to the Minister - he will not release the report - but I tell him the Fire Commissioner has said that the City of Mount Pearl should have their own fire station. He has said that regional services are not necessarily the best and that experiences in other parts of Canada have shown that, and his recommendation, Mr. Speaker, is that the City of Mount Pearl establish their own fire department.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. WINDSOR:  
So, I ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, will he now stop -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave! By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR:  
Give me another half hour.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
No.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR:  
Will he now authorize the city to proceed with manning and establishing that fire department?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Municipal & Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:  
Mr. Speaker, I do not know how

often I have to answer these questions. It is about four times now, I suppose, I have been asked the same questions over and over again. It is like a recording. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, the Mount Pearl station, as we all know, was put there under the previous Administration. He talks about a contract entered into with a different union. It is not effective, by the way, it is not an effective contract until it is put in place and you have men hired. He talks about a contract they have in place. I might suggest to the hon. Member that they also have a contract in place and are very much a part of another agreement.

MR. WINDSOR:  
Imposed upon them.

MR. GULLAGE:  
Not imposed upon them, they have been part of that agreement for a long time.

MR. WINDSOR:  
They have been trying to get out of it for several years now.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I remind the hon. the Member for Mount Pearl that he has just spoken for five minutes and now I am going to allow the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs to have his five minutes.

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:  
The fact of the matter is, they have been part of an agreement for a long time, paying their share for firefighting services in the northeast Avalon. They are not the only partner to that agreement. Unfortunately, years

ago the department was called the St. John's Fire Department - totally misnamed; the wrong name. It should have been called the metro fire department or something similar, so that any misunderstanding would be cleared up. Because it is not a St. John's fire department. Sure, St. John's is part of it, but it also services five other areas, five other towns and cities, and Mount Pearl, as I mentioned, is very much a part of it and part of the contract that is in place with a union.

Now, for the Member to suggest that Mount Pearl should simply walk away from that obligation they have, an obligation they entered into on behalf of their people and are very much a partner in, and leave firefighters on the streets, some 55 or 60 firefighters, is blatantly wrong, and he continues to suggest that over and over again in spite of the fact that the Mount Pearl Council and City Manager, along with the City Manager and Mayor and Council of St. John's, have agreed in good faith to enter into negotiations with the union that is in place towards formation of a regional fire department to service the northeast Avalon and service the existing partners in the present fire department, the present arrangement, and we are proceeding to do just that. So to suggest that we should not continue on that way in good faith, considering we do have the union agreement in place, Mr. Speaker, is obviously wrong. As far as the station in Mount Pearl, is concerned, last year I offered to man that station.

MR. WINDSOR:

You cannot do it, and you know it.

MR. GULLAGE:

And Mount Pearl rejected my offer and that was obviously wrong. To try to make a point on one hand, as the member has done, that we do not have adequate fire protection and yet I offered to man the station with firefighters in the meantime, with no obligation as I said, because we do not know if we are going to get an agreement and we are going to form the regional fire department. But in the meantime, I said, until we can enter into negotiation and see this thing through, in all fairness to all the players involved, all the players, including the union -

MR. WINDSOR:

How long are you going to keep Mount Pearl protected?

GULLAGE:

In all fairness, I said, in the meantime, I will man the Mount Pearl fire station if there is any concern. You will not have any concern, because it will be manned with firefighters and the Mount Pearl Council said no. Now regrettably, they have retracted that, of course. They now wish they had agreed, but they did say no at the time. The Member likes to conveniently say that I am the one who is not manning that fire department, when I offered to do so. Now that is on the record. Everybody knows that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

Mr. GULLAGE:

The Member mentions an emergency response vehicle. As we know, those vehicles are decided by way of location in concert with my Department. To say that I spoke out against the emergency response vehicle, how ridiculous!

Everybody knows the response vehicle is going in Mount Pearl as a result of my agreement with its going in Mount Pearl.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

Mr. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, one final comment. He made the point himself that I represent part of Mount Pearl, and to suggest in any way that I would proceed in a fashion that would not be in the best interest of Mount Pearl is obviously ludicrous.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would like to welcome to the galleries this evening on behalf of hon. Members, Mr. Frank Coleman, Chairperson of the Board of Governors of the Fisheries Institute of Applied Arts and Technology, Corner Brook.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until 7:00 p.m.

The House resumed at 7:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

When we adjourned for the Late Show, the hon. the Member for Kilbride was one minute into a petition. Four minutes left. The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

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

I just want to say, as I was saying when you left the Chair earlier, that I want to congratulate the Member for Torngat Mountains for presenting a petition from forty-five residents of Williams Harbour, a petition which criticizes the Government for its health care system on the coast of Labrador, particularly in that community.

I was very surprised, talking to my colleague, the Member for Torngat Mountains, knowing him to be a very fair and honourable man, that he had this petition in his hand and he went to the Member who represents that District, which I thought was a good gesture, and offered that Member the opportunity to present the petition in this House of Assembly. I thought I should commend the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains for making such a gesture. I do not know if I would be statesman enough to even think of that, but the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains was.

But to my surprise, Mr. Speaker, to my great surprise, and I must say this shocked me, because the hon. the Member for Eagle River has impressed me since he came to this House, I think he is doing a good job, I thought, until today, he was doing a good job, he

refused to present a petition on behalf of the residents of his District. Then, Mr. Speaker, I understand he criticized the Hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains for soliciting the petition, for doing his job as an M.H.A., which is the silliest thing I have ever heard of.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to represent people throughout the Province, and for an M.H.A. to be doing a job and a good job, especially as the Member for Torngat Mountains has been doing, to be criticized by hon. Members opposite for doing that job, obviously they do not have the experience yet to know what the job is, so we can forgive them for that slip of the tongue, I would say.

When I was Minister of Rural Agriculture and Northern Development, Mr. Speaker, I did have the opportunity to visit Williams Harbour. It is not an easy place to live, I would say, not a place I would be able to live in too easily. It is a struggle for the people to survive there, Mr. Speaker, but the people there do it very well. When I was speaking to the people along that coast I asked them several times if they were satisfied with Government the services I, as a Minister, was providing them. Just to show the individuality and the hard work of these people, they said to me, We do not want anything special. We are not looking for special services, we are not looking for anything special, just give us the regular services Government is expected to provide. A good mail service is what they expect - they will pay there own way, a good health care system, which is what people expect from a government. Mr.

Speaker, this really impressed me and is one of the reasons why I am standing in my place today supporting the people of William's Harbour and supporting my colleague, the Member for Torngat Mountains, on this petition.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. DUMARESQUE:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Eagle River.

MR. DUMARESQUE:  
Mr Speaker, I rose the other day to support a similar petition presented by the Member for Torngat Mountains, presented on behalf of a number of people in the different communities in my District. Certainly I support the improvement of health care throughout the coast of Labrador, and I highlighted some of the reasons why the other day. I have no problem today also supporting the people of William's Harbour. While I know that in previous times the Minister of the previous Government visited William's Harbour, today I had the Mayor of the community here in the House and a couple of other people from William's Harbour, who had to come in to tell me that they thought it was the best Member they ever saw for William's Harbour since 1949.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, since the Liberals have come back into power, the people of William's Harbour have had a half million dollars spent for telephones, the first time in their history - a half million dollars. We have for the first

time now some \$3.5 million dollars being spent on a new airstrip in William's Harbour and, Mr. Speaker, for this very small community, this year we are going to put a new fish plant in William's Harbour.

Mr. Speaker, I can only let the facts speak for themselves, and I can only indicate to the hon. Member what has happened and what is going to continue to happen, not only for health care, but for every other thing that will affect the social and economic well-being of every Labradorian on the coast of Labrador. That will continue, Sir, with this government and with this Member. I will tell the Member to continue his efforts, to continue his grandstanding, but the next time around we will vote, as we always have, with the great Liberal party.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I have another petition to present. I listened with interest to the hon. gentleman, but I found he did not address health care in Williams Harbour; he addressed other items but not health care.

Mr. Speaker, my next petition - in fact, I have seventeen here - is from Norman Bay, in the District of Eagle River again, and it is signed by twenty-three residents of the community of Norman Bay which, I would think, is about 90 per cent of the voters in that little community. Again,, they are asking for better health care.

MR. DUMARESQUE:  
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

I say to the hon. gentleman, he should give the results of the last election in Williams Harbour and Norman Bay. I am sure everyone in this House would like to know what the results were in those two communities.

Mr. Speaker, this petition is calling upon the government to have a public inquiry into health care in Labrador. The hon. gentleman can say what he likes about what this present Government is doing. The people are concerned about health care, not only in Norman Bay, but right along the Labrador Coast. And the Minister of Health is not doing his job, because, Mr. Speaker, a new hospital in Happy Valley/Goose Bay would mean improved services along the coast of Labrador.

We now know NATO is not going to go to Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What? What?

MR. WARREN:

We know, Mr. Speaker, NATO will not be going to Labrador. And not only that, this Government knows. If they did not know, they would be proceeding with the construction of the hospital. Mr. Speaker, by not going ahead with the planning, this Government knows that NATO is doomed for Labrador.

I say to the hon. the Minister of Health and to the Premier, if it is not true, why do you not go ahead with the plans for the new hospital? We do not need NATO for Health Care in Labrador. We have a Government here. A government is supposed to serve all people equally, and the people on the Labrador Coast need just as good

health care as you do in St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be referred to the Minister of the Department to which it relates, and I hope NATO will not stop the people on the Labrador coast from getting proper health care, which they deserve.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I once again wish to rise in my place to support the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains who obviously has been working very hard in the District of Eagle River as well as the District of Torngat Mountains, on behalf of the residents, all the people living in Labrador. The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains has been working very hard on their behalf for as long as I have known him. It does not matter the community or the district, if people phone the hon. Member for Torngat Mountains for assistance, he will try to do his best to make the concerns of the people of Labrador well known to this present Government, as he did with the Government I was part of two years ago, Mr. Speaker.

I particularly want to stand up here for the residents of Norman Bay, Mr. Speaker, another community I had the privilege of visiting while I was Minister of Northern Development, and responsible for Northern Development. I must say the people in Norman Bay are among the nicest people I have met in my



eleven years as a politician in this Province, and in my fifteen years as a surveyor in this Province. I have travelled extensively throughout the Province and I have not met any better people than the people in Norman Bay. They are very individualistic people, Mr. Speaker. They have worked very hard to make a living, to scratch out a living with the very rough conditions on the coast of Labrador. They are very independent people, Mr. Speaker, and they too have the same attitude as the people in the Williams Harbour area, who say all they want from government - they do not want any special privileges - are expected Government services. They do not expect a road to be built to them right away. It is a long ways away from the road system in the Province now, Mr. Speaker, but they do expect a reasonable coastal boat service, which is a federal responsibility and which can be improved on their behalf. They do expect a reasonable postal service, which, again, is not a responsibility of this government but can be improved for the residents of that area. They do expect, Mr. Speaker, reasonable communications, which can be provided and has been provided through a lot of federal money for the coast of Labrador. It is a reasonable system, but it can be improved.

Mr. Speaker, one thing they have great concern about is the health of their families, obviously, themselves and their families. They should be able to expect good health care services for their community, for their families, so that they can be cared for in time of need. Mr. Speaker this is a reasonable request. It is a

reasonable expectation from people anywhere in this province, that a good health care system be provided and improved.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems I know they have is that they feel, because their health care needs are looked after from St. Anthony, there might be a need for more local input into the decisions made to provide health care to the families in Norman Bay, Labrador, Mr. Speaker.

This concern is not only in Norman Bay, Mr. Speaker, it is not only in Williams Harbour, this concern is all along the coast, both in Eagle River and in the District of Torngat Mountains, that they expect, and they should expect, reasonable government services, the same as we expect here in St. John's and throughout the Island part of our province. These services should be provided to areas such as Norman Bay and Williams Harbour on the Labrador Coast, Mr. Speaker.

It is with great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I support my hon. colleague, the member for Torngat Mountains. I commend him once again for the hard work he is doing on behalf of the people of Labrador. And, Mr. Speaker, the last time I spoke, if I made any remarks which seemed to indicate I did not think a lot of the member for Eagle River himself, I did not mean that, Mr. Speaker, and I withdraw it. When I spoke last time I commended the Hon. the Member for Eagle River, and I do so again.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

The hon. the Member for Eagle River.

MR. DUMARESQUE:

Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to acknowledge the benefits of this particular petition. I have to say, after listening to a couple of the Members and previous Ministers, what audacity! What audacity! When the previous Minister of the previous Government sat in a back seat in a hall in North West River, when the North West River Hospital was being closed down around his ears, he said, I did not know anything about it. The Minister for Labrador was standing there in the back of the room, the hospital was closing down around his ears, and he said, I did not know anything about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DUMARESQUE:

No, it was not a Tory. It was not a Tory, was it? No. No. It was somebody who was totally dedicated to building up the municipal infrastructure in Labrador. Sure, that is who it was. And who is it, Mr. Speaker, who is now going to be building two new hospitals in Torngat Mountains District? Who is it? Is it going to be a Tory? It is going to be a Liberal! The Liberals have always done it for Labrador. What audacity! What audacity! What we have seen are Ministers going around in helicopters, settling down in small communities, giving us platitudes we were sick and tired of, and we will take no more of it. We will soon tell you, Mr. hon. Member for Torngat Mountains. The next time around we will tell you what platitudes you have been putting to the people of Labrador.

We have had 17 years of Tory rule, Tory propaganda, Tory audacity, Tory misuse of public funds and Tory misuse and ignorance of the people of Labrador.

I have nothing, nothing, Sir, to come here and answer to you about. The people of Labrador know exactly what I have done for them. What I have done is work hard, not go around in helicopters misusing public funds and making promises and platitudes to the people of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

Before recognizing the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains I ought to remind hon. Members at this juncture that in speaking to petitions, hon. Members should keep their comments to the material allegations of the petitions. The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a petition, Mr. Speaker, to present on behalf of 104 residents of the town, city, community, fishing village of Hopedale.

Hopedale, I believe, is in the District of Torngat Mountains, where, for almost the past eleven years they have had a Member who has worked very hard. They have voted that person in now on four different occasions, and, Mr. Speaker, there will be another four.

Let me say that this petition concerns a public inquiry into health care. The hon. gentleman

just mentioned a Minister in the former Government who did not know anything about the hospital closing down in North West River. In the Labrador paper I received today, Mr. Speaker, it is reported that a Minister of this present Government has had nine phone calls made to his office by a reporter and has not returned one call yet.

Now about health care in Labrador. That is what I call a Minister concerned about Labrador, a Minister of this Government who has had nine phone calls made to his office and not one returned.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who is it?

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, it is the hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands. And this was over the last two weeks.

I say health care is important to the people of Hopedale, Norman Bay, Pinsent Arm, Paradise River and everywhere else on the Labrador Coast, and, I say to the hon. gentleman for Eagle River, why does he not get up when I finish and say that he will continue to fight for health care, because he has not mentioned health care yet. He spoke twice, but he never mentioned health care. He spoke about the two hospitals going to be built in Hopedale and Davis Inlet. Where is the money coming from? The money is coming from the Federal Tory Government, Mr. Speaker, from the Federal Tory Government, an agreement that was put in place by the former Tory Government of Newfoundland with the Tory government in Ottawa. Now, where is the money coming from?

I say to my hon. colleague, do not take credit where credit is not due. Credit is not due you fellows for this one.

Mr. Speaker, let me clue up by saying that Hopedale has a nursing station at the present time which is practically unfit to look after patients. It is a building that is falling down around their ears. There is urgent need for a new clinic in that area. I have to close by saying this. The Minister of Health had his officials draw up plans for a hospital or nursing station in Hopedale. Hopedale has 502 people at the present time, and you will never see more than 600 people there, maximum, yet the plans the Minister had a consultant draw up will cost, I do not know, probably \$30,000 or \$40,000, plans for a nursing clinic equivalent to the one the Government had built in Forteau, which looks after 3,500 people.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the Member for Torngat Mountains, on behalf of the residents of Hopedale, his constituents who have seen fit to elect him time and time again because of the tremendous job he has done in that particular area, as he has done in the rest of his constituency. 104

people, I think, represents a sizeable percentage of the people in that particular community. I guess everybody, whether you are Liberal or Tory recognizes the fact that on the Coast of Labrador there is a difficult problem, a difficult situation with respect to health care.

I think what the Member has done is to be commended. The approach he has taken by indicating to people and residents in communities on the coast of Labrador that he is quite prepared to represent them in the House of Assembly by presenting petitions on their behalf to call to the attention of the Government and the authorities the need for this improved health care is an admirable approach. It is unfortunate that other Members in the House, representing communities in other constituencies, do not do more of it, Mr. Speaker.

I have to say I was somewhat surprised and taken aback by the attack of the Member for Eagle River, particularly in the initial presentation of a petition for some people in his own constituency. He made reference to seventeen years of Tory propaganda. Seventeen years of Tory audacity was another word he used, I think. Now, there may have been another one. I am not quite sure.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Mismanagement.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mismanagement. Mr. Speaker, let me just say this in remarking on that and conclude my support for this particular petition. In supporting this petition, seventeen years of Tory

propaganda, seventeen years of Tory audacity and seventeen of something else, I am not sure what it was he said. Seventeen years! Mr. Speaker, already in this Province today we have had more signs of audacity, more signs of arrogance, more signs of incompetence, more signs of cutbacks on things like Labrador Travel, more Meech Lake, more increases in electricity, more job losses, more economic devastation in this Province, Mr. Speaker, in just one year of Liberal rule than we had in seventeen years of Tory rule.

MR. SIMMS:  
The only thing we have to be thankful for, Mr. Speaker, is that I do not think there is going to be much of an opportunity for the Liberals to show what they can do in seventeen years, thank God!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I have another petition, but if some Member on the other side wants to support the previous petition, I would be willing to yield.

Mr. Speaker, I have so many here, I am taking them in order. The next one is from the community of Paradise River, in the District of Eagle River. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are three petitions I have presented from Eagle River and I have more; there are more are coming and I cannot help it. Today, the hon. gentleman was given the opportunity to present petitions on behalf of his constituents, and he said no.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:  
I can go to 10:00 or 10:30. I can keep going, Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I would urge the hon. Member to get on with presenting the petition, please.

MR. WARREN:  
Okay, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

I guess you are aware of what the prayer is. It says, We want proper health care in Labrador. We need a public inquiry. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to read from the Labradorian, a paper that is circulated in Labrador. Only a few moments ago the Member for Eagle River talked about all the good things this new Government has been doing. I will quote, Mr. Speaker: 'The Wells Government went into office promising to address Labrador's problems; they promised to take a fresh look at the way capital funding is distributed and to divorce policies from business decisions. The new Budget, so highly praised by the Newfoundland media, is a big step backwards for Labrador. Not only was there no money for improvements to transportation, but the air subsidy was cut and a \$100,000 budget for planning the Lake Melville Hospital was scrapped. The Newfoundland Government is broke and they must show restraint, but not at the expense of the health of Labradorians.'

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

Not now, I do not think, but he was one of the owners of it.

'North, south, east or west, Labrador is used by Newfoundland, receiving little or nothing in return for what the Government takes from Labrador.'

Mr. Speaker, this is true. This Government has shown it now by cancelling the new hospital for Happy Valley/Goose Bay because of no NATO. Mr. Speaker, they are taking everything out of Labrador and putting absolutely nothing back. I say to my hon. colleague, I would think that very shortly he is going into the Cabinet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:  
Yes, Mr. Speaker, very shortly my hon. colleague will be in the circle. When the Kitchen comes out of the Cabinet, then, Mr. Speaker, I would say, the Eagle River man will go into the Cabinet. I hope the hon. gentleman from Eagle River will get up and support this petition. This is calling for health care in his district, calling for health care in Paradise River, where there are only 14 families.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Is there an airstrip?

MR. WARREN:  
Yes, an airstrip built by the P.C. Government in Ottawa and the P.C. Government of Newfoundland. I say to my hon. colleague, stand up and support this petition and say you are going to call for a public inquiry, you are going to get the Minister to make sure that a public inquiry is called for and called for immediately.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my colleague who presented the petition from the residents of Paradise River. Mr. Speaker, I never realized there were so many Paradises in Newfoundland. There is Big Paradise and Little Paradise in my District, there is a Paradise out here, and now we have Paradise River in Labrador, and it looks like the saviour is from Torngat Mountains.

I stand to support this petition, obviously, after listening. I do not mind admitting I am a person not too familiar with the coast of Labrador, but I have had the opportunity to sit in caucus and Cabinet with my colleague, and now my colleague from Menihek, and I have had the opportunity to listen and hear about what is taking place in Labrador, and obviously I have visited there on a few occasions. But one thing is blatantly clear tonight, and that is the people of Eagle River are crying out for some assistance. And for some reason, I do not know what the reason is, but for some reason, Mr. Speaker, the people of Eagle River have selected my colleague here to make the presentations on their behalf. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if that is any reflection on their Member or not. That is not for me to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No. No.

MR. TOBIN:

Far be it for me to decide whether or not he is a good Member. I do

not live in his District. I am not familiar with what he does in his District. But there is a bit of a message, Mr. Speaker, when someone else has to make these presentations.

The other thing that comes to my mind tonight, or comes to my attention, is that if the Member for Torngat said he has been elected on four occasions down there and he is here tonight presenting petitions on behalf of the people of Eagle River, Mr. Speaker, I wonder where he will be running in the next election? Because not only Eagle River, but, I know for a fact, there is a

AN HON. MEMBER:

A strong lobby.

MR. TOBIN:

- strong lobby out in the Bellevue District for my colleague to run out there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, they should not laugh. They should not laugh. Because the present Member for Bellevue, only two months before the last election campaign, figured the District was going tory and asked some of us if we thought he could win the nomination against a city Member. Do not tell us, Mr. Speaker. Is there any wonder there is a strong lobby for the Member for Torngat Mountains to go out there?

Mr. Speaker, to get back to the petition, I am sorry if I strayed, and I apologize to the House.

MR. HOGAN:

(Inaudible) hear you.

MR. TOBIN:

If you keep representing the rest of your district like you have Long Harbour, they might be after him to go out there, too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HOGAN:

Come on down!

MR. TOBIN:

By the way, your colleague from Carbonear asked me to say that.

There is a strong, clear message in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that the people from Eagle River are not only crying out for health care services, they are crying out for someone to speak on their behalf in this Assembly. Tonight we have witnessed that and, I am sure, in the next several hours we will see more petitions being presented; I believe my colleague has seventeen. Mr. Speaker, as the night progresses, we will probably see more petitions.

But, Your Honour, this petition is something this Government should take seriously. I have noticed in the presentation of all the petitions tonight dealing with health care, the Minister of Health has totally ignored them.

MR. WINDSOR:

He will not answer calls from his own constituents.

MR. TOBIN:

And, Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised. The Minister of Health cannot return calls from his own constituency, from the fishermen. Ask my colleague from Grand Bank, the spokesman for fisheries on our side.

I believe it is incumbent on this

Government -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down!

MR. TOBIN:

No, I will not sit down. I will sit down when the Speaker tells me to sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

It is about here.

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I have more petitions, but I want to get on to the Meech Lake Debate.

### Orders of the Day

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Motion 13, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame! shame!

MR. FLIGHT:

It is about time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Motion 13: To move pursuant to Standing Order 50 that the debate or further consideration on Motion No. 12, the constitutional

resolution standing in the name of the hon. the Premier, and any amendments to that Motion shall not be further adjourned and that further considerations of any resolutions, amendments, clauses, sections, preambles, schedules, titles relating to Motion No. 12 shall not be further moved.

On motion, Motion No. 13, carried.

MR. SIMMS:  
On division.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Call in the Members.

### Division

MR. SPEAKER:  
Those in favour of the motion, please rise.

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Efford), the hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation (Mr. Gilbert), Mr. Hogan, Mr. Reid, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Crane, the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Baker), the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. Decker), Mr. Walsh, Mr. Noel, Mr. Gover, Mr. Penney, Mr. Barrett, Mr. L. Snow, the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture (Mr. Flight), the hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs (Mr. Gullage), Mr. Grimes, the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Kitchen), the hon. the Minister of Education (Dr. Warren), the hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations (Ms Cowan), the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Dr. Gibbons), Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Dumaresque, Mr. Short, Mr. Langdon.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Those against the motion, please rise.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hewlett, Mr. Hearn, Ms Verge, Mr. Simms, Mr. R. Aylward, Mr. Matthews, Mr. N. Windsor, Mr. Tobin, Mr. A. Snow, Mr. S. Winsor, Ms Duff, Mr. Warren, Mr. Power, Mr. Hynes.

MS VERGE:  
Tyranny of the majority.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. NOEL:  
I hope you feel the same way when we throw out Meech.

MR. HEWLETT:  
The nation reduced to a numbers game.

MADAM CLERK:  
Mr. Speaker, 'ayes' twenty-eight, 'nays' fifteen.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I declare the motion carried.

We are now on the amendment. I remind hon. Members that the rules are twenty minutes for a Member speaking.

Is the House ready for the question on the amendment?

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:  
A point of order, Mr. Speaker, first of all.

MR. SPEAKER:  
On a point of order.



MR. SIMMS:

From a procedural perspective, I presume the debate that was adjourned last night is no longer the existing debate; in other words, the person who adjourned the debate on the amendment, is that person supposed to be the first speaker, or is it a new debate?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes. He did not rise. That is the person.

MR. SIMMS:

Okay. So, the hon. the Member for Ferryland, obviously.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

MR. POWER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Am I correct Mr. Speaker. Do I have thirty minutes now or twenty minutes?

MR. SPEAKER:

Twenty.

MR. POWER:

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Mr. Simms on a point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

For clarification purposes. My recollection of debate after closure was introduced is that it was basically a new debate and any Member in the House could speak for a twenty minute period. I mean those members in other words who had spoken could not speak anymore or anything of that nature. Is that correct?

MR. SPEAKER:

That is correct.

MR. SIMMS:

So anybody could speak?

MR. SPEAKER:

My understanding is that Members who have previously spoken to the amendment will not be permitted to speak again to the amendment. And people who have spoken to the resolution will not be permitted to speak again. However, while the Member for Ferryland is speaking, we could have the table officers research it and make a ruling on it, or if Members want the House to recess, we can go either way.

MR. SIMMS:

Now Mr. Speaker if I may, I would like to request Your Honour to perhaps take a short recess to check it out. It would be better to do it at the beginning so we know what the rules are, but my recollection is that in this kind of debate anybody can speak and that no Member is pre-empted from speaking, but I could be incorrect. It is only by recollection because it has happened so infrequently in this House it is hard to remember exactly what the details are.

Rather than try to look for references or anything, Your Honour is going to recess. So perhaps he could recess it and clear it up for sure so we all know exactly.

