



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 10

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Thursday

12 March 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the news release of August 22, 1986 which outlined Government's plan for reorganizing the Provincial Vocational School System into a Community College system, stated that Advisory Committees would be appointed for each region.

Today I am announcing the names of those who are being appointed to the five Regional Community College Advisory Committees.

Mr. Speaker, these Advisory Committees are being appointed to advise my Department on matters pertaining to the implementation of the Community College System in their respective regions, and will be replaced by Boards of Governors when the Act establishing a new Community College System is approved and proclaimed into law.

Mr. Speaker, we envisage that that act will be approved in this session of the House and that the full Boards of Governors will be in place by September of this year.

Mr. Speaker, the following people have been appointed to the Advisory Committee for the regions indicated. I should also say, Mr.

Speaker, before I announce the names of the persons on the Advisory Committees, that we have been very cognizant in trying to set up these Committees to take all geographical locations into consideration. Also we have been very concerned to make sure that we have male and female representations on these Boards on a fairly equal footing, and I think we have done that.

The names for the Community College for Labrador, Mr. Speaker, are: Mr. Patrick Furlong, Ms. Marie House, Ms. Sadie Popovitch-Penny, Ms. Marion Lyall, Col. John David, Mr. Gregory Penashue, Mr. Leander Pittman, Ms. Ruby Cabot, Mr. Gary Mitchell, and Ms. Regina Wright.

The Community College Region for Central Newfoundland include: Mr. Roy Belbin, Ms. Mildred Ivany, Mr. Don Manuel, Ms. Sandra Kelly, Ms. Geraldine Devereaux, Mr. Sam Blagdon, Mr. Frank Howard, Ms. Mary Manuel, Ms. Jean Tremblett, Ms. Betty Wells, and Mr. Garry Payne.

The Community College Region for the Avalon Peninsula Advisory Board are: Dr. Gordon Young, Ms. Barbara Sullivan, Mr. Harvey Mercer, Ms. Thomasina Cleal, Mr. Douglas Marrie, Ms. Marilyn Cryderman, Mr. Vince Withers, Ms. Barbara Carey, Mr. David Power, and Dr. George Hickman.

The Community College Region for Eastern Newfoundland include: Mr. Cyril Pinsent, Mr. William Mayo, Mr. Ray Picco, Ms. Kay Riggs, Ms. Yvonne Whiffen, Ms. Ruby Blackmore, Mr. Roy Orr, Mr. Frank Kennedy, Ms. Margaret Abbott, and Mr. Winston Walters.

And the Community College for

Western Newfoundland include, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joseph MacIssac, Mr. Bruce Patey, Ms. Tina Moores, Mr. Edward Penney, Ms. Lorna Penney, Ms. Julia Swyer, Mr. Vincent Parsons, Ms. Shirley Frost, Ms. Laura Caines, Mr. Paul Snow, Ms. Margaret Hewitt, and Mr. Douglas Bath.

Mr. Speaker, I am very cognizant of the need for a strong educational link between the new Community College System and the existing High School System. Furthermore, I feel that it is essential that the Advisory Committees be sensitive to the regional nature of the new College System. For these reasons, in particular, as well as others, I have selected School Superintendents to Chair the Advisory Committees. It is my firm belief that these educators, who are the Chief Executive Officers of Regional School Boards, along with the other community leaders, can provide the leadership and direction that will be required from the Advisory Committees.

The five Chairmen are as follows: Mr. Patrick Furlong for the Labrador Region; Mr. Joseph MacIsaac for the Western Region; Mr. Roy Belbin for the Central Community College; Mr. Cyril Pinsent for the Eastern College, and Dr. Gordon Young for the Avalon Region.

Mr. Speaker, these appointments I am announcing today are another major step forward in Government's Reorganization Plan for the Province's Post Secondary Education System. This Plan will see the Provincial Vocational School System restructured into a Community College System by September, 1987.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the minister for making a copy of his statement available to us earlier. Could he enlighten me first? The term advisory committee, is that to be translated as board of governors or is there a separate body?

MR. POWER:

The advisory committees, Mr. Speaker, are being put in place to give us advice until the permanent board of governors can be put in place. The permanent board of governors cannot be put in place until we have legislative authority, which will be after the legislation is passed and proclaimed. So we would hope that we would have a full board of governors who would have a lot more autonomy and responsibility for running the system in place by September, and I guess a lot of the members who are on the advisory boards will very likely be on the permanent board of governors, as well.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I thank the Minister, Mr.

Speaker. What we are dealing with here, I say on behalf of my colleagues and probably on behalf of all legislators, is an important new step in vocational education. We have to see it is done right, and that is why we on this side will be constructive, and we will criticize if we think it helps make for a better post secondary system.

I believe that the reorganization of the system was long overdue and I have already publicly commended the government for taking the initiative to reorganize. I have been somewhat concerned that on certain matters the advice of the public appears not to be taken, and I am delighted to hear from the minister, in this context, that this advisory committee is strictly an interim measure. I do not know all the individuals on this list, but I do know at least a dozen or more of them, and those I know I can attest to being very competent individuals who, I am sure, will bring much expertise and concern to the responsibilities on the advisory committee.

To my larger point, though, I would hope that when it comes time to set in place a mechanism for choosing the board of governors that the principle now well established in the administration of school boards will prevail here, that at least a portion of the members will be elected from the outset. I would hope that provision will be made. That is one of the bits of advice the minister has gotten from around the Province and has not indicated yet whether he will be following. There is much merit in having part of the board elected. I get suspicious of those who take the elitest approach that we cannot

trust the people to elect boards of governors, when we trust those same people to elect the government of the Province.

The second and final point I want to make in response to the minister relates to the appointment of the administrative personnel, in particular the president. I say to him that some of his confidants are not very good at keeping confidences. They are talking around about appointments as presidents of those colleges and that, in itself, is distasteful. A person who would do that, does not deserve to have the appointment. But more to the point, this is not the kind of a job to hand-pick a person on the basis of any criterion, whether they are political criteria or what. This is the place where these colleges will succeed if they have the right personnel in place. And there has to be an impeccable screening process, above partisan politics, above the buddy buddy system, which has only one goal in mind, the putting in place of the best possible individual to ensure that that college is a smashing success.

And I say to the minister that we have picked up the signals that people are being approached privately. One person I could name, but will not publicly, thinks that he has the job already. If that is the case, that is a disgrace. The system has to be by full screening - by application first, so that any person who aspires to the position and feels he has the criteria to fill that position can have access to it, and I am talking about the presidencies of the community colleges. Open it up to full access by an application process,

a full screening process, an interview process, and let the best man or woman win.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
If I could just take one minute to introduce some of our guests in the gallery. I take great pleasure in welcoming the Mayor of Grand Falls, Mr. Paul Hennessey, and Mr. Wilf Maloney, the town engineer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I would also like to welcome to the visitor's gallery forty Grade IX and X students and their teachers, Mary King, Linda Woodman and Beverly Whalen from St. Anne's school in Dunville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, if I could just have thirty seconds, possibly by leave, just to say that we did as a government consider appointing all of the chief executive officers and some of the rumours that may have come out may have related to that. Simply for the sake of expediency and to make sure we had the system in place as early as possible we have since decided that the fairest and most open approach is to have open advertising for all of the seven chief executive offices that we need. We have appointed a very neutral committee to select and to advise government and to make

recommendations on those CEOs and that will be done very quickly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, in a very quick response.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! Does the hon member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave!

MR. SIMMONS:
Simply to say to the minister that in fairness to the individual going around Central Newfoundland as late as a couple of days ago saying he has the job would you do him a favour and tell him he has not got the job yet?

Oral Questions

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer). I want to ask him what is the government's policy if a Minister of the Crown is under investigation for possible breach of the law? Is it expected, for example, that the minister will step down until the matter has been resolved, or just what is the government's position?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that there is a specific policy

covering various hypothetical situations so the hon. gentleman would have to be a bit more specific. As I understand it, it has to do with if there is an investigation going on with respect to a minister, and I am not sure in connection with what it would be. You know, that is such a broad area.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Let me broaden the question for the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You mean narrow it. It is broad enough now.

MR. TULK:

Let me narrow it down for him. I was asking what is the government's policy, and surely you must have one, if a minister of the Crown is either under investigation or charged under the Criminal Code or for a criminal offence in this Province until the matter is resolved? You must have a policy.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I would think that that would be a matter that the individual in question, if there is such a person, would obviously discuss with the Premier. The fact that a person can be investigated for something is very, very broad - being investigated for or there was reason to believe that they were dealing in drugs, murder, this or that, or if it were a highway traffic accident. I really think it is not only difficult but

sometimes meaningless to reply to hypothetical questions. It can be an investigation under any number of things.

MR. TULK:

I said the Criminal Code.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

The Criminal Code.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Unless the minister wants to further answer that previous question I will carry on. Does the minister want to elaborate on his answer?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question regarding the premises which used to comprise the Come By Chance hospital. Even though one member of the press referred to this as a hobbyhorse of mine, Mr. Speaker, it is not. I want to ask the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) if at any time he or any member in his department offered one or more doctors in this Province the premises, what used to be the Come By Chance cottage hospital and which is now the Come By Chance clinic, whether or not the Minister of Public Works or his staff offered for the sum of \$1.00 these premises to be used by that doctor or doctors for the practice of a private clinic? Would the minister indicate whether he or any member of his staff offered the facility there for \$1.00 in the last two or three years, since

the topic, of course, became topical?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, no.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). Mr. Speaker, while the Come By Chance hospital was a hospital, and since it became a clinic, during that period of time, say, of the last three or four years, would the Minister of Health indicate whether or not he or any member of his staff offered one or more doctors, who are now, Mr. Speaker, presently operating a private clinic in this Province, 'for the sum of one dollar, you can use these premises for a private clinic'?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

For myself, Sir, absolutely no. I cannot give you the affirmation that I am absolutely sure that someone, whoever that individual might be, who could be a member of the Department of Health, but certainly it has never come to my attention.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Health another question. Two days ago, when I asked the Minister of Health and the Premier several questions, I hand delivered to the minister a letter asking the minister to provide me with certain information. Would the minister indicate if he can lay that information on the Table of the House today, or, if he cannot do that, could the minister indicate to me how soon I can expect to get some or all of the answers to the questions contained in my letter of two days ago?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Yes, I did receive the letter over your signature, I believe yesterday or the day before. I have asked the department and the officials of the department to get the information. All the information is not available within this building or within the department, so we have to get it. As soon as I get that information, certainly it will be given to you.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young). It deals with the Public Tendering Act. In 1985 the minister sought office space in the City of Corner Brook under three separate packages. I think companies were asked to bid either collectively for this space, or in a combination of either one block or two blocks, or in separate

blocks. I would like to ask the minister - he will recall, in fact, that a private businessman shut the government out of the Social Services offices at that time - why he awarded the contract to the Lundrigan Group for these three parcels of office space?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Because they had the lowest tender, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

I would like to table in the House today, Mr. Speaker, the actual tender from the Lundrigan Group, which shows that they did indeed tender for block two and block three, but did not tender for block one. How could they possibly be the lowest tender on something they did not tender on?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

I am sure that I have no objections whatsoever in tabling the tender that was submitted by the Lundrigan Group. I am sure that the Lundrigan Group tendered separately and for the whole lot of office space.

MR. FUREY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the

member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

In the estimates committee on Government Services dealing with Public Works and Services, I asked the same question of the minister. I said all three parcels were awarded to the lowest tender, and he responded, 'Awarded to one person'. Now, I ask the minister again, how can you award public money on a public tender for a contracting out of office space to a company that has not sought that office space contract?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, about a year and a half ago that was tendered. I do not know if I did table it here before, but, Mr. Speaker, I will gladly table all the correspondence and the reason why the tender was awarded to the Lundrigan Group.

MR. BAIRD:

And not to his buddy, Graham Watton. That is what is behind that.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works and Services. Last June 5 the minister will recall that in this Legislature, in reply to a question from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), he said no when he was asked if he has issued an memorandum regarding who should or should not sit on future

selection boards to select workers in his department. Does he still stand by that statement? In other words, is the answer no?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, yes, and I will at the first opportunity table the correspondence and the information I gave to the Leader of the Opposition. I will gladly table it so it will be open to the public.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, he does not need to bother, I will table it for him.