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes, the Honourable the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding that this particular form of limiting debate to move

that the debate or further consideration on that particular motion and so on shall not be further postponed. It means that it sets a time limit in terms of how long the debate can go on. My understanding is that we are still at the same debate we were on before and I am sure if your Honour checks the sources he will find that there is reference in Beauchesne to instances where amendments have been carried and new amendments made and so on leading up to the point of 1 o'clock in this case when all motions have been put. So my understanding is that it is simply a motion that the debate be no longer postponed and be finished in a particular sequence and we are really on, still on the previous debate. This is not a new debate of any kind. Now it is my understanding that your Honour, and maybe if you want to take just a minute to check it, but that is my understanding.

MR. SPEAKER:

That is the Chair's understanding as well but we will recess for just a few brief moments to check it out.

### Recess

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

As we had indicated before we recessed the closure motion is the same debate. All we have done is brought in restrictions of time. Checking with our own precedents Members would find it difficult to be able, at a glance, to see that that was the case. What happened in each case we had closure in the past: the House was in committee where the rules of speaking are

different and where a person can speak more than once.

In checking with the House of Commons their rules clearly state that closure is the same debate and a Member who has spoken in that debate does not get a chance to speak a second time. So the ruling is we are now on the amendment so members who have spoken on the amendment cannot speak a second time, by the same token those who have spoken on the resolution cannot. The Member for Ferryland adjourned the debate so he has the right to resume and he has twenty minutes. Honourable the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Point to accept that ruling. I hope this time is not coming out of the Member for Ferryland.

PREMIER WELLS:

No.

MR. SIMMS:

The premier says no. I mean we are obviously trying to straighten the matter out. The Member should have twenty minutes by agreement. The other thing I will mention-

MR. SPEAKER:

Order Please!

MR. SIMMS:

The other thing I will mention, Mr. Speaker, is that, here is the reality of. The Member for Ferryland and the Member for Menihek are the only two on our side who have not spoken to the amendment. They both intend to speak on the amendment obviously. Then I would assume the vote will be on the amendment. Then we are back on the main motion. In which case everybody in the House can speak because nobody has spoken to the main motion with two

exceptions, The premier and the Leader of the Opposition.

I think in view of the significance of the debate and by agreement, we could probably indicate that we would certainly be prepared, at least, to offer the right to both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, the privilege, to the Premier and the Leader of the opposition to speak for twenty minutes at their leisure, whenever they wish to rise in the debate, some time during the evening. I make that suggestion, in particular, because I know the press are having a bit of a frenzy, because I think they were here with their cameras hoping to get both Leaders in action, in full flight, and if they were not able to speak that would certainly make it kind of a rough night for the Members of the press. So I make that suggestion and would seek some agreement from the government House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Two points Mr. Speaker. On the first point, it is proper that time taken up by points of order and so on actually come out of the time allotted for the Speaker who is speaking. This has been ruled many times in this House and been used many times in this House for other reasons. I would say to the House we would be agreeable to giving the honorable Member for Ferryland his twenty minutes. On the second issue I think it is not from the point of view of the press but from the point of view of the significance of the occasion. From that point of view I would be very agreeable to agreeing that both Leaders be

allowed to speak tonight before the debate ends.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear,hear!

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, it seems these constitutional wrangles happen at a local level as well as a national level. Mr. Speaker, I think we are involved in a very, very serious piece of business both within Newfoundland and within the Canadian context. I might say, in the beginning, that I am not a constitutional Lawyer. I have always found, as most people find, that constitutions are very dry. They are very dull. They are very difficult to read and very difficult, I suppose for most ordinary persons in any organization whether it is Kinsmen, Lions Clubs, provincial political organizations, or governments, to actually sit down and decide what a constitution is, why it should be changed, and why it is not working. But although, I am not a constitutional lawyer, Mr. Speaker, I am a Canadian.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

Unlike many Newfoundlanders, I am a Canadian first, and a Newfoundlander, a very substantial distance in difference, second. I am a Canadian. Much more proud to be a Canadian than I am proud to be a Newfoundlander. My father would not say that. Most of my constituents would not say that but I say it with every bit of

sincerity I could ever muster.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, Hear!

MR. POWER:

I was born in 1948 just before Confederation and I cannot imagine what my life, the life of my family and many of my constituents would be if in 1949 we had not joined Canada.

I cannot imagine a Newfoundland living, subsiding, subsisting by itself. I think it would be fundamentally impossible. You would not have 560 thousand people in Newfoundland, you would have 300 thousand starving, very poor, economically depressed, low standard of living, low standard of education and an awful lot of other things that go with it. Imagine, just imagine, I hear in this House every day about the transfer payments from the Government of Canada, I think I looked it up the other day, was \$223 million this year in transfer payments for education and health alone.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine how proud I would be to say I am a Newfoundlander if we did not have a decent school system for my children and all the other children; if we did not have a decent hospital system. So, Mr. Speaker, when I speak about Meech Lake, I do not speak as a constitutional expert, I do not even necessarily speak as a parliamentarian. I think I speak as a person who was born the year before we joined Canada and I am very proud to be a Canadian. Mr. Speaker, Meech Lake: Why has it proven to be so divisive in this country, why is it threatening a country which is probably one of the very, very best in the world?

Some people do not fully appreciate what Canada is. I just wish that some of the young people especially had the opportunity I had, especially in the last ten years or so when I was a Minister for the Government of Newfoundland, to travel around this world and see other countries. People only appreciate Newfoundland when they go away and even more so they will only appreciate Canada when they travel abroad. When they see the different countries of this world. When they see the lack of democracy, when they see lack of decent health care, when they see a very poor educational system.

I got off a plane one time as Minister of Forestry in Helsinki, Finland, and saw people with submachine guns at the airport and I thought that Finland was one of the more progressive nations in the world. It is a country where you still have to have airport personnel with machine guns to keep the peace, because of terrorism and all kinds of things. Mr. Speaker, Canada can only truly be appreciated when you go outside Canada. Unfortunately, many many Newfoundlanders and many many Canadians have not had that chance to really respect and believe and love what Canada really is; which is a truly unique nation in the world.

Mr. Speaker, when you talk about Meech Lake: I wonder what would have happened to Canada today if we had passed Meech Lake three years ago. What would have happened? Why would you have all of this turmoil if we had had a change of Government in Newfoundland and in Manitoba and in New Brunswick? But you had passed Meech Lake if the Premiers and the Prime Minister of the day

in 1967 had said we are going to give three months or six months for the legislatures in all the Provinces to approve Meech Lake. And we had approved Meech Lake. And the five clauses that had concerned Quebec, where Meech Lake came from, was to I suppose, in many ways to placate Quebec, to get Quebec to sign our constitution and be really a fully active participant constitutionally, in Canada.

Would Canada be any worse off if we had signed Meech Lake, if Quebec was really written down in our Constitution either in preamble or in main body, that Quebec is distinct. Would it really make much difference? You know what we would be doing today if we had passed Meech Lake a year and a half ago? We would all be here, everyone of us would be here trying to give that Premier, this new Government, support to go to the next rounds of constitutional talks, to get more say in the fishery'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

We would be here, supportive of, as I believe the Liberal Opposition was supportive of the former Premier, who tried to get the constitution and the persons who dealt with the constitution to deal with the fisheries problems in Newfoundland and Labrador. We would be here today supporting the Premier of Newfoundland, to really try to get substantive changes in fisheries' management in this Country so that the people who really know and who benefit most from it, especially from the Atlantic Fishery, would have some say in how it is managed. Mr. Speaker, if we had passed Meech

Lake we would probably be here today supporting the Premier in his efforts to change the Senate system in Canada, to really fundamentally change what is happening. Unfortunately we cannot do that because Quebec has said unless we pass Meech Lake, unless that hurdle is overcome, we are not going to accede to any request to change the constitution. It is not going to happen. So we are here debating something in retrospect rather than something in the future, something to make Newfoundland stronger within the Canadian confederation.

If we had passed Meech Lake, Canada would not be substantially worse. Newfoundland would not be worse in any real way. We would have overcome one hurdle and gone on to the next level of constitutional talks within this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a fearmonger. I like Canada the way it is. I think Canada is better because we have Quebec. But you had better realize and, I am sure as politicians most of us do, that there are many persons in Canada, and many of them within Newfoundland, who actually believe that Canada is worsened, is reduced in stature, because of this nonsense with French and with Quebec and that we would be just as well off without it and that Canada would be better having an all English, predominantly white county.

Mr. Speaker, that is not true. This country is better because we have Quebec. And anybody who has had the opportunity to deal with the Ministers from Quebec, the people from Quebec, to interact, it is just an amazing cultural,

educational experience to be able to say that within Canada we have the opportunity to experience two entirely distinctive types of people, culture, language. That is a benefit for Canada. We are better off than Louisiana and Mississippi because we do not all speak just English, we do not come from all one ethnic background and it is very, very important for many of the Members opposite and for many of the persons on this side as well to appreciate the fact that Quebec is not a nuisance element in Canada. It is not something we would prefer to be without. It is one of the great strengths of Canada that we have different people in different parts of the country.

And one of the great strengths of the Canadian constitutional process has been that as a people we try to compromise. We do not believe in armies and submachine guns to inflict the power of the majority. In this country a confederation called Canada grew up differently than the U.S., which was born in a violent system, in a rebellion system.

Canada is not like that. I do not want it to be like that. I do not want to be a little U.S. That is not what Canada is supposed to be.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have real concerns. Real, legitimate, genuine concerns for the first time in my adult life that Canada is going to change. It is going to change because for somehow, for some reason, that I really do not fully understand yet, we have lost the fabric that keeps Canada together. We have lost that willingness to know and understand the other side of the argument. We have lost the desire to communicate, to be compromising,

and we decided to say we are all going to do our own thing. Newfoundland is going to change the Senate or we are not going to have a Canada. Quebec is going to get it's way or they will not stay within Canada.

Mr. Speaker, when you lose in any parliamentary process, and we saw some of it here in this House last week when we were in kind of a contentious issue, when you lose the power of thought, the power of reason, when you lose your willingness to compromise, then as a Country you have a very, very, very serious problem. And I will say having lived in the '60's through the FLQ crisis, having lived through the Trudeau 'just society' years, having lived through the referendum in 1981, Mr. Speaker, Canada is in real jeopardy of substantive change. There is a real, real danger in Canada that we will have to change the structure of this Country. We can do it within the Constitutional process or we may do it without the Constitutional process.

Now I am not a fearmonger, if Quebec leaves Canada, my life is cheapened somewhat. The opportunities for my children to experience a different culture are lessened somewhat, but we will live. The people down in Brigus South in my District, the fishermen will still fish, they will still have to get out of bed. It will not reflect a whole lot on their day to day lives but somewhere in the entity that is Newfoundland, that is Canada, and in the soul, the inner thought process of most of us human beings, we will all be a little worse off because Quebec decided to go a different way. The same as we would be, by the way, if the

wonderful people from Saskatchewan, where I have many friends, if they decided to leave Canada.

What we have got to do in this constitutional process, and I have no wonders at all, I said to myself today, look why bother to stay up late last night and prepare a few thoughts. It is a parliamentary process but 31 is going to beat 21 and I said to myself the only place that 21 beats 31 is in blackjack. And I said I just hope that we are not playing blackjack, Russian roulette, or any kind of gambling game with the future of this country.

I have been here for 15 years, Mr. Speaker, representing the people of Ferryland and very proud to do so. I know that the Meech Lake accord, which I was proud to support back I guess two years ago, is going to be rescinded sometime tonight or early tomorrow morning. My comments are meant primarily for the Premier who leads this Province, who has become a very outspoken, a vocal person in Canada for anti-Meech Lake sentiment, and my words are mainly for the Premier to say to him, when he goes back to the next round of constitutional talks, when he goes back to sit down with his nine other Premiers and the Prime Minister of this country, to remember that the constitutional process is a process. It is not an end unto itself. No constitution ever is. If you look at the constitution of any of the democracies, Britain, France, the United States, Canada, constitutions are processes. You go through them. They are not finished products. What we do, what this Premier will do and his cohorts around the country, the

changes they make may have to be changed again in 20 years time or 70 years time or 150 years time if our country is going to survive.

So constitutional changes and amendments will happen over a long period of time. And I only hope that the Premier, when he goes back to the next round of negotiations, that he goes there with a very open mind. With a deep understanding and appreciation and respect for the history of Newfoundland and the history of Canada. An understanding of constitutional process rather than just a letter of the law, rather than just the four or five points that we have to deal with.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is so important in this country today that we all appreciate, and as I said yesterday when I asked the Premier a question about the Minister of Finance's comments, I did not want the Minister of Finance to resign and I did not expect that he would resign, he made some very unfortunate comments but you know he made comments that reflect an awful lot of what our constituents are saying to us. The reality is that every person in this House of Assembly hears our constituents, some of them are good supporters some of them maybe not so good, but say to us look the hell with Quebec. They have done us in long enough on the Upper Churchill.

Look, I have heard people in the Cabinet I was part of say you might just as well deal with a foreign country as deal with Quebec on Upper Churchill. You could not get anywhere with it. But, Mr. Speaker, you have always got to keep those things in perspective. They are the opinion

of the minority. They are the opinion of someone who is not well versed in where this country has come from and where it should go and the great strengths that we have.

Mr. Speaker, there is four or five points that I want to go over in particular and I know I have only got five or six minutes left and I just don't have time enough to do it. The recognition of Quebec as a distinct society: Everybody in this Legislature, everybody in this country recognizes Quebec as a distinct society. They are a distinct group. The real question in this whole debate is one, whether you acknowledge that distinctiveness in the preamble of the constitution or you acknowledge that distinctiveness in the body of the constitution. The Premier says if you acknowledge it in the body of the constitution you, in effect, give Quebec certain rights, certain powers, as legislators, that the rest of the provinces do not have.

Do I have 15 minutes or 5 minutes? I think I have 5.

Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that I do not think that will happen. I read an awful lot of literature in the last little while and certainly several years ago when we were doing Meech Lake for the first time. It is interpretation, it is a matter of attitude. If I assume that everyone in this world is anti-Irish, anti-Newfoundland, then I had better not go to that person with an Irish sentiment from Newfoundland. I know I am going to be ruled on in a certain way. So, constitutions are based on interpretation.

If you believe your fellow man is fair, is going to be just, is

going to treat us as honourable members of the Canadian society then I think you can look at the constitution and say that in effect Quebec does not have any real constitutional legislative powers different from us. But I will also say that if the Quebec legislature has a power to protect linguistic and cultural rights that this province does not have, I understand that.

There is a big, big difference between a unilingual English town in Ontario passing laws to outlaw French to protect English than a French speaking town in Quebec passing a law to protect French. The difference simply is English in Ontario is not threatened by anybody. English is there by the simple function of majority. It is not threatened. So if Quebec has to pass a law which might be unconstitutional if Newfoundland passed it to protect English but if Quebec passed it to protect French, that is not necessarily bad for Canada. They may have a legislative power that we do not have.

But there is a big difference between trying to protect the rights of minorities rather than protecting the rights of majorities. Why do we have a status of women Minister in Newfoundland? Because we as a Government, before this Government, acknowledged that women had a special case. That they had been wronged for a long period of time. We have done the same thing for disability or handicapped people for accessibility. We have done it. Why? Because something was wrong for a long period of time and we have made special rules, special laws, special legislative regulations to make sure that



minorities can be protected. So if Quebec does have in this distinct society problem, a little chance to be different and to pass some different laws, then it is a lot different than English Canada or English only towns in Ontario.

And the second point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, in the two or three minutes that I have left, is this idea, that somehow or other, an elected senate is going to solve the economic problems of Newfoundland and Labrador. Now Mr. Speaker, there is not another person in this House who believes more fundamentally than I do, that the Senate system we have in Canada is wrong. It is abhorrent to anybody who believes in democracy. It is the old English system of peerage, the House of Lords appointments, it is undemocratic, it is unfair, it is unjust and it should either be changed or abolished. We do not need a Senate that is appointed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

We need a Senate that is changed - that is elected and effective, sure we do. But Members opposite seem to think that by voting against Meech Lake, and somehow or other trying to get Senate reform, we are going to have economic reform. Now I know the Premier in his heart and soul does not believe that. Newfoundland's economic problems do not relate to an elected or a non elected Senate. Our problems relate to geography, where we are in the North American continent. How far we are away from the market place. Resources that we have. The educational system that we have, which is not up to scratch. Those are the things which cause

our economic problems. There is no way that an elected Senate is going to solve economic problems in Newfoundland unless the Premier is successful in finding some way in convincing his counterparts that the 39 thousand people we have in Newfoundland unemployed last month should all become Senators. Premier, you can shake your head, the elected Senate may help, but it is not going to solve the reality of the economic problems of Newfoundland. Changing the Senate for all Members opposite is a democratic reform badly needed and certainly outdated but it is not an economic reform. It is not going to solve the problems of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador as it relates to the economy.

Mr. Speaker, the other parts, the Supreme Court, the immigration problems, many of those are not serious concerns for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. I suspect what we have done in trying to hold out the Senate as being some kind of magical Utopia that is going to solve our problems, we are leading some people astray. We are leading some people to think that that can solve all our problems when it cannot.

The distinct society clause for Quebec is real. They are a distinct society and should be acknowledged in the body of the constitution as well as the preamble or any place else that it needs to be done. When it comes to immigration, Newfoundland does not have a serious problem with immigration except recently when we have had too many. Quebec wants to make sure they have an adequate flow over a period of time. When it comes to the Supreme Court, again, you cannot

but allow that the Supreme Court of Canada has to have a certain component that is made up of french speaking judges from Quebec. How else can you interpret there different legislative system, their different judicial system?

In summary, Mr. Speaker, let me say, I am very concerned about the future of this country. There is an awful lot of concern about Meech Lake. It is unfortunate that we are in this system and I can only beg the Premier and hope that when he goes to the next series of constitutional meetings, that he goes with an open, compromising, fair, honest, Canadian approach to constitutional reform. Then and only then will we get through this impasse and be able to preserve a country which is one of the very best in the world. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Pleasantville.

MR. NOEL:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the hon. Member for Ferryland agrees with us that we need to have senate reform, it is too bad that he does not appreciate some of the other things that we can accomplish through senate reform. An economic reform is one of the things we can accomplish, that is the way we are going to get a better deal for our Province and for the other minority in Canada, the minority of people who live in the eight Provinces that do not run the House of Commons.

We understand the constitutional process is a process and that is the point the Premier and this

side has been making, Meech Lake and June 24 is not the end of Canada. The people opposite have been telling us throughout the course of this debate, we have to pass Meech Lake now because Canada is going to end this June. But this is a constitutional process and Canada will continue debating the way we relate politically with all the Provinces and all the people, we will continue doing that after June but you know a reformed senate will make a major difference to how this country operates and is not going to be given to us.

I appreciate the concerns of Members on the other side and the soul searching that they are doing, and I know many of you agree with a lot of the things that we are saying and you believe that we need to have more say in this country, and you wish we would be able to get it, but unfortunately I think you are excessively concerned that in the course of fighting for what we want over senate reform and the other reforms in the constitution, we are going to alienate the rest of the country and cause the breakup of Canada, and that is not what this is about. Even the Premier of Ontario in the newspaper today, there is a headline, Failure of Meech Lake not end to Confederation, Ontario Premier believes. And that is the case, but the Members opposite have been telling us for the past week or two it is going to be the end of Canada. Now, if we want to have senate reform, we have to negotiate tough, and that is what we are doing right now, it is no good saying let us get Meech Lake over with and Canada will continue and we will be one big happy country, that is what we have been doing as long as we have been part

of Canada.

At so many Federal Provincial Conferences they have talked about senate reform, the need to change regional disparity in this country but what happens, nothing ever changes. I would just like to put this thought to the Members opposite for consideration during the rest of this evening. If a reformed senate is so meaningless, as a number of honourable Members opposite have indicated, why are Ontario and Quebec willing to see the country go to the brink of disaster, as that is what they believe and apparently what Members opposite believe, rather than agree to senate reform. Surely they realize that agreeing to senate reform would place enormous pressure on the dissenting Provinces to agree to the accord.

If Senate reform is not important for us, why is it such a concern for Ontario, Quebec and the Federal Government. At this crucial stage in these constitutional negotiations, do we hear anything from Premier Bourassa, Premier Peterson, or Prime Minister Mulroney about what kind of senate reform they would consider? No: pass Meech Lake and we will talk about it later. We cannot talk about everything later, now is the time to do something, this maybe, is our last chance, if we pass Meech Lake now, what chance do we have of getting this kind of constitutional reform in the near future. But if we stand firm today, and if we develop an alliance with the other smaller Provinces, the Provinces that constitute the other minority in Canada, I think we have a chance of bringing Ontario and Quebec and central Canada around to their senses.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. NOEL:  
Well, that would be progress. As the constitution stands right now we, if we could get Ontario on side, we could have the Senate reform we want because right now it only takes seven provinces and 50 percent of the population.

MR. HEWLETT:  
(Inaudible).

MR. NOEL:  
We will see what we will have. Now as your friend from Ferryland said, this is a constitutional process that is ongoing. Now we understand the concerns that you people have about Quebec's five requirements in the proposed constitutional reform and I think you understand some of the concerns we have about the distinct society and the spending powers, the Supreme Court and those other things. We have made our case in those details and the Premier, I am sure, will refer to them in his summary tonight. But the fact is nobody can say how the constitution will be interpreted by the courts, if it were amended by Meech this June. We can only guess at what may happen and there are a lot of things in there that we feel we should be concerned about. So there is very little in the Quebec five requirements that are of any advantage to us and the things that the gentlemen and ladies opposite suggest would be to our advantage, things like the annual First Ministers Conferences, at which the economy and the Fishery and Senate Reform would be discussed are only commitments for discussion.

That is nothing new. That is what has been going on in this country

as long as we have been part of it. Fishery: if we can get the kind of Senate reform we are talking about we will have more say in how the Federal government operates and that is what we want. We will have real say. We will not just have say in a federal provincial conference every year. We will have real say in the extra control we will have in the Government of Canada. I want to review some of the realities of our position in Confederation and the economic realities. I was very unhappy to hear the Member for Ferryland talking about the possibility of our Province consisting of 300,000 starving Newfoundlanders today, if we were not a part of Canada. It is time for Newfoundlanders to realize that we pay our way in Confederation

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. NOEL:  
We do not live on handouts from Ottawa. You know, we do it in so many ways. I just want to relay a few statistics here. When we joined Canada, shortly after we joined, March 31, 1951 we had a cash surplus of \$40 million in the bank. We had the lowest per capita debt in the country at \$28 in 1951 and Ontario had \$256 in per capita debt.

AN. HON. MEMBER:  
You know who made away with the \$40 million.

MR. NOEL:  
Listen, let us try to keep the debate tonight to a reasonable level. Nobody made away with the \$40 million. It was spent. All people who form governments in this country since we have been in Confederation have made mistakes

and did some good. Some of it was wasted most of it was used sensibly but the fact is we had \$40 million when we started out. Today our per capita debt in Newfoundland is \$9000, per capita for a total of about \$5 billion. The Canadian per capita debt is about \$13,000 for a total of about \$6.5 billion dollars.

At the end of 1989 in Canada the per capita consumer credit plus mortgage debt was about the same as our national per capita debt. About \$13,000 per capita, so you put together the per capita debt that we owe as a province, which is about five billion, our share of the nations, which is another five billion, and the per capita debt of our people, in their personal debt which is about another five billion. We are about \$15 billion dollars in debt and then you have to add in business debt in our province. So we are \$15 to \$20 billion more in the hole today than when we joined Canada. Now that and the taxes we have paid since becoming Canadians is what pays for all of the services we have had and all of the capital expenditures we have had.

You know it has not been sent down from Ottawa, we have sent it up to Ottawa, anybody who looks at the budget for the year will get an indication of just how much money we send to Ottawa. This year it was something like a billion and half dollars, and so much of that was in the retail sales tax, five hundred and ninety six million, personal income tax, gasoline tax, Newfoundland Liquor Corporation tax, tobacco tax, it all adds up to a billion and a half dollars.

You know we pay roughly the equivalent amount to Canada in

Federal taxes, our personal income taxes for the Province is four hundred and twenty five million, our Personal tax is 61 percent of the Canadian tax rate, 62 now, so we probably paid about 7 or 8 hundred million in personal taxes, personal income taxes to the Federal Government, and our retail sales tax in this Province will bring in five hundred and ninety six million. Manufacturers sales tax, which the Government is trying to change now and bring in the GST as a replacement, probably accounted for another four or five hundred million paid in from this Province.

So when you add up all the ways that we contribute to the Canadian treasury in the course of a year, you will find that we pay our own way and I am really tired of Newfoundlanders who say that we do not pay our own way.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. NOEL:  
Yes, sir, that is an argument, that is a case I will make to you later on as this debate goes along, we will demonstrate to you. The report of the Royal Commission on Employment and unemployment, do not blame some Newfoundlanders you know, for accepting the false argument that we are kept by the rest of the country. In the report, that Commission said "we are politically, economically, and financially dependent upon Central Canada."

Now you know, for a Doug House and Andy Wells, who are two of my best friends actually from my school years and my University years, were both on that Commission but the unfortunate thing about them

is that Andy studied History and Doug studied Sociology but I was the one who studied Economics. I would just like to relate a few more statistics I have here. We all know the per capita earned income of Newfoundland has only gone from 53 percent to 56 percent of the Canadian average. Our Unemployment rate has doubled the national average, 95 percent of our people live in deep disparity while 94 percent of Ontario residents live above the national average, and that is the statistics of the infamous Department of Science Industry and Technology that the Federal Government has just set up to be the Department of Regional Development for Ontario and Quebec.

The Atlantic Provinces' share of regional development funds dropped in 1987 to 36 percent from 56 percent while Ontario's has risen more than 100 percent and our share of economic growth in the last decade has declined from 2 percent to 1.4 percent of the national average. The infant mortality rate in Newfoundland is 50 percent higher than the national average. There are so many statistics, you know to back up the case that we make, even your former leader, Premier Peckford, understood the case that we made at a First Ministers Conference in 1987. He said that our relative position within Canada in terms of per capita economic activity has barely moved in 30 years and he went on to say that one of the reasons that has been the case is because of the national tariff policy. Fully 50 per cent, Premier Peckford said, of the current policy accrued to the Province of Ontario, 50 percent of the benefits of our tariff policy were enjoyed by the Province of Ontario. But they

only absorbed 30 per cent of the cost. In Quebec cost and benefits were fairly evenly balanced. In the western provinces and Newfoundland and the other Atlantic provinces, we were the clear losers.

Now we think this can be changed through a reformed Senate and through making the Senate, you know, what it was intended to be. And this is another thing I cannot understand in the Members on the other side of the House. They say how can the Senate have more power without getting it from somewhere from the Federal Government or from the Provincial Government. And the fact is that the Senate today in Canada has the same powers as the House of Commons.

I refer you to section 17 of The Constitution Act.

AN. HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. NOEL:  
To you in particular man, because you are one person who has gotten up so many times in this House and outside and said how can the Senate be given more power without getting it from somewhere else. Well this section says there shall be one Parliament in Canada consisting of the Queen, an Upper House style of Senate, and the House of Commons. Now that is the Federal Government of Canada.

MS VERGE:  
That is theory, talk about reality.

MR. NOEL:  
Is Meech Lake theory?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. NOEL:  
Well what are you debating with us for, if it is only theory. We are talking about reality here. What we are saying is that if we can reform the Senate in the proper way, we will have more say over how the Government in Ottawa operates. Right now it is run by the two-thirds of seats which are controlled by the Central Canadians in Ontario and Quebec. And that is why the country does not operate in our interest.

In giving a reformed Senate more power we will not be taking power from the provinces. We will not be taking it from the Federal Government, but we will be taking it from the House of Commons and forcing the House of Commons where the majority of citizens have this control to share it with the Senate where the majority of provinces would have control. And that is the way a Federal system should operate and that is the way our system was intended to operate.

George Brown one of the Fathers of Confederation said in the Confederation debates in 1865, 'The very essence of our compact is that the union should be Federal and not legislative. Our Lower Canada friends have agreed to give us representation by population in the Lower House on the expressed condition that they shall have equality in the Upper House. On no other condition could we have advanced a step. Confederation would not have been agreed to if the people in the smaller provinces had known that the Senate was not going to have any real power. We are the only country in the world with a Federal system where all of the Members of the second body are

appointed by the National Government. In all of the other countries they are either elected, appointed by the entities within the Federal unit, the states or the provinces. In Germany they call them the lands. We are the only country in which they are not elected and which the Senate does not have real power. Now do you think that is in our interest for Canada to be distinct in that way?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
I do not think.

MR. NOEL:  
You do not think so. You think the Senate should be reformed in the way we are talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. NOEL:  
Well how do you think we can make it happen, if we do not say to the rest of Canada, look, if you want to have constitutional change now to satisfy Quebec, and you know we are going to have to make some changes to satisfy Quebec.

We can look at what Quebec needs and what the other provinces need, but you have to look at what we need as well. And do not expect us to agree with what other provinces need and want in this country, if you are not going to look at what we want. And there is no point as I just said for us to sign on the bottom line now, let this resolution stand and together with all the rest of the provinces say, okay you can have your constitutional change which we believe will mean that Quebec will become more autonomous, that Canada will become more of a decentralized country and the people on that side who are so concerned with weakening the

powers of the Federal Government should be very concerned about that.

So this is our opportunity and this is the constitutional process that the Member for Ferryland was talking about. You people want something out of constitutional change we want something out of constitutional change. Do not expect us to give you what you want until you agree with what we want.

Now let us sit down and start over and put together a Constitution we are all satisfied with. What is the point of saying you will never get it? What our responsibility as Members of the Newfoundland and Labrador House of Assembly is, is to serve the interests of the people of our Province. The way you people talk over there a lot of the time I think you believe you have been elected by the rest of Canada to save Canada or to satisfy the interests of Quebec, but your first responsibility is to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. We have to get what our Province needs out of constitutional change and if we pass Meech Lake as it is today, good luck, in getting constitutional change.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

The hon. the Member for Menihek.

MR. A. SNOW:  
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Just as the hon. Member for Pleasantville (Mr. Noel) was in full flight and I was getting to really enjoy him. I am pleased and proud to have the opportunity

to stand and speak to the amendment proposed by our Leader in this historic debate and to express my views, both as a citizen of this Province, as a resident of Labrador, and as a Canadian. A large part of living in a democracy is being able to express your view and to be able to fight and discuss it in a forum such as we are doing here today, and indeed in a public forum out in the streets. The Premier of this Province would probably be one of the first to recognize that these words apply to him as well as to me and all the other Members of this House. Even though it is not necessarily the most popular view it is a privilege which this country has given to all of us.

The Premier will recognize that if the Constitution of Canada was not as it is and instead we were run from Ottawa by a Government like that in Beijing then he, nor I, nor any of us would have that privilege. A few words here and there in the Constitution of this country could mean the difference between life or death for those such as the Premier, or myself, who chose to express their views about the Government or the Constitution of our country. His speeches in Montreal could have meant a jail sentence, and a speech in Toronto could have meant the exact same thing. His speaking in his tour of Western Canada could have brought the wheels of a tank across his head because that is reality some people not fortunate enough to live in this country have to fear every time they open their mouths and speak the truth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

(Inaudible).

MR. A. SNOW:

The hon. Minister of Finance is attempting to put his foot back in his mouth again and make national news.

But for an accident of faith, I too, as a lot of us, could have been living in an autocratic country but for the foresight of our leaders who built this country. But I thank God that I live under a Constitution which gives Premier Wells the privilege to speak to his opinion in this country and to express views which are not necessarily in the majority. I thank God that I live under a Constitution which gives me the privilege to stand in this House and speak for a view which I am told is in a minority in this House but a view which is mine, my very own, although I must say that I do have a lot of people on this side of the House agreeing with me. We heard the hon. Member for Ferryland speak very eloquently about his feeling as a Canadian. Canada has existed for about 123 years on several principles and has grown to become one of the worlds most prosperous and influential countries.

People are willing to risk their lives by leaving their own countries to seek a better life in this country and that should tell us something. I might add that we built this great country, Canada, with a Constitution that has never been perfect. You could say it is flawed as some people have suggested and may joke about Meech Lake being flawed. Our Constitution has been flawed, but one that has nevertheless been built on solid principles and a sound vision, and it is that, Mr. Speaker, that the highest pinnacle



or perfection to which we can aspire in this very imperfect world in which we all live.

An old expression I am sure a lot of us have heard is that, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. The proof of a founding principles of a nation is in the workings of that nation and in the lives of the people who inhabit that nation, and the proof of the founding principles of Canada is that we have then and have remained the true north, strong and free. A democracy permits the people to choose their leaders and their leaders represent the people insofar as they are chosen by the people. At the beginning of the last decade, the people of Canada, chose Pierre Trudeau as their Prime Minister. The people of Quebec chose Rene Levescuc as their Premier. It was at this particular time, that the Canadian Government were attempting to bring home the Constitution to this country. These two particular gentlemen were at loggerheads. Is there blame to be cast, was either one of these leaders any less chosen than the other, did either of these leaders have less of a right than the other to fight for his views? I put it to you that the answer is no. Premier Levesque, had his twenty-two Constitutional demands and Prime Minister Trudeau was unwilling to accept those demands, so Quebec was left out. After 115 years of Confederation, Quebec was on the outside of the circle looking in.

Whose fault was it? Was it Levesque, was it Trudeau, was it the fault of the people of Quebec for having elected him, was it the fault of the Canadian public for electing Trudeau, was it Trudeau's fault for being unwilling to give

Quebec the sweeping constitutional changes they wanted? No, I do not agree that it was either one of these gentlemen's faults, but I thank God for the Premiers, who instead of casting blame, decided to right the wrong. Instead of leaving Quebec outside looking in, the constitutional family that we are in this country, decided with a concerted effort, the Prime Minister of the day, Brian Mulroney and from Robert Bourassa, the Premier of Quebec, and the other nine premiers of this country representing their individual provinces, they decided to reach an acceptable solution to the constitutional division of Canada that was created, in 1982, when Quebec was left outside looking in.

The next years were long and drawn out hard work. Some people would let you believe that the Meech Lake Accord, the Meech Lake solution was devised in some darkened room which suggests a few men sat around a table and devised this constitutional accord with some ulterior motive. In reality, the Accord was worked on for several years, it was not just devised in the dark rooms of a lodge beside a small lake called Meech Lake. Of course the final sessions of that particular accord were worked out in a back room in this lodge at Meech Lake, the final sessions of any agreement are usually worked out in a back room. The final sessions of the Wells constitutional proposal were probably worked out in a back room. He says no. Some people suggest that maybe the whole thing was worked out in a back room, and I bet you that-

MR. GRIMES:

You worked on (inaudible).

MR. A. SNOW:

I did. To the hon. Member for Exploits. But I would be willing to bet that there were not eleven people in the room when that Accord was reached. Perhaps what we should have done was name the Meech Lake Accord something different. Maybe the 80's Accord could have probably helped us take a different approach, we would have looked at it with a different perspective, or maybe it would not have made an iota of difference. It is the name that is taking all the flack these days. It is not what is in the Accord.

How many Canadians, how many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians actually know what is in the Accord, and actually understand what is in the Meech Lake Accord, or why the Accord was written in the first place? The eleven representatives of the people who spent practically three years working on this Accord understood the details that Quebec had reduced its prerequisites for Constitutional ratification from nearly two dozen - twenty-two to be exact - down to five. And in June 1987 the representatives of all ten of Canada's Provinces and the Federal Government and four political parties agreed to an amendment in seventeen sections that would have the effect of making Canada Constitutionally whole again.

They went to their respective legislatures and brought in legislation and brought the amendment up for debate and on September 23, 1987, Saskatchewan ratified Meech Lake; December 7, 1987, Alberta ratified Meech Lake; May 13, 1988, Prince Edward Island ratified Meech Lake; and on May 25, 1988, Nova Scotia ratified Meech Lake; June 22, 1988, the

Canadian parliament ratified Meech Lake on behalf of all Canadians; on June 23, Quebec ratified Meech Lake and made a giant leap forward into this Canadian family and became a whole partner in Confederation again. On June 29, both Ontario and British Columbia ratified Meech Lake; on July 7, 1988, Newfoundland ratified Meech Lake with votes in the P.C. caucus, N.D.P. caucus, and even the former leader of the Liberal caucus at that time, who had the support of his caucus then, he supported it.

On March 21, 1990, New Brunswick under Frank McKenna introduced a resolution in their legislature to ratify the Meech Lake Accord along with a parallel amendment to bring about further changes in the Constitution. And may I remind the Premier and the Liberal caucus of Newfoundland and Labrador that in July of 1988, when Newfoundland ratified the Accord, Premier Filmon of Manitoba supported the Accord, and probably would have introduced the Accord to his legislature except for the political realities in Manitoba at that particular time.

So there we have it, it is Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, P.E.I., New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario, Premier Filmon of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia and the Canadian Government of Canada, they have accepted the Meech Lake Accord. Is it time for rescission? I do not think it is. Is it time for a referendum? No. It is time for Premier Wells to swallow his considerable pride and for his caucus Members to rediscover their pride, and for Canada to get on with making this nation Constitutionally whole as it has not been for the past eight years.

I started out talking about this country as a democracy, and we have worked as a democracy precisely because we have been able to empathize with the concerns of others and put our own concerns into their appropriate context. We have operated as a democracy with being honest with one another and be ensuring the truth is held high and not deception or lies.

Canadians have been told at great expense to the Newfoundland and Labrador taxpayers of my day that Meech Lake was a fraud, a sham, a blatant attempt by the various Governments to sell the country for short term political gain. Canadians have been told that Meech Lake is wrong. The implications that those who support the Accord are leading the country down the slippery slope of disintegration. And we have been accused of fearmongering by a man who has built the argument on fearmongering. Using words such as enshrined poverty, economic shackles forever, better to be part of the USA, those are familiar things, they have been headlines for the last couple of months.

Why do eight other Governments support the Meech Lake Accord? Why do not other Governments support the Well's Accord? Perhaps it would be wise to look at the criticisms that the Premier has put forth around the nation to see if they are based on fact or based on something a little lesser than fact.

We talk about the distinct society clause. There has been no disagreement basically in this Chamber about the distinct society, I do not think. It has been recognized, the hon. Member

For Bonavista South -

AN HON. MEMBER:

We agree with the distinct society but in the preamble.

MR. A. SNOW:

We feel that -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Legal mumble jumble.

MR. A. SNOW:

- after all it was reasonable that the recognition of the fact that Quebec has been recognized since 1867 as being very distinct. The fact that they have civil law whereas the rest of the country has a common law system. The unique culture they have developed. Over the years they have evolved into an even more distinct society if you will and the fact that they have their own tax system. They have a different system in their Province. Their own Chambers, a Member here is called a Member of the House of Assembly, a Member in Quebec is called a Member of the National Assembly. But they are distinct. Even our Premier has agreed that they are a distinct society.

Another issue that has been discussed quite a bit is Senate reform. I just listened previously to the hon. Member from Pleasantville on his understanding of the great Senate reform proposal that is going to be put forward right after we rescind the Meech Lake and have a referendum and all those other things that are going to occur. This is going to be the panacea for this Province.

I am sure that the people in West Virginia and Mississippi have not got - while they may have political equality in having a

couple of Senators elected they do not have the same economic equality as the state of California or New Hampshire.

MR. SIMMS:

That is true. He overlooked that.

MR. A. SNOW:

Although he suggested that we are going to get economic equality.

Mr. Speaker, let me put it this way, Senate reform will not even be on the table until all the provinces are at the table.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Go ahead and do it without the feds. Why does Canada not go ahead and do it without Newfoundland? That is silly.

MR. A. SNOW:

Let us not forget that the Senate was also first a federal institution as the hon. Member from Pleasantville suggested earlier. Of course, we know that federal institutions have done this Province tremendous good over the past forty-one years. But they have also been accused of doing considerable harm.

The federal control and lack of provincial influence in the fisheries has had a lot to do with the problems we are experiencing this year in that industry. I am sure that maybe if we had a greater influence and control over the fishing industry we would be discussing or would not have the problems as they are today. We would not have the crisis that is today in the fishing industry if we, as a province, had more control and influence over the harvesting of that particular

resource.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. A. SNOW:

I believe a reformed Senate is desirable but not at the expense of a strong Provincial Government. I also agree with the hon. Member for Ferryland who suggested earlier that most people on this side, actually, would probably agree with it, that possibly the greatest reform of the Senate would be to abolish it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SHORT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for St. Georges.

MR. SHORT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the debate started in this Chamber I have listened with a great deal of interest to speeches that have been made by Members on both sides. Sometimes there has been a feeling that it has all been perhaps a waste of time and boring and whatever else, but I can say quite honestly that I have enjoyed listening to the various viewpoints of people in this House.

I would like to speak first of all about the speech given by the Member for Ferryland a few minutes ago. He talked about his feelings about being a true Canadian and having been born less than three months after we joined Canada in

1949. I am very proud to say that I am a true Canadian as well.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I hope the Premier can say it.

MR. SHORT:

I am sure he can.

The Member for Ferryland made a couple of points that I jotted down when he was speaking. He said, 'we are a country of compromise', and a little bit later on he said, 'we have lost the desire to see the other side of the argument.' He also made a point about the Constitution being a process, and he said that the economic problems will not be solved by Senate reform in this Province. And I want to come back to a couple of those points in a minute, but first of all I want to say that having listened to all the speeches so far in this debate that nothing has been said by Members Opposite that would make me change my mind and to vote with Members Opposite. And I do not mean that from a political point of view either. I have listened to it. I have waited for some good strong solid arguments, and I still have not heard them.

Over the last couple of days there has been a thought running through my mind about a play I did when I was a high school teacher. I did it for a number of years, and for those people who might be interested in it the play is called Twelve Angry Men. It is in the grade eight literature course in the old study of literature called Twelve Angry Men. And for those people who are not quite familiar with the play, the play starts off with a trial being over and twelve members of a jury are about to go into a room and debate the guilt or the innocence of the

person who has been on trial.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Like your Cabinet.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Muzzle him will you.

MR. SHORT:

The play, and I want to draw an analogy between the play, Twelve Angry Men and the debate in this assembly, because there is so many similarities between them that I suppose it is why it has kept running through my mind for a number of days. In the play, Twelve Angry Men, as the play starts off the judge makes this point to the people who are about to decide the guilt or the innocence of a young boy. He says, 'The one thing you have to remember is reasonable doubt. And if you have any doubt whatsoever as to the guilt of the person then you must vote not guilty.' And that is the central theme in the play. It is ironic, I suppose, in this sense here that the person in the play who voted not guilty in the first instance was juror number eight. And I do not know what that says about this particular building and the eighth floor, but juror number eight votes not guilty in the play. And I suppose it is from that point of view that we have to look at this debate on Meech Lake. I am not saying that the gentleman on the eighth floor is the only one saying we are against the Meech Lake Accord as it now stands. We are certainly not, but it is ironic in a sense.

As I said, and I believe Members Opposite have not said very much about the possibility of a deal we could have struck here a couple of days ago. It has not been mentioned by any of the speakers

opposite. But I firmly believe that we could have been beyond all of this wrangling and this sitting here tonight until one o'clock in the morning, had Members opposite been in a spirit of compromise. Because I watched the reaction the other night in this House and it was unbelievable just to see Members opposite when the Premier said, 'I am prepared to split the resolution into two parts and go to public hearings as people had been saying.'

MR. SIMMS:  
They tried to pull a fast one.

MR. SHORT:  
It was not a fast one at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SHORT:  
I would just like to deal with that issue for a minute because I believe it is very important. The Premier the other day, and this was the very first time this had ever been mentioned in this House in the whole debate, he put it very succinctly when he said, you have to revoke or rescind the Meech Lake Accord. Why would you go to public hearings as people opposite were saying, if we were to go along with the motion that was made back in July 1988. It would be ridiculous to be out having public hearings if we agreed with people opposite. There would be no need for it. It is too silly to even talk about.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
What are you talking about it for.

MR. SHORT:  
Because the other night we had an opportunity to do exactly what you people were saying. You admitted that you made a mistake back in

1988.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Oh no we did not.

MR. SHORT:  
Oh, yes you did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SHORT:  
Sure you did.

So what I am saying is that the other night I think we lost the opportunity. We could have done it. We could have had the public hearings.

MR. SIMMS:  
You are still going to have the public hearings, the Premier said (inaudible) -

MR. SHORT:  
Well maybe we will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SHORT:  
A couple of things that bother me about, not the debate so much, this whole Meech Lake Accord process. The one thing that I listened for and tried to get some sense out of is what the wording in the Accord means. I have listened to everybody who has made a speech in this House and I think if there is one clear message that has come from everybody who has spoken, is that we all seem to be saying that we are not sure exactly what it says, or we are not exactly sure as to what it means.

When I hear somebody say that it

is going to be interpreted by a court somewhere in the future, if that needs to be the case, then that makes me very, very leery of passing something and then saying we will leave it to the courts later on. I have a lot of difficulty with that particular process.

We have a number of lawyers who sit in this House and who have expounded on this Accord over the last couple of weeks. I have not heard anybody say, 'Yes, I know precisely what this particular Article means.' Nobody. Even when I hear Premier Wells I believe he is saying as I said about the Twelve Angry Men example, that Premier Wells is saying, 'I have a reasonable doubt as to what is going to happen if we sign The Meech Lake Accord and that is the message I am getting.'

There is a reasonable doubt in everyone's mind. The other point I want to make is that I cannot understand why the other side has not given anything in return. People, the other day, said, why are we rescinding now, why can we not wait. And I say to you, we have waited since November and the Premier made it quite clear back in November that he was prepared to wait, that he was prepared to see somebody put something on the table and that has not happened yet, so why is everybody else so set in their ways - as the Member for Ferryland said, it is a country of compromise. Well, if it is a country of compromise, then I do not see the other side compromising.

I do not see the Federal Government compromising and I certainly do not see Quebec compromising. Look at what happened when Premier McKenna

brought in his Companion Accord. Quebec immediately went into an uproar. They said we are not even going to look at that idea, so where is the compromise in all of this?

AN HON. MEMBER:

The compromise is at Meech Lake.

MR. SHORT:

No, it is not. If we could be sure what it all means, sure, then it might be! But I would love to have heard Quebec say, we are definitely going to do, A and B and C, if you sign Meech Lake, but they have not even done that! They have not said one single thing in this whole process about what they are prepared to do afterwards, nothing, and I am not so sure that we are standing alone. I am sure that after tonight Manitoba will not be standing alone, I am sure of that, and again, if I refer to the play 'Twelve Angry Men', in the play juror no. 8 got up and said at one point in the play, 'I will let you have a secret vote and if everybody else votes eleven to nothing again, then I will change my mind', and I think that message has been coming through by the Premier as well. But in the Play, one of the other jurors voted for 'not guilty' and it changed the whole thing, and I think after tonight, it will not be only Manitoba and I guess we have to include New Brunswick in that as well, there will be at least three people or three provinces which will be saying that we do not agree with everything that is in the Meech Lake Accord.

The other day as well, somebody said, we will not be on an equal footing by rescinding the Meech Lake Accord. I submit to you that we do not have many options. If

we do not rescind it, then we are saying we agree with it, we like what is there and we are prepared to pass it and live with it, and I am sure right now that Newfoundlanders and people across Canada are saying to us that they do not like what is there, and are not prepared to let it go the way it is, and I guess the Member for Ferryland was right and perhaps it is what we should be thinking about, is that the constitution is only a process and I suppose June 23 is only part of that process.

I do believe that we can have another shot at this after June 23, after that deadline, if it is such a deadline, but I do not believe that we can support the ideas that are in Meech Lake right now.

I believe we are doing the right thing here this evening by rescinding the Meech Lake Accord. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Thank you, Larry, you did a great job.

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
This is the amendment I am already after speaking.

MR. REID:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Carbonear.

MR. REID:  
Thank you, Mr. Tobin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. REID:  
Mr. Speaker, I want to take a bit of a different approach to the Meech Lake Accord tonight and talk basically as an outsider outside the Government as well as outside of where I am right now, and I am going to base my comments on a number of comments that have been made to me by numerous people in Newfoundland, in my own District, and in other Districts of the Province, as well as people from outside of Newfoundland who are Newfoundlanders, and consider themselves to be Newfoundlanders.

I guess I am like my hon. colleague, the previous speaker, I had some doubts about the Meech Lake Accord in the beginning myself, and I struggled with it for some time and I listened to both sides of the argument and I investigated and read as much as I possible could. And I finally made a decision, I guess, about a month or a month and a half ago that I had no other choice but to support the stand that my Government and the Premier of the Province was taking on the Meech Lake Accord. And I want to mention tonight some things that have happened over the years in Newfoundland and some of the things that are happening now in Newfoundland, that will I am sure, encourage a vast majority of residents of Newfoundland and Labrador and Canadians to say



after we are finished here tonight, that we did the right thing in the Legislature in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. REID:

I happen to be a year older than my hon. colleague for Ferryland, but that still made me, I guess, more to be born a Canadian or a Newfoundlander rather than a Canadian and I can honestly say that I feel the same about Canada as basically he does with one exception, and that is in the last few weeks and months for some reason or other my friend - I am beginning to revert to being more of an Newfoundlander than I am a Canadian.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. REID:

And that maybe is unfortunate. But when I look back, and I guess being a history major from Memorial University, and my major was in Newfoundland History -

AN HON. MEMBER:

And a Returning Officer.

MR. REID:

And a Returning Officer - and I think about the struggle that Mr. Smallwood and his Government had when they took over in 1949 and the woes of the Newfoundland public and the problems with the fishermen and the problems with the loggers, and everyone knows what I am talking about, and I guess the economic disparity in Newfoundland compared to all the other provinces of Canada. I can honestly say, Mr. Speaker, in comparison to 1949 when we look at the other provinces, I do not

think we have come very far in relationship to the other parts of this wonderful country we are living in.

And Mr. Smallwood worked hard and maybe in some cases it may have been a little bit deceitful to us, although I am sure he will forgive me for that tonight, because Mr. Smallwood believed in Confederation. He believed that things would get better as his term or his tenure in office as Premier continued. But by the time he was ready to retire I think he realized that we had not come a great distance in comparison to Nova Scotia, Alberta, British Columbia and the other provinces. And then after Mr. Smallwood came Mr. Moores and I will say Mr. Moores was a very good friend of mine and my families, comes from my particular part of the Province, and still is a good friend.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He was a great man.

MR. REID:

I am not going to say he is a great man, Mr. Speaker, but I will say he is a friend of mine and I have talked to him about the Meech Lake Accord and a lot of other things. I am not going to say what he said to me, but I will say this much, the words were not discouraging.

Then came Mr. Peckford who, eleven years ago, a lot of people had respect for, and we thought and, to be quite honest about it, Mr. Speaker, I thought, too, being a common, ordinary Joe who came up from White Bay and came out of Whitbourne, that maybe a new face with some rural ideas would help us as Newfoundlanders gain a little bit, just a little bit on

our fellow Canadians outside the Province. Then I heard the wonderful saying, 'In Newfoundland have not will be no more,' and I stood up and I said, rally around the cause and please God something will happen to make us a little bit better than we have been during the past twenty-five years.

I do not have to say very much about the next Premier. I cannot, really, other than what I have seen of his performance in the House, because he was not there long enough, I suppose, to have much of an influence on anybody or anything.

Then came Clyde Wells and he, Mr. Speaker, was faced with the same problem as Mr. Smallwood, Mr. Moores and Mr. Peckford were, and we are still, in 1990, being looked upon as not being equal to the rest of Canada. Mr. Speaker, to be quite honest about it, I am tired of it. I am only a young man, I have not lived a long life, and I am tired of being looked on by the rest of Canada as being a second-class Canadian citizens. And we are second-class Canadian citizens. Everywhere we go in Canada the first thing thrown at us is a Newfoundland joke. We are told on a daily basis by other people in Canada that we are a have-not Province and, to be quite honest about it, I am tired of it; I am tired of living in a have-not Province; I am tired of being looked down on by the rest of Canada. And there is not one single soul in this House tonight, including the Members of the Opposition, who do not have that tinge of inferiority once they leave this Province. There is nobody going to deny that, because they do, they have to.

I have family members living in

Alberta; they had to leave and go to Alberta. I have family members living in Montreal. I have a French Canadian aunt whom I love. She is a wonderful person. I have family members living in Ontario, and I can assure you that those people today, my family, and I can speak on behalf of my family, and I am sure Mr. Wells can speak on behalf of the thousands of other people who have written him in the past couple of months, but I speak on behalf of my own: I have a sister living in Alberta who called me two weeks ago and told me she was never so proud in her life to say that she was a Newfoundlander, and she has been living in Alberta some twenty-five years. My French Canadian relatives, in Montreal, have called me on a number of occasions and have said to me, believe it or not - have said to me - you tell Clyde Wells to stand firm, because not all of us Quebecers believe in Mr. Bourassa, or believe in the Meech Lake Accord.

All of you, even those Members on the opposite side, have had people from parts of Newfoundland and other parts of Canada, hundreds of them, tell them, tell them that Clyde Wells' stand on the Meech Lake Accord has to be promoted to the point where we rescind the Meech Lake Accord. I wonder about it and it has to have an influence. I argue quite often with other Members of the House, on the opposite side, on the Meech Lake question and what is on it. Like my hon. colleague for St. George's, I do not hear any arguments. I do not know what it is that you are so afraid of. I really do not.