MR. YOUNG:

Oh, thank you!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have taken his answer as, no, he did not do that. Does the minister recall issuing a memorandum on November 1, 1985, to the Deputy Minister, signed by Haig Young, who is the minister, Mr. Speaker, in which he says, concerning the same incident, "In the meantime I would like to have Mr. Upshall and Mr. Conran removed from all interviewing boards in the future as I discussed with you previously." Does he recall that memo?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do recall that memo but it had nothing to do with what the hon. gentleman is talking

about. What I discussed previously had nothing to do with the memo that you are trying to say something about.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I would like to ask him one other supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Surely, Mr. Speaker, I cannot be led to believe that the Minister of Public Works and Services is lying to this Legislature. I cannot be led to believe that. I cannot be led to believe it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask him again so that it is clear to me that indeed he is not. "In the meantime" - this is his statement - "I would like to have Mr. Upshall and Mr. Conran removed from all interviewing boards in the future."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask him once again, how does he square that with his statement that he issued no such memorandum? Here is the memorandum to the Deputy Minister, signed by the Minister of Public Works and Services on November 1, 1985.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure it has all been answered but I said yes, and no. I said yes to something. I said yes I issued a memorandum, and no to something else.

MR. TULK:

No. No.

MR. YOUNG:

Oh, yes! We answered. You are beating a dead horse. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member had to bring civil servants into this, name civil servants who cannot come and defend themselves, Mr. Speaker, about a private memorandum that I issued to my Deputy Minister. It is unfortunate that he did that. I do not want to bring anyone's name into it, but if the hon. gentleman wants to come and speak to me as to why I asked that these hon. gentlemen be removed from the interviewing committee, I will gladly tell him confidentially. But it has nothing to do with what he is talking about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I want the hon. gentleman to stand and reply in this House once again because I want to read him another part of the same memo, Mr. Speaker, and I have to do this to clear it up. "I am concerned about the recommendations of the board in their selection of candidates for the MED Centre." That is what the memo was about, the selection of candidates for the MED Centre. And then he goes on to say -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

- "I want Mr. Upshall and Mr. Conran removed from the board."

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Now will he stand in this House and admit that one statement or the other is false.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

May I remind all hon. member that this is question time.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Let me ask the hon. gentleman once again, because the memo, I say to him, was about the hiring of employees for the MED Centre, one inescapable fact. Which statement is correct? Did he or did he not tell his Deputy Minister through a memo that Mr. Upshall and Mr. Conran were not to sit on boards in the future? Answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I tried to explain to the hon. gentleman and I say now, Mr. Speaker, that that memo was in two parts, that I wanted to go to the Public Service Commission -

MR. SIMMS:

That was a leading question.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, that is not a diary I

wrote there. My deputy was speaking to me about something else and I asked that they would be relieved from any future interviewing committees, but it had nothing to do with the MED Centre.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the hon. gentleman to clear up for this House what both statements meant. As I said, I cannot believe that the Minister of Public Works in this Province is lying, but I will ask him once again to stand in his place and either explain to us the difference between the two statements he has made, or submit his resignation to the Premier of this Province, as he should have done six months ago.

MR. YOUNG:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:
Mr. Speaker, I am sure if the hon. member will table - I will table it if he does not want to do it himself - the correspondence and the answers I wrote back to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), he will find that I am talking about two different things in that memo. It was a private conversation I had with my deputy and I have no intention of disclosing it here, and that is it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

In other words, you are lying.

MR. YOUNG:
Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

MR. FUREY:
How can you withdraw the truth? Withdraw! Withdraw!

MR. YOUNG:
Mr. Speaker, I would ask him to stand up and withdraw that remark.

MR. FUREY:
How can you withdraw the truth?

MR. YOUNG:
That is another remark I would like to have withdrawn.

MR. BAIRD:
Yes, or he will be withdrawn.

MR. FUREY:
How can you withdraw the truth?

MR. CALLAN:
Withdraw yourself.

MR. SPEAKER:
About that remark, I was just recognizing the hon. the member for Gander at the time and I did not hear that remark. I will certainly look it up in Hansard.

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. YOUNG:
Every member in this House, and everyone in the galleries heard the hon. member for Fogo (Mr.

Tulk) say that I was lying, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like you to recess the House and get Hansard and see what happened.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, if I may, if they want to recess the House, that is a different matter. But if the hon. gentleman recognizes that he said it in heat and wishes to withdraw it, then there would be no need to recess. So I am just putting that forward as a possible alternative. I can see that Your Honour does not necessarily hear everything, if you are thinking of something else, but if it is generally agreed that the word was uttered and then it is withdrawn, then we can go on with the other things.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Your Honour has made a ruling. He has said that he will check Hansard at the appropriate time and come back to the House, and at that point I will decide what it is I will do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I recognize the hon. the member for Gander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Good ruling! Good ruling!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am having Hansard checked on that matter and I will have something further to say on it later.

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), I would like to direct this question to the Government House Leader. In view of the fact that last year there was a tremendous amount of turmoil in this Province with regards to the close down of small schools, and in light of the fact that now, at this time of the year, the planning is now going on for next September, and there is likely to be once again a great deal of turmoil with regards to the close down of small schools, if phone calls to me are any indication, and in light of the fact that there has been a study in this Province into small schools, I would like to ask when the government is going to release the report on small schools that has been in the hands of the Department of Education for quite some time now? When is the government going to release that report?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly have to confer with the Minister of Education to see when he plans to make it public. I will certainly do that, and I will inform the hon. gentleman tomorrow. If the Minister of Education is not here tomorrow, and I do not know that, I do not think it would be appropriate for me to say when he is going to do it. But I will certainly check and let the hon. gentleman know.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the House Leader is going to check with the Minister of Education, would he please also point out that the Minister of Education has released I do not know if it is some or all of the recommendations of this report to hundreds of people in this Province and has not yet tabled that report in the House? Would he please find out what the Minister of Education is trying to hide by not presenting this report to the House in proper fashion?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I definitely will not try to find out what the Minister of Education is trying to hide, because everybody knows the Minister of Education is one of the most honourable and competent and capable people in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

What an accusation!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I would not insult that hon. gentleman by passing along the kind of question the hon. gentleman asked. If the hon. gentleman wishes to insult the Minister of Education, I cannot say that he is privilege, but that is par for the course. I certainly do not intend to ask the Minister of Education that question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question, in the absence of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), is to the House Leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, we all remember last Fall when the Government of Canada issued three factory freezer trawler licences to various companies in Canada, one to National Sea, one to Fishery Products International, and one to an independent group. In view of the fact that Fishery Products International will soon become a private company, can the minister

say, Mr. Speaker, if that company will be allowed to use that licence? What will be the government's policy? Are there any conditions, for example, written into the agreement of sale that that company will not be able to exercise that licence for a factory freezer trawler?

MR. SIMMONS:
That is a good question.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Yes, I certainly agree that that is a good question, but it is one that I would have to check on to see whether there is a condition of sale or whether there is an agreement with respect to the transfer of that licence. I would have to find that out.

MR. W. CARTER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
In view of that fact that the privatization of Fishery Products will be an accomplished fact, within about two weeks I think, will the minister undertake to convey to the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier that if that condition is not already attached to the sale that it will be, that every precaution will be taken by this government to ensure that Fishery Products International will not be allowed to exercise that licence to operate a factory freezer trawler

in the Northern waters?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
I will certainly pass along the hon. gentleman's concern.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I know I have a question here in my pocket for the hon. the House Leader. The question was prepared for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), but in his absence I will ask the question to the House Leader. In view of recent statements made by the Premier concerning the volatile and abominable financial condition of this Province, and in subsequent statements by the Minister of Finance this position was indeed supported, I wonder if the minister can indicate whether the Minister of Finance or the Premier plan to give an accurate updating of the Province's financial position, and when they plan to bring down the Budget?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, actually both things will be done the same time, because the budget will be the

updating of the Province's financial condition. We will review the situation last year and, of course, will set out the fiscal policy for next year. So that, in fact, is what the budget will be about. As to the date that the budget will be brought down, I have no doubt my colleague, the Minister of Finance, will be announcing that date to the House in the near future.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LUSH:

Again, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister of Finance in recent statements indicated that the deficit for this fiscal year had escalated, in view of the escalation of that deficit, I wonder again when can we expect a statement from the minister indicating just how far his slipshod fiscal management style had sunk this Province in the hole?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, we will never know to what extent the hon. Minister of Finance's slipshod style has done anything because the hon. the Minister of Finance does not have such a style. The hon. the Minister of Finance has a very clear, forthright, responsible style. But in terms of the Minister of Finance's clear, forthright, responsible style, we

shall find out the deficit with respect to the fiscal year, which is now ending, and the fiscal position for the fiscal year which will be beginning on April 1, during that budget. That is the reason we have the budget.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, we have had three or four sets of figures about the deficit for this year. The last one was \$53 million. Then we understand that the Province went to the federal government for \$150 million to help offset the deficit. The Evening Telegram in a recent editorial put it at somewhere around \$250 million. In view of those facts, Mr. Speaker, in view of the escalating deficit, in view of the last editorial in The Evening Telegram putting it at about \$250 million, can the hon. the House Leader indicate to the nearest million what is the actual deficit of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman asks a question and then says, 'in view of these facts,' that negates the whole question because what he put forward were not facts. The hon. gentleman was speaking about \$150 million in talking about the deficit for the current year. Whatever the \$150 million relates to, it relates to the next fiscal year. It relates to a request for the next fiscal year. So it has nothing to do

with this. So actually the hon. gentleman's facts are fictions. The hon. gentleman, I think, would make an excellent writer of short stories.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
A high degree of imagination.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt). We know, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Environment, both inside this House and outside, has indicated that he has no intention of releasing the report on the toxic waste site in Come By Chance. He said that and we have to accept that.

Now I ask the minister, if he has to take the rest of Question Period, to tell us why is it that he is refusing to release that report? He will not release it. Why, specifically, is he refusing to release that report? What are you hiding, Mr. Minister? Why will you not release it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker, all I say to the hon. gentleman is he can read yesterday's Hansard. That is an

internal document that was used by Cabinet. I can assure the hon. member that he will never be reading Cabinet documents, never.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, this is not a funny situation. There are a lot of people in the Come by Chance area concerned about what is in that dump and whether it is a threat to the health of the people in the immediate area. They have a right to know. That report has been sought under The Freedom of Information Act. Mr. Minister, it is not a case of reading a Cabinet document but a case of asking, on behalf of the people, what is in that report? You owe it to the people to tell them why you will not release it. Why will you not release that report? What are you or the Cabinet hiding from the people of the Come By Chance area and from Newfoundland?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be repeatious with my answer, but the hon. gentleman asked the same question. The fact of the matter is there was some documentation done in a very preliminary way to advise Cabinet on making serious decisions. We are now going to do

a more comprehensive study on the two existing waste disposal sites in Come By Chance and if indeed there is a clean up required after that it will be done. I have given that undertaking. I have also informed the people of Come By Chance, through their local municipalities and their member, that they have no problem with their water supplies or anything like that. That has all been verified by scientific and professional people who advise me on a daily basis. As for the hon. gentleman getting a look at Cabinet documents, I can tell him once again he will never, ever see a Cabinet document. He will never be in that privileged position.

MR. FLIGHT:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans, a final supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, \$5,000 of public money, of taxpayers money, was spent on a study of a public site for the good of the general public of Newfoundland. Now, why is the minister holding that report back? Why? Come clean! Why is he holding what is public information? The minister is stone walling, Mr. Speaker, and he owes it to the general public of this Province and he must come clean. It was public money that paid for that document. Why is he withholding that information?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) in this Question Period on

three occasions ask the very same question. I refer Your Honour to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Page 129, Paragraph 357, Section (d) "A question oral or written must not: repeat in substance a question already answered, or to which an answer has been refused." So, clearly, Mr. Speaker, the question the member asked is repetitive, it has already been answered, or perhaps in his opinion not answered, but in any event it is out of order, and Your Honour should clearly direct the member that he is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. member may not repeat a question that he has already asked. I think the question he was asking slightly varied so I will allow that question.

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon member made reference to some \$5000 that was spent on that preliminary study. In fact that figure is quite correct. I can tell the hon. gentleman now that we are going to spend a considerable amount more than that to do a comprehensive study, so we can do the necessary drilling, taking soil samples and so on, that will be required to ascertain exactly what the constituents of the soil are there, what it is made up of, what if anything has drained into it or anything else, and we will be able to determine that once this comprehensive study is done. So, besides the \$5000 that was spent we are going to have to spend probably five or six times as much as that again now to ascertain what exactly, if anything, damaging is there at those two

waste disposal sites. I cannot give the hon. member confidential information.