Mr. Speaker, I think what is wrong with the hon. Members on the other side is the same basic thing that

is wrong with Mr. Bourassa. Mr. Bourassa said two weeks ago, or a week and a half ago, that you behave yourselves Newfoundlanders, because we are putting million and millions of dollars into your Province each year.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
It was disgusting.

MR. REID:  
Sure it was.

What was he saying, Mr. Speaker? He was saying you down in your have-not-Province, you second-class Canadian citizens, stay in your place, keep your mouth shut, and we will operate this nation the way we want it operated.

MS DUFF:  
That is your interpretation.

MR. REID:  
My interpretation, Mr. Speaker, is basically that the only thing - and I am not being critical of the Opposition - my interpretation is that basically you feel the same way. For some reason or other, you will feel the same as Mr. Bourassa feels.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Put it on the record, that the Deputy Mayor agrees with Bourassa.

MR. REID:  
And it is hurting me and it is hurting all kinds of Newfoundlanders all over the country, not only us back home.

Just this morning I was driving to work and on a local radio station they gave the story out about how the RC School Board of Montreal ruled last night at a meeting that if the high school kids continued to speak anything other than

French on school grounds, out of doors, out in the park, anywhere, if they refused to speak anything other than French in their schools, in Montreal, they would be expelled and be forced to go to another school.

That is shameful. Is that what our Canada is all about? Is that what we do here in Newfoundland? Is that what they do in Toronto? I sat here today and listened to a Member talking about the refugees and how hard we are treating them. Sure we are being treated just as bad, if not worse, by our Canadian counterparts, if we go by what the hon. Member has said today. But nobody believes that, of course.

MS DUFF:  
(Inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MS DUFF:  
Well, he is putting words in my mouth.

MR. REID:  
One quote has said 'Quebec has a self-imposed constitutional isolation.' In 1981, Quebec was given the opportunity along with the other nine provinces and, I guess, the territories, to enter into a constitutional Accord and they turned it down, they refused it. Since then, they have been refusing everything that has been offered to them by both Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Trudeau, and I wonder, Mr. Speaker, even if they were offered and got the Meech Lake Accord, how long that would satisfy them.

I believe the Meech Lake Accord was not a concoction of the ten Premiers and Prime Ministers in

this country, I think the Meech Lake Accord was a concoction of the Prime Minister himself, because the Prime Minister himself needs the people of Quebec in order for him to get elected. Without them, he knows he does not stand a chance. Is that what the Government of Canada under Mr. Mulroney expects us and the rest of Canada to do, go along with his particular whims on that question? I hope not.

Earlier, somebody mentioned New Brunswick and Manitoba, and said we were not alone. We are not alone. This is something that bothers me too, when you consider that New Brunswick seems to be holding steady. Just today the National Assembly, by the way, of Quebec - that is what they call themselves, the National Assembly, the only province in Canada that calls themselves, a provincial government, a National Assembly. That says something in itself.

MR. POWER:

We are the only ones to call ourselves a House of Assembly, so what does that mean?

MR. REID:

Look up the word 'house' and look up the word 'national' and you will find the answer.

Why is it, I wonder, that all this emphasis is being placed on Newfoundland to salvage the Meech Lake Accord. If we voted tonight against rescinding the Accord, I wonder would New Brunswick and Manitoba say because Clyde Wells has now gone along with the Government of Canada, well, we will have to as well? I do not think so.

So I do not really think the emphasis should be placed only on

Newfoundland. The emphasis has to be placed on Manitoba, it has to be placed on New Brunswick. And, funny thing about it, I would place it on British Columbia as well, because Mr. Vander Zalm, some - what? - four or five months ago, made a proposal to the Prime Minister to have the Meech Lake Accord changed. The answer to that, of course, by Mr. Mulroney and by his friend, Mr. Bourassa, was, 'no way.' Today they came out and said no way to New Brunswick. They have already said, in no uncertain terms to Newfoundland, 'no way.' And they have said it to Manitoba. The surprising thing about it all, and the ironic part of it, is that you all know that the stand of those Premiers who are supporting Mr. Mulroney on the Meech lake is weakening on a daily basis.

Look at the article in The Evening Telegram today about our hon. friend, Mr. Peterson, in Ontario. Basically, he said he does not believe any more that the country will die or separate if we do not sign the Meech Lake Accord. That is a 180 degree turn from where he was a month ago. What is happening across the country, I wonder?

One of the other points the Opposition have been raising, and I have heard it on a number of occasions here, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that the Opposition of the day, in 1988 I guess, which was made up of a number of now Government Members, and I can go back to Hansard I guess, but I do not have to, because everybody has heard it, voted in favor of Meech Lake. Then I heard the comment, Well, your Leader did or your ex-Leader did. I went back and I found out the truth of it. Let me, if I may, Mr. Speaker, and if

you wish me to table it I certainly will, but it is Hansard, July 7, 1988, and I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am confused. I am actually confused. Because I look down over the list of Members who voted in favor of adopting Meech Lake, and then I read 'those against the motion, please rise:' the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells), Mr. Efford, the hon. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Walter Carter, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Hiscock, Mr. Decker, and Mr. Gullage.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Who were for it?

MR. REID:  
I knew they were going to ask me that, Mr. Speaker. I will enjoy reading out the names of those people who did vote, and I will table it: Mr. Windsor, Mr. Rideout, Ms Verge, Mr. Hearn, Mr. Brett, Mr. Power, Mr. Simms, Mr. Collins, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Dinn, Mr. Young, Mr. Matthews, Mr. Butt, Mr. Russell, Mr. Blanchard, Mr. Warren, Mr. Greening, Mr. Reid, Mr. Carter, Mr. Baird, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Woodford, Mr. Callan, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Fenwick and Mr. Long. What was the name of that gentleman who was supposed to have voted in favor of that?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
It is on the next page.

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

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, I would not want the hon. the Member for Carbonear to

be misled or misunderstand what happened. I think if he moves on through the rest of Hansard, a little further on he will see that Mr. Barry came in late and leave was given him to stand up and vote in favor of Meech Lake, and that happened.

MR. REID:  
I believe it was the next day, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:  
At least you are now admitting he did vote for it.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
That evening.

MR. SIMMS:  
Make up your mind. You knew it all along.

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order.

The hon. the Member for Carbonear.

MR. REID:  
Let me finish. If I had not been so rudely interrupted, I would have finished and you would have understood what I was going to say. It was on the next day, in fact. Somebody said that Mr. Barry was not in the House at the time, and it was on the next day that Mr. Barry voted. There are records of him voting. But out of the total number who voted that night on the Meech Lake Accord, I can find only thirty-seven names, and Mr. Barry makes thirty-eight - the next day. I have searched back through this, through Hansard, and I cannot find it. The point is, I am sure there were fifty-two Members in this House in 1988. Where were the other fifteen Members of this House, a substantial number from the now Opposition? Where were they?

Where were they when the vote was called? Did they rescind? Did they decide not to come? Why did they not come in the next day and vote in favour of it? And I am questioning whether or not there were Members who refused to vote.

MR. SIMMS:

That is unparliamentary.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You do not have thirty-one here tonight, do you?

MR. REID:

I am not questioning that. I am saying that a man out of honour had his name put on the record the next day and I am wondering why all those who were Members of the House of Assembly did not have the honour of having their names put on the record the next day as well.

MR. HEWLETT:

(Inaudible) Barry's position, that is why.

MR. TOBIN:

All your Members did not vote against it, either. They are not all on the record.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. REID:

Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make on that is I do not know. I can only suspect there were other Members in this House who were basically the same way as I was two months ago, when I was not sure on Meech Lake, and I guess because of the lack of information put forth by the previous Government, they had to back out as well and not show up in the House. I am only assuming that. I do not know. And maybe some of the Members of the Opposition at the time did the same thing. I do

not know. I am sure there were. But I want to impress upon you that all those Gentlemen whom I mentioned in the Opposition did vote against the motion and I do not think, for the record, that it is fair for Members to say that certain Members on this side -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

MR. REID:

May I make one final comment, Mr. Speaker? Just one final comment?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes.

MR. REID:

Mr. Speaker, basically, what I am saying here tonight is that I do not really want to fight with anyone over Meech Lake. I am not going to fight with anyone over Meech Lake. All I want people in Newfoundland and Labrador to do is look at what this Government is proposing. I think if they look at it with sound minds and rational minds, they will have no other choice but to say, Look, we want something better for the Province of Newfoundland and they will vote and they will support this Government's stand on Meech Lake. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, when this debate started a long time ago, I really did not have any intention of participating. I felt that others much more knowledgeable about this subject than I am, and perhaps

much more capable of political debate, would have covered all of the issues and, therefore, I could listen. I might say that they, the participants and the speakers, have covered the subject extremely well, and spoken very eloquently at times, and I have enjoyed it very much. And I might want to thank the Members. I have learned a great deal from the speeches and the debates. But I do feel compelled to say a few words, Mr. Speaker.

I have listened with great interest to the reasons for passing the Accord, particularly the reasons presented by the Members of the Opposition. There seemed to me to be four reasons I have identified in the past few days. The first argument used to support the passage of this Accord is that Quebec was left out of the Constitution in 1982 and should now be brought in. I have heard that more often than any other reason, and that is a very powerful argument, Mr. Speaker. I am sure we all agree with the suggestion that Quebec should be brought into the Constitution. I guess the question I have to ask is, under what conditions — under what conditions, Mr. Speaker? I might say, also, that I have some difficulty understanding the argument that Quebec was rejected by the people of this country in 1982. As the Premier stated quite early in the debate, and some of my colleagues have said, a Quebecer was the leader of the Federal Government at the time of patriation; number two, the senior Ministers in the Federal Government were from Quebec; the most powerful Members in the Federal Government were from Quebec; number three, Parliament at that time, in 1982, spoke for Quebec as well as for the rest of

the country. So I have some difficulty accepting this suggestion that Canada rejected Quebec.

I might add, that in 1982, as someone pointed out in this House — I jotted it down a few days ago — Quebec was led by a Separatist Government which was not about to accept a package which suggested that Canada can work. That Government had no intention of accepting any package. I might say, also, Mr. Speaker, that my understanding is, and I am not sure about this, that the Quebec Government has received all the benefits of the 1982 package, including enhanced authority over natural resources, guarantees of equalization payments, and the notwithstanding clause in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. So, Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to understand the argument that Canada rejected Quebec in 1982. Quebec may have been left out, but Canada, I would suggest, did not reject Quebec in 1982.

Now, the second argument given by the supporters of the Accord, and I have heard it from the Opposition, is that the Meech Lake Accord provides more power for the provinces, and that provides a balance to the centralist policies of, say, the Trudeau era. I do not think I need to expand on that argument, because I reject most vehemently the concept of Canada as a community of communities. This country needs a strong central Government, not only to provide the degree of equality that we have come to expect in this country, but also to be a strong actor on the international stage. I think that is a very important reason to support a strong central Federal Government

in this country.

The third argument that has been used to support passage of the Accord is this one, and this is a most interesting one. I have heard some of the best constitutional persons in the country use this. I heard a phone-in show a few weeks ago. I just forget the political scientist, but he was a supporter of the Accord, but increasingly I heard him say, 'While the Accord is flawed, we should pass it now and fix it later.' Now, that seems to be the line he was using. Those who support the Accord say you will never get a perfect solution, you will never get an adequate solution, so let us go with what we have. That is what I have heard the Opposition say. Let us go with what we have, because passage will bring stability to Federal Provincial relations in Canada and help the country survive. That is the kind of argument.

Mr. Speaker, all of us on this side of the House want this country to survive, but we also want it to thrive; to thrive as a country, to survive and thrive. Not just certain parts of this country, either, Mr. Speaker. So that is the third reason for passage, and I reject that one.

Now the fourth argument, and perhaps this one is related to the third, is that we cannot imagine another decade of constitutional debate and tension, and there have been times in this House in the last few days where I have almost bought that. We cannot go through another period of that. They say we are turned off with Constitutional debate. Let us get on with the more important things I have heard people say. Well, I

would ask the question what is more important than the Constitution of a country, the basic laws of the land which determine how people work and how jobs are provided and how wealth is distributed, and how people are treated irrespective of where they live in this country or irrespective of what colour they have or what wealth they have? A Constitution making is important, so I reject that fourth argument.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the main arguments that are now being put forth by the supporters of the Accord. Even the academics, as I said earlier, are using these reasons. No longer do I hear them talk about the substance of the Accord, the specific sections, the meat, as somebody said the other day. I think that throughout this country even the people who have supported this Accord have recognized that the Meech Lake Accord is as flawed as the process that produced it. I think they have come to realize that.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should say a few words about the substance of the Accord and indicate why I am unable to accept it, despite the strong emotional arguments that we hear from time to time. I will list two or three of the reasons and not comment on them, but then, perhaps, comment in some detail on a couple I think are important from my perspective.

The first argument is that while I believe Quebec is a distinct society, I do not believe that we should pass an Accord that gives one province significantly expanded legislative jurisdiction. We have heard that, and I would suggest that is my first reason. I do not need to expand, because that has been



dealt with adequately.

Number two, and we have heard this, I believe we must have a reformed Senate that will help balance political and economic decision-making in this country, and I would suggest that that reformed Senate is impossible with Meech. I am not suggesting a Triple E Senate is a panacea, and I do not think anybody on this side has suggested it, but I think it is an important element in constitutional reform.

Number three: Mr. Speaker, I believe we must make it possible for additional provinces to join the Federation. Changing the amending formula to require unanimity for the establishment of new provinces, I would suggest, will virtually eliminate the possibility of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon ever becoming provinces. Now, maybe I am wrong on that, but I sense that this is a very important problem.

These are three of the reasons I reject, but there are two others I would like to address in a little more detail. These relate, Mr. Speaker, to the impact of the Accord on the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and, secondly, on the spending powers of the Federal Government. And I want to say a few words about the distinct society clause and the Charter. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that because the distinct society clause is in the body of the Constitution, it will have a major impact on the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The courts could very well rule that the Charter is subservient to that clause. In other words, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that an Anglophone in Quebec may not have the same rights, may not have the same equality or freedom of

rights as a Francophone in Manitoba. Is the press to be free in one province and not in another? Will there be different religious freedoms in one province from those of another? It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that constitutional rights must apply equally to all Canadians. If the distinct society clause is adopted, the nature of our basic rights could henceforth vary, depending on the province in which we live and the linguistic group to which we belong. The recognition to Quebec as a distinct society, in the body of the Constitution, must not be permitted to impact on the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We do not want in this country a patchwork of human rights, and that is what could result.

I want to make another comment on the Charter. I remember the Charter debate quite well, and I am not ashamed to say that I was very, very proud as a Canadian when the Charter of Rights and Freedoms was entrenched in the Constitution. The Charter, to me, Mr. Speaker, is the people's package in the Constitution - it is the people's package.

But I was never happy, Mr. Speaker, with the notwithstanding clause. In fact, I had hoped that that clause would be renegotiated before now, or at some future conference. The notwithstanding clause was included originally as a compromise in order to obtain the agreement of certain provinces, and I gather they were the western provinces, particularly the Province of Manitoba. Put this clause with the distinct society clause, and I think we have a major problem for individual rights in Canada, particularly the right to freedom

of thought and expression, the right to freedom of religion, freedom of the press, equality rights, Section 15 of the Charter, and the right to life, liberty and security of the person.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, I believe the distinct society clause should be placed in the preamble and the notwithstanding clause eliminated.

If we were to amend the Accord to state that the distinct society clause was subject to the Charter but considered under Section 1 of the Charter, I think that would be a fair Canadian compromise, and I would be much, much happier with the Accord if that were done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the spending power of the Federal Government. I believe it was Section 91 Subsection (3) - I guess Professor Noel is not listening up there at the present time, but I believe it was Section 91 Subsection (3), my colleague, of the Constitution that gave Parliament exclusive jurisdiction to enact laws for the purpose of raising money. This gave Canada, I would suggest, a strong central Government, because the right to raise money is accompanied by the right to spend money on national programs, programs of national interest.

The Accord changes this by providing that the Federal Government financially compensate a province which chooses to participate in a national cost-shared program. Mr. Speaker, I believe that national cost-shared programs are important in this country. I would suggest they have provided a mechanism for the development of a sense of community, a sense of belonging in Canada. In this country we have

built a national identity that is centered on a shared concern for human welfare, an identity that is enhanced when national programs help less prosperous provinces, provide social services and programs that would otherwise be beyond their reach.

I might add one additional point, Mr. Speaker, if you will remember the free trade debate. I believe a consensus developed during that debate that national social programs were one of the defining dimensions of Canada. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the Meech Lake Accord does not define national shared cost programs, and I wonder about the possibility in the future of a national Day Care Program. I even wonder about a reformed Health Care Program. I know the Accord talks about new national programs, but we hear a great deal from the Federal Government about the cost of the Health Care Program. What if a totally reformed program were introduced? What would happen?

As the Premier said in one of his speeches, and I am not sure, he said inevitably the result of the change in spending powers will be a patchwork of programs across the country with different standards, a reluctance to develop such programs and a steadily weakening commitment to reduce regional disparities and promote equal opportunities for all Canadians, especially in the poorer, disadvantaged regions. 'Inevitably,' the Premier said, 'this will steadily weaken our sense of national community,' and, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should never let that happen.

Mr. Speaker, there are other programs I could talk about that we need in this country, and I am

sure if I had the time I could talk about the need for a national program in the area of education. The Federal Government has talked about excellence in education from coast to coast, and what have they done? They have talked about it and they have cut the programs that already exist.

I would like to make one additional point, Mr. Speaker. I am pro-Quebec and pro-Canada. I want this country to survive and thrive. I spent a considerable amount of time, in the 1950s, in Quebec, I suppose before Larry was born, or some of the other people. I always felt very much at home. Quebecers and Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have a great deal in common. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a Canadian, travelling this country from coast to coast. It is a great country. A very rich country, with its diversity and the people we have. I have never been prouder, Mr. Speaker, than when I travel abroad. When I travel Europe and I go from country to country, and the Far East just a few years ago with my family, I wore my Canadian flag and as soon as I was identified as a Canadian, my family and I felt we received special treatment.

So I am proud of this country, I can assure you, and we must do everything possible to promote it. But I believe this can best be done, Mr. Speaker, by undertaking an open review of this badly flawed document, by negotiating a new deal. I share the optimism, Mr. Speaker, of Claude Ryan, a very articulate, thoughtful Quebecer who said, 'The failure of the Accord will not be a catastrophe.' I believe that. I believe we have the strength and the ingenuity and the courage to

renew it. There is a great deal of tension, Mr. Speaker, in this country at the present time. I admit that. There is a great deal of tension in this country. I believe that. But tension can be creative - tension can be creative. Now is the time, Mr. Speaker, for real negotiation. Canada's and Quebec's all or nothing approach must be rejected. John Kennedy once said - I think it was John Kennedy - 'Let us never negotiate out of fear, but let us never fear to negotiate.' Mr. Speaker, I believe that. This is the spirit that should guide the present Meech Lake debate.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity to build a special nation, a nation that will be strong years from now. Meech Lake, I would suggest to you, may buy peace in our time. It may do that. But we must ensure that it buys peace in our children's time. That is the challenge! We cannot let this Accord destroy the Canadian dream, Mr. Speaker, a dream of trust and understanding and harmony and equality for all. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. SIMMS:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, what we are witnessing here now for the last

hour or more is nothing short of a sham. We have to ask the question, what kinds of games are the Government now playing? What has happened is absolutely scandalous.

First of all, this Government introduced closure to limit debate on the resolution by the Opposition. No question, that is the reason for closure. Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen is the introduction of another form of closure within closure. That is precisely what has been happening.

The Opposition finished debate on the amendment an hour ago. Since that time, the Government have put up four speakers to the amendment. I spoke to the Government House Leader out behind the curtain an hour ago and he said, 'Oh, maybe one more speaker. That is about all we plan to put up.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is nothing short -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
That was the deal.

MR. TOBIN:  
What is the Premier afraid of?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:  
This is nothing short of high-handedness. It is the worst form of dictatorship I have ever seen in this Legislature. It is typical, though, of what we saw occur throughout this whole process: A rush on the resolution, five days, closure, last Friday they used their majority to overrule the Speaker.

MS VERGE:

Their own Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:  
Evidence, Mr. Speaker, of absolutely tyranny, and it is something this House should not stand for. I can say to the Premier now, if this is the kind of game he intends to play for the rest of the evening, then we might as well pack up shop and leave.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker, this is a little intolerant.

MR. SIMMS:  
Yes. You can say that again!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER WELLS:  
The Opposition House Leader, ever since he sat in the Chair Your Honour now occupies, thinks he runs the House in everything and does, and operates on a scheming basis to control the House on a daily basis.

Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMS:  
(Inaudible) an attack.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker, I will address the problem. The problem raised is that the Opposition House Leader wants to run the affairs of the House. Well, he cannot do it, Mr. Speaker. He is one Member, and he is the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:  
What did you do last night, if you

did not run the House. This is scandalous what you are doing, scandalous!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader again rose on a point of privilege. I did not hear anybody to my left raise any objection, they listened to the point of privilege. I would now expect that Members to my right would afford the Premier the same courtesy and listen to his response.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is a simple matter. When we discussed earlier this evening, the - I would still like to be heard, Mr. Speaker. If the only Member would just restrain his mouth for a minute, I would still like to be heard. Earlier this evening, at seven o'clock, when we talked about the rules that would apply and Your Honour ruled the rules, I had no hesitation saying of course we should agree, and though the Opposition House Leader stood up, the offer to do it and the suggestion that it would be done, that the Leader of the Opposition and I would speak, came from this side of the House, despite the fact that the hon. the Opposition House Leader stood up and put it forward as -

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible).

PREMIER WELLS:

He does not disagree now - put it forward as his own at the time. We know the way he operates. In

any event, Mr. Speaker, we want to be totally fair and accommodating. All of a sudden, the Opposition House Leader insists that even though this is a Government motion, the motion that I tabled as the Leader of the Government and in the ordinary course I would be the wind-up speaker, that is the normal rule of this House, now the Opposition House Leader insists that the Leader of the Opposition have the right to speak last. I disagree with that. I agree that the Leader of the Opposition should clue up the debate. If he wanted to, I would agree to his cluing up the debate on the Amendment, or speaking later on, if he wishes.

Mr. Speaker, everybody in this House has a right to speak, but I will not sit and see the Opposition House Leader take this House on his back and run it as though it must be run to suit his needs. We would agree, Mr. Speaker, if they will agree, to the proper and fair conclusion of this debate in the ordinary course, that as the mover of the motion I will clue up the debate, and the Opposition House Leader will speak when he wishes, before me if he wishes, or at any time during the course of the evening he wishes. We would agree to call the amendment now and alternate speakers during the course of the evening. The problem is, the Opposition House Leader says, 'it is my way or no way' and that is not acceptable, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) that is the problem.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order please!

I just heard the Opposition House Leader say to the Premier that 'he lied'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

He did, too. He did. He did.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. House Leader must retract that statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

I am asking the hon. Opposition House Leader to retract the statement. He said to the Premier, 'you lied'.

MR. TOBIN:

He did.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that it has to take a point of privilege or a point of order to finally get before this House the real reason for what is happening here this evening. Under the normal course of events, and everybody who has attended this historic debate over the last couple of weeks know, including the press who has covered it, under the normal course of events, Government Members for the last two weeks, with the odd exception, every now and then a Government Member would get up and speak for ten, twelve or fifteen minutes, but with the odd exception they stayed in their seats.

Tonight we have a closure motion before this House. If there ever

was a time when debate should alternate back and forth across the House, it is now. Mr. Speaker, if the Government wants to muzzle the Opposition, they can do it according to the rules of this House - if they want to muzzle. They are muzzling now this Legislature with closure, they can muzzle us for the rest of tonight if they so wish, because they have a number of Members who did not speak on the Amendment. They can do that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

We have a right to speak.

MR. RIDEOUT:

They have a right to speak. Under the rules of this Parliament, the Government can do it, just as the Government, last Friday, scuttled the Deputy Speaker of this House, one of their own Members. They had the right to do it, it was wrong, but they used their majority to do it. Now, Mr. Speaker, if they wish, they can continue to do that for the rest of this night. It has all fallen down, Mr. Speaker. I did not ask, nobody from this side of the House asked. We stood on a point of order earlier tonight and asked what the rules were going to be. But, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Government in this Chamber, without being asked, came across the floor tonight during the time when Your Honour was looking at the rules and precedents of the House and offered, offered to the Leader of the Opposition, to clue up the debate.

MR. SIMMS:

That is right. That is what you did.

MR. RIDEOUT:

There was nothing about an amendment, nothing about

amendments that was heard hither and yon. Now, Mr. Speaker, we accepted that. And I can tell the Premier now that the rules of this House will apply, and that if that deal does not go, nothing else is going in this House tonight!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Right on! Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, let me say there is no point of privilege whatsoever.

The Opposition House Leader made an amendment to a motion before the House, and every Member in the House has a right to speak to that amendment - every Member

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I again point out that the hon. Opposition Leader spoke without interruption and now, when the Government House Leader starts, we get interruptions from the right. I ask the hon. Government House Leader to continue.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The hon. the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island was chattering all the while I was on my feet.

MR. BAKER:

Every Member in this House has a right to speak to that amendment. That is a normal rule of this House. It is no trick. There is no trickery involved here. They are simply following normal procedure. Mr. Speaker, a number

of times in the last few years in this House -

MS VERGE:

We have not spoken on the main motion and you are cutting us off.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BAKER:

I would say to the hon. the Member for Humber East, if you did not want people to speak to the amendment, then why put it? If your amendment is not important enough for us to speak to, then why put it?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Why did you bring closure? You brought closure. This dictatorial Noreiga Government brought closure. That is what happened. That is why, Manuel. It is a farce! It is a fraud! It is a sham! Manuel and his cohorts.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, having established the fact that this is not a point of privilege, having established the fact by their actions that they are simply grandstanding, having established by their actions they intend to continue to grandstand, I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I am quite willing to allow the amendment to be voted on, to get back to one speaker from each side. If that is what has to be done, we are quite willing to do that. But, Mr. Speaker, on those grounds, all previous deals are off and we will simply go back and forth in the normal course of events. If Members are so incensed by the fact that we want to speak to their amendment, and we have every right to, if they are so incensed by that, then we are willing -

MR. RIDEOUT:

You are a double-crosser. That is what you are.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The Leader of the Opposition must be asked to retract that remark made about the hon. the Government House Leader, that he is a double-crosser. I ask him to retract that.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Without any prompting, Your Honour.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, as I say, we are willing to go back to one speaker from each side, the twenty minutes, following the normal rules of the House. We will not put up any more speakers to the amendment, we will simply put up speakers to the main motion. We will, first of all, take the vote on the amendment, then put up speakers to the main motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

If hon. Members persist in speaking to the same point of privilege, there is no point of privilege. The Chair cannot be party to agreements. The Chair does not negotiate agreements, Opposite parties do that. The Chair can only call it according to the rules, and the rules are we are debating an amendment and until such time as the Chair can call the question, quite obviously the amendment must continue.

There is no point in carrying on these frivolous points of privilege, because there is no point of privilege. I have not heard the point of privilege that has been raised yet, but I tell hon. Members the Chair cannot be

part of agreements reached by either side because the Chair cannot rule on agreements. If agreements are broken the Chair has no way of enforcing them, that has to be worked out by hon. Members again, and I say there is no point of privilege.

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, the President of Treasury Board in his submission that time said all Members of this House have the right to speak on this amendment. I concur, but Mr. Speaker, all Members of this House have the right to speak on the motion. And the Government has muzzled us in speaking on the motion.

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order I am sure I speak for all of my colleagues when I say we will not object to every Member over there speaking on the amendment if they will do the decent, honourable thing and let every Member in this House speak on the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once



again there is obviously no point of order here. It is simply an attempt by the Member to let off a little steam. I will say to him, however, that he should talk to his leader. His leader is the individual in this House who took the main motion off the floor by presenting the amendment. And I would suggest to him that he should have argued in the first place if the main motion was what he is interested in speaking to, and he has been sitting there chafing at the bit for days, then he should have persuaded his leader not to put the amendment yet. So, Mr. Speaker, there is really no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The question. All those in favour of the amendment please say 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against the amendment please say 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

'Nay'.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion is defeated.

Now we are back on the resolution.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the opportunity to speak to this resolution before the House. Speak to it, Mr. Speaker,

realizing of course, that I am speaking to it to some extent under duress because of the muzzle tactics of the President of Treasury Board and the Government, Mr. Speaker. Because of their desperation to ram something through for some unknown reason, they in their wisdom have decided to put a muzzle on the Opposition. The President of Treasury Board, Mr. Speaker, could stand in this House a few minutes ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a few words that are not parliamentary and I will not use them, but when the President of Treasury Board or the Government House Leader could stand in this House a few minutes ago and articulate that every Member has a right to speak on the amendment. No argument, Mr. Speaker, but should not every Member have a right to speak on a motion as well? Should not every Member have the right to speak to the Motion? Should not every Member in this Legislature have the right?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Speak to it.

MR. TOBIN:

I am going to speak to it. And I am also going to speak to the muzzle tactics of the Government House Leader.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

You have, Sir, tried to muzzle the people of this Province and the people that we represent by bringing in closure on a Bill as important as the destiny of this Country, Mr. Speaker. Not because this Government here is out with one objective, and that is to

destroy this country, that the people have got to be destroyed who have been democratically elected to come in and represent their constituents. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is something that we should not have to put up with.

But Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak to this resolution. I intend to speak to this resolution in a very sincere and genuine way. Because like some speakers before me, like the Member for St. George's, while disagreed with what he had to say there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman spoke with sincerity, no doubt in my mind whatsoever.

But Mr. Speaker, there are lots of doubt in my mind about the sincerity of the Premier of this Province and the Government House Leader when they get together and bring in a muzzle motion, Mr. Speaker. That is what is before the House right now, a muzzle motion to deny us the right as elected officials to debate. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, on a motion right now there is going to be approximately three hours debate on a motion to decide the future of Canada. There will be three hours debate, Mr. Speaker, on the Meech Lake motion. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that democracy. Is that what we are elected to come here for? Is that what Canada is about, Mr. Speaker? I would suggest it is not.

Mr. Speaker, everyone I speak to and indeed the Members that I have listened to agree that Quebec is distinct. French is different from English. They are both languages. Civil law is different from common law. However, both are methods to create a law abiding society. Same or different, distinct or similar, we

as Canadians have all decided that Quebec is significantly different from the rest and they warrant the description distinct.

How to constitutionally acknowledge the distinctness of a country is what is in turmoil. Preamble or main body. To use one of the Premier's most favourite sayings 'How silly, what difference does it really make.' The Premier, Mr. Speaker, in his arguments feels it is a substantial change in the constitution by affirming for a Quebec Legislature a role to preserve and promote a distinct identity for Quebec, reflecting a distinct society creates a special legislative status that no other province would have. So he says put it in the preamble and the legitimate concerns of aboriginal people and multiculturalism and all should be well understood.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, or fortunately there is another body of opinion that disagrees with Premier Wells, that group of many learned scholars, professors, lawyers, politicians will quote song and verse to prove that Quebec has been granted no distinct legislative authority. Our present constitution, imperfect as we will all agree, sets down in six sections, four original, two amendments, the powers of the Province of the Parliament of Canada.

The Constitutional Accord of 1987 does not change any of the six sections, the courts are to be aware that they should interpret the constitution in a manner consistent with the recognition that Quebec constitutes within Canada, a distinct society. This in effect has been happening since 1867. There are no new powers.

Meech Lake goes on to say for greater clarity that nothing in this section derogates from the powers, rights or privileges of the Parliament or Government of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how can you say that the Quebec Legislature has more power? It can be fabricated, where will they get it? Can they create it? Can they make it, Mr. Speaker, from nothing? It is indeed highly unlikely, however, let us assume, as some do, that Quebec does have some distinctiveness to persevere or promote its obvious distinctiveness that does not bother me or most Members. There is a big difference in English Ontario, Mr. Speaker, as my friend for Ferryland said tonight, there is a big difference in the communities in English Ontario that make laws protecting the rights of English than a French town or a community that makes laws protecting the rights of French. Some may argue, Mr. Speaker, that when you put forth that argument what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. The difference is that every democracy in the Western World has acknowledged that we must go the extra step to protect the minorities.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do you believe that?

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, I do believe that. Yes, most certainly.

How the Premier, Mr. Speaker, can appoint — there are several things come to mind, Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Ferryland said tonight the Premier has the Minister responsible for the Status of Women, because, Mr. Speaker, it

was the Peckford Administration that brought in that ministry, but it was brought in for a reason, that was to protect the rights or to correct something that had been wrong, I guess, for a long time.

I believe we should continue to make special efforts to have laws equal for all people. Language is the soul of a culture, lose it and you lose your difference and uniqueness. Language laws in Quebec where French minority wishes to protect their linguistic heritage must be looked at differently from the town in English Ontario as I have already said.

I personally do not believe that if the Meech Lake Accord were to pass that the Quebec Legislature has untold powers that the other provinces would not have. The Constitution of Canada, the Charter of Rights would make sure of this and the Supreme Court of Canada would be the way to follow. As it relates to other issues which have been brought forward such as the rights of the veloes which the Premier has talked about, we all know that these have to be interpreted. In the case the Premier is assuming the other side is incapable of understanding or accommodating our situation, constitutional change on many issues would still be accommodated under Section 38 which requires two-third provinces and 50 per cent of the population, and I would suggest that the Premier should be very much aware of this Section and to look at what could happen if we are not extremely careful.

MR. EFFORD:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

What is that? Mr. Speaker, - table that. Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Social Services tables the answers he could not give this morning about the \$10,000 slush fund which is in the Minister's office, that is when we start tabling stuff, when he would not give the answer this morning. There will be a time to deal with that, by the way.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

(Inaudible) he has not heard the last of that yet!

MR. TOBIN:

No, he has not. After we get into the Meech Lake Accord, and get into the issues which are of concern here and talk about various issues, we have to realize of course the economic conditions of this Province, we have to realize that we, as Newfoundlanders, Canadians, Newfoundlanders living in Canada, that there is an extremely delicate situation in terms of the unemployment rate, in terms of the numbers of people who are unemployed, and in terms of how the Premier proposes to change the economic conditions of this Province as it relates to Senate reform. Mr. Speaker, I, like my colleague from Ferryland earlier tonight, must say that I agree very strongly, that there are one or two things which must happen to the Senate and that is, it has to change or be abolished, because the English system of doing things which we are witnessing in the Senate of Canada, is not the type of Body, that I for one, want to be heading up this country.

I do not know why, or where, if there is Senate Reform, and if every thing happens, if the ideal situation happens which the Premier is putting forth, where

will the Senate get their power? The Senate right now do not have any power. There are no powers in the Senate, none whatsoever, so, if the Senate is to get power, somebody has to give up something. There are two levels of Government in this country right now, there is the Federal level and the Provincial level and he wants the Senate to be the Utopia of all of this, so if the Senate becomes the utopial power, if all of that power that the Premier wants is designated to the Senate and they are all elected. So tomorrow we go out and we vote for senators, six from each province, they are all elected.

An elected Senate has to have some function. In order for them to function with more autonomy, more power than the present Senate has, it has to come from somewhere.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

What was that?

The Senate of Canada has some power. How many days can the Senate of Canada hold up a Bill before they have to refer it back?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Forever.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, forever. Like they tried to do with two or three of these and they had to refer them back with amendments and the Parliament of Canada sent them back to the Senate, Mr. Speaker, and said proceed as directed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, The Premier knows as well as I do and everybody else in this country the Senate of Canada is the place for

political appointees, political hacks. That is most of what is in the Senate of Canada, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Most of them Liberals.

MR. TOBIN:  
Yes, most of them Liberals, Mr. Speaker. There are Senators in this country today, Mr. Speaker, who are picking up their cheques and do not even know where the Senate is located. That is what is going on in this country today with the Senate.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
I do not care what they are. I do not care if they are PC or Liberal, it is not important to me what they are, all I am saying is the Senate does not serve a function. The people who are sitting in the Senate today are there because of their political affiliation and were appointed by either a Tory or a Liberal Prime Minister of this country. Now that is the long and the short of the Senate.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
Pardon?

If the Senate is to stay as it is, yes I would rather see it abolished than functioning the way it is. I have no difficulty with arguing to change the Senate. But if the Senate of Canada has to have more power and more autonomy than they have, and in order to get it, it is either Government of Canada or the Government of the provinces who are going to give it

up, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
Who is Kaiser? Did you say Kaiser?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
Oh, I thought you said Kaiser. Because we all know who Kaiser is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how are the powers of the Senate and how are six elected Senators from Newfoundland in the elected Senate in Canada, an equal Senate, how are they going to find jobs for the 20 per cent unemployment rate that is in this Province? If you are going to have sixty Senators you cannot send 39,000 unemployed Newfoundlanders up there because that is what is unemployed today in this province.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Thirty-nine thousand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:  
Thirty-nine thousand, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
No, but we might hear you.

I would say to the Minister of Finance that we might hear him before the night is over. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we might hear the Minister of Finance before the night is over. I am not sure if the Minister of Finance knows what I am talking about or not.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

We might just hear from him before the night is over.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier talks about the spending powers and what is involved in the spending powers, and how the Federal Government can come into areas - do you know what the Premier used the other day for a demonstration, it was medicare.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Medicare?

MR. TOBIN:

Medicare, medicare, he used medicare. The Premier said that if you looked at medicare for an example-

PREMIER WELLS:

Day care.

MR. TOBIN:

You said medicare Sir. I can produce Hansard that will show you where you used medicare. And you know, and I know that this is not for programs that are already in place. So medicare was in place and you talked about day care after you said it. The Premier can shake his hand all he like but Hansard will show that the Premier of this Province got up in the House of Assembly the other day and used day care as an example of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

That is right. Now you have it right.

MR. TOBIN:

Now, let me finish. He used day care as an example after he used medicare and it was brought to his attention by some of the Members opposite. He said that is right, that is an old thing.

So the fact of the matter is the Premier talks about us using scare tactics and things such as that. He was the fellow who got up here in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and tried to use medicare. When it was brought to his attention he changed it to day care. That is exactly what happened in this Legislature. The day care program, Mr. Speaker, would be better served under what is in the Meech Lake agreement than under what you are proposing. The day care would be better served, because as I have said so often in this debate, a day care program tailored by the bureaucrats in Ottawa, would be dedicated and meant for who, for Central Canada.

That is who the bureaucrats would have it designated and tailored for, Mr. Speaker. A day care program good for Toronto - Ontario may not be good for Petit Fort, Newfoundland. Under this system here we would be able to have put in place, with Federal funding, the appropriate day care system for this Province. It would be a system suited and tailored for it. It would be a day care program for somewhere in this Province, whether it be in Ming's Bight or in Winterland, but it would be a program where the Minister of Social Services and his officials would be able to take the money from Ottawa, put it together, look at it, use their dollars and apply a day care program to be most suited to the Province.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

What about the women's centres, \$1.7 million?

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. Member that there is nobody on this side of the House who

disagrees with what he is saying. There is nobody on this side of the House who supports the actions of the Federal Government in cutting funding to the women's centres. It is terrible, Mr. Speaker, it is terrible. We condemn it to the fullest. What I am saying is we must be able to tailor programs to the needs of this Province and this will give us the opportunity to do so. What happens right now? If the Federal Government brings in a program today what happens?

MR. MURPHY:

We would all pass out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Will you pass out taking their \$2.7 billion for Hibernia?

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. John's South has not got a whole lot of passing to do to pass out, because if there has ever been a corpse sitting up in this House it has to be the Member for St. John's South.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Member for St. John's South (inaudible) new care program.

MR. TOBIN:

What did you say, new care program?

The Member for St. John's South is usually interrupting me, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier has this great fantasy about the Supreme Court. Granted he knows a lot more about the Supreme Court than I do. He knows a lot more about it than anyone in Newfoundland does because he has been there so often defending the Federal Government against the

rights of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, he has a path broke there. There is a list of what he has been involved in. All you have to do today is read the editorial in the Evening Telegram and it will give you some indication of what I am talking about.

The Supreme Court of Canada has never had a Newfoundlander sitting on it - maybe the Premier will be the first one and good luck to him if he is. I would be as proud as anyone to see a Newfoundlander, and if it is the Premier I would be just as proud to see him there as anyone else. Now for the first time we have the right as a Province to nominate someone to the Supreme Court of Canada. Under this agreement we have the right to nominate people to the Senate of Canada. As a matter of fact I believe the Prime Minister, in the appointment of Senator Ottenheimer - I believe that was the first time the Prime Minister, while Meech Lake was not passed - it is the first time that he actioned Meech Lake in taking these names, when asking the Premiers of the provinces for names.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Does the hon. Member for the other side wish to speak?

MR. FLIGHT:

No, that is okay.

MR. HEWLETT:

I will speak after the hon. Member. There is no problem. We will be civilized in this, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

MR. FLIGHT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I sincerely thank the hon. Member for Green Bay for yielding to me. Obviously I have to presume he was on his feet before I was, Mr. Speaker, but I thought we had agreed to go one on one and that would be automatic.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud and pleased to speak in this debate, particularly on the main motion. I may not take the full twenty minutes accorded to me, Mr. Speaker. It will be very difficult not to be repetitious after the past fifteen or sixteen hours of debate on the debate to rescind the Meech Lake Accord. And what has really drawn me into this debate, Mr. Speaker, is listening for the past two weeks to Members of the Opposition attempting to attribute motives to the Premier of Newfoundland, somehow or other trying to attribute base motives to his desire and his intention to rescind this motion - rescind the Meech Lake Accord.

They use phrases like, it is a red herring, he is somehow on an ego trip, somehow seeking national recognition, pandering to vested interest groups. Mr. Speaker, Hansard will show that all of those phrases were used. And I want in the few minutes accorded to me, Mr. Speaker, to try to put

this in perspective from my vantage point and try for a minute to focus on the real motivations of the Premier of this Province and his involvement in the effort to rescind the Meech Lake Accord. And I want to go through a certain sequence of events, Mr. Speaker.

Everyone in this House and most everybody listening will know that in 1987 the Liberal Party went through a leadership convention, and the present Premier entered that race and became a candidate for the leadership of the Liberal Party. I am probably one of the only people in this House who knows - and I will have to take a chance here, and if I am wrong the Premier will undoubtedly correct me either here in the House or elsewhere, as he should. However, I am the only person in this House who probably knows the first time the Premier of Newfoundland saw, read, and was aware of what was involved in the Meech Lake Accord. I do not think that it causes any undue embarrassment, I think that time, Mr. Premier, you were campaigning for the Leadership of the Liberal Party travelling in an automobile on the northern peninsula and received a copy of the Meech Lake Accord and read it. From that day onward, on every occasion, at every chance, he spoke out against the Meech Lake Accord.

He drew attention to the flaws in the Meech Lake Accord. He pointed out to Newfoundlanders what it would mean to Newfoundland and indeed to all Canada if we ratified the Meech Lake Accord. From that moment on, on every possible occasion, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this Province took advantage of the opportunity to express his views on the Meech Lake Accord.



Now, Mr. Speaker, as we all know the Premier went on to win the Leadership of the Liberal Party and that Leadership convention took place in June of 1987. And for the next seven months, while he was leader of the Liberal Party outside the House of Assembly, he took occasion to again express his views and to inform Newfoundlanders what was in the Meech Lake Accord and what it would cost this Province if we were to, indeed, to have to accept and live with the Meech Lake Accord.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that the hon. the Premier went on to become the Leader of the Opposition. And I understand, I was not in the House at the time for a very good reason, but I understand, Mr. Speaker, that in the debate to ratify the Meech Lake Accord the Opposition spoke against the Accord, spoke against the ratification, and I understand the Premier not only spoke against the ratification, he also served notice on this House of Assembly that if he indeed became the Premier, he would rescind the Meech Lake Accord.

Now, Mr. Speaker, tonight under his leadership we are in the process of rescinding the approval of the Meech Lake Accord. You talk about wheels coming full circle, Mr. Speaker. And let me say this, Mr. Speaker, that I suspect had he not won the Leadership of the Liberal Party, and obviously if he had not won the leadership of the Liberal Party he would obviously not have become the Leader of the Opposition and obviously not become the Premier of Newfoundland, but I suspect that he would have entered the debate. I suspect that as a private

citizen he would have entered the debate, and he would have, as a private citizen, pricked the consciences of the people of Newfoundland and all Canada.

I tell you if he were not in the House tonight, and if he were not the Premier, I suspect this House of Assembly would be debating this issue tonight, because I tell you why, the public opinion in this Province would have forced that debate. Now we know what the outcome of it would have been if the hon. Members opposite were still Government. We know what the outcome of such a debate would be, but I suspect there would be indeed a debate because I suspect his talking about the Accord across this country, and again he will undoubtedly speak before the night is over and, of course, he would not have wasted the time this last couple of years wondering about what he would have done had he not been elected. But I suspect that might well have happened.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on June 27, 1987 I resigned my seat in the House of Assembly to force a by-election. And when I say force a by-election I mean force a by-election because it became very obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier of the day had no intention of calling a by-election until he was forced to under the legislation and under the statute requirements. And we recognize, Mr. Speaker, that had I not resigned or someone had not resigned and forced a by-election then the Leader of the Opposition would not have been in the House of Assembly for the opening of the new session which would have come early in 1988.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel fairly proud of the role that I played in

the political life of Newfoundland. I feel very proud that I forced that by-election or at least I played a role in forcing that by-election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

I have, Mr. Speaker, as I said here since we became the Government, since last May, I have had reasons to feel proud of the fact that this Party and this Government is under the leadership of the present Premier, when I look at the style of Government, when I look at the kind of attitude he takes towards problems in the Province. When I look at other people of this Province who accepts his sense of integrity, his sense of fairness. But, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you were there no Meech Lake I suspect I would have been very proud to have resigned and to have helped bring about the situation we have. But, Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that I put the hon. the Premier in a position or I helped put him there, I do not take credit for putting him there, but I look action that helped put him in the position to play the leadership role that he is playing on this issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me deal for a moment with the by-election because it may well relate to the Meech Lake debate. Mr. Speaker, I was first elected in 1975 and I was re-elected in 1979, defeated in 1982, re-elected in 1985. So I have some political experience and I have some political astuteness and I have been involved in

campaigns and organizing campaigns, by-elections, Federal/Provincial, campaign managers, a Member of the House of Assembly for the best part of ten years, up to that point in time.

And I wondered what would happen in that by-election. Traditionally we expected, we did not necessarily want it, but we sort of expected it, that maybe the Government of the day would not field a candidate in that by-election. Traditionally across the country it happens when the Leader of the Opposition is seeking a seat or the Premier or the leader of a party is seeking a seat, traditionally it has been known that the opposing party would honour an age old commitment and maybe not run a candidate.

Mr. Speaker, I could not believe my ears, I could not believe what I saw for the next three weeks. For three weeks, Mr. Speaker, the Government of this Province stopped, everything in this Province stopped, except politically, the by election in Windsor - Buchans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Twenty-three Ministers, Mr. Speaker, flew into Windsor - Buchans, three Ministers in one day, Mr. Speaker, in Buchans Junction, population about 150.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

Yes, and stayed with my brother.

MR. FLIGHT:

That is right. Three Ministers, Mr. Speaker, in a given day in Millertwon, seven or eight in Windsor, three or four in Buchans. Mr. Speaker, in all of

the campaigns that I ran, on principal I did this, when I found out my opponent was, for instance, campaigning in Millertown or Badger or Buchans Junction, I deliberately, and he may have also, decided not to campaign in that particular community on that particular day for no real reason other than I thought it was the principal thing to do.

Since the Premier was accepting some advice from me as to how we should campaign in that particular by-election he accepted that advice and we agreed that if we, for argument sake, went into Badger and the Member for Humber East and then the Minister of Justice, it would be better if we would move on.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that principal was very hard to stand on. It was very difficult. One particular day in Badger, Mr. Speaker, I took the Premier to one of the outskirts of the town and started to work through. We had covered three houses, looked down the road and the Member for Harbour Main was coming out of the house.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:

Well Clyde, I guess I said, he was not the Premier. I said well, Clyde let us go down to the far end of Badger, out on the Trans-Canada Highway, that is a long ways away and we will work our way up; went down to the far end of Badger, started up three houses, came out looked up and there was the then Minister of Justice coming out of a house. So I was getting embarrassed now, Mr. Speaker, and he was I am sure. One more shot, and we went on to the center of Badger in the Maple

Street area, started to campaign and I am not sure, now, Mr. Speaker, which Minister it was. I will be honest but it was a Minister with two or three consorts coming with him. We said, Premier let us get out of Badger. Let us leave Badger and go to Windsor. Certainly, it is big enough.

We had difficulty finding streets where we could knock on doors and not embarrass a Minister campaigning on behalf of their candidate. So, I go through that Mr. Speaker, the influx of Cabinet Ministers, the monies that were poured in, the vast expenditures. Now, Mr. Speaker, everyone in Newfoundland wondered why. And I am wondering why tonight too. I am wondering if they had recognized in that candidate not only a potential Premier from Newfoundland but a man who would live, who had the strength of his conviction, he had already indicated that if I become the Premier of Newfoundland I will rescind the Meech Lake Accord. The one way to stop that Accord from being rescinded, Mr. Speaker, the one way to make sure that they were prepared to submit Newfoundland to the flaws in that Accord, prepared to guarantee for all time, carved in stone Newfoundland's place in Canada. The kind of a thing that the Premier on many occasions pointed out would happen.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons the effort was put in and one of the reasons that they went to such pains and effort to win that by-election was that they recognized the commitment of the gentleman who was seeking to be the Member for Windsor - Buchans and recognized that if, indeed, he did win the by-election he may

well go on to become the Premier and he would meet his commitment, and he would indeed rescind Meech Lake. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, this is just my personal opinion because in truth I have searched my mind for reasons that they would have put such an effort into defeating the gentleman who is now the hon. Premier of this Province. That may well be one reason. I could see them now huddling over there and saying, you know if he wins look out we will be exposed for having supported and having been party to the Meech Lake Accord. Mr. Speaker, maybe I am off base, but that is one reason. Maybe I will find other reasons, but certainly that is a good one.

Mr. Speaker, my time is very quickly running out. I would like to say before I sit down that democracy to me and I guess to every hon. Member in the House means Government for the people, by the people, and of the people. To the extent you can as a Government you do what you believe the people you are governing want you to do.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question in this Province and the hon. Member for Humber East knows, there is no question in this Province, what in this particular situation the people of this Province want the Government and the House of Assembly to do. They would love to see this unanimous, Mr. Speaker, as we would. I have entered debates in this House in the years that I referred to when we in the Opposition tried to make a certain vote unanimous and the Government which wanted to play politics, played a political game, and the Member for Torngat is well aware, he was standing over there with me, refused to allow us to move a motion that would send the

Premier to Ottawa with an unanimous vote out of this House. They wanted to play the political game. They wanted to paint the Opposition into a political corner where the people would suspect they were against the better interests of Newfoundland.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are not playing that game.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

And there is nothing that this Party and nothing that this Government would prefer tonight than to have an unanimous resolution going out of this House, that we the people of Newfoundland and the Government rescind this resolution and go on to seek a better accommodation for Newfoundland and Quebec and the rest of the country.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me say in ending; I said earlier I guess my experience if nothing else, the time spent the time punched gives me a little claim to some political intuition, some political astuteness - well, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, I have never seen an election in this Province that was not called on a specific issue, and I have no desire to see an election at this time, nor will there be one, I am sure, called on this issue.

But being the political animal, which I guess I am, I will tell you that I would welcome an election called on this issue, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I tell the hon. Member for Torngat, that if there were an election called on this issue, and if the number of Members back in the Opposition is relevant to the

letter of the debate, it would not take very long to rescind Meech Lake. I am delighted and I am pleased and I am proud to have been part of the debate. I am delighted and I am proud and I will forever be proud that I had a chance to have stood in this House and supported the party which puts Newfoundland and the better interest of this country first and takes on what the Opposition Members, in their misguided way, have tried to pretend and tried to argue is not right. I am proud to be part of the Government which votes later on tonight to rescind the Meech Lake Accord. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. Member for Windsor - Buchans would love to have an election on this matter right now because the Government of which he is a part, has refused to put this matter out to public hearings, absolutely refused to put the rescinding motion out to public hearings because they do not want the people of the Province to know the possible consequences of what this Government and this Premier is all about. He wants an election now, before the people know what is going on in this matter.