MR. FLIGHT:

You are covering up and you are going to get into trouble.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to raise a matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage on a point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS:

It is a serious matter, and I would hope that Mr. Speaker, would give me the protection to state my point. The Question Period today was terribly noisy, but we will come back to that later.

Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne provides, and long tradition in this House and other Houses of Parliament provides, that a member of this Assembly cannot knowingly give false information to the House. It is understood that sometimes a member will quite unwittingly say things that are not true, and time-honoured tradition shows that that is acceptable. If a person unwittingly gives information which turns out not to be true, that is another matter.

Parliamentary tradition also will show that at such time as a member's information to the House is shown to be false - that is the operative issue there - at that

time the onus is on that member either to correct the record or, in the absence of his doing so, for Mr. Speaker to take the appropriate action to protect the rights of members of this House. It is in that context, Mr. Speaker, that I rise. My privileges and the privileges of every member of this House have been breached.

I refer you, Sir, first of all, to Hansard, June 5, 1986, page L2751, in which the Leader of the Opposition raised a question as follows: "First of all, did the minister" - and he was, as the context will show, referring to the Minister of Public Works, the gentleman from Harbour Grace - "issue a memorandum regarding who should or should not sit on future selection boards?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a very clear question. There is nothing ambiguous about it. To the minister's credit, he was able to answer it quite unambiguously. He said, "No, Mr. Speaker." I understand from that that the minister said, 'No, I have not issued a memorandum regarding who should or should not sit on future selection boards.' I think, Sir, that is a fair interpretation of that exchange between the minister and the Leader of the Opposition. He says, "No, I did not issue a memorandum. No, I did not."

Mr. Speaker, that exchange is dated June 5, 1986. In a memorandum dated January 11 -

MR. TULK:

That is November 1.

MR. SIMMONS:

I am sorry, it is the other way around, November 1. The numbers here say '85, 11 and 1 and I

always have trouble knowing which is which. But it is November 1, 1985. In a memorandum dated seven months before he made that undertaking to the House, the following was said in a memorandum to the Deputy Minister: "I am concerned about the recommendation of the board in the selection of candidates for the MED Centre and why not..." - I cannot read all of it, but the point I want to get to is this: "In the meantime, I would like to have Mr. Upshall and Mr.----" - the name is not clear here - "removed from all interviewing boards in the future as I discussed with you previously."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that memo says two things. First of all, it says - and, by the way, the memo is signed, "Haig Young". It is all in somebody's handwriting, I presume the minister's handwriting. The memo says two things which are in contradiction, or which twice contradict the Hansard. One it says, "In the meantime, I would like to have Mr. Upshall and Mr. Conran removed from all interviewing boards in the future", and secondly it says, "I discussed this with you already. You have already got an instruction from me verbally, but in case that is not enough, I am now putting it in writing."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you, Sir, and with this I will clue up very shortly and I thank you for your patience, I submit to you that this was no inadvertent act that the minister forgot about at the time, this was something he did first in discussion, followed it up with a note so there would be no doubt about his intentions in the matter, and seven months after, Mr. Speaker, he rises in the House and denies that he did

it.

Now, let us give him the benefit of the doubt for the purpose of argument. Let us suppose he forgot on that occasion that there was such a memo, let us suppose that, surely a matter of this profile would immediately have been brought to his attention by the Deputy Minister who would say, 'By the way, Minister, I heard what you said in the House yesterday but, you know, you did write me a memo.' Or if that did not happen, giving the benefit of the doubt again, since then it has been made a public issue in the press at one point during the past few months. My colleague from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) gave him the opportunity today to withdraw the statement and to correct the record, and yet he persists.

Mr. Speaker, I want to table these items in case we do not have them already, and I want to say to you that I believe, Sir, this is an open and shut case. There can be no doubt about this one. We have the minister's word playing against what he said in writing and both of it cannot be true. It is mutually exclusive. Either one is true or the other is true, but they both cannot be true, and I ask you, Sir, to take the matter under advisement; you might want to deliberate and give us a ruling later. But the point of privilege I raise is that my privileges and the privileges of every member of this House have been breached, because we must be able to rely on the truth of statements that we get from members of this House. We must assume that what is being said to us is true or, at the very least, it is not deliberately untrue.

Mr. Speaker, as required under the

rules I want to give notice that if you find, Sir, as I expect you will, as I hope you will, that there has been a breach of privilege, I am prepared to put down the appropriate motion.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader to that point of privilege.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, in addressing this matter I would certainly submit that there is no prima facie case of breach of privilege and I would refer Your Honour to section 19, page 12 of Beauchesne, "A dispute arising between two Members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege."

I will refer Your Honour as well to page 25, section 82, "A question of privilege must be brought to the attention of the House at the first possible opportunity.

Even a gap of a few days may invalidate the claim for precedence in the House." In the allegations made here, the Chair is asked to direct itself, number one, to an alleged memo or communication or some document of November 1, 1985, and then to Hansard of June 5, 1986. So certainly within the earliest possible moment criterion would not appear to be met.

Then I would refer Your Honour as well to page 25, Section 84 of Beauchesne, "Once the claim of a breach of privilege has been made, it is the duty of the Speaker to decide" - there are basically two things - "if a prima facie case

can be established. The Speaker requires to be satisfied, both that privilege appears to be sufficiently involved to justify him in giving such precedence (or as it is sometimes put, that there is a prima facie case that a breach of privilege has been committed)" - then the second factor - "and also that the matter has been raised at the earliest opportunity."

I would submit, Your Honour, that neither of those two criteria have been met. Quite obviously the earliest opportunity has not been met, because the reference is to a document of November 1, 1985 and to something in Hansard of June 5, 1986. So I would suggest that the earliest opportunity requirement has not been met, and I would also suggest that the prima facie case has not been made, because there can obviously be a difference of opinion with respect to facts, or the significance of facts or their interpretation. These are matters of a difference of opinion, difference of understanding. Different people have different information or interpret it in a different way. I would suggest that there is no prima facie case of the kind alleged by the hon. gentleman.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, if I may respond very briefly to the Government House Leader's two points.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I think I have heard the submission made by the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I do not want to repeat my earlier points,

I just want to rebutt a couple of things the hon. gentleman said.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I will do it very briefly. First of all, the issue here does not relate to a difference of opinion at all about what the facts are. We have two sets of facts, and they are both the minister's, not ours. So the only question is a judgement. Do the two facts corroborate each other? If they do not, they contradict each other. We submit they contradict each other, and in that context he must be found to be in breach.

Secondly, the first possible opportunity argument: First of all, we could not get the memo because he said there was not one, so we had to get it under Freedom of Information after the House closed. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we submit today is the first possible opportunity in the context that we, today, wanted to give, as I said earlier, the minister the benefit of the doubt and we, today, at sometime after three o'clock, once again gave him the opportunity to correct the record. So I say to you, Sir, that it is only since he gave that latest answer that the matter of privilege fully arose.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, I would like to study that matter. I will take it under advisement.

Orders of the Day

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Motion 1.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I could inform the House that I had a conversation with the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) yesterday and we discussed the timing for this resolution. It has been agreed with respect to this motion that we will come to a vote tomorrow at approximately 12:55. I thank the hon. gentleman for his co-operation.

I also mentioned it to one of the NDP members, but I believe they have a function or meeting on somewhere. They did not invite me, so I did not have a chance to go. But anyway, they are aware of it and did not appear to have any great problems with it. So I think it is understood that we will bring it to a vote at 12:55 tomorrow. Obviously, everybody is aware there is an amendment and there is the motion. Natually, at 12:55 we would vote on the amendment, if it has not been voted on before, and then the resolution.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Of course we want to co-operate with the Government House Leader. As we have been saying for the past four or five days, this is a very urgent resolution. It is not just to help the government, it is to help the Province. We want to co-operate on this matter and get it out of the way. There are a number of people who want to speak. We may even have to ask some people to speak for ten or fifteen minutes rather than speak

for half an hour, if there a number of people who want to speak.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing I would remind the Government House Leader of before he leaves the Legislature is that I would think the government is soon going to be looking for Interim Supply. It is well up in March. I hope he does not come in here with two days left in the month expecting that the Opposition would have enough time in this Legislature to debate it before March 31. Part of the reason for giving him the fish resolution now is so we can start to get into the financial affairs of this Province.

I would hope that if he is requiring Interim Supply, which I guess he is, that he will bring it on in time for us to have debate before March 31, and not have the threatening situation that we had from the former Government House Leader of saying, 'Oh, you are keeping the widows and the orphans and everybody else without their cheques in this Province' by just his own mismanagement. I hope that is not the case with this Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
I am sure my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), will be introducing his Interim Supply measure in lots of time for all hon. members to comment thereon. That is consistent with our policy. I must disassociate myself from the views expressed by the hon. gentleman with respect to my illustrious predecessor.

MR. SPEAKER:
Motion 1, the hon. the member for Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to address a few comments to this very important resolution that we have before the House. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to say that it seems very ironic that, it was only yesterday, the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) was standing here in this hon. House and I am not sure if he was complaining or if he was trying to cover up for some of the shortcomings of his leader. But he was making the comment that the government did not care enough about the fishing industry to have this resolution debated without any further delay. The party opposite, Mr. Speaker, knew full well of the plan to debate this resolution in the House.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, and I am sure in the opinion of many others, not only in this hon. House, but around the Province who have followed the proceedings and the debate in the House over the past several days and weeks in particular, it is very ironic, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is not here. He is so caring about the fishermen in this Province, and was so concerned, as he said he was, about having a resolution put on the table. The member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) was trying to get some media coverage yesterday by suggesting that the resolution should have been debated before the Premier went to Ottawa to discuss the free

trade talks. Yet the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, has not been here.

I understand he is not going to be here today and he is not going to be here tomorrow to clue up debate on this important issue. I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, where the Leader of the Opposition is gone. There has been quite a lot of speculation in the media, I understand, inside and outside this Province. Does he care about the inshore fishery? Does he care about the offshore fishery? Does he care about fish in this Province at all? Where is he, Mr. Speaker?

I am sure it is a matter that was discussed at the Liberal caucus meeting over the last couple of days, but I am not party to that discussion. Is the Leader of the Opposition in Florida? Is he off to a fish show in Boston? I just wonder, Mr. Speaker. Is he leading some delegation off to the fish show that our own provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) is attending, and, I understand, making great progress at in the U.S. market when it comes to marketing our product? Is he on party business, Mr. Speaker? Is his trip being financed by some fish company in the Province? Is his trip being financed by taxpayers' dollars in this Province? I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, is he leading a rather large delegation down to the Boston fish show, or is he leading a rather small or minute delegation? I do not know if the House Leader would have some other French word to coin for such phrases.

Those questions, Mr. Speaker, are questions which I am sure his party, his members, must be

greatly concerned with. I am sure the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) is concerned, being a former Fisheries Minister, and in a district that survives or does not survive on what happens to the fishery. I wonder and question, Mr. Speaker, how much concern the Leader of the Opposition does have for the fishery in this Province. I would say very little, if any. If he wants to go out and get some hands-on experience in occupations of this Province, probably he should go out and try to haul a cod fish in over the side of a boat.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very important resolution. It is probably the most important resolution that has come before the floor of this House. As I look at the motion itself, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of very important parts in the 'WHEREASes', and, indeed, some very important words stated there in the two 'BE IT RESOLVEDs'.

Mr. Speaker, it was only last week that I visited a number of schools in my district during Education Week. One of the schools that I visited, Corpus Christi High School in Northern Bay, I spoke to their Grade XII, or their Level III, I guess, Cultural Heritage class. One of the things that they were extremely concerned with, Mr. Speaker, was the state of our fishing industry, in particular as it relates to the Canada - France fish deal.

They were so concerned, Mr. Speaker, that a couple of weeks ago they took it upon themselves to circulate a petition through the North Shore part of the Carbonear district, actually from Kingston through to Caplin Cove and on into Bay de Verde. It was

great, Mr. Speaker, to see students concerned, and they were, I can assure hon. member, indeed concerned. They presented this petition to me, but I could not present in the House because it was a petition that was addressed to our Prime Minister. So, because of that, I received the petition at their class and spoke to them and explained what our position, and I am sure the position of all members of this House, is on this important issue.