It is funny, but finally the message is starting to get home in the towns of our Province. The Evening Telegram, I am sorry, The Georgian, a West Coast paper, in the Premier's neck of the woods, April 3rd, 1990, a man named Doug Sheppard of Stephenville wrote a poem, and I would like to read it

into the record of the House. The poem is entitled: 'Fisherman's Heaven'. I'se de boy that builds the boat/and took her out a'swilin/ Trepassey, Grand Bank, Gaultois too/all around the Island/ In bygone days we fished the Bays before the grounds were empty/ Now we can't wait to fish Meech Lake where stocks are full and plenty/Meech Lake I am told is ringed with gold as rich as any fable/With fish galore along the shore just begging for the table/There is no talk of quotas there/No bill collectors waiting/Just piles of pie up in the sky and 'caviar' for the taking/No chill wind blows across the cold/Just calm and pleasant weather/And caplin float around the boat/We dip them up at leisure/There is no artic ice they say or any foreign trawler/And not a seal to snatch a meal to make our catches smaller/No Company takes away the right we've had for generations/To fish the grounds through ups and downs and leave us devastation/We till the land God gave to Cain supplied a scanty table/But now we found our fishing ground and the land God gave to Abel/ The land God gave to Cain, Mr. Speaker, was Labrador and the land God gave to Abel, one thinks, is on the shores of Meech Lake. Not wanting to be outdone by the person writing to the paper, Mr. Speaker, and insofar as my hon. friends opposite have often indicated that I am the poet laureate for the Opposition, I wrote one of my own, but first, my friend from St. Mary's - the Capes passes me a quick little one which says: 'Twas in the year of 90 the country was destroyed/Confederation ended by the hand of Premier Clyde.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It does not rhyme.

MR. HEWLETT:

It does not rhyme -- but it is close.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Destroyed.

MR. HEWLETT:

Destroyed yes, all right. If I were a Townie, it would have rhymed, I am sorry. The newest Premier in the land is a man we all call Clyde/His biggest claim to fame so far is to have Meech set aside/And what is Meech the people say and why is it so wrong/Meech is wrong because I say that's Clyde's only song/Meech has no Senate triple E Meech to Quebec is special/Clyde would have us tear it up and make our nay official/But Meech was passed by this dear House and now we will rescind it/To be replaced by something else that Clyde thinks is more splendid/The Government lost the vote on Meech'cause it didn't say Division/The Government's only plan on Meech is to bring about rescission/With Dr. Kitchen's Budget Speech our power rates have risen/To disguise the reality of that fact we deal with Meech rescission/ Our fishery is in a mess, but does the Government care?/ This day we talk of naught but Meech, we will talk of fish next year./ The Committee we did seek on Meech, but did the Government care?/ Rescind it first their battle cry we will talk of that next year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Sounds like The Rhyme of the Ancient Mariner.

MR. HEWLETT:

We are getting to the point now, Mr. Speaker. How many smoke screens can we make to hide the truth from all/ To fool the world and hide the fact that Clyde is

not on the ball/ Jobs he said I will create to bring home mother's sons/ but empty words are all he gives and he gives us those in tons/ Rise up you sons and daughters, take yourselves a stand/ either Clyde gets down to business or it is God guard thee Newfoundland/.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HEWLETT:

Mr. Speaker, when I spoke to the amendment the other night I indicated that I had in the previous T.V. address called the Meech Lake debate a smoke screen, and that was certainly the theme of my poem. Smoke screens are meant to disguise things, Mr. Speaker, to keep the truth from getting out. There are two smoke screens in Meech Lake, Mr. Speaker, one of which is to keep our people's minds off the realities of our Province's economic realities, and the other is to keep the people of the Province from really looking into the Meech Lake matter. George Bush, when he ran for President of the United States talked about a thousand points of light. Clyde Wells talked like that when he was a candidate for Premier, but what do we have now? Do we have a thousand points of light, Mr. Speaker? No, we have a thousand points of deception, we have a blanket of slickness covering this Province and this nation. The ice on Meech Lake is very thin, Mr. Speaker, but our Premier is a marvelous skater. But sooner or later, Mr. Speaker, he is going to hit what we used to call a 'swatch'.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
A what?

MR. HEWLETT:

No it is not a swiss watch, Mr. Speaker, but in Newfoundland terms it is a soft spot in the ice. In a real bay, Mr. Speaker, well I come from where bays freeze over, believe me. Swatches are caused by currents or variations in water temperature. In political terms, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's swatch will be caused by rising electrical rates, program cut backs, hospital bed closures or the disintegration of the Canadian nation.

My hon. friends Opposite have called me a fearmonger, but I would rather say that I am just a worrymonger. I am a worrywart, Mr. Speaker. I worry about my father's pension because it depends on not only the survival of the Canadian nation but the prosperity of this Canadian nation. And our Premier's position on Meech Lake, if it is not downright destructive at least it causes uncertainty which may diminish the social and economic viability of this country.

Earlier I referenced the previous the TV debate. I did another today, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to read it into the record of this House. Those citizens who stay up to watch the hockey game on Saturday night may see and hear me, those who miss Church on Sunday morning may see and hear me, and now hon. Members get the opportunity for a preview.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. HEWLETT:

This is not a poem, Mr. Speaker, sorry to disappoint my

colleagues. Quote: 'Sometime ago on this broadcast I indicated the Government's stand on Meech Lake was a smoke screen' I also said however, 'That where there is smoke there is fire. And that smoke would be coming from our burning boats. Yes, ladies and gentlemen the Liberals are back in power again. And again, they want us to burn our boats.'

The fishery, the backbone of our rural economy is in a severe crisis but the response of Premier Wells to a cry for help is to say, 'I would if I could, but I cannot.' The Premier and his Government appear to be quite willing to sit back and watch this crisis grow ever worse. They appear to be willing to let Ottawa, which is largely responsible for the mess, clean up the mess. I can only hope that Ottawa is as good at clearing up the mess as it was at making it.

Well what have we been doing in the House of Assembly, ladies and gentlemen, during these last few weeks. Have we been dealing with the crisis in the fishery. No, the Premier has us tearing up Meech Lake. Ladies and gentlemen while the Meech Lake debate has been front and center in the news media, recent provincial budgets have been sneaking up on you. Last year's Budget involved a massive tax grab. This year's Budget is going to make sure that your hydro rates go straight through the roof.'

AN HON. MEMBER:  
How much longer?

MR. HEWLETT:

Four and a half minutes, Mr. Speaker, of absolute mortal cruelty to the Liberal Party of this Province. For two years in a

row the Well's Government has taken budgetary action that will see Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro seek a power rate increase of approximately 50 per cent over the next eight years. And this from a Liberal Party that was violently opposed to power rate increases. The hon. Minister of Social Services knows this because he was in his day in Opposition, they were violently opposed to power rate increases when an Opposition and now you would swear he had changed his electrical systems in his house over to wind power or something or another, Mr. Speaker. I continue to quote: 'Meanwhile, back in my own District of Green Bay the fish plant at Triton is in danger because of the crisis in the fishery. That plant is the major employer in an area of some 5,000 people. That plant represents 300 irreplaceable jobs in a rural area with few if any other alternatives. The social consequences of this and other fish plant closures will be absolutely devastating to rural Newfoundland. But is Premier Wells concerned? No. He is leaving that matter to far away Ottawa. But what is Premier Wells doing? He is tearing up the Meech lake Accord and going out of his way to aggravate Ottawa. Why? Because he cannot accept the fact that Quebec is a distinct society in Canada. To deny that is to stick your head in the sand and to deny a reality that has existed for more than 100 years.

Quebec has at times been less than kind to our Province. We have a right to our fair share of resentments but these are times when we should be ruled by our heads and not our emotions. The simple fact of the matter is that Quebec is becoming increasingly

frustrated by the fuss over Meech Lake. The simple fact of the matter is that separation is being viewed more and more favourably by the people of Quebec. As I indicated earlier disintegration of the Canadian nation, if you want to talk about distinctness, is becoming a more and more distinct possibility.

Some of my constituents have said to me, what odds, let them go. I understand that feeling Mr. Speaker, but I ask you ladies and gentlemen, can there be a Canada without Quebec? Can you take 6 million people and such a huge chunk of territory out of the middle of the Canadian nation and expect it to survive? I think not. The people of Triton are hoping that their fish plant this year will give the 300 workers their UI benefits. If the plant closes, then the people will have to fall back on a host of other Federal programs for their very survival. But if there is no Canada, if there is no Federal Government there are no Federal programs, no UICs, no pensions, no family allowances.

MR. NOEL:

Shame! Shame! Shame!

MR. HEWLETT:

That is possibility mongering, Mr. Speaker. We in Opposition have been asking that the Premier put his plan to tear up Meech Lake before a Committee that would hold public hearings. But the Premier's position is to kill Meech Lake first then have a committee. And that amounts to closing the barn door after the horse is gone.

And I conclude my television address with this, 'Premier Wells is playing Russian roulette with



the fate of the Canadian nation. The Premier is playing with fire. And unfortunately ladies and gentlemen, maybe you and I might get burnt.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEWLETT:

The Premier talks about the fact that he has had tremendous support from all across this nation. I have an article here from the Vancouver Sun, no less.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No less.

MR. HEWLETT:

No less. And it says 'Clyde Wells dangerous fantasy.' Now for a moment, Mr. Speaker, when I saw the title, I thought maybe this is something that should be censored and not looked at because heaven knows what dangerous fantasies are about. But a Mr. Bruce Hutchinson speaks very plainly about the fact that our Premier, in his approach to this matter, is not being real. It is all fantasy.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has been in power now for about a year. The place is gone to wreck and ruin and it is amazing that they are able to get away with what they are doing. But they have been tremendously good, I will give them credit, at throwing up their smoke screen. But somehow, somewhere the truth is finally trickling through. One of the national polling organizations, I believe, it is Decima, I think it was the end of February polling, gave the Wells Government the lowest economic performance rating ever recorded in this Province since Decima has been polling in this Province, the lowest ever, gave them a -35 per

cent approval rating, Mr. Speaker. Somewhere - even though a lot of people obviously seem to support the Premier's Meech Lake position -35 per cent is their approval rating on their handling of the economy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HEWLETT:

Now sooner or later Meech Lake is going to be settled and go away or the nation is going to be in turmoil, in which case Mr. Wells will take his share of the blame, or if things are smoothed over and everything goes nicely, then the people of the Province will have to deal with the reality of the performance of this Government on economic matters. The real change that they promised the people of Newfoundland and Labrador - well Decima has found the real change, Mr. Speaker, they found a -35 per cent approval rating on economic performance. And do you know how you get -35 per cent, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is a Decima poll?

MR. HEWLETT:

Decima poll is a good poll, do not worry. I used to subscribe to it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How do you get a -35 approval?

MR. HEWLETT:

I will tell you how you get a -35. You asked the question, Mr. Speaker, do you approve or do you disapprove of the Government's handling of the economy? Those who approve, that is a certain percentage, that is a positive number. Those who disapprove that is a negative number. You put the two together and the disapproval rate was so high, that when you

put the positive in with the negative you still came out with a net negative -35.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What?

MR. HEWLETT:

So no wonder Meech, Meech, Meech, you cannot eat Meech, Mr. Speaker, but that is what the crowd opposite have been trying to get the people of the Province to eat. Trying to get them to swallow Meech, Mr. Speaker. You put the positive with the negative and you do elementary mathematics and you get minus 35 per cent approval rating under handling of the economy. Is it any wonder that we have closure? Is it any wonder that we do not have the motion to rescind Meech Lake going before a Committee, to go out there so that people can talk about it, people can learn about it, people can understand it, because once they start to disagree with the Premier's position on Meech maybe then they will start to turn their heads and wonder what the Premier is doing about the things he was elected to do. He was not elected to tear up Meech. He was not elected to amalgamate.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Did you write this?

MR. HEWLETT:

No, I did not write that.

I did several brochures in the Premier's office, Sir, and they were all excellent. But I did not write that one. I did many brochures when I was in the Premier's office but I had nothing to do with the pickle brochure whatsoever. A humongous disclaimer, Mr. Speaker, I had nothing to do with the pickle

brochure. I also did many polls of my own when I was in the Premier's office, hundreds probably, and the one thing that was consistent on every poll you do in Newfoundland, and I am sure the Liberal Party does it because I am sure even they have a vague interest now and then in what the people think and they probably do test the waters now and then to find out what people think. On every poll you ever hold in Newfoundland, anywhere from 75 to 90 per cent of the respondents say the greatest problem in this Province has to do with the economy, jobs, and unemployment - always related to jobs, Mr. Speaker. So what do we have here? We have a Government that has spent a solid year ranting and raving across the Canadian nation on a matter of the Constitution, confusing everybody, blurring the issues, trying to let people think about anything under the sun except jobs.

They were going to bring home every mother's son, Mr. Speaker, and every mother's daughter, I would presume, hon. Member for St. John's East. The women are from the east, Mr. Speaker, like the wise men, I guess, come to think of it. I wonder where the star is, Mr. Speaker? Is it up there right now? Here we are talking for days, and days, and days, on the Constitution of Canada, not because we had to, but because the Premier wanted us to. We did not have to tear up Meech Lake. The Premier decided we had to, maybe because of some of his own convictions with regard to the Constitution of this nation but more probably, Mr. Speaker, because dealing with the Constitution of this nation avoids having this House deal with the economy and reality of this

Province. Meech Lake, and amalgamation before it, both are smoke screens, and as I said in both my TV addresses, and as I have said in this Assembly, merely smoke screens, but where there is smoke there is fire and with the Liberals in power again the smoke is coming from our burning boats.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for St. John's South.

MR. WALSH:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WALSH:

The sun did rise over Signal Hill on June 24 and Canada was still one nation continuing to go forth.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Member for St. John's South.

MR. MURPHY:

Mr. Speaker, I know the hour is getting late. I can tell the hour is getting late. My father once told me, 'Tom, if you ever get on your feet I give you three things to remember. Do not follow animals, kids, and people who recite silly poems.'

I think what I will tell the hon. Member for Green Bay is to leave the poetry to my friend Loyola, stay away from it. The lights are on and nobody is home. I suppose, before I get into this and some thoughts on the Meech Lake Accord that I have, how time turns the coin. The hon. Member for Green

Bay was talking about polls and exactly this time last year, exactly one year to the day, the hon. Gentleman and his colleagues were twenty-one points ahead in the polls. Twenty-one points ahead in the polls. Now, I am not too sure where he got his math from either as he rambled through this 35 minus factor, but I look at twenty-one ahead, ten we had, a majority, and that adds up to thirty-one ahead, so in a matter of fifteen days, the polls turned around thirty-one points, that is positive thirty-one, not negative thirty-five, right?

The hon. Minister of Finance mentioned Churchill Falls the other evening in the heat of debate and I will mention it and I shall try to contain myself. Hind sight is 20/20 vision obviously, and I remember very well, Mr. Speaker, and even before Churchill Falls, the hon. Member for Menihek, when the Carol Lake project started under the great, the great Liberal Government of that day, Newfoundlanders went in to that particular part of Labrador and worked side by side with the people from the Province of Quebec. Not the francophone population from Manitoba, not the francophone population from New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, but they worked side by side with the people from the province of Quebec. As the Carol Lake project came on and was completed and the Twin Falls Project came on behind that, the same Newfoundlanders and the same workers, thousands of workers from both this Province and the province of Quebec worked side by side, and one of the conditions of the Churchill contract that Premier Smallwood signed at that particular time was that 51 per cent of the workers belong to this Province and in

order to make it work with Premier Lesage, at that time, he had to give in to 49 per cent of the workers from the province of Quebec and if there were any other jobs left over, of course, they could have been filled by any other provinces throughout the nation.

So, Newfoundland, historically, from the time we entered Confederation, we have been very conciliatory, we have been in the development of this Province I might add, in the development of this Province. We have invited the Quebec work force into Labrador to share, to share, Mr. Speaker, in that development, in the wages and in the experience in the expertise that was developed in creating what was at that time, the greatest engineering feat probably of any Hydro electric project, a massive, eleven turbine powerhouse sitting in the middle of a mountain and it was put there by ten years of Newfoundlanders and French Canadians from the province of Quebec working side by side, a total tribute to both the work force from this Province and the work force from the province of Quebec.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how often have we heard over the last year that we would love to bring back the contract of Churchill Falls. Why would we like to bring it back, Mr. Speaker? We would like to bring it back because it is flawed. It is flawed, Mr. Speaker. It is flawed because it gives all of the better part - the economy of that contract goes to the Province of Quebec so we would love to bring it home. The hon. Members opposite would love to bring that contract back. We have asked and we have negotiated. They have asked and negotiated.

Mr. Moores asked and negotiated. Mr. Moores became incensed, when he was the Premier. He said that he was so mad that Quebec would not sit down and renegotiate the contract that he was going to cut off the power that was going and flowing across that Province and into the United States markets. He did not do it. We all know why he did not do it because he had a contract that was signed.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, if we could get that contract and bring it back and make it what we feel as fair, then so we would. But we signed that contract when oil was approximately \$2.50 a barrel. Little did we know, or little did anybody know at the time that ten or fifteen years later the producers of potroleum products throughout the world would inflate oil to \$36 or \$38 a barrel and then the termo plants became impossible to generate electricity and all of a sudden Churchill Falls took on a majestic amount of dollars and cents and it was worth a fortune. We realize that we got shortchanged.

Now in saying all of that, Mr. Speaker, let me say this that Newfoundland never at any given time tried or sought any more than we asked and to renegotiate the Lower Churchill, that tremendous hydro potential I suppose. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, of anywhere else in the free world or probably any part of this world, that such an outstanding renewable resource - and we would love for Hibernia to come in tomorrow and, please God with the hon. Minister of Mines and the Premier's efforts and the Government's efforts we will see Hibernia come in, but one thing that we know that twenty-five years from now the possibility is that the offshore

will be gone. But one thing that we do know, is that the Lower Churchill, the Upper Churchill, the five other rivers that flow out through Quebec will forever in time be a renewal resource to be shared by the people of this Province and the Province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, the point that I try to make in this analogy is that Newfoundland, from the time we entered Confederation, has been a sound solid partner in this Confederation. We have continually sent an uncountable resource, a resource that has never been brought to light, to Canada and that is, our people. Our people, thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders have gone off to all parts of Canada from British Columbia to Nova Scotia, our greatest resource and developed the rest of this country. At no time did the Federal Government or any Provincial Government ever say to Newfoundland that here is an equalization in payment for your people. Because that would not have been acceptable to anybody. But in reality there is nothing greater that Newfoundland has to offer this country, that we all want and love and want to belong to, the hon. Members opposite said, and all the Members on this side said, we all understand that the people of this Province if they came home tomorrow we would almost stand shoulder to shoulder. They have been great contributors in this country, great.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our friends sat down in 1988 with the now Prime Minister of Canada, and they signed an intent to bring this constitution together in June of this year. One of the second

issues that they placed on the Meech Accord to be discussed, and it was put on by the previous Premier, Premier Peckford, was the fishing industry. It was to be discussed and entered into the Meech Lake Accord.

And I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that satisfied Mr. Peckford and he had now a reason to come back to Newfoundland and say, 'Hey we are not out of this. We have been given something by the Feds.' And you know, the hon. Members Opposite all during this debate have been adamant about the watering down of the Federal end of this country and giving more autonomy and more responsibility, more say in our fishery and other areas. And Mr. Speaker, in reality a have not Province like Newfoundland, the last thing it needs is the lessening of a strong core, the lessening of a strong Ottawa because it withers down our position.

You know, the hon. Members Opposite talk about more jurisdiction, more management, more whatever in the fishing industry. IF the Federal Government said to Premier Wells tomorrow the fishery, the jurisdiction of the fishery, the whole fishery is yours, Newfoundland would be in a state of very serious concern because first off, I am sure our friends overseas would find out that Newfoundland now had a jurisdiction of it's continental shelf, a 200 mile limit. And then they would come in and of course we would take our three water bombers and maybe the Norma & Gladys - I do not know if she is still floating or whatever - and we would go out and we would fend off our friends from France, Portugal and Spain and we would

say hey we got it, we own it now get out of here. Get out of here you guys and we drop water on them or we throw cucumbers at them or something. I do not know what we would do with them. What silliness for Members Opposite to stand in their place and talk about having jurisdiction, watering down the Federal end and turning the fishery over to us. How in heavens name could we possibly, Mr. Speaker, look after the total continental shelf. It is impossible.

Now the second issue in the Meech Accord was promised the then Premier of the day. If I thought within myself the signing of the Meech Accord would bring prosperity back to the fishing industry in this Province and every ounce and piece of fish plant out there that we have now could be brought to full production, that every plant on this Island that workers could walk in tomorrow morning and process fish, then I would have great difficulty standing up here and condemning the Meech Accord. But I know, as you know Mr. Speaker, and all hon. Members know in this House that that is not possible. The Meech Accord cannot put anymore fish off the coast of this Province and you can discuss it until the cows come home.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when you stop and think about what the Federal Government told the industry, told the previous Premier and fisheries Minister in 1987 when he was the then Fisheries Minister, that 240,000 metric tons was certainly under what they hoped it would be in 1990. And in 1990 basically we were looking at a TAC of 300,000 tons. We saw the Harris Commission the other day which a

lot of Members are very concerned and very interested in, and so they should be, especially the rural end and even me because I suffered the consequences in my own District and the wetfish or groundfish operation on the south side was in demise until this Government came along this year and encouraged National Sea, who were very difficult to encourage, and now at least we have a plant with a shrimp peeling operation over there on the south side. But in thinking through what the Harris Report says, Mr. Speaker, in basic language this time next year if Mr. Valcourt and Mr. Mulroney and his friends listen to the Harris Report, we will be faced with 125,000 metric tons of ground fish, of northern cod off our coast.

Now, if the Meech Lake Accord will put it back to 350,000 metric tons, as they told the then Fisheries Minister, as the Federal, then Fisheries Minister said, Newfoundland would be able to go out without hurting the resource and catch 350,000 metric tons in 1991 then I would stand and support the Meech Accord, because at least within my mind I would know that the information they had given us could be trusted.

We can talk about the Mulroney Government and trust. We can talk about it for a longtime, and the things that impact Newfoundland as a 'have not' Province are in demise. We are subject to UIC whether we like it or we do not like it. It has become a way of life in this Province. There are many reasons for that and they are too lengthy to discuss right now.

Talk about closure, Mr. Speaker. Today in Ottawa the Tory Government offered closure on the

GST. There is a 7 per cent tax that is going to be dropped down around those who have in the province of Ontario, Alberta, and Quebec, but is also going to be dropped down around those who do not have, in the provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and the other 'have-not' areas and regions of this Country. Trust for the Mulroney Government. No, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that gives the people of this Province any reason to trust the Tory Administration in Ottawa.

We will see Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Valcourt in the next few days coming again and dumping their bag out on the people of Newfoundland, and I would really hope that if that bag of money, when it hits the ground and it is dispersed among the communities who are going to suffer throughout this year, that this time next year the bag will be smaller and people will be better off, people will have a feeling of security, they will be into full-time jobs and they will have something to do, come on with the money. I will be very surprised, Mr. Speaker, and I will be the first to stand and admit that it was a good move if we do not need the same amount of money to support and sustain Newfoundlanders this time next year. I will be very surprised. We will probably need more.

Mr. Speaker, if there was anything that the Meech Accord offered this Province, to take it and put it in a have position, for forty years we have been part of this great nation of Canada and we have been a 'have not' Province. We have heard the adjustment of regional disparity forever but at least as the crumbs fell from the table and we played the Lazarus role and

picked them up, we knew that maybe someday, or we hoped that someday, we would have an opportunity to become part of the nation and be equal in this nation. Now all of a sudden we are looking at a document that is so flawed that they are asking this Province and all other provinces to sign it and it would forever enshrine Newfoundland as a 'have not' Province. Now how in Heaven's name can logical thinking fall down around the ears of the Members opposite and how can they stand in their place and ask this Government to support and sign a document that would forever make us a 'have not' Province? It is incredible, Mr. Speaker. However the eloquency of the Members opposite and their points were well taken and well raised but this evening, not far from now this Government will have to make a decision that will be a Newfoundland decision. I do not think one hon. Member on this side has one single solitary feeling about denouncing that flawed document called the Meech Accord. I would hope that in the upcoming months, with the effort of this Government and this Premier, we can offer the people of Canada a new Constitution, a new thought, a new idea, whether it be called parallel or companion or whatever, we can offer Canada an Accord that is fair, not only to Quebec and Ontario, but fair and fundamental to all of us. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

It is with a fair amount of sadness and concern that one rises tonight to speak on the motion. I have listened to a number of the speeches and shared in some of the joviality which has gone on tonight. I wonder, are we taking the issue as seriously as people across the country? Perhaps we should ask what is the main concern across this country tonight, from here where we are to the far reaches of British Columbia. From the calls coming in, I would suggest the main concern is what is going to happen in Newfoundland tonight? Is the axe going to fall? It is a very, very serious question, because it is not just another resolution. We have gone through in this House this year and in the past years a number of resolutions, especially in relation to Private Member's Day, some of them extremely serious, some of them put on the Order Paper to have something to pass away the day, and when the vote comes, the effect, perhaps, does not have that much to do with what happens in the Province or in the country or in the world. But the vote on the resolution tonight has a tremendous amount to do with what happens in this Province and in this country and, yes perhaps, in this world, because what happens here tonight could decide - I will not say will decide - could decide what happens to Canada as a country.

We have seen in the past, from the days when the first settlers came to our shores, followed closely by the French, and I will forget about the Norse people and the people who came by way of the Bering Strait, as the Member for St. John's centre, the Minister of Finance, discussed the other night, and we will get into more modern history about the French

and English. Shortly after Newfoundland was discovered, we saw the French come along and drop in on our shores. Some of them stayed here, and the rest moved on up the Gulf of St. Lawrence into Quebec and, consequently, across the country. If we look at Canadian history we will see that most of the original discoverers, most of the original explorers were French. We have Cartier and Champlain and Radisson and D'Iberville and the rest, and then eventually Henry and the others pressing further west. We hear vivid descriptions of what they saw, from the forested lands filled with game to, eventually, the Prairies, then the mountains and the nice peaceful land on the other side of the mountains and the big ocean on the far side.

Now, that was the first real vision of Canada as a country, a tremendous country. We can imagine how tremendous, how big it seemed then, when it took years and years and years for the explorers to force their way across the country to finally find the shining sea in the west. We can picture the impression it made on these explorers. They realized what a tremendous nation we had and, hopefully, we, today, also realize what a tremendous nation we have, a nation that was tied together, perhaps by the railroad. Maybe it is significant that the pulling up of the railroad in Newfoundland is the start of the pulling apart of the nation again. Maybe that also starts in Newfoundland. Where the physical disruption of the chains that bind started, maybe the actual destruction of the country starts here tonight. But we saw a nation develop, a nation diverse in our people, in our interests, in our needs, in how we live, in



what we produce, yet, we were independent. There was a common bond between us. Even though in the beginning the people who pushed forward, who really opened up the heart of the country were French speaking people, a lot of the settlement that was done here in our own Province was done by the French. But as history goes on and describes the battles between the English and the French, we talk about the visits from the people in Placentia across the Avalon to attack St. John's, Bay Bulls, Renews and other places; we see the old fortifications along our coast where we defended ourselves against the French; we talk about the Battle of Louisburg and we talk about the battle on the Plains of Abraham, the famous last battle in the fight for dominance of the country, where the English finally took control of Canada but then accepted the French as they were and gave them a number of concessions and let them be part of this great country. Yet, it seems, even though many years have gone by, that the French are still not really at home in this great country of ours, that some people seem to think they should not share in the things all the rest of us share in. And it is because they feel that way, perhaps, that they look for a little more guarantee when we come to the written laws and rules of the country than some of the rest of us would look for. Consequently, up until now we have not seen them become really part of this great nation; they have not come in under our Constitution.