I did, Mr. Speaker, take the petition and send it off by registered mail, as a matter of fact, to the MP for Bonavista - Trinity - Conception, Captain Johnson and asked him if he would present it to the Prime Minister or to the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Siddon).

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to read a couple of comments from that petition. I am not presenting it. I am just quoting what was in the petition to show the interest that those young students had.

They addressed it to the Prime Minister and they said, "The people of Newfoundland, ourselves included, would like to see the maritime boundary dispute with France over the fishing waters near St. Pierre and Miquelon settled on a permanent basis." A great thought. It is great work and a great education in our cultural class.

"We feel as the Speaker of the House, John Fraser has said, that the fishing dispute is an urgent national priority." I think, Mr. Speaker, it is such a priority that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) should be here in this House. He should be in his seat.

He should be supporting this resolution. He should be supporting the resolution which is going to our people in Ottawa to see that this matter is resolved.

They went on to say, Mr. Speaker, that, "However, we are very disturbed about the measures taken by the Canadian Government in its efforts to get the French to the bargaining table. Not only do the French continue to fish in the waters which are still under dispute, but your government has given them allocations in 2J+3KL which needs strong conservation measures."

Mr. Speaker, they further say, "The Newfoundland inshore fishery has a right to expect a future based on a protected, well managed and self-renewing resource. Your government's move threatens the well-being and very existence of substantial core areas of our Province. We urge you to balance your commitments to France which are obligations to us."

Mr. Speaker, I was very impressed indeed with some 336 signatures that those students at Corpus Christi High in Northern Bay gathered from their parents and their friends around the various fishing communities in Conception Bay. I guess, Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat moved to also find that in their presentation of this petition to me that they did really express their pleasure with the way in which our Premier and the way in which our provincial government was handling this matter. I have passed the correspondence along to the Premier and to our Fisheries Minister.

They did, Mr. Speaker, say to me that they felt that a great

injustice was inflicted on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. They said that our people feel that they are being robbed of their most valuable resource by this Canada-France fishing agreement. This agreement, which allows France to increase their catch in our waters, not only affects, in their opinion, the present generation of Newfoundlanders, but it also affects future generations.

"A way of life in this Province," they went on to say, Mr. Speaker, "is being destroyed, the only way of life most of us know. The Newfoundland inshore fishery is the background of our history. It is a vital part of our culture and of our tradition." Since the discovery of this Province back in 1497, our economy, as we all know, as do the students at Corpus Christi High in Northern Bay, that our economy is based on the fishery. They feel that this "secret agreement," as they have called it, will have a disastrous affect on our way of life and indeed on our economy.

Mr. Speaker, in a note that they gave me with their petition they urge me, as their representative in the Provincial Legislature, to make their voice heard. That is what I am doing today knowing that I could not present their petition because it was addressed to the federal government. I have, as I have said earlier, forwarded it along.

They said, "Accordingly, we present this petition to you and ask that you submit it to the proper authorities at the federal government level. We appreciate the stand," Mr. Speaker, and I hope the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) is

listening, "We appreciate the stand that you, the member for Carbonear district, have taken on this issue and we support you in your efforts."

MR. SIMMS:

It does not matter if he is listening, he does not understand you anyway.

MR. PEACH:

That is right, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the member for Windsor-Buchans would understand it or not.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take the time of the House because, as the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has said, we should probably limit our time in speaking so that all those who wish to speak can. Some of the more important phrases in the first WHEREAS includes: "Notwithstanding the implementation of drastic reductions in the Canadian quota." I think, Mr. Speaker, that is the part that has upset many people in this Province, the fact that the Canadian fishermen, the fishermen on the Northeast Coast and indeed in the whole Province of Newfoundland and Labrador have agreed to reduce their efforts by some 10,000 metric tons of cod because we thought it should be done in the name of conservation.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we find, all of a sudden, in some secret deal that fish is put on the table. Nobody, I guess, has pinpointed the amount that has been put on the table. We all speculate that it is 1,500 metric tons and whatever but the fact is that nobody in their right mind going into negotiations like this would lay their ace card on the table.

Mr. Speaker, on the French over fishing, I think, we all agree, I am sure that members opposite do agree, that one of the greater concerns, and I suppose there is no way to resolve it other than to get the boundary issue out of the way, is the over fishing by the French fleet, not the French fleet from St. Pierre and Miquelon, but the metropolitan or national fleet of France. That has upset the people in St. Pierre and Miquelon. It has upset one of their great spokesman, a good friend of my friend here, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), Jean-Pierre Joel, who has spoken out very clearly, a gentleman who I have spoken to on many occasions when I visited St Pierre.

MR. SIMMS:

And now a good friend of yours.

MR. PEACH:

He is now a good friend of mine because of my relationship with the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

Newfoundland was excluded -

MR. FLIGHT:

By Mr. Crosbie.

MR. PEACH:

- from this meeting in Paris.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that is fair to say. I think Mr. Crosbie was excluded as well as the government of this Province. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think for those of us who have read the brochure that was put out by the federal government - I guess we should say put out by Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Price and Captain Johnson. I am sure my friend the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) there, who did not support the former member

in Ottawa from Bonavista - Trinity Conception will indicate his support for the present member for Bonavista - Trinity Conception, although he has a different stripe.

Mr. Speaker, this brochure, in my opinion, has some good points in it. It does state, Mr. Speaker, the facts that we have stated in our resolution that we want to reinforce and to put forth in a more forceful way. They have admitted in this brochure that we are right and that what was done, Mr. Speaker, was wrong.

I do not know how much this brochure cost to put out but I understand every household in this Province received one. We know, Mr. Speaker, that the programme that was on the CTV/NTV network cost somewhere close to \$40,000. It was a great way, I guess, for Mr. Crosbie to make amends, for Mr. Price and Captain Johnson to have their views expressed but I am not sure that they expressed them very clearly.

I must say I was impressed at the outset that Captain Johnson did stand up in that evening debate that they had in the House in Ottawa and that he did, I understand, receive a great deal of support from all parties in the House of Commons that evening. Since then, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitancy in saying that Captain Johnson has become somewhat more wishy-washy in his comments as it relates to this fish deal.

I received this brochure. It cost a great deal of taxpayers' money. I think Mr. Crosbie did admit that the programme on TV would probably even be shown again. The cost of producing it was the greatest cost and it came out of the budget of

his department, the Ministry of Transport, simply because he was the minister in the Cabinet from Newfoundland. Well, that is fair enough. It gave the other side of the story as well.

MR. FLIGHT:
Traitor.

MR. PEACH:
Mr. Speaker, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) has read it, I am sure, coming from a fishing district like he does, and there are fishermen in his district, I am sure. Many fishermen from the Conception Bay area have settled down in the Windsor - Buchans area.

What they say is 'the facts have been badly misrepresented and inadequately explained. There was a serious breakdown in federal - provincial relations for which Canada has apologized.' In this, Mr. Speaker, they have admitted to the people of this Province that the facts were handled very poorly, and for that they did apologize. Now, I do not know if apologies will take the fish off of the table. I sure hope that it does.

As well, Mr. Speaker, they did go on to say in this brochure, on one of the other pages - it is a quadruple fold - that 'Canada says France has overfished the 3Ps zone for the last three or four years. In 1986 alone the France-based fleet took at least' - and it is ironic to hear them say, 'at least'. They are admitting that Fisheries and Oceans Canada do not know for certain how much fish has come out of this zone, but they say they have taken 'at least 26,000 tons of cod, more than four times what Canada considers to be a reasonable limit.' Yes, Mr.

Speaker, it is very important to note they have taken 'at least.'

Surely goodness, somebody in Ottawa, some of the fisheries observers stationed in this Province must be able to get a more exact handle on how much fish has been taken out of 3Ps.

'The French plans for 1987 are to continue catches at this unreasonably high level.' Now, Mr. Speaker, for the federal government, for Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Price and Captain Johnson, to put out a brochure to every household in this Province telling them that their government is supporting or not going to do anything or very little about the overfishing that is going to continue in 1987 by the French fleet, Mr. Speaker, is very difficult for me to comprehend and to believe. It is amazing that they would put out such facts but, if they are the facts, well the people of the Province need to know them.

They did go on to say, Mr. Speaker - I think this is the bone of contention with the people in the Province, with the students in Corpus Christi High, a Northern Bay school, the people in the Carbonear district, and, indeed, I am sure all fifty-two districts in this Province - that 'on January 16 negotiations broke down because France was not satisfied with the proposals.' France was not satisfied! 'As a result of renewed contact and new instructions,' so somebody, Mr. Speaker, gave those instructions. Mr. Crosbie says he knew nothing about it. Well, it must be the PMO's office. It must have been the Minister of External Affairs, or it must have been the federal Fisheries office because somebody

gave instructions.

'The Canadian officials travelled to Paris and signed an interim agreement on January 24. This was done without the participation of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and without fishing industries and unions.' They admitted in this brochure that they are putting into every household in this Province that this was done without this Province knowing it. That is what we have been saying, Mr. Speaker. We are saying that it was done without our knowledge. 'This was inexcusable, because the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador had been promised participation in these negotiations.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is what it is all about. I hope when my friends on the other side get up to address this important issue, particularly the Leader of their party, their interim Leader, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), who lives in a fishing community, that they will agree this was inexcusable because we were promised to be part of that negotiation.

'The Government of Canada,' again, Mr. Speaker, they say, 'has apologized to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, and will ensure' - finally they got the message that they should ensure - 'that this Province, the fishing industry, and unions, are fully involved to the end of these negotiations.'

I say, Mr. Speaker, it is about time that the federal government, Mr. Crosbie, Captain Johnson, and Mr. Price woke up and realized what the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) realizes. He lives

in the same area that I do, and he has experienced, I am sure, particularly over the last two or three years some very, very rough times in the inshore fishing industry.

The only thing that saved many of our fishermen out in Conception Bay this last two years and in this last year, in particular, was the caplin. For many of the fishermen in all of Conception Bay, the people that my good friend for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) represents and those represented by the member for Port de Grave, the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young), and the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid), all around the district of Carbonear, for the last two years, this last year, in particular, the caplin was the saviour that made it economically possible so that, thank God, we did not have to go and look for a lot of make work programmes this past year. But apart from that, it was a complete disaster.

If we continue, Mr. Speaker, to overfish; if we continue to give cod stocks away, not only Conception Bay, but this whole Province is going to be affected. I think, Mr. Speaker, the time is now. As they ask in this brochure, 'What lies ahead? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada has stated categorically that 'the rights of the fishermen of Newfoundland and Labrador and of Atlantic Canada are the first and highest priority of the Government of Canada in these negotiations.'

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this commitment that has been put out to all householders in this Province through this brochure will stand. Mr. Crosbie goes on

to say, 'An unprecedented letter that he received from the Prime Minister to ensure that Mr. Price and Captain Johnson and Mr. Crosbie will now be involved in all future Canada-France negotiations.' Finally, Mr. Speaker, they woke up.

Finally, the people in Ottawa have said, 'we will have to give this one lonely Cabinet minister from Newfoundland some say.' They finally realize that they have in their caucus a fishing captain from this Province who, I am sure deep down in his heart, must have the fishermen at heart. But he has been somewhat misled. He has not come out somewhat as strong as he should have. I am sure that he will have to take his knocks, Mr. Speaker, when the time comes. But hopefully now they have woken up.

Only this last week we find that Mr. Crosbie is in the Province every day with T.V. cameras, announcements out of Hotel Newfoundland, announcements on development funds, announcements on funding that we do not have to pay back to the federal government, announcements on what he is going to do with the fishery, and announcements in Catalina with Captain Johnson on a rebate on gasoline which a friend from Twillingate alluded to several days ago. I mean it is just amazing the amount of time that those three federal politicians have spent in this Province. It is great to see them here.

I have seen them here in this Province more often in this last three to four weeks, Mr. Speaker, than I have seen them before. I do not know if they are trying to defend themselves or if they are trying to make amends for the

blunders that the Federal Tory Party in Canada has made. But it is great, Mr. Speaker, if what has been done by the Premier of this Province has finally woken up those people and finally got them to come back here, and finally listen.

So, Mr. Speaker, over the next few days when we get this resolution through the House and into the hands of the people in Ottawa, and into the hands of the federal minister, Mr. Crosbie, the Federal Fisheries Minister, Mr. Siddon - who I have to say, Mr. Speaker, I have found him to be a very, very decent individual. I met personally with the man on two occasions when we had a problem in Harbour Grace with getting the Harbour Grace plant put on the block for sale. Now it is operating very well.

I have to commend and thank the Federal Minister, Mr. Siddon, who, along I must say, with our own provincial officials, found 3,000 metric tons of fish that was not allocated to the Spaniards, and put it into good use into the Harbour Grace plant at that time. Since then it has been sold and is known now as the Harbour Grace Fish Company.

Today, Mr. Speaker, that company is operating. There is fish in Harbour Grace, which affects my entire district today. Because of the great co-operation that we had with Mr. Siddon, that plant will operate for ten months this year, Mr. Speaker, and that will employ a great number of people of the district.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I hope that over the next few days and the next couple of weeks that support for this resolution will

come from the two parties opposite because it is very important that we send to the federal government, Mr. Speaker, a very strong message, and a message that is unanimously agreed upon by this House, particularly, by the government and the Official Opposition. I do not know what our capitalist friends want to do.

MR. CALLAN:

They are going to be gone.

MR. PEACH:

They will probably be gone politicking, but I am sure that the party here opposite, despite the fact that their leader is not with them, will support it. He is not with them presently and I doubt if he is with them in mind because they have gone their separate ways. We all know about their disarray in caucus.

I think if The Sunday Express gets the chance Barbara Yaffe will report their comments and their caucus meetings of the last several days. It is good that my friend from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) has been out of the Province, because I am sure he would have been well informed on what happened in the caucus meetings, but he was out of the Province, so I do not have a great deal of information to report on what happened in your caucus meeting. But I do know that there is a great deal of dissension from the December 21 media coverage of what happened in your caucus meeting.

I understand that yesterday CBC got some news that somebody wanted to make a comment to the media while their leader was out of the Province. Mr. Speaker, those rumours are rampant not only in this Province, they are rampant in

Ottawa. Everywhere, where is the leader gone? Where is their leader gone? Has he deserted them? He came in for the opening of the House and there are rumours that for a half an hour or so he dropped in on a fish show in Boston but, Mr. Speaker, those are only rumours and I do not listen to rumours. No, I do not believe it at all.

MR. TULK:

You just spread them.

MR. PEACH:

No, I would not even spread a rumour like this. But I realize, Mr. Speaker, that my time must have expired but, with such a vibrant and intelligent and forceful comment that I have just made on this resolution, I will not delay. I just ask members opposite to support us, Mr. Speaker, on this resolution. Let us send a unanimous message to Ottawa. We want the federal government to see what is affecting the lives of every Newfoundlander and Labradorian in this Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) I stand today to say that I am going to support what I refer

to as this little exercise in futility. All of my colleagues in the Liberal Party have indicated that they will support this little exercise in futility, I expect the members of the NDP will support this little exercise in futility, and I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the PC Party, who brought in the resolution in the first place, have trapped themselves now so that they, too, are going to support this little exercise.

After we have gone through the motion, Mr. Speaker, the House will give unanimous approval, that is my prediction today, Mr. Speaker, and the document will go off to Ottawa saying that all parties in this House will support this little piece of paper. The media will get in on the act, On the Go will report what happened, The Fishermen's Broadcast will report what happened, and newspapers across this Province will carry editorials about it. There is a possibility that as a result of this exercise the Premier might even get an interview on CBC, the Leader of the Opposition might, or might not, get an interview on CBC or NTV, and the Leader of the New Democratic Party most definitely will get an interview on all T.V. stations across this Province. After this exercise is over and the press has had its day, and the dust has settled down, I ask, what good will it all do? What good will this all-party resolution do for the fisherman in Cape Onion? What good will this little exercise do for the fisherman in St. Julien's or the fisherman in Goose Cove? It will not do him any good whatsoever. As far as helping the Newfoundland fishermen is concerned, you might as well take this all-party resolution and send it down to the Department of

Fisheries and, if you can find a shredder which is not in service destroying somebody's files, take this document and feed it through that unoccupied shredder and then let the Minister of Fisheries take the shreds and let him go up to the top of Signal Hill and climb to the top of Cabot Tower and feed the shreds to the wind. I suggest today that this document shredded and thrown to the wind would do as much good for the Newfoundland fisherman today as the document would do if we took it and sent the Premier, himself, to Ottawa to deliver it in person to the Prime Minister.

I have at least three reasons for feeling the way I do about this exercise, Mr. Speaker, three reasons why I consider the motion that we have been going through in the last number of days is nothing but an exercise in futility. The first reason I believe it is an exercise in futility is that the Prime Minister knows that the document has been engineered by the Premier. The Prime Minister knows that this is nothing more than a game. He knows this because the Premier's credibility is after taking a severe beating in Ottawa over the last number of years. Can anyone blame the Prime Minister? Can anyone blame the member for St. John's West? Here is a Premier who, by his own admission, is a self-confessed posturer. He has admitted publicly that he postures to get his point across. So, when this document reaches Ottawa, the first response will be, 'the posturer strikes again. Here is some more hot air. Here is something which has no soul, has no being. It is nothing but a little bit of posturing on the part of the Premier of Newfoundland once again', and it will be ignored

because of that.

Can we blame Ottawa for not taking this document seriously when they know it is engineered by the Premier, when they know that the Premier is a gentleman who argued over and over again that Newfoundland has a constitutional right to the railway and admitted later that we really do not have a constitutional right to the railway, 'I was only posturing'? This is the very gentleman who promised Newfoundlanders that he would create 45,000 jobs, we still need 48,000 jobs, an increase of 3,000. How can the hon. the Premier expect that anybody in Ottawa is going to take him seriously when he engineers a document to be sent up to Ottawa.

This document was engineered by the hon. gentleman who predicted the Province of Newfoundland was about to go bankrupt within two years, then changed his mind a few days later and said, 'I was only making a little joke.' Some joke, Mr. Speaker! This is the gentleman who told the people of Newfoundland that Mr. Mulroney would inflict prosperity upon them. This is the fellow who took part in the crusade for prosperity, the fellow who supported Mr. Mulroney and instigated the movement whereby many other Newfoundlanders supported him, then, hardly two years later, gets up and says, 'I do not support Mr. Mulroney any more. The Liberals treated Newfoundland better than the Tories are treating Newfoundland.' I do not know what the status of the hon. Premier is today, whether he is supporting Mr. Mulroney or not. It is pretty well impossible to know from day to day where the hon. Premier stands, whether he supports the

Prime Minister in Ottawa or not.

MR. TULK:

Did you hear what he said today about free trade? He said he did not care what really happened as long as he was kept informed. Now, remember in the fish thing? 'The process was not important, they sold the shop!'

MR. DECKER:

This is the Leader of a government which every year draws up a budget and comes up \$50 million, sometimes \$100 million and sometimes \$150 million short, and the figure is still rising or still going down, however you want to look at it. Even the very document that we are discussing has a gap in its credibility, Mr. Speaker. Now, we have put forward an amendment to try to correct that gap in credibility. I refer to the third WHEREAS in this document which suggests that the Province had no knowledge of the Paris meeting. Now, the people in Ottawa are not so stunned, are not so stupid that they do not know the difference of this third WHEREAS. They know full well that the Province, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and the Premier were informed and kept advised every step of the way. The people in Ottawa know that. Yet here is this document, if the amendment is not passed, which comes up with a third WHEREAS which has no credibility.

Mr. Crosbie said something about five letters or phone calls, whatever it was. The Province was informed. Now, in fairness I will concede that the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), who denied any knowledge of the meeting in Paris, and the hon. Premier, who denied any knowledge of the meeting in Paris, did not

know about a specific meeting in a specific place at a specific hour in Paris, but I will say this, the Newfoundland government, the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries knew that the Newfoundland fishery was about to be shafted. They knew that. They probably did not know the precise moment that the shafting was going to take place, but they knew and that third WHEREAS leaves a credibility gap in the document we are considering sending off to Ottawa, if the amendment is not accepted, or if it is not corrected.

This document is not going to do the Newfoundland fishermen any good because Ottawa cannot take the Premier of this Province seriously anymore. And I do not blame them for not taking the Premier seriously anymore. Because how many times can you holler fire? When Mr. Mulroney receives this document, he will be like Matilda's aunt, "Her aunt who, from her earliest youth/had kept a strict regard for truth,/attempted to believe Matilda/ - the effort very nearly killed her". This document will not receive any support in Ottawa because of the credibility of the hon. Premier of this Province, who engineered the document in the first place.

My first point is it will not be taken seriously because Ottawa, the Prime Minister and the member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), know that it is just a piece of engineering.

The second reason that I see this as an exercise in futility is that it attempts - the very exercise that we are going through, the very motion that we are going through today - to drag the House

of Assembly into a personal squabble between the Premier and Mr. Crosbie.

The second reason why I see this as an exercise in futility is it is attempting to manipulate the House of Assembly. Now, it is the most normal thing in the world for Tories to fight Tories. Nobody can stop that. That is a fact of life. That is like the weather, nobody can change it. That is something which has been there from the beginning of the Tory Party, which, I assume, started back in the Dark Ages, when all the other conservative movements started up on the face of this planet. Nobody can stop in-fights amongst Tories. This Premier in his desire to fight everybody around him, always fights Ottawa. However, it is a proven fact that the fight always gets more heated, the fight always gets more vicious when Ottawa is occupied by a Tory Government. That, Mr. Speaker is a fact, it is a fact which has been borne out; it was borne out when Mr. Clark was Prime Minister with the fights we had, when we had the worse Fisheries Minister in the History of Newfoundland.

Tories cannot get along with each other and they never will. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there is a very strong suspicion, and I have not made up my mind whether I hold to it yet or not, but there is a very strong suspicion that Abel and Cain were of the Tory persuasion. That is a strong suspicion.

MR. TOBIN:

Who?

MR. DECKER:

Abel and Cain, the two brothers who just could not seem to get along together.

As I have said, there is nothing new about Tories fighting each other, but when the Premier of this Province attempts to drag the Newfoundland fishery and the Newfoundland House of Assembly into this personal squabble, as he is doing with this all party resolution, the best interests of the Newfoundland fishermen are not being served and the House is being used, the House is being manipulated into taking sides in a personal, petty dispute between two Tories.

This resolution when it passes, and I predicted that it will, might be one up for the Premier, but dragging the House of Assembly into a squabble between two Tories cannot help the Newfoundland fishermen. That is the second reason why I cannot have any trust in this resolution. I will explain later why I am going to support it. The reason I consider it to be an exercise in futility is because the Premier is trying to drag the House of Assembly and the Newfoundland fishery into his personal fight, his petty personal fight, his silly personal fight, his foolish personal fight. That is why it cannot do any good, Mr. Speaker, because it is an attempt to manipulate the people in this hon. House.

The third reason I cannot support this exercise in futility is because the Canada/France deal is a fait accompli. The deal is made. It is struck. As the French themselves would say, and I am sure they are saying, "It is fini." It is over. It is done. The deal is finished.

Now, we can pass unanimous resolutions in this House until the cows come home, we can pass unanimous resolutions in this

House until the Grey islands are obliterated from this planet, we can pass unanimous resolutions in this House as long as we like, but it will not make one iota of difference to this particular deal. This deal is a fait accompli. It is finished. It is done with. The Premier can posture all he likes. He can go on every open line show in the world, let alone every open line show in Canada, he can appear on Question Period - even nature tried to prevent us from being exposed to that, but they re-ran it on another night - he can go on Cross Country Checkup, he can manipulate this House of Assembly and the House of Commons, yes, and he can go to Moscow and try to manipulate their House, but the fact of the matter is, no matter what he does, no matter what we do, the deed is done. It is a fait accompli. It is over and done with and the only way that it can be changed is for a deal to be struck between France and Canada. If France and Canada were prepared to strike a deal, then they can scrap this. And I understand that France has indeed indicated a willingness to change this deal, but they have attached one little condition: They will scrap it if they can get access to even more fish. These are the terms that France is using if this deal is to be scrapped, Mr. Speaker. So it is obvious that this deal will not change. This deal is done and we cannot change it; France will continue to take our fish.