But, finally, as our Premier's got together, all of them, they came up with this common bond that would unite the country, even though it meant, perhaps, giving a

little bit here and there, making some extra concessions. The concessions that were made were concessions that added, that gave to provinces. They were not concessions that took away from anybody else. I think too often, perhaps, we feel, if I am not going to get anything out of it, then I do not want anybody else to get anything out of it. This is where we stand with the Meech Lake Accord: if Quebec is going to get a little more than I am, then I want no part of it. If it is not hurting me, I do not mind who wins the lotto. If I do not win it, great! If somebody else wins it wonderful for them, I am not losing anything. On the other hand, if the \$1 million they have in one hand came out of my pocket on the other hand, yes, I would worry. But, in this case, that is not the case. Quebec's gain is not our loss, it is not the loss of Prince Edward Island, nor is it the loss of Nova Scotia.

We wonder, as we look at the other provinces, how come Newfoundland is the only one which seems to be so right or wrong?

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about New Brunswick and Manitoba?

MR. HEARN:

I will get to that. It is a long way across the country yet.

We do not see the Premier of Prince Edward Island rescinding a motion. In fact, we see him speaking out very, very strongly in support of Meech Lake. One of the signers, he understands what went on, he understands the reasoning behind Meech Lake, he understands the implication, he understands the interpretation, which is perhaps a lot more than

ours does, and his Province is the smallest in Canada. If we talk about being entrenched as a have not Province, as the Member for St. John's South talked about, certainly Prince Edward Island and Premier Ghiz would have a lot more to worry about than us.

When we look at the Premier of Nova Scotia, he is unflinching in his support for the Meech Lake Accord; the Premier of Ontario, the Premier of Alberta, the Premier of Saskatchewan, the Premier of British Columbia, and the Premier of New Brunswick has come up with an idea that gets him out of a tight bind and lets him accept the Meech Lake Accord provided there are other things that will be considered later. Of course, that is part of the agreement anyway. And do not be surprised if the Premier of Manitoba - we all know why the Premier of Manitoba is not jumping on the band wagon. It is not because of his concern alone about the Meech Lake Accord, he is in a tighter position than anybody else. He is the Leader of a minority Government, which puts him in a very precarious spot; he has to make sure he makes the right moves politically. But do not be surprised if between now and the 23rd of June the Premier of Manitoba finds a way to be accommodated in relation to the Meech Lake Accord, which leaves Newfoundland, perhaps, the only Province outside the agreement.

Just a short while ago, the Member for St. John's South talked about our Province becoming entrenched as a have-not Province; fearmongering basically, and it is a complete reversal of the speech of the Member for Pleasantville a little earlier this evening, when he talked about Newfoundland and

how much Newfoundland has contributed to Confederation, and I agree with him. I agree with every word he said. We have paid our own way in many ways. He did not spell it out, but from what he was saying, one would get the feeling that the Member for Pleasantville, if this country falls apart, as it quite might well, the Member for Pleasantville was basically saying, don't worry, be happy, we can make it on our own. And, once again, I am not sure that the Member for Pleasantville is all that much incorrect in what he is saying, because I do think, with the will of the people who inhabit this Province of ours, yes, we could make it on our own if we want to, but we would make it a lot better as part of this great nation.

The number of Members on the other side in speaking talked about the fear of weakening the central Government by giving more power to the Provinces. Surely the Provinces cannot have power. What are they going to do with power? What they are going to do with power, Mr. Speaker, I submit, is they will use it to influence a centralist Government. I am not against a strong Government in the country, but I am not for a strong Government if it means taking away all our powers, where we are just little pawns bending at every breath that is breathed in Ottawa, as we say during the Trudeau era.

Getting back to the Member for St. John's South when he described what it would be like if we had jurisdiction over the fishery - how could we patrol the 200 mile limit? That is always the argument. I can never remember anybody asking for jurisdiction over the fishery. We, in Government, were always accused of

that by the Members Opposite, but you will have to do a lot of searching to find the word 'jurisdiction.' The word 'influence' is the word that was used. Some say 'in management.' Tonight we have had a number of fishermen up in the galleries and I am sure they would only be too glad to have some direct say in some of the decisions that are made in relation to quotas, in relation to licencing, in relation to management of our resources. If we had had it, we would not be in the mess we are in today - if we had been able to do what the fishermen asked in relation to not only when we talk about fish in Newfoundland we think we are talking about cod, or we are talking about all aspects of the fishery, including the seal fishery, whereby if Newfoundland had some influence and control over the seal herds we would not have the major problem we have today because Ottawa is afraid to make a move in case they disrupt the international situation. All we ever asked for was some influence.

It is a bit peculiar that in the last couple of weeks, now that the heat is really on in relation to the fishery that is falling down around the ears of the present Government, with fish plants closing, workers not knowing where to go, fishermen not knowing where they are going to have markets, and this Government closing a blind eye and closing the doors to any assistance to help keep the operations going, it is no wonder that the Minister of Fisheries is now requesting some say in what is going on, suggesting that a panel be set up, a joint panel, so that there be some joint say over what is going on. That is what Newfoundland has been asking for

for years, and the people opposite would not go along with. And if we had gotten something then, some years ago, as I said, we would not be in the mess we are in today. And, of course, the attitude of this Government is well, 'I would do something about it if I could, but I cannot.' Well, if the Government of the Province cannot do something about it, who can? You can do something about it if you want to try to do something about it.

MS VERGE:

I would if I could, but I cannot.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, we are approximately one hour away from taking a vote on the resolution; we are one hour away from making the biggest mistake this Province has ever made; we are one hour away from not only pulling the plug on the Meech Lake Accord, we could be one hour away from pulling the plug on Canada as a nation. And if you think that is fearmongering, well, then, there are much more dedicated, educated, intelligent, constitutionally aware people than I who have the same concern.

As I said when I started, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of concern across the country tonight. A lot of people are wondering what is going to happen. And it is not whether or not the Canadiens can come back and beat Buffalo, or whether Gretzky will be ready for the third game, it is what is going to happen when Newfoundland pulls the plug on Meech Lake, and what is going to happen to this country? Mr. Speaker, I just hope for the sake of Newfoundland and for the sake of Canada that the decisions made here tonight eventually turn out to be the right ones. Thank you, Mr.

Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Exploits.

MR. GRIMES:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I mentioned the last time I rose, Mr. Speaker, in addressing the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, that I would beg the indulgence of Members of the House if I spoke more quickly than I normally do, and I must doubly beg that indulgence tonight, since the time is restricted to just twenty minutes instead of thirty.

I cannot help but reflect on a couple of matters, and I will try to get as many of them as I can into the next few minutes while I take advantage of this great opportunity to participate in the debate on the revoking of the acceptance of the Meech Lake amendments by this House of Assembly and this Province a couple of years ago.

A couple of hours ago we witnessed one of the great displays, the great harangue again, the ire and the wrath of the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition House Leader, and a couple of other Members crying out foul and so on, crying out because their rights to debate this very important resolution were being trampled on and so on. And we had a classic fearmonger just finish his presentation, which I addressed in my last remarks. Before that, they wanted so badly to debate that they went through that fuss so they could put up a griper and complainer, who griped

and complained about not being able to debate instead of using the opportunity, and a poet.

So that is how important it was to debate Meech Lake. They wanted to have the time this evening to put up someone who complained about not getting the opportunity to debate, a poet, and one of the fearmongers, which is the only real weapon they have left in their arsenal. The poet even mixed in a few of the threats that we know are going to mount in the next little while. It is bad enough to talk about breaking up the country, but we fully expect people to go around the Province in the next little while and really try to talk to people about the Canada Pension Plan being gone, the unemployment insurance scheme being out the window, family allowances gone, all the things that went into the Confederation debate in 1949. I think it is unfortunate that people stoop to that in this debate, but I guess for their own politically partisan reasons they have no choice but to do so, to go along with their friends upalong.

Let us deal with the urgency of the debate. There has been lots of time for debate, Mr. Speaker, if they had wished to use it in the fashion they cried out they did.

MS VERGE:

(Inaudible).

MR. GRIMES:

I will get to that, as well.

Our calculations, up to 10:30 today, indicate that there were thirty-one and a half hours available in this Legislature to debate this resolution, since it was introduced by the Premier.

Since Resolution 12 was first called up to 10:30 tonight, not counting the last hour and a half, there were thirty-one and a half hours available to be used. Now, the most optimistic and lenient recounting of what happened a couple of years ago brings it to seventeen hours and twenty-three minutes. But the Opposition House Leader, who was almost Leader of the Opposition save for a few votes, and some friends over there who pretend they are his and were not a year or so ago, indicated that he was saying that it was maybe fifteen or sixteen hours. In our checking, we have stretched it and said the most you could ever get was seventeen hours and twenty-three minutes, that were available when Premier Peckford introduced it - thirteen days spread over parts of four months. Now, we have had thirty-one and a half hours available, straight time, steady on the Order Paper, called continuously since this debate started, because we believe it is important, and we think it should be debated first.

Now, Members opposite decided that petitions were more important, and I have no quarrel with that. I understand the place of petitions in this House of Assembly and I respect that, but certainly some of the petitions which were placed here may not be in the same exact realm right now as the Meech Lake debate should have been, but that was their decision. It is on the Order Paper. That is what they chose to do with the time available, and they also engaged in a few little slick tricks that made them feel good because they thought they did something wonderful. They cry out then, when we counter their little tricks, that we are violating the rules. But every rule in the

Standing Orders and so on is there for a purpose. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition showed his hand from the first day, and in it in Hansard. Because in his opening address, in the first hour, he said, 'We will use, Mr. Speaker, every parliamentary trick in the book.' So he exposed himself right from the beginning.

There was no intention to debate this recision motion based on its merits, because they know they do not have a leg to stand on. That was the idea right from the very first day, when the Leader of the Opposition rose and said they would use every parliamentary trick in the book. And when we counter those tricks by using the appropriate rules of the House, oh, we are squashing debate, we are muzzling them, we are trampling on their rights and all the usual complaints. We understand that, and we understand why they have to resort to those kinds of things, and if they get some feeling of satisfaction and comfort from that, well so be it.

Then the public hearings. I am glad the Member for Humber East asked about the public hearings. Not to be unkind, but I must say on the record in Hansard what I have said across the House on a number of occasions and which, I understand, was not picked up. I understand the Member for Humber East, having been on the Government side for some ten years and a Cabinet Minister for a period of time, was not known to speak much in the House of Assembly but has developed a great vocabulary and a great interest in debate since becoming an Opposition Member. I guess she is better suited for that job, and I wish her luck with it in the time to come. I want to put that on

the record, not to be mean or anything, but just to say if I were over there, I would try to do some of the same things.

On Tuesday evening the Premier, who has been described as intransigent, inflexible, non-accommodating, bullheaded and all those kinds of things by Members opposite, offered to Members opposite without any prompting, without any pressure, just walked over and said, 'We will give you public hearings.' Now, the arrangement was to be to split the motion. We all know that kind of stuff. Of course, in The Evening Telegram and on the news that evening, and I will quote from The Evening Telegram: Mr. Rideout, welcomed the move by the Premier and suggested it was a major victory for the Opposition because they were finally going to get public hearings, that the Premier offered. He was not bullied into it, he was not asked for it, he offered it of his own accord. Yes, we will have public hearings. Mr. Rideout said, 'He feels this action represents substantial movement by the Government and a victory for the Opposition which has been calling for public hearings.'

Again it is a bit like, I guess, the fateful night of the Meech Lake Accord in the first place, that that great victory somewhere overnight, in the Leader of the Opposition consulting with the Opposition House Leader, I assume, and some mystical constitutional advisor they have, the same constitutional advisor who suggests the Senate has no power, and has these people convinced the Senate has no power, must go somewhere to get the powers and all these kinds of things - I would suggest you look at your

constitutional advisor - but between dark and daylight, there was a great change of mind; the public hearings which were offered were not important anymore - no deal! No public hearings, that is not important. We have to come back and gripe and complain again.

To make sure that the record is clear for the position offered by the Premier on the public hearings let me state it for you again one more time. The Premier has stated that this Government is ready to have public hearings anytime, as necessary, on proposals for constitutional change. Proposals for constitutional change, -

MS VERGE:

Why not (inaudible) before it is done?

MR. GRIMES:

If you would listen until I have finished, you will understand.

In 1982, the Constitution was patriated and we had the Charter of Rights. There have been no changes since. Meech Lake is one attempt to have some amendments. These are the first major proposed amendments. We are talking now about constitutional change. The Premier says we are willing to go around this Province and let people talk about the Constitution as it exists, which is still the 1982 Constitution, the Meech Lake Accord being one set of proposals for change. We will also have the hearings and let people talk about Mr. McKenna's proposal for change. We would also like to introduce our own proposals for change and, to use an expression from the Leader of the Opposition, 'If Tommy Toe from Ming's Bight wants to bring in a proposal, we would like to hear that too.' We really would.

But we do not, and it was stated clearly, Mr. Speaker, for the House and for Members opposite to understand, we do not think and cannot understand how anybody would think it is fair to talk about constitutional change when this House of Assembly is already on record as endorsing one lot of them. We want to talk about the relative merits of all the proposals, and that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have a free, open discussion about every single proposal for change, whether it was drafted in Meech Lake, whether it was drafted by Premier McKenna, whether it was drafted by Premier Wells, whether it was drafted by Tommy Toe from Ming's Bight. So, any time Members opposite are ready for the public hearings process, we still stand ready, no doubt about it, and let the record be clear.

The other point then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address: I still find it very difficult to comprehend and understand why it is that we are supposed to believe that we cannot speak of our concerns during these few days leading up to the 23rd of June. We are supposed to stand here as elected Members and believe in our hearts and souls that something has happened in this country and in this Province that precludes us from discussing the merits of the proposals that are there, because if you do so, you are going to break apart the country, and do this and do that, and cause great damage to the nation.

Why can we not discuss our concerns now, leading up to the 23rd June, just like the people in Quebec can discuss theirs and the people in Manitoba can discuss theirs, and those in Alberta can discuss theirs, and so on? There

is some problem. Why can we not discuss Senate reform? One of the great things, I might again inform the hon. Member for Torngat Mountains, because I am sure he did not read this before, I am not even convinced, from his comments so far, that he has read it this time. But why can we not discuss Senate reform, when, in fact, almost three years ago, when this thing was put together, there were going to be constitutional conferences that would deal with Senate reform? Why could we not, in these three years, talk of our concerns about Senate reform at the same time, instead of having to wait the three years, sign some document and then talk about Senate reform? If these people are serious about Senate reform, why can it not be discussed in the next couple of months? I see no reason not to discuss it. Is there some ban on discussing that in Canada? Not that we are aware of.

People opposite say there is no problem with the spending power provision. That is fine. That is an argument that can be well made. The other argument is also well made, so nobody might be certain as to exactly who is right; however, certain people suggest that if there is no problem and if you are convinced there is no problem, why not add just a couple of words at the end which will say that nothing here will in any way cause a problem with money that is being spent under the constitutional right to address regional disparity? Because they will tell you to your face, 'Oh, no, it is not going to affect that.' But when you ask them, okay, could you please write that down?' - 'Oh, no, we cannot write that down. You cannot change a word in this thing, not a

word.' I find it strange. I find it strange that they will tell you to your face it does not mean that, but when asked to write it down, and we say, 'Show me that it is true,' - that is fairly normal, is it not? I mean, I have done that lots of times. Not that you are questioning the person, but you just say, Well, why not write it down? That will show everybody that you are operating in good faith. It shows everybody that you really mean it. It shows everybody there is no problem. It clears out all the suspicion. But, no, you cannot change it, not a comma, not a dot, not anything. So, clauses to allay fears, you are not allowed to entertain those.

We are told by the Prime Minister when he speaks outside Quebec, we are told by Premier Bourassa, the distinct society clause does not extend legislative authority in the Province of Quebec, nothing to it, nothing for anybody to worry about. It is not a problem. So, we say, if it is not a problem, if it does not do anything, does not cause any change, why can we not talk about putting it back in the preamble, which is where Quebec asked for it to be in the first place? No, not allowed to talk about that. You cannot change the arrangement of this thing. Something magical happened at Meech Lake, and whatever it was, for some reason everybody who was there comes out now and admits it was flawed. But when you suggest how you might correct one or two of the flaws, no, you are not allowed to talk about it.

As a matter of fact, just recently, I am sure I heard a comment from former Premier Pawley, in Manitoba, saying, yes, he really did finally say in public that he thought there

should be some changes in the Meech Lake Accord before June 23. He is one of the authors who says he now believes that probably there should be a few little adjustments in some of the wording of the Accord. And everybody admits it is not perfect, but no, you cannot change it, you are not allowed to look at that.

The other thing I would like to do in the few minutes that remain to me, Mr. Speaker, if I might, is to deal with a few of the objections to this rescission motion that were raised by the Leader of the Opposition in his opening remarks in the hour before he moved the all-important amendment, which was so important that they did not want us to speak to it tonight. We do not know now why they moved it. I guess it must have been a parliamentary trick. He said he was going to use some parliamentary tricks. I guess that was one of them. Because when we wanted to exercise our right to debate, no, no, we were scuttling this and we were shutting them up because we decided we would like to exercise the rules, and so on.

A couple of the concerns raised by the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks: He started off by saying it was a dastardly deed we were doing here, because Premier Wells is breaking Newfoundland's word. I would like to remind everyone that if you read the motion before the House, presented as Motion 12, it says in one of the recitals, "AND WHEREAS Section 46(2) of the Constitution Act, 1982" - this is provided for right in the Constitution, as it exists now; this is something that you are allowed to do - it "specifically provides that a resolution of assent made for



purposes of amending the Constitution of Canada" - which the Meech Lake amendments are supposed to do - "may be revoked at any time before the issue of a proclamation"; right in the Constitution.

I fail to understand why anybody gets upset when somebody exercises one of the rights he is given under the Canadian Constitution. Now, all of a sudden Members opposite go around and say we are doing something awful. We are exercising a right given to every Legislature in Canada under the Constitution under which we live. But, no, because we choose to do it, because we believe there are problems and because we want to express them before June 23rd and have them dealt with, there is something wrong with us. I am not sure that I follow the logic of that.

He also pointed out that it was an awful thing to be doing because it was precedent-setting in its nature. Well, there has to be a first time for everything. It is the first time the opportunity has come since 1982, under Section 46.2 of the Constitution, because they are the first proposals for change that have been produced, so it is the first opportunity for any Legislature to vote for them and then get rid of them if they decide they do not like them. We have decided that we do not like them and, as the last speaker said, in less than an hour now we hope we will finally do the best thing that has been done here for a while and make that correction, so we get back to where we can discuss this first.

The Member for St. John's East, Mr. Speaker, agreed with and went to some lengths to explain the

other thing about the great wrong done to Quebec in 1982, the night of the long knives. I submit to everyone, Mr. Speaker, that because of the political realities everyone recognizes within Quebec at that time, it did not matter what happened, you could pass it over on a silver platter, it was not going to be signed. I am sure she will admit that; every Member here will admit that. Anyone who followed the debate at the time knows that. It did not matter what you put there. The Minister of Education in his remarks tonight dwelt on that. That is the reality of it; it would not pass anyway. However, everyone knows that that was the peg which was chosen at the time within Quebec, that was the peg chosen on which to hang their hat. What was going to be the great excuse given for not signing the Constitution? The great excuse was 'we were not dealt with fairly. They went behind our backs. It was a bad night; they left us out at the last minute.' So they came up with a great excuse and I think, if in fact, we had a strong federalist somewhere within Quebec now, or if the Prime Minister of the country were to really expose the reality of the situation instead of hiding behind it, someone would really say, you have to stop using that as an excuse now. We know it was useful at the time because the Government needed it and used it, but you cannot live forever and hide behind that excuse.

If we face the facts now it was not going to be accepted, no way possible. It has already been dealt with, Mr. Speaker. The Federal civil-servant who wrote the memo and wrote to Premier Wells indicating that he was quite correct in contradicting Prime

Minister Mulroney's statement about Quebec's stand on the Constitutional issue in 1982, they were not left out, they kept themselves out by their previous decision, and the night of the long knives was the convenient way to explain it at the time.

We also had the Leader of the Opposition talk about the fact that experts disagree with Newfoundland's position. Well, I think we have put that to rest. Everybody recognizes that there is divided opinion. That is why we should be allowed to discuss our concerns on an equal, even footing, openly before the 23rd of June as equal partners in this debate, so that we can try to resolve the differences rather than hide behind the flaws and say for some other reason it must be done because you are going to break up the country, you are going to lose your pension, you are going to destroy the UI program, and you are going to lose family allowance.

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

The hon. Member's time is up.

MR. GRIMES:  
Just to conclude, Mr. Speaker, if I could, I would like to finish by suggesting that what we want to do is discuss our concerns and any others now, currently, beginning today, because we have not really been listened to before in a reasonable accommodating fashion. The Premier is on record as saying he will listen to any proposal. Everyone remembers the excitement of the night of the Prime Minister's address. When someone talked about the fact that there was a proposal and people were willing to talk about it, it

disappeared in a day or so. But our Premier was there being praised because he was willing to talk about anything, even including some kind of sunset arrangement. This will be given the process with this vote tonight

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

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

MR. GRIMES:  
— and I would ask all Members to put aside their partisan politics and vote the right way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

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

I say to my hon. colleague for Exploits, that was an excellent speech! In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is one of the better speeches the hon. gentleman has made, and, Mr. Speaker, it was for closure in this House. Mr. Speaker, I find it most unusual for a gentleman to get up and give a speech asking Government to have closure on a resolution that is so important to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Talking about Newfoundland and Labrador and talking about Meech Lake, I want to read a comment from the paper in Labrador this week. Its title is, Brutally Frank, and it is by Frank Carrol. Mr. Speaker, it ties into the Premier's stand on Meech Lake and I quote: "The only time we hear the words 'justice and equality'

from the lips of the Premier lately is when he is fighting about Meech Lake. Somehow, according to Mr. Wells, the Accord would constitutionally enshrine Newfoundland's status as a have-not-Province. While the Premier may be right, his stance has a certain odor of hypocrisy, especially in the light of last month's Provincial Budget. What goes around comes around. If the Newfoundland Government expects to be treated equally in Confederation, it should be willing to dish out some justice and equality to Labrador.

'We constantly hear our politicians remind Quebec politicians how Newfoundland owns Labrador. In Dave Gilbert's case, we hear him refer to the relationship between the Province and Labrador.'

PREMIER WELLS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:  
Now, Mr. Premier, if you are upset with what I am reading, you can either go out or close your ears, whatever you want to do.

'It is an attitude of imperialism that translate into policies of exploitation. With every new administration there comes a hope that maybe things will change. Well, it seems things have changed since the Liberals took power. They have gotten worse.

'The significance of Mr. Kitchen's first major Budget is not lost on Labradorians. And I say to the famous Dr. for them...'

DR. KITCHEN:  
(Inaudible) last week.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. gentleman he already has hoof in mouth disease, and I would suggest that in the next day or so he may have more than that.

'For them it is an obvious slap in the face, it is a combination of insensitivity and broken trust that has left Labradorians even more cynical about their relationship with the Island.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, what this says to the Minister of Finance is that what the people in Labrador are saying, is exactly what the Premier is trying to do. The Premier is trying to break up Canada. And, Mr. Speaker, by the Premier breaking up Canada, the people in Labrador are saying to the Premier and are saying loud and clear, Mr. Premier, you are already breaking up Newfoundland and Labrador. In this past Budget by the Minister of Finance he has shown in five different instances that he is separating Labrador further and further.

I have to say this, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting. On Tuesday past, a gentleman in Labrador West said to the Minister of Education - he asked the Minister of Education a straightforward question - What is the name of that great body of water which separates Quebec from Labrador? The Minister of Education said, The Straits of Belle Isle. That is how much the Minister of Education knew about the Labrador boundary. And when the gentleman said in a joking manner, It is Meech Lake, it showed the hon. gentleman did not even catch on to the joke the young fellow was telling him.

The hon. gentleman knows what I am saying. When 300 school children

turned up at the airport to present the Minister with a petition asking that the air subsidy be returned to the people of Labrador, the Minister was not there. Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague got a petition with 1,700 names today. I know the Minister would not have presented a petition if he received it.

I tell you this, Mr. Speaker, it was good to see the news in Labrador, knowing that the people gave the petition to the right Warren instead of the wrong Warren.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

And the Premier said there cannot be two (inaudible).

DR. WARREN:

A point of order. At the assembly we had on Tuesday night, Mr. Speaker, they tried to distinguish between the two Warrens, and the spokesperson said, 'Dr. Warren, the Minister, is the man with the brush cut, and Garfield is the man who wishes he had one.'

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Ray Cole was a good chairperson at that meeting and he did a great job. And one thing that came out of the opening of the Labrador Community College was that they thanked the former Government for putting everything in motion.

Last Sunday, Mr. Speaker, in Maple Leaf Gardens, some 18,000 people attended a major sporting event. It was the World Wrestling Championship.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It was at the Skydome.

MR. WARREN:

Right, the Skydome. And the person who held the belt for the last five or six years, Hulk Hogan, was defeated by the Ultimate Warrior.

I read in the paper today, and I also heard on UOCM, that the Ultimate Warrior is coming to Newfoundland on May 1 and he is going to wrestle the Canadian Destroyer, the Canadian destroyer sitting over there. There is only one thing left to do now, and that is for the Canadian destroyer to go down to Memorial Stadium on May 1 and take on the Ultimate Warrior. Because this man is going to be responsible for breaking up Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me go one step further. Let this event take place. It will be the beginning of the break-up of Canada. I said this in this House before and I am going to say it again, once we see the first crack, some province in this country leaving Canada, breaking away from Canada because of the ego of this Premier, I assure you, Sir, and I assure this House, that I will help to lead Labrador away from this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Now!

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, because I say to the Premier, Labrador has no part to play in the Province of Newfoundland when you break up Canada, Sir. Labrador is better away from Newfoundland and away from you.