Now, there is nothing new about France fishing in Newfoundland waters. It has been said that John Cabot heard about the fish in the new found land waters from European fishermen who had already been over in these waters, even before John Cabot came over and

rediscovered the land. Some of those European fishermen were French. We all know about the French Shore and the French Treaty. I belong to the French Shore, Mr. Speaker. We all know about the French presence in this Province. The French have been here for years, as the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) very vividly pointed out to us in an excellent speech. I only wish, Mr. Speaker, that more of his own members had had the decency to stay in here and give him a quorum. We had to keep our members in the House to give the member a quorum when he was speaking to this motion. That is the only thing I wish, that the members had had more regard for their own member and not rely upon us in the Opposition to keep a quorum here for him.

The French have been in Newfoundland waters for years and years and years. It took some expert negotiating on the part of a government in Ottawa, which, incidentally, happened to have been a Liberal Government, to get jurisdiction over our 200 mile limit. A Liberal Government in Ottawa got jurisdiction for Canada and Newfoundland over the 200 mile limit. The Liberal negotiators, Mr. Speaker, left a few loose ends. Remember this now: Before the Liberal negotiators started, we had a three mile limit. So they went from three miles to 200 miles. Not bad, Mr. Speaker! Not bad negotiating by anyone's standards, from three miles to a 200 mile limit.

In 1987, the time had come for the loose ends to be tied up. Now, we had staked our claim to the 200 mile limit the few loose ends were to be tied up, and we were to have absolute jurisdiction over the 200

mile limit until the very end of time itself. But, before 1987, an event took place across this Nation which was reflected in Ottawa. With the Premier's help and with the help of members opposite, the hard-nosed negotiators were taken out of office in Ottawa and they were replaced by a bunch of inexperienced bunglers who are more concerned with the niceties of international diplomacy than with the well-being of Newfoundland fishermen. Just think, Mr. Speaker, that very same group of diplomatic bunglers is today negotiating a free trade deal between us and the United States.

I have some advice about those free trade negotiators, Mr. Speaker, advice to the hon. members over across the way. I would advise them, Mr. Speaker, that rather than concern themselves about where our leader is today, they should get in touch with him, if, indeed, he is in the States, and ask him to bring back some copies of the Star Spangled Banner, and they had better start learning it immediately. Because if those negotiators who negotiated the French deal are negotiating free trade, then you can say good-bye to Canada as we know her today, you can say good-bye to Newfoundland; we will all be standing to attention with our hands on our hearts singing the Star Spangled Banner. This resolution is an exercise in futility because it is too late. The agreement cannot be changed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I will summarize: The resolution is an exercise in futility because, number one, it will not be taken seriously in Ottawa because of a lack of credibility. There is no

credibility to this Premier. Number two, it attempts to drag the House of Assembly into a dispute between two Tories. Number three, it is too late. The deal is made with France, and the French are having the last laugh.

Now, notwithstanding all I have said, notwithstanding the low regard I have for the resolution, I will support it today and I will support it not because I believe that it will do any good, but because I do not believe it will do any harm. That is why I am supporting it. Also, I will support it with the hope, Mr. Speaker, that by the time the next round of negotiations come up the actors might well have been changed in Ottawa and sanity will be restored once again, and with the hope that the present bungling ineptitude that has infiltrated Ottawa will have been eradicated and reasonable people might accept this resolution on its own merits, for what it says rather than for the reason that it has been put forward. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Before recognizing the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West, we have two questions for the Late Show. One is from the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk): 'I am dissatisfied with an answer given me concerning the Terra Nova oil field development in today's Question Period. I wish to debate the item on Thursday's Late Show.'

The second one is from the hon. the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford). I am dissatisfied with

an answer given today by the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), and I would like to debate it on the Late Show on Thursday.

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

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

I would just like to make a few brief comments as it relates to the resolution that is before the House, and which we had hoped, Mr. Speaker, would receive unanimous support from all members opposite.

After listening to the member who spoke previous to me, from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), I can only conclude, Mr. Speaker, that if the rest of the members are as ill-informed and as uncaring and as unconcerned by what is going on in the fishery in this Province today, as the member who just spoke, then I would suspect that anything is possible to come from the members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important resolution. It is a resolution that is far, far too important, Mr. Speaker, for the partisan mood or mode of the Opposition. I glanced through Hansard, Mr. Speaker, and I have spoken to some of my colleagues as it relates to some statements that were made yesterday by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. FLIGHT) regarding this, Mr. Speaker. The member for Windsor - Buchans got up in the House yesterday and he had this editorial from Newfoundland Lifestyles on the cod war, Mr. Speaker, Peckford and Crosbie Square Off. He made reference to certain sections in it and he went through it, Mr. Speaker, in great detail.

But there is one thing that the member for Windsor - Buchans, Mr. Speaker, omitted, and I wonder why? Maybe it was intentional and maybe it was not. But this great article, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Windsor - Buchans kept alluding to, who would you say is the author? Who would you say was the author, Mr. Speaker, of this great cod war editorial in Lifestyle?

Mr. Speaker, I asked this afternoon who was the editor? I ask the member for Windsor - Buchans this afternoon who wrote it? Do you know what the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) said, Mr. Speaker? The member for Fogo said, 'it was probably a Tory.' Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know what is going on in the Opposition ranks these days as it relates to their leader, as it relates to where he is and what he is doing and everything else. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the editor of this is not a Tory, nor do we want him to be a Tory.

The article that the member for Windsor - Buchans put so much credence into yesterday as it relates to the cod war was written by Rex Murphy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ha, ha!

MR. TOBIN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, who is Rex Murphy? Is he an author? Does he work for Newfoundland Lifestyles, Mr. Speaker? Did he ever run in politics, Mr. Speaker? Has he ever been elected in politics, Mr. Speaker? Has he ever been defeated in politics, Mr. Speaker? I wonder who this Rex Murphy is, and I wonder where does he work, Mr. Speaker? Does he work with the Newfoundland

Lifestyles? Does he work, Mr. Speaker, in the Tory offices, the Progressive Conservative offices of this Province, Mr. Speaker? Or does he work, Mr. Speaker, in the office of the Leader of the Opposition? Mr. Speaker, probably I should rephrase that. Does he work in the office that used to have a Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. Speaker, there is something on the go over there in that caucus. There is something on the go, Mr. Speaker. What it is, I do not know. But I do know, Mr. Speaker, that the press across this country are asking people if they would like to make any comment on what is happening in the Liberal caucus. They are asking, 'Where is the Leader?'

Do we remember, Mr. Speaker, the day and the time that the Leader of the Opposition held a press conference outside the door? He was knocking on the door, Mr. Speaker, "When is the House going to open?" Mr. Speaker, the House is open and the Leader of the Opposition has showed up since. Now, Mr. Speaker, if he is going to be a Leader of a Liberal Party in this Province, where is he, Mr. Speaker? Where is the man who wanted the doors of the House of Assembly open so he could come in and debate resolutions as it relates to the fisheries and the offshore and free trade, Mr. Speaker? A former Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, has not opened his mouth yet as it relates to the announcement by Petro-Canada on Terra nova. Not a sound! Not a quack! Nothing, Mr. Speaker!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Do you know where he is?

MR. TOBIN:

No, I do not know where he is.

MR. MATTHEWS:

He is down organizing for the Democrats in Boston.

MR. TOBIN:

Organizing for the Democrats in Boston. I do not know where he is, Mr. Speaker. I do know, Mr. Speaker, that he made one hell of a fuss here trying to get the House of Assembly opened, and the House of Assembly has been opened now, Mr. Speaker, and the Leader of the Opposition is nowhere to be found.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much if his caucus knows where he is.

MR. BAIRD:

And they do not care either.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if they care too much. But I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that when something is as important as this fisheries matter, as it relates to Newfoundland, for the Liberal Party to take it in the same vein, in the same tone as has just been exhibited, Mr. Speaker, by the member for the Straits - and as Hansard will show, Mr. Speaker, the member for Windsor - Buchans came in yesterday with an editorial from Lifestyles written by one Rex Murphy, Mr. Speaker. All of the sudden that became the gospel of what was taking place. That was the gospel on the cod war, Mr. Speaker, an article written by Rex Murphy who works, Mr. Speaker, in the Liberal Party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have today an issue that is facing this Province and has been facing this Province -

MR. FLIGHT:

And the Premier said Tom Siddon is a liar.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Windsor - Buchans is over there again today. The other day when my colleague, the Minister of Forestry, was speaking the member for Windsor - Buchans never stopped yapping. Mr. Speaker, he is at it again.

He is not interested in the fishery in this Province. He knows nothing about it. The only thing he is interested in is the partridges. We all know that, Mr. Speaker. That is the only question he ever asked in the House. He would be up behind the curtain, Mr. Speaker, trying to find out from the Minister of Wildlife when the partridge season was open. That is all the member for Windsor - Buchans ever cares to talk about.

We are talking about something that is very serious here. We are talking about a betrayal of our rights, Mr. Speaker, here today. We are talking about an agreement that has been reached between the Government of Canada and the Government of France as it relates to the fishery of this Province.

I do not think that there is anyone here who does not realize how important the fishery is to Newfoundland and Labrador. As I sit here, Mr. Speaker, with my colleague from the Grand Bank district (Mr. Matthews), we are especially aware 3Ps is very important to the South Coast. It is of vital importance to the South Coast, particularly in the inshore fishery and, to a large extent, to the deep sea fishery as it relates to the other areas.

And what has happened?

The French for years have been overfishing the stocks in the 3Ps. They have, Mr. Speaker, no concern whatsoever for the conservation of fish stocks in this Province. They have treated the country with nothing short of contempt as it relates to the fish stocks in the 3Ps area. For the fishermen from the South Coast and I guess the fishermen from St. Pierre, there has been, I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that it is fair to say that there has been a loss of income to these fishermen in that area because of the contempt that has been displayed for the fish stocks by the people from France.

Now what has happened, Mr. Speaker? What has happened? The French, while continuing to abuse the fish stocks in 3Ps, have now been given approval by the federal government to catch cod in the 3J+3KL area. That is important, Mr. Speaker, to everyone in Newfoundland. That fish stock is important to everyone in Newfoundland. It is important to the fishermen from the Northeast Coast, the inshore fishermen in particular, and to the South Coast, Mr. Speaker. I know in Marystown, for example, in my own district, where we have a fish plant, which is probably the largest single industry in Newfoundland - there are 1,000 people working in the Marystown Fish Plant today. I believe just about all of the trawlers are ice re-enforced, fishing Northern cod, Mr. Speaker, the same as the trawlers from my colleague's district in Grand Bank that are down there fishing, trawlers, Mr. Speaker, from the Catalina area are fishing in that area, so what we have got are two major fish

stocks which the French have already overfished in the 3Ps area and now, Mr. Speaker, if they ever get down in the 2J+3KL area, we will never know what is going to happen.

How are we supposed to believe anyone that will say that the French will act accordingly in 2J+3KL when we all know what they are doing in the 3Ps area.

MR. FLIGHT:

How can you believe Crosbie? How can you do it?

MR. BAIRD:

I would believe him before I would believe Rex Murphy.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you something right now. We listened to them here, you know, we listened to the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) that time when he was up there about the Premier of this Province, Mr. Speaker, nobody will trust him, he does not blame the people in Ottawa for not taking him seriously because all he wants to do is fight, do you know what happened in the last session of this House, Mr. Speaker? The Premier was being referred to as a lap dog for Ottawa because he was not standing up he was saying, he was not fighting for Newfoundland, he was not interested in Newfoundland. Now, Mr. Speaker, when he stands up and fights on an issue that has vital importance to Newfoundland as the Northern cod stocks, as the fisheries, now Mr. Speaker, he is a fighter, he is not interested in what is going on in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

The fact of the matter is, and it is clear, they cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. They cannot have it both ways.

I have been here, Mr. Speaker, since 1982 and I have witnessed over that period of time the Opposition, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) in particular, Mr. Speaker, sitting there day after day, week after week, month after month, voting against resolutions when we were fighting for the offshore. When we wanted our offshore, Mr. Speaker, when we wanted the Atlantic Accord that we got today, the member for Fogo stood with colleagues, Mr. Speaker, because there was a Liberal Government in Ottawa, and stood firm and supported the Liberal Government. He did not care about Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, or the future of Newfoundland or Newfoundlanders, that is what the member for Fogo did. He can shout all he likes now, but he was one of them. He is one of the culprits.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I want the hon. gentleman to keep his voice down because I am over here being shaken by the body blows.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, what he just said

that time I think quite clearly points out the representation that the people of Fogo got in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you something else. When you talk about fish, do I ever remember when the South Coast of this Province as being pushed down the tube. I remember when Mr. DeBané came to St. John's, together with the member who is now from Fortune-Hermitage, and announced, Mr. Speaker, a unilateral plan for the fisheries in this Province. Where was Burin? Where was Grand Bank, Mr. Speaker? They were all closed. The member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) was not there then, nor the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), but the member for Fogo was there, and he supported it, Mr. Speaker. It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the majority I had in the last election was four times what I had in 1982, and twice as much as what the member for Fogo had.

The bottom line is, Mr. Speaker, that we, as Progressive Conservatives, are members of the Progressive Conservative Party of Newfoundland and we will put Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders and Labradorians first and not our brothers and sisters in Ottawa. We have seen that for years when the member for Fogo, Mr. Speaker, stood in this House day after day and voted against resolutions that would support Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders, because, Mr. Speaker, there was a Liberal Government in Ottawa. That is what we have seen, Mr. Speaker. We have seen the member for Windsor - Buchans come into the House with a document written by Rex Murphy and all of the sudden that became the gospel.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national issue. This issue goes far beyond Newfoundland. This issue stretches far across this country, Mr. Speaker. All I will say, Mr. Speaker, is that I wish the Premier would come up some day with the files as it relates to the mail he has received supporting his cause, from people, not only in Newfoundland, but people from Vancouver to Newfoundland. People, Mr. Speaker, from one end of this country to the other are writing letters. As well, Mr. Speaker, there are people talking about the stand of the member for Fogo as it relates to this fisheries issue. He tried to play politics with it.

Now the bottom line is that this is a national issue. We are supported, Mr. Speaker, from one end of this country to the other. I would like to think, Mr. Speaker, that we have the support of the Liberal Party. I would like to think, Mr. Speaker, that they would support this resolution that is so important to Newfoundland. I know, Mr. Speaker, that their leader is not here to tell them what to do. Was he here since the House opened? Yes, he was here since the House opened. Mr. Speaker, it is nearly as well if he was not here because his contribution to this House has not been anything great in any case.

MR. BAIRD:

There are too many knives out for him.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that are a few knives on the go.

There is an article, Mr. Speaker, that was written some time ago by The Sunday Express. It said,

'Several members of the Liberal caucus, immediately following the December 9 by-election, suggested to the party leader, Leo Barry, that he resign.' Now, Mr. Speaker

MR. MATTHEWS:

He was on the phone to Brian Tobin, he was.

MR. TOBIN:

Who, the member for Windsor - Buchans?

MR. MATTHEWS:

When the meeting was on, he was on the phone to Brian Tobin at the same time.

MR. TOBIN:

The member for Windsor - Buchans?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I have heard stories about the member for Windsor - Buchans. It is not the first time there have been knives out for leaders in the Liberal Party. It is not the first time, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell you something, the member for Windsor - Buchans has been around for most of them. So what my hon. colleague from Grand Bank tells me does not surprise me one bit, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PEACH:

He was Neary's hit man.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know. What about the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan)?

MR. MATTHEWS:

What about him?

MR. TOBIN:

Where was he to in all of this? Where was the member for Bellevue in all of this? Who were the members of the caucus that went to the media as it relates to this?

What did Mr. Neary, the former leader, say? He said he is 'sick and disheartened with what has happened to the Liberal Party.' I think, Mr. Speaker, that when you read this article and see a former leader making statements like that, you can only say how fortunate we are in the Conservative Party that it is Liberal Party that attracts candidates like the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, the situation as it relates to what has taken place and the reason why the resolution was brought before the House of Assembly -

MR. FLIGHT:

Imagine, I have to sit and listen to the like of that.

MR. TOBIN:

The partridge in flight is on the go again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Tell the story about where he shot at the bird and hit the kettle. Tell the story about where he blew the kettle apart.

MR. TOBIN:

I do not know any stories, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, A quorum call is needed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

Quorum

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have just been informed by a couple of my colleagues that the Leader of the Opposition is on his way back and that the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) has a partridge dinner cooked.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ha, ha!

MR. TOBIN:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the partridge from Windsor - Buchans will not distract me any further. As it relates to, Mr. Speaker, and to get on because I think my time is getting short -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

MR. TOBIN:

We have on the South Coast of this Province a very serious situation. We have the fish plants that will not be working this year to the extent that they worked last year because we, in Newfoundland, have been given a 10,000 metric ton reduction in cod fish and that is very serious. But, Mr. Speaker, it is something that the people were prepared to accept and probably are prepared to accept in terms of conserving the stocks. If it means that there has to be some down time in order to conserve the stocks, well

then, sobeit.

But when the federal government cuts back on the cod stocks for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and within a matter of days, Mr. Speaker, turns around and gives a quota of Northern cod to France then, I believe, that is very serious.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government ought to be ashamed of themselves for what they have done as it relates to the allocation of fish to France. They have showed, Mr. Speaker, that they have been uncaring, they have shown that they have no concern for the fishermen in this Province, for the fish plant workers in this Province and indeed they have no concern for Atlantic Canada whatsoever.

There were meetings ongoing between Canada and France for some time. I think the meetings started back in 1977 or 1978. There were always a continuation of discussions and we have always been a part of it as the Newfoundland government. There was one meeting that we were not part of. There was one meeting that we knew nothing about and that was the meeting where the people from the Canadian government went to France and signed away our most valuable and very important resource.

I want to say that I will be supporting the resolution. I think it is a good resolution. I want to commend the of this Province, Mr. Speaker, and his Cabinet for the stand they have taken as it relates to this very serious matter and I believe that the federal government has realized that this government is for real, that we are interested

in the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that when you look at \$66.3 million worth of work the other day that has come, when you look at the announcement on Terra Nova, when you look at some of the statements that were made yesterday in the House of Commons by the federal Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson), I believe that the federal government realize that the Premier of this Province and his government are interested in the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. BAKER:

Say it with a straight face.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, I will say it with a straight face any time at all, Mr. Speaker. We are interested in Newfoundland and Labrador. We are Progressive Conservatives. We are not Liberals. We are not Socialists. We are Progressive Conservatives, Mr. Speaker, that always have the best interest of Newfoundland and Labrador at heart.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) saying anything constructive yet as it relates to the fisheries or anything else, Mr. Speaker, of an important nature in this House. All I have ever heard the member for Bellevue do, Mr. Speaker, was yap across the House. I would appreciate, Mr. Speaker, if the member for Bellevue would remain quiet while I am speaking.

MR. PEACH:

A billy goat.

MR. CALLAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I did not open my mouth, I did not say a word. Now who the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) heard make a comment I do not know, but it was not me. But I must say this, Mr. Speaker, that the member is totally and absolutely wrong when he says that I have not said anything substantial in this House about the fishery or any other matter. That is an untruth, Mr. Speaker. I think if he is a gentleman, he will withdraw on two counts. Number one, because I did not say a word to interrupt him, and number two, because what he said about me was totally false.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. A difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, what the member for Bellevue said is true, he did not open his mouth and he has never opened his mouth since I came here, Mr. Speaker, but he has always made a lot of noise.

In any case I want to be part of this resolution, Mr. Speaker. I want to say how proud I am to support this resolution. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that we need unanimity in this House on this resolution.

We want the people of Newfoundland

and Labrador and we want the people of Canada to see that all fifty-two of us in this House of Assembly are supportive of Newfoundland as it relates to this very important resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, as a member who represents a district with a lot of interest in the fishery, and as one who was born on the Northeast Coast of this Province and have some familiarity with the issue of the cod fishery and its importance to that part of Newfoundland, as well, I am pleased to support this resolution, the resolution that we in unanimity condemn the unconscionable act of the federal government.

It was an act of inexcusable treachery, an act by a prime minister who has not acted in isolation here. This is the pattern of his behaviour. It is the kind of behaviour, Mr. Speaker, that we tried to alert this Province to before the last federal election. I remember, Mr. Speaker, very well my absolute amazement the day I read a particular book. I forget the author, but I am sure my informed friend from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) can help me. The name of the book was Contenders. I

believe Alan Gregg was one of the authors, I am not so sure, but there were three authors, as I remember. In any event, as he will affirm, I am sure, the book *Contenders* has to do with a history, not a history so much as a history of certain recent events in the Conservative Party federally, including, in particular, the ascension to leadership of the current Prime Minister, Mr. Mulroney. And there is one particular page - I used to be able to remember the actual page, I cannot any more, but I will be pleased to give it to hon. members once I check - there is one particular page in that book, that publication that came out around 1985, the publication called *Contenders*, which is particularly revealing, and I submit to you, Sir, that had any person of reasonable intelligence read that page alone, or certainly read it in context, they would have known as early as a couple of years ago the nature of the man we are dealing with in Ottawa, so that this issue of the Canada/France agreement and the way it was done should come as no surprise to the Premier of this Province nor to the people of Canada generally. Because the man was behaving in character, if that is not too abusive a use of the word 'character', in this particular instance.

On that particular page in the book *Contenders* it tells about an event that happened in about November, 1982 in a Toronto hotel room, and Mr. Gregg, who was one of the authors, I believe, and who was for many years the pollster for the Tory Party, plus two other authors, describe that party meeting in a hotel room in Toronto between Michael Meehan, a well-known Conservative worker,

and Mr. Mulroney, who was then in private business as President of the Iron Ore Company of Canada, practicing then what he has since been able to do with flair, that is to say, be the branch plant manager of an American enterprise. These days he continues to fulfill that role despicably well with another title.

Then, as President of IOC but as a person with some aspirations for a bigger branch plant job, he pulled a piece of paper from his pocket and he said to Michael Meehan, "Michael, what do you think of this?" and he handed him this piece of paper. On that piece of paper was written a draft statement which Mr. Mulroney was proposing he read publicly at a press conference in Montreal. The statement, drafted by Mr. Mulroney, said in effect that he, Mr. Mulroney, wanted to renounce any aspirations to the Conservative leadership and to assure Mr. Joe Clark, the incumbent leader, of his full and unfettered support.

Michael, a long time friend of Mr. Mulroney - we will know now that being a friend of Mr. Mulroney is an important asset on your curriculum vitae in Ottawa, it is the line you should put first - was surprised and he said in effect, 'Brian, are you telling me you are going to renounce your aspirations? Are you telling me that you are going to say this publicly?' He says, "Michael, I want to say it publicly. You see it up. Will you talk to Mr. Clark on the phone and see if he will agree to a joint press conference?" Mr. Meehan took the statement, went to the phone, called Mr. Clark - all this is recorded word for word in the book - and they agreed to set up a

press conference in December, 1981. I hope my years are correct. When was the Winnipeg meeting, January, 1982 or January, 1983?

AN HON. MEMBER:
January, 1983.

MR. SIMMONS:
January, 1983. So in December, 1982. The meeting is taking place in a hotel room in November, 1982 in Toronto, they agree to set up a press conference between Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Clark in December, 1982, they have the press conference, as any perusal of journalistic files will attest, and in that press conference Mr. Mulroney read the statement in which he assured Mr. Clark of his undying and unqualified support.

Now, then, let me back up to the meeting in Toronto, because it is very pertinent, Mr. Speaker, to the need for this resolution, pertinent to why it is we find ourselves in this absolutely shocking position of having to protect what is ours, having to try and close the gate after the horse has bolted. In that November, 1982 meeting between Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Meehan there were two events. I have just described to you the first event, in which Mr. Meehan agreed to talk to Mr. Clark and subsequently did so. As soon as that matter was disposed of in that meeting, Mr. Gregg, the Tory pollster and two others tell us, Mr. Mulroney took the statement, put it back into his pocket and then said, "Now, Michael, how is everything going for Winnipeg? Do we have the numbers to bring Joe down in Winnipeg?"

Mr. Speaker, that one page in that book tells you volumes. There is

the mind of the man. But if that is not enough, Mr. Speaker, recall another event on the public record. Recall, will you, during the 1984 federal election after Mr. Trudeau, and particularly Mr. Turner on behalf, I suppose it should be said, of Mr. Trudeau, but that is beside the point, Mr. Turner was then the Prime Minister so one would assume he was acting in his own behalf, but the public record is that some of the appointments that Mr. Turner made in late June, 1984 were made at the behest of Mr. Trudeau, the just-having-resigned Prime Minister, and quite a number were patronage appointments, clearly patronage appointments. One of them, you will recall, was the appointment of one Bryce Mackasey to be the Ambassador for Portugal. I take you now, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of making my point, to a plane trip during the 1984 election campaign in which the Leader of the Conservative Party and a number of press, I believe 40 or 50 press, the normal entourage for a national leader during an election campaign, in which that leader, Mr. Mulroney, decided to speak, so he says, off the record, and in speaking to the press he said something that got reported the next day.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
I will clue up in just a moment, Sir.