Mr. Speaker, I say the time will come, because it was only eight or nine years ago, or twelve years ago, when there was a New Labrador Party in Labrador and there were

two Members elected. My hon. colleague for Eagle River knows he was one of the greatest supporters. In fact, Mr. Speaker, he was only a small kid at the time, but he supported the New Labrador Party. He supported it then, Mr. Speaker, and I will support it today if this ever happens. Because the time is coming when the Premier's ego not only will destroy Canada, but it will destroy the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I want to continue Brutally Frank - what Brutally Frank has to say about this Government and what I am saying ties together. It ties right together, Mr. Speaker, this comment here from Brutally Frank. 'By cutting the twenty per cent air subsidy all Labradorians were entitled to, the Liberals have made health care even more expensive, especially for coastal people. It has made life a little harder for all concerned. It represents one less incentive for nurses and for doctors to stay on the coast of Labrador, because of this Government's budget.' Mr. Speaker, it all ties together. What the Premier is doing to the people of Labrador is driving the wedge deeper, and deeper, and deeper, exactly what he is doing to Canada. He is driving the wedge deeper, and deeper, and deeper, and it is all tying together.

This guy right here, he is called Brutally Frank, but he is right to the point, he is brutally to the point, but he is coming right back and saying exactly what is happening within the Canadian domain as well as within the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

The last paragraph, Mr. Speaker.

Oh, my goodness gracious! 'The Liberals have betrayed a public trust that Government should protect the principle of equal opportunity. I know no Government can guarantee equal opportunity, but it should not stand in the way of it either. Labrador students will now find it even more difficult to participate in Provincial athletic, musical and drama events now that air subsidies and athletic funding has been cut off. This move robs them of an opportunity to better know this Province and broaden their minds.' Mr. Speaker, the last sentence: 'Do not tell me it is only a matter of money. It is a matter of priorities. Where do Labrador children stand in the great scheme of things?' He closes off by saying: 'It is time to put Meech Lake on the back burner.'

Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. Premier tonight, that he only has another thirty-one minutes to drive the hatchet deep down into the core of Canada. He set out in the last nine months to do that, and now he is down to the eleventh hour, the last thirty minutes, when he is going to drive in the hatchet that is going to break up the great country we all stand to enjoy. And I say to the Premier, you still have time, Sir, you still have time to say to your followers, do not vote on this resolution tonight. Let us go out and have public hearings. I would say all Canadians will be better off, and the Premier may go down in history as a great Newfoundlander and a great Labradorian.

Mr. Speaker, Joey Smallwood will go down in history as the person who brought Newfoundland into Confederation, and Premier Wells

will go down in history as the man who took Newfoundland out of Confederation. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, we are within a half hour of one of the most important events to have taken place in the history of Newfoundland and Labrador, possibly since 1949 when we became part of Canada. This is an important event in the life of a nation and in the life of a Province. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa/Carlton probably gives some indication of what this event means to the nation. In a letter of March 30th of this year to the hon. Clyde K. Wells: "Dear Mr. Premier: I want to firstly support your stand with respect to the Meech Lake Accord. I believe the vast majority of Canadians are counting on you to stand resolute and uncompromising." The vast majority of Canadians, this gentleman says. "There cannot be any distinct society in Canada. We are Canadians and Canadians only. Distinct societies have in the past become elite societies and have been at the forefront of civil rights abuse. The words 'distinct society' mean all things to all people. It is not defined in the document and will be abused by the courts either by ignorance or emotion in the future. The continuing demands of a distinct society are never-ending. Those demands are in Canada to date, always met by accommodation. A better word, I believe, is appeasement. In the name of being 'good fellows' - and the gentleman puts the words good fellows in parenthesis - "in the

name of being good fellows like Chamberlain and Deladia, the Doctrine of Appeasement cost 60 million lives in World War II. The only politician to continually denounce appeasement policies was Winston Churchill. Throughout 1939 Churchill was scoffed at by the press and the media." The Premier was scoffed at, Mr. Speaker, by Members on the other side of this House.

"The BBC would not allow his voice, the influential London Times would not publish his letters nor report his comments. He was denigrated in the House of Commons as a warmonger and the Chamber emptied when he spoke." And the writer of this refers to Manchester's alone, to back up that statement. "And yet with dwindling financial resources with no political support, with public loathing he steadfastly held his course, history has judged Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain and Prime Minister Winston Churchill, Mr. Speaker. 'Be not dismayed', the Premier is being told, "by the immense pressure to conform, to be accommodating and to compromise. The day belongs to Clyde Wells because at no other time in his life will he again have this momentous occasion to do the right thing. History is very unkind - a Churchill or a Chamberlain - it is Clyde Wells who must choose."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

This, Mr. Speaker, was written by Andy Hayden who is the Chairman of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa - Carlton. This is some indication of what we are doing here tonight means to the nation of Canada. I could not say it better than that gentleman said it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are saying that if we are going to prosper as a Province, if Newfoundland and Labrador is ever going to become a have Province within this great Confederation of ours we must have a Triple E Senate. We believe that we must have equal provinces within this nation. Now if there is any doubt in anyone's mind about the importance of an equal, elected and effective Senate let me table for all hon. Members a chart. I have here a chart, Mr. Speaker, and it shows the population by level of disparity. This is based on earned income by province in 1987. There are three colours use, the red is used to show a deep disparity; the blue is used to show a moderate disparity; and the green is used for no disparity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will notice that the six provinces in this nation which have the most deepest disparity are Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. The six smallest provinces within this nation.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
No way!

MR. DECKER:  
And the worst province, the province with the deepest disparity, the province with the worst disparity is the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. If we are going to make a place for us in this Confederation, we have to deal with the bigger issue and we have to deal with something which will make ten, or whatever the case might be, equal provinces in this Confederation. If we are not to take this action tonight and Meech Lake were to become a reality, we can whistle Dixie as far as ever getting any equal

Triple E Senate, it would be totally uneventful.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are winding down the debate on the rescinding of this Meech Lake Accord and over the past few days we have seen the Leader of the Opposition, live up to his threat. I heard him, the Member for Exploits referred to it, it was referred to a few times in this Chamber, when he said, 'If the Premier thinks that he is going to get co-operation on rescinding this Meech Lake Accord, then he had better think something else, because I am going to use every trick in the book to delay, to filibuster this momentous event.' Now, Mr. Speaker, we saw him do it. We saw the games that he played. We saw him tonight - I am going to be one of the last speakers, there may be a few minutes for someone else, I do not know. This position of being the last speaker, if there were any courtesy or decency within this House, this, surely goodness, this privilege would have been given to the man, the Premier of this Province, the man who has stood up and put this motion on the Order Paper to begin with. If there were any decency, if people of goodwill could agree on something, it is only common sense that the hon. the Premier, should be given the opportunity to be the last speaker in this debate, but we saw and we all know what happened. I heard some of the hon. Members say a little earlier in this debate, that they did not get an opportunity to speak to the main motion. This is when we had enough speakers to go on until 12:00 o'clock in the night talking about the Amendment, then they could begin to scream and shout because they could not get an opportunity to speak on the main motion. Mr. Speaker, do you know

what they were doing? Do you know what they were doing when they should have been speaking on the main motion? The hon. Member for Torngat admitted in this House several times that he went out and solicited petitions. He made up petitions and solicited them, so that he could get up in this House and stall the Meech Lake debate, and then when it comes to an opportunity, when we wanted to do this in an orderly, reasonable fashion, Mr. Speaker -

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
On a point of order, the hon.  
Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister has  
just told a lie in this House.

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

AN HON. MEMBER:  
No, there is no point of order,  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I will ask the hon. Gentleman to  
retract that please. You cannot  
tell a Member that he has told a  
lie.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the word  
'lie'. But, Mr. Speaker, the  
petitions that I received from the  
people on the Labrador Coast were  
petitions from the people who were  
concerned about Health Care, that  
was given to me -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. WARREN:  
Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister  
has told a lie!

MR. SPEAKER:  
I ask the hon. Gentleman to make a  
withdrawal please, unequivocally.

MR. WARREN:  
Withdrawn, Mr. Speaker, but he is  
not telling the truth.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. Gentleman should withdraw  
unequivocally and without any  
qualifications.

MR. WARREN:  
Withdrawn, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker -

MR. WARREN:  
Now tell the truth this time.

MR. DECKER:  
The hon. Member for Humber East,  
squeals, literally squeals,  
calling for public hearings, she  
says, public hearings.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Yes, that is the truth.

MR. DECKER:  
My hon. friend, the Minister of  
Development put that in its proper  
context when he said, 'yes, we  
will give public hearings, but  
first, we have to clear the  
garbage off the table! First we  
have to clear the garbage off the  
table.

The table which we inherited was  
cluttered, Mr. Speaker. It was  
cluttered with this Meech Lake  
motion and we have to clear off  
the decks, then, when that is



done, we will give the people public hearings if they want public hearings. We will give them to every Newfoundlander and Labradorian in every nook and cranny of this Province who wants an opportunity to speak in public hearings. If that is what it takes, that is what we will do. And, Mr. Speaker, if it is necessary, we will even go to the ultimate public hearing and we will call a referendum on the issue, wide-open democracy, wide-open debate from every nook and cranny of this Province of ours. But, before we can do that, we have to put this Province back where Manitoba is and where New Brunswick is. We have to clear the garbage off the deck and we are about to do that, Mr. Speaker, in a very few short minutes.

Mr. Speaker, after that all-night affair which took place at Meech Lake some months ago, the nation of Canada was left hanging on the edge. The nation went through a night of horse trading, not constitution-building, not nation-building. Mr. Speaker, it was a night of horse trading. The Premier of British Columbia wanted something, our Premier wanted to talk about fish, not for some input into the management, he just wanted to talk fish. And they said, 'Yes, Brian, boy, sure we will put fish on the agenda.' And that was supposed to be some way to pacify him.

MR. FLIGHT:

A few concessions.

MR. DECKER:

A few concessions, to talk about fish. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, we have to do more than talk about fish.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that night of

horse trading when our Premier sold out for the sake of talking about fish at some future date, the nation of Canada came to the brink. We in the Liberal Party saw this when the vote was taken in July, 1988, and we made a promise to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. In our election, we did not make a whole lot of promises. We promised we would put health in the proper perspective where it belongs, we promised we would make education one of the main points in our Government if we were elected, we promised what we would do with Development, we promised fairness and balance, we promised responsible government, all of which we have delivered, Mr. Speaker.

But the overriding thing we promised, the crowning star of our campaign was this, we made a covenant with our fellow-Newfoundlanders and Labradorians; furthermore, we made a covenant with our fellow-Canadians across this great land. We said, 'Elect us and one of the first things we will do as soon as we possibly can, is we will introduce legislation into the House of Assembly to rescind our approval for the Meech Lake Accord.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

That was the commitment we made. And tonight, Mr. Speaker, I say to my fellow-Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, tonight, I say to my fellow-Canadians, here is evidence of a party which is not afraid to deliver. We are delivering tonight, and we are going to deliver on the promise we made that we will withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

It is with a great sense of satisfaction that I can stand here with my colleagues in this great Liberal Party, with my colleagues and friends throughout Newfoundland and Labrador, and deliver on this promise we made. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to do that. I could have taken advantage of this twenty minutes, I suppose, got up and followed in the steps of the Rhyme of the Ancient Mariner, who complained because he could not get time to speak in this debate. Instead of being relevant, he gets up and goes on. Well, the albatross is around his neck, Mr. Speaker. This albatross is around the necks of all of the hon. Members over there, because they are absolutely against what Newfoundland and Labrador expects of us tonight.

We are being watched by Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, as we are being watched by Canadians across the nation, as the hon. the Premier would be watched tonight making the final speech in this debate, had there been any decency left in this House of Assembly.

MR. HEWLETT:

Decency was taken away from this House last Friday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

(Inaudible).

MR. DECKER:

Before I get to my conclusion I want to correct or at least high light some of the comments that were made by my friend for St. Mary's - The Capes. And I have heard other Members also make the same remark in this debate. The remark has been said that the Premier of Manitoba, somehow is not really firm in his objections to the Meech Lake Accord. They

are saying that somehow, if the Premier of Manitoba had a majority Government, he would be in favour of Meech Lake and would not be withholding Manitoba's support.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that anyone on the other side would make such a statement. I am doubly surprised that my friend for St. Mary's - The Capes would make such a statement. Essentially what he is doing, he is referring to the Premier of Manitoba as being unprincipled, as being politically expedient. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that is unfair, because the Premier of Manitoba even though he is a Tory, has just as much principle, Mr. Speaker, on this issue as any other names across this nation who are standing up for something that they believe in. And I believe that the hon. Member for St. Mary's - The Capes owes an apology, because this is not something that is going to be decided on party lines, this is something where principle and integrity must prevail.

Mr. Speaker, on July 7, 1988, I stood in this House and I took part in a debate which ultimately ended in the tearing down of a nation - tearing down a nation, Mr. Speaker. Tonight I am standing in this House and I am proudly taking part in the building of a nation. We are building a nation because, as I said in an earlier speech, there are essentially two different visions of Canada. Two visions of Canada which are diametrically opposed, which are as opposite from each other as black and white, which are as different as chalk and cheese.

One vision of Canada, Mr. Speaker, is a vision that I hold and that

my colleagues hold, and that many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians hold, and that the vast majority of Canadians hold, Mr. Speaker. That vision is one strong, united Canada. That is the vision. And within that strong united Canada there are ten equal Provinces, and the door is left open for other Provinces to become equal Provinces within this great domain. And within that great nation single united -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. DECKER:  
Just to clue up, Mr. Speaker. Within that great nation -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am delighted to have the last opportunity, the last twenty minutes in this debate to speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The gentleman does not have twenty minutes. The hon. gentleman has eight minutes.

MR. SIMMS:  
No, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that is correct.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, Standing Order 50 makes it clear that no Member shall rise to speak after the hour of one o'clock, but any Member who has been recognized to speak before one o'clock can finish their twenty minutes. That is according to our own Standing Orders.

MR. SIMMS:  
That is right, Mr. Speaker.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I will get underway. Your Honour may wish to consult with the Clerks rather than recess or take any time.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the entire debate practically, mostly in this House. I have not left my seat too frequently, occasionally to go outside for a coffee or something of that nature. I have tried to analyze why both sides are taking the positions they are taking. I am trying to cope with the argument within my own mind as to whether or not they are taking positions simply because it is the party line.

Now I have listened to some speakers on that side who, I believe, probably feel quite sincerely that what they are doing is the right thing. I know Members on this side from personal knowledge feel the same way with respect to the position they are taking. But, Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is, in all of this debate in my view, is the whole question of the future of the

country. That is the issue that pops out in just about every speech that I have heard. Somebody, even on that side, makes reference to this question of the future of the country. Members opposite, quite rightly, try to overcome any arguments that we make on this side and vice versa. But what I have seen is that Members opposite quite frequently in their debates have not given the whole story. They have not said it all. For example, and I will give you just a couple of quick examples.

Somebody made great reference tonight, I am not sure if it was the Member for Exploits or who it was, to Premier Peterson. Perhaps it was the Member for Pleasantville, but somebody mentioned the fact tonight as if it were gospel that Premier Peterson today said, 'The future of Meech Lake is not the end of Confederation.' I guess that is a quote attributed to him in the paper or at least it is the headline. But the same Member did not go on to say: 'A failure to ratify Meech Lake would make Senate reform and changes sought by other Provinces extremely difficult.' Now that little side of the story was not mentioned by the particular Member who made reference to Peterson. That is one of the argument that we have been putting forward. If Quebec does not become a signatory to the Constitution, as we hope and as we want, then the chances of Senate reform are extremely limited. But that is the kind of argument that Members opposite often put forth, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Exploits tried to plead with Members to listen to his reasoning. He could not

understand the logic behind our arguments because we were making certain comments back and forth in the House. And he made a great to do about in the Constitution of Canada there is a provision where you are allowed to revoke or rescind a constitutional amendment as long as it has not been proclaimed. That is true. You are allowed. You are also allowed, Mr. Speaker, according to our own Standing Orders to challenge a Speaker's ruling. You are allowed to do it. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not right to do it in the way that Government Members did it last Friday. Nor is it right to proceed with the rescinding resolution of Meech Lake, and that is the point, and that is the logic. That should not be too hard for the hon. Member to understand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Then I heard speeches, the Member for St. George's earlier tonight, I think it was - it has been a long day but I believe it was earlier tonight - and he talked about how difficult it is. He does not see any compromises being offered from other Governments, I believe, is what he said. I think he made reference to the fact that the Quebec Government says, no. Ottawa says, no, and so on and so forth. He does not see any compromise from these other Provinces.

Well, Mr. Speaker, how ironic a statement. How ironic a statement for a Member from this Government to say that they do not see any compromise being made on the part of other Provinces. Exactly what compromise is being shown by this Government and by this Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

None.

MR. SIMMS:

I have not seen any evidence of it, Mr. Speaker, none whatsoever.

So it is rather ironic that the hon. Member would make such-

AN. HON. MEMBER:

That is compromise.

MR. SIMMS:

That is not a compromise, Mr. Speaker, that is a fantasy in the mind of the Premiers. That is exactly what it is.

Mr. Speaker, I have to address some of the procedural entanglements that we found ourselves in over the last few days. I have to address some of the misconceptions again - the misconception about us delaying debate on Meech Lake. Mr. Speaker, the accusations made by Members opposite are inaccurate. They are unfair and grossly exaggerated. The Member for Exploits said we delayed everything by presenting petitions. Well, Mr. Speaker, I already pointed out in this debate a few days ago that last Tuesday when this debate began we had one petition, on Thursday we had three petitions, on Friday we had three petitions, Monday we had no petitions, and Tuesday, I believe, we had one or two petitions. That is not an unusual number of petitions.

Two people speak for ten minutes to a petition and every petition I saw presented in this Legislature were legitimate concerns on behalf of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. They have a right to be heard under petitions, and that is why petitions were presented. It

was not to delay debate. That is a foolish argument. I say to the Member for Exploits if we had wanted to delay debate we would have done what we did today. Yes, we did delay today because we were not prepared to accept closure. We had enough petitions to go today and tonight as well, but we certainly did not do it over the last five days of debate. That is a false, inaccurate accusation, but, of course, it fits the mood of their argument. It fits them to say that. It fits them nicely to try to paint us into that kind of a corner and hope that the press pick up on it. Unfortunately, they did, I think.

Mr. Speaker, we have also heard talks about the debate. This will go on forever and a day, I suppose. The Member quoted the number of hours that were allocated and the number of hours that were used, but what he did not identify, of course, was the number of hours used, not counting tonight because we have not been into it, but until tonight, up to tonight, the number of hours used are found by taking the number of speakers and giving them half an hour each. That is all you do. And, if you do that, Mr. Speaker, you will find that the Government had twelve speakers up until today, five and a half hours each, the Opposition had fourteen speakers, seven hours each, the two Leaders, you had about an hour and twenty minutes and he had about an hour and ten minutes, two and a half hours, the two independents had one hour in total. The total number of hours in the debate were fifteen and one half hours. He has thirty-four because what has happened is that the Premier, as he often does, as he quite frequently does, of course, is including all the time

that was in there for debates on points of order and points of privilege, particularly on the first day of the debate. That is, as usual, totally misleading the public and misleading the people of this House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, they make fun of the fact that in 1988 when the original Meech Lake resolution was introduced here in this House, they make fun of it, that there was thirteen days debate, and there was thirteen days debate. There were thirteen different days that the debate was called and the debate was spread over a three and a half month period. Yes, you are correct. It was not forced in a five day period. It was not crammed or rammed into a five day period and that is a considerable difference, particularly on the importance of the issue and the topic that the Premier and Members opposite say it has. Now, why did not the Premier and Members opposite take a little more time and spread it out? That is a question that has not been answered in this entire debate, at least not to my satisfaction - the purpose and need to rush into this resolution that the Premier has put forth to rescind the original Meech Lake Accord. Why had he rushed into it particularly at a time, just a few days ago, a week or so ago, when there was some movement the other way. Instead of trying to wait and see how things flowed he had to rush right back and rescind his own resolution. It was a very inopportune time, it was not helpful to the process, and I to this date cannot understand why.

I did not want to get into a lot of debate on what transpired here earlier tonight, but suffice it to say, and I will say this

categorically, the Premier told me on the floor of the House that he had no problem with the Leader of the Opposition closing debate. That is what he said to me.

PREMIER WELLS:  
On the amendment.

MR. SIMMS:  
You did not say amendment. I will state categorically here the Premier never mentioned the amendment not once in the discussion nor were we talking about amendment. We were talking about the right - or letting the two leaders speak for twenty minutes in the debate at their leisure by leave, not on the amendment. There was no discussion on the amendment, and he knows it, Mr. Speaker. And that is why I was so upset tonight.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will get on with the debate if the hon. Member will hold onto his horses.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) For the Premier over there.

MR. SIMMS:  
Well if the hon. Member could keep his trap shut he might hear something. Okay, it is my time. If the hon. Member wants to interrupt me and throw me off, that is fine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, the whole process that we have seen in this debate for the last week is something that bothers me very, very much. Closure, Mr. Speaker, has been used twice to my knowledge in the last decade in this Legislature. Twice only that

I can recollect, 1988 and 1984 at least.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What was that?

MR. SIMMS:

1988 and 1984. Well I got a list from the Clerks as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker. The whole tenor of the debate from the Government's perspective has been to force and ram through the resolution, Mr. Speaker. The approach has been distasteful, the approach has been unprecedented in many ways. The introduction of the resolution to rescind is unprecedented, has been unprecedented, Mr. Speaker. Rushing the resolution of such an importance, a Constitutional amendment over a five day period has been unprecedented, no question about that. They have broken all the Parliamentary rules available. And the grossest thing I ever saw in a Parliamentary sense, Mr. Speaker, was what occurred last Friday to your colleague, the Member who sits in the Chair as Deputy Speaker. I think that was a travesty. And it certainly was evident, of course, of the tyranny of the majority being in action, and we said that on Friday and we still feel it and still believe it, Mr. Speaker. And I think it is unfortunate.

They do not like what I am saying so they will try to interrupt me. Now, Mr. Speaker, then, of course, comes the ultimate weapon after five days of debate, we will bring in closure. We will bring in closure, we will end off the debate, cut off the debate, we will not give them a chance to speak. That is the only way to get this through, we can see it now.

MR. HEWLETT:

The ultimate weapon is the ultimate warrior.

MR. SIMMS:

Then, of course, there was another ultimate weapon, then there was another ultimate weapon, and then there was another weapon within a weapon, and that was the despicable action we saw tonight by the Government with respect to introducing closure within closure. Now that was the end of a five day example of tyranny in my view. The tyranny of a majority, Mr. Speaker, and it is something, I think, to feel very bad about as Members and Parliamentarians. I have never heard of it before - what happened with respect to last Friday's actions. Indeed, it has never happened in this Legislature before, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I spoke in the debate a few days ago and explained my arguments with respect to Meech Lake and the points that the Premier has raised. But I want to touch on a couple of other things, Mr. Speaker. I want to point out what the Minister of Finance had to say the other night with respect to Hydro Power and Meech Lake and the tie-in to Hydro Power and Meech Lake. The Evening Telegram's editorial today, I thought, put it very succinctly and very clearly, and did it very well, I believe. I hope that the Minister has read it because it tells the story. It tells the story, Mr. Speaker, particularly when he had the gall to attack Quebec on the Upper Churchill contract. Now, Mr. Speaker, he, as a Member of the Government, or at least was a Member of the same Government that actually put in the Upper Churchill contract, brought in the

Upper Churchill contract. The Liberal Government of the twenty-three years before the seventeen years of Tory rule that he often talks about, and he served in that Government with his old friend Mr. Smallwood. Not at the time, but he served with Mr. Smallwood. And the editorial in the Evening Telegram, I think, puts it very succinctly, it would do the mouth from the south good to read it because then he will know what I am saying, and he will know what people are saying, and he will know what other people are going to be saying over the course of the next number of days. But the interesting thing is the Premier says it had nothing to do with him. The Premier said it had nothing to do with him. It is not his view. Yet, Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1990 in this House, in fact, the Premier himself flicked across a similar sentiment when he was asked a question by the Leader of the Opposition, whether you had looked at any negative economic impact on Newfoundland should Quebec separate. And the Premier said oh, I do not know, I dare say we might get \$500 million a year out of the electricity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Now there is another little hint, Mr. Speaker. And you have to wonder truly if the Finance Minister's comments were truly comments of his alone, whether they were comments that reflect the Premier's thoughts, and we may, in fact, hear more about it in the days ahead that might tie the two together, and the Premier might have a good opportunity to try to explain himself out of another little pickle.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude simply by saying this, and I tell Members this sincerely, Members can laugh. This is typical of this Government, it is a serious issue and they are over there laughing and joking and that is the shame of it all, Mr. Speaker. That is the shame of it all, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The country is falling apart and they are over there laughing.

MR. SIMMS:

Forgive them for they know not what they do. Everything is a joke, Mr. Speaker.

MS VERGE:

One of them knows.

MR. SIMMS:

Let me just say this, Mr. Speaker, in closing up, it is the last opportunity I guess with one minute left or two minutes or whatever it is. The opportunity is to make one last appeal, I guess to the Premier, because it is no good in appealing to the Members, they will do whatever he says. So it has to be directed to the Premier.

MR. HEWLETT:

They follow their Leader.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They do not have one, who are you trying to kid?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier to consider the appeals and requests of Members on this side throughout this debate. I assure him they were sincere appeals. The questions they asked were, certainly for the most part, most sincere. And they do have concerns about the future of



Canada and other people do. I am sure he knows that. He recognizes that. You read it every day in the paper, day in and day out. I guess, more and more you hear people saying that. I believe, in fact, the Premier admitted that tonight in an interview on a national news cast.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:  
Do not sit there and pooh pah all the comments that are being made by other Members. Do not sit there and just pooh pah all these concerns that are being expressed by people across the country. Do not think that it is imaginary, all of this kind of concern, because it is not. I can assure him it is accurate, true, real concern, Mr. Speaker.

I say to the Premier perhaps he could take the advice of one of our own Newfoundlanders who teaches at Memorial University, who said: 'Accommodation is the key.' And he said it in a recent article. 'Mr. Wells must bend a little. His case is not so strong that he can afford to do otherwise.'

All we are asking, Mr. Speaker, is that the Premier hold off on this very damaging and unprecedented move which many people feel it is, many of us here. Put the matter out to public hearings is what we ask for. There is no need to rush into it. Use your same determination and stubbornness that have done you well in many ways, but use that same determination and stubbornness to lead us out of this constitutional impasse. Because it is a very, very serious situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:  
But, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Premier, in the process do not isolate us any more than we are being isolated. Do not hurt the Province and do whatever you can to help build, not only a better Newfoundland and Labrador, but a better Canada for all of us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Is the House ready for the question?

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the Motion? All in favor 'aye'?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER:  
All those against, 'Nay'?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
'Nay'.

MR. SPEAKER:  
In my opinion the 'Ayes' have it.

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until 2:00 p.m. April 24, 1990. And the House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, April 24, 1990, at 2:00 p.m.