In speaking to the press he referred to an event that became public the next day and it had to do with his opinion of Mr. Mackasey, in terms which are not parliamentary so I shall not repeat them, but the objective,

the context of what he said was, "If I were in the same situation, I would have done exactly what Bryce had done."

Mr. Speaker, it being five-thirty I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion is before the House to adjourn, and I will call on the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave is not satisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Social Services, and it was in connection with the supervision of homes.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) is not here today, because this is a very important issue concerning a young lad who escaped from custody just recently. And I do not want to just talk about the fact that a young lad from my district escaped from custody and suffered frostbitten fingers and hands in the woods just recently, I want to talk about the Minister of Social Services and his not taking responsibility for the actions of his Department just recently and over the years. Always he seems to come out with the statement - and this is what irritates me most and, I think, the people of the Province - 'This is a fact of life. These things are going to happen.' Obviously, what he is saying is that there is nothing that can be done about it.

Now, we witnessed this near tragedy just the other night. We witnessed a more serious incident some time ago, when a young lad escaped from the Boys' Home in Whitbourne and perished in the woods. We witnessed a lack of responsibility on the part of the Department of Social Services in following up on a tragedy which took place in one of the group homes last year in St. John's. The whole point of the matter is that the Minister of Social Services is not taking the responsibilities of his department seriously enough.

I am not saying that the Minister of Social Services is supposed to know everything that is going on within his department. That is not the issue. The point is that he is the Minister of Social Services and he is responsible for what is happening within the department. And if the people in his department, which is administering the Boys' Home and the group homes, are not doing their jobs properly, it is not right and proper for the minister to react by saying, "These things are facts of life and they are going to happen." I think it is his responsibility, as minister, to check into the situation to see if there is a lack of responsibility on the part of members of his staff, and then take steps to ensure that the same thing does not happen again in the future.

MR. PATTERSON:

Never again.

MR. EFFORD:

Well, it is fine for the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) to say never again, but we do not want to see somebody lose their life. It is not a matter of

playing politics, who is going to get the best interview on television, it is a matter of somebody losing their life. Those boys in the Boys' Homes are there because they have done something, or they are not responsible for looking after themselves, so it is the responsibility of the Department of Social Services and/or the Department of Justice to ensure their safety. And if ensuring their safety entails having two security guards or two people responsible for them when they are being transported from the Boys' Home to the hospital, or wherever, then that is the way it should be carried out.

In this particular case, where a young lad from the Boys' Home escaped from the hospital, the minister said it was not the responsibility of his department but the responsibility of the RCMP. Sure, it was the responsibility of the RCMP once he had escaped and once he had run into the woods - it was the responsibility of the RCMP to get him back - but the point I am making is it is the responsibility of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) to ensure that a better security system is put in place. It is the responsibility of the administrator of the Boys' Home and the people who are transporting these people to ensure that they are protected. If they were responsible people, they would not be inmates - residents, or whatever the proper term is - at the Boys' Home. I bring this to your attention.

Unfortunately, the Minister of Social Services is not here. But this is the point we are trying to make: If the minister is not capable of recognizing that it is very serious when somebody loses

their life, if the minister is not capable of recognizing this situation, then he is showing the people of this Province, and he is showing the Premier of this Province, that he is not capable of handling the situation and he should be removed from his position and somebody put there who can handle the situation, and who can make better provisions for those boys, or anybody in that sort of situation.

MR. BAIRD:

Are you interested in the job?

MR. EFFORD:

Certainly. It is an interesting job.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I should explain that the Minister of Social Services is on Her Majesty's service out in his own constituency area and, unfortunately, could not be here this afternoon. He was not aware, of course, that the question was going to be asked on the Late Show. The only thing I can say to the hon. member is that the Minister of Social Services, of course, responded to the question earlier this week, during Question Period, and, I think, handled the situation admirably. I hope there is no suggestion by the hon. member that the minister is derelict in his duties, or does

not have any interest in the matter that the hon. member raised, because that is not so.

In fact, the hon. member now, this afternoon, really says he is only suggesting that the minister should look into the matter and ensure it does not occur again, if there was some breach of regulations or rules or whatever. I feel quite confident in saying that the minister has done exactly that. These matters arise from time to time, and, when they are brought to the attention of the minister, I know that he responds in a responsible way.

In fact, I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anybody who has had any dealings with this Minister of Social Services who could say in all honesty that he is not responsible in his duties, because he certainly is. He is, in fact, one of the most conscientious ministers, I suppose, we have ever had in that particular portfolio, notwithstanding his predecessors, of course. I will pass on to the minister the concerns of the hon. member that he raises here this afternoon. It is not my intention to debate the issue. The member has raised the points, the minister has responded, and I am sure the minister will do whatever is necessary to ensure that situations like that do not occur frequently, or do not occur at all, hopefully, and I think that would be his intention.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo is not satisfied with the answer given concerning the Terra Nova oil field development and wishes to

debate that item.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I am sorry that the Premier is not in his seat, not to say that he has to be in his seat, but yesterday or the day before, I think it was Tuesday, I asked the hon. gentleman a question about the Terra Nova oil field development and, of course, I was talking about a statement that Mr. Crosbie had made in his press release in which he said 'The Terra Nova field, and we are not talking about exploration - and I would hope the Government House Leader is going to answer - we are talking about the development mode, not the mode of the development as the Premier keeps referring to.'

Mr. Crosbie had said that the Terra Nova field will utilize either a semi-submersible base production system or a ship base production system. Now, that is a statement made by the federal Minister of Transport, Newfoundland's minister in the federal Cabinet, the fellow who chose to come down here along with Marcel Masse, the Minister of Energy, and announce they were only giving the Premier and the government twenty minutes notice that the press conference was on. He has not said that they have to go to the Province and I am concerned, of course, about the sufficiency of supply clause that is in the Atlantic Accord where it is stated that, Until such time as Canada has sufficiency of supply - of oil - the federal government has the say about the mode of development.

Now, if we were operating in this Province in normal circumstances,

I probably would not have even posed the question. But the truth of the matter is, as my friend from Fortune - Hermitage so well put it this evening in referring to a book written about Mr. Mulroney, the man says one thing one day and does something else the next. We have seen example after example since he has been elected. FFTs is a prime case in point. He basically tore up Clause 12, I believe it was, or clause 15. Clause 15 has been torn up, too, but I think this was Clause 12 of the Restructuring Agreement he tore up and threw out the window. We have seen him neglect a very important process in the Canada/France agreement, and we now have his federal minister from Newfoundland and the Minister of Energy not saying at all if they are going to consult or, indeed, allow the Province to have any say in the mode of development of the Terra Nova field. He made the statement that it is already decided. It is already decided, as far as John Crosbie is concerned. What is to prevent them from doing the same thing as they have done with FFTs, go to Petro-Canada and say, go out there and do it under the self-sufficiency clause for Canada? They could use the excuse.

Now, the question I want to put to the Premier and I want to put to the government is, are we heading for another situation where we see the federal government come into this Province and do what they want to do and then see another row after the fact, after it has been done?

MR. SIMMS:

Do you want them to use (inaudible)?

MR. TULK:

I want to see the details. Can there be a gravity base system? I do not know. But given the record of that federal government, I am not so sure that we are going to see it. That is my point, if the hon. gentleman can understand that. I am not so sure that we are going to see it.

I do not want to see a situation like I saw with the FFTs. We thought in this Province, and according to the government they thought, that they were going to issue one license. We were told here at nine-thirty on a certain morning they had issued three. If we were to believe the Premier, he was not aware that the meeting was going on in Paris where they signed away some of our natural resource. That is the situation I am talking about. There is very little point in the Premier of this Province standing up after the decision has been made and saying, no. Because where does his authority come from? Are we going to see another resolution in this House and that is it? I mean, we had a resolution last year on NATO in this Legislature.

MR. DAWE:

There must be a time limit on this, is there not?

MR. TULK:

Yes, as far as the hon. gentleman is concerned there is always a time limit on the truth. He cannot stand too much of it. It hurts him. He has got to get into the record.

MR. DAWE:

That is verbiage

MR. TULK:

I want to note that the hon. gentleman said that is verbiage. But if this thing comes about,

that we do see Terra Nova without any consultation with the Province at all, without any laying out of the facts, I want him to come back and apologize to this House rather than having his Premier ranting and roaring. I want him to do that. If he will do that, then I suppose there is some forgiveness for him. Not very much, because the fact of the matter is, the project will have been underway and he again will be left out in the cold, except for having the Premier rant and roar.

MR. DAWE:
Sit down!

MR. TULK:
The other thing, of course, that you have to keep in mind here - I have only got a couple of more minutes - is the Premier's record of what he says. I mean, I saw this Premier.

MR. DAWE:
There is really no need to shout.

MR. TULK:
There is no need to shout. Put a muzzle on him.

I saw this Premier, Mr. Speaker, stand in Grand Falls, in the hon. gentleman's district and say, 'the process was not important. They sold the shop,' he said. 'They sold the shop! The process was not important.' I heard him this morning on radio -

MR. SIMMS:
He did not say it was not important.

MR. TULK:
He said, 'do not bring me up and tell me what you are going to do and then do it. That is no good.'

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is elapsed.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, the whole point is that the hon. gentleman opposite should pay attention to what their Tory buddies are doing in this particular instance.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, the basic situation in this is that the determination of the mode of development, whether it is going to be a semi-submersible or a vessel-like structure, does not rest with the federal government. That is why there is a joint federal/provincial board, the Canada-Newfoundland Offshore Petroleum Board, and that board is established pursuant to the Atlantic Accord. That legislation has been passed through the House of Assembly of Newfoundland. It has passed through the House of Commons in Ottawa. It is due to be proclaimed when the Liberals in the Upper House agree to put it through, that is what I understand.

There is some attempt to slow it up by the Liberals in the Upper House, but obviously that can only last for a certain period of time, but it will be proclaimed then both federally and provincially simultaneously. It is then a statute. It is then the legislation, and no federal

minister or provincial minister or federal government or provincial government can alter that.

With respect to Mr. Crosbie's statement, I think, that was largely based on what the developers, Petro Canada, what their preferred options are. But Petro Canada is not the Board, the federal government is not the Board, the Board is there. It will have the sanction of the law of Canada and the law of Newfoundland. There is really no problem there at all. I suppose it is, perhaps, endemic in Oppositions to try to identify a negative in something where there is an awful lot of positive, and to ignore the positive.

Let us look at a little bit of the positive as well. There will be two additional delineation wells drilled this year which will provide employment for about one hundred people. It will give a very important injection to the offshore-related industries in Newfoundland. According to Petro Canada, they have already identified out there a large amount and they think that with the drilling this year they may well have potentials up to about 130 million barrels which will bring approximately ten years of development out there. Again, it is their intention to propose a development plan, and that is what they do, propose a development plan. They are saying in proposing that development plan, they are going to propose, p-r-o-p-o-s-e, like when the hon. gentleman for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) came across his beloved and what did he do? He proposed to her, he asked her, he suggested to her, he invited her to consider, and she -

MR. SIMMS:

That is what Petro Canada is doing, the very same thing.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

- well, I do not know if she had the choice all over again if her answer would be the same.

Anyway, that is what it is. Petro Canada is going to propose a development plan which will suggest either a semi-submersible or a vessel shaped craft. I call it 'vessel shaped' rather than ship shaped because I find the latter term difficult. From now on I am going to call it vessel shaped.

So what it is is a proposal. The development plan proposed would include the particular modes of vessel shaped or semi-submersible and this is part of the proposal, just like when my hon. friend from Bellevue made a proposal as well. I know he did not propose a semi-submersible, he proposed himself totally -

MR. SIMMS:

Be careful now.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Well, I should not go into details on what he proposed.

So that is what it comes to, a proposal and that is all that it is. The positive parts of this are matters which are extremely important to this Province. There is a proposal for a development plan of the Terra Nova field in 1988 and it is Petro Canada's hope and anticipation that construction could begin in 1989 and that oil production could start there in 1991. Those are the premises they are going on and the proposal they are going to make to the Canada-Newfoundland Offshore

Board. I think it is a very positive development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 13, at 10:00 a.m.