



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 9

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Wednesday

11 March 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a few minutes of the time of the House to indicate that I have had discussions with members of both parties opposite concerning introducing a resolution on which, following five minutes of comment by members from each party, there is an agreement to put the motion to a vote for a unanimous vote on an issue that I think is very important to the people of the Province. If Your Honour wishes to see it first for clarification.

MR. SPEAKER:
I am assuming this is being done by leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, there is no problem. We have had an agreement since, I believe, around noon that this would happen, so there is no problem here.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to introduce the issue by saying that everybody, no doubt, is aware of the issue related to the Olympic Torch relay route.

There is obvious widespread public disappointment, I think, across the Province that this route will only briefly involve a very small

part of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I want to briefly outline the situation for hon. members. I am sure they are all aware of it anyway.

Despite the many pleas that have been made to the organizers of this project to have the relay route extended to include more of the Province than has been proposed, which is from Signal Hill to Argentia, the organizers, I understand, have refused to alter their schedule. The manager of the Torch Relay project itself, in Calgary, a Mr. Jim Hunter, to whom I spoke last week personally, has said that he feels to lengthen the Newfoundland part of the relay would set a precedent, leading to many similar requests from all across the country. He has also said it is too late to add any additional time to the schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated to him, and I say now, that I think the wishes of the people of this Province could easily be met by the organizing committee without setting any precedent or upsetting any time frame. Because, in the first place, the run through all of the other provinces in Canada touches on or passes close to their respective main population centers but that is not the case in Newfoundland, it is simply on this portion of the Province.

The other point is, of course, and the point that I made to him, since the Province is at the start of this relay and not in the middle, it should be a simple matter of simply adding an extra day to the front end of that schedule.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that in mind I want to move the following resolution:

WHEREAS the people of Newfoundland and Labrador have a right to be included in an important national sports event; and

WHEREAS the Olympic Torch Relay only includes a small geographic portion of our Province, and

WHEREAS a large number of residents, municipalities and organizations in Central and Western Newfoundland and Labrador have vigorously expressed an interest in participating in this project with other Canadians, and

WHEREAS the Newfoundland and Labrador Amateur Sports Federation has proposed a schedule that would include major population centers of this Province - being done, by the way, in a two day period;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House strongly urges the Olympic Torch Committee to review its planned route in this Province with a view to giving the people of Newfoundland and Labrador the same opportunity as other Canadians to be part of this important event associated with the Calgary Olympics.

I so move that resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to rise in support of the minister's resolution and to report full and absolute support of our party, and to mention to the House for their information,

as I mentioned to the minister in our conversation earlier, that we had also discussed this in our caucus and had intended to approach the government side, at the time the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews). When we did hear from the Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), we decided to certainly comply with that particular route.

Many members of the House of Assembly have taken some action as individuals. What I have done, for the information of the House, is circulate a small survey form in my district, and I have a number of them in. When that receipt had been completed, I would have provided copies to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth with basically the same intent or request that is going to happen right now.

I fully agree with the minister that the reasons given by Mr. Hunter do not hold water and are easily argued against, in that the time frame can be easily adjusted on one end, certainly. The cost may be a factor, but we may have to consider that he has never approached, for example, this House of Assembly to see if we could not assist in making something possible in our Province, and unless he asked us or approached us on that, how can he say that there is a funding question involved. Perhaps we can assist, I do not know that. That is to be discussed, I would imagine.

But emphasis should be placed on the fact that Newfoundland and Labrador is an integral part of Canada, and that the proposed relay in this Province is pretty well minimum tokenism, where it

comes in and gets out as quickly as possible and that is certainly not good enough, I would think, for any member of this House or any citizen in our Province.

But by the very same token, because I do represent one of the four seats in Labrador, we must place emphasis on the fact that where Newfoundland and Labrador is an integral part of Canada, then Labrador, of course, as the minister indicates in his resolution, is an integral part of the Province and that we do very, very strongly request that the appearance of the relay would take in both our regions, the Island of Newfoundland and the region of Labrador, which makes up this entire Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
With the limitation on time, and to allow the other party in the House to make some comments, that will wrap mine up, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure to join with the other parties of the House to give our unanimous support to this resolution, and on this occasion for all members of the House to be able to express concern on behalf of many who are watching the activities in advance of the Calgary Olympics, a concern that has been very publicly expressed across the Province, that

Newfoundland is not really being included. I think the initiative by the minister to give support to the efforts of the Newfoundland and Labrador Amateur Sports Federation is exactly the kind of action that is in order. I have seen media reports of the proposed schedule and how it can be extended beyond Argentina. I think that is the intent of the resolution, to give support to their specific actions, and we are glad, in this party, to be able to be a part of giving that support.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
You have heard the resolution. Shall the resolution carry?

On motion, the resolution to have the Olympic Torch relay route in Newfoundland extended, carried unanimously.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a moment to apprise the House of an event that I am sure they would want to be aware of and would take some pride in. Last week the Windsor All Star Broomball Team won the All Newfoundland Championships in Windsor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:
You only found out about it now?

MR. FLIGHT:

No, Mr. Minister, I was aware of it. Very shortly they will travel to Montreal to represent Newfoundland in the All Canadian championships. I am sure hon. members of this House would want to go on record with me as offering our congratulations on their winning the All Newfoundland, and to extend to them our best wishes for success in their pursuit of the All Canadian championships. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to stand up here and pass this information on to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MATTHEWS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As Minister of sport in the Province, I would like to join with the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight).

MR. SIMMS:
And the curling team.

MR. MATTHEWS:
We are dealing with broomball now, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has just finished with the Olympic Torch relay, so now he wants to go on to curling.

I would just like to join with him and, of course this side of the House, in extending our congratulations to the Windsor Broomball Team on winning the provincial championship and, of course, wish them all the best at the national in Montreal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:
In the same vein, Mr. Speaker, and because the House was not open at that time, we should extend the same sort of congratulations to the ladies team from Makkovik who won the senior ladies B provincial championships and the ladies from Happy Valley - Goose Bay who won the senior A provincial championships.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Before calling for Statements by Ministers I want to welcome to the galleries thirty students and two instructors, Mr. Reg Button and Ms Marjorie Badcock, from the E.J. Pratt School at Brownsdale.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, today, on behalf of my colleagues, the hon. Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett) and the hon. Minister of

Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), I want to announce the release of a Green Paper on the hunting and inland waters fishing industry - or outfitting industry - in this Province. The Green Paper will be distributed shortly and also will be distributed for public examination and discussion.

It is to be distributed by government to a number of groups, individuals, organizations and business people who are involved or directly affected by issues surrounding the industry. I want to emphasize also, that the Green Paper will be of interest to many other citizens in this Province.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we invite everybody who is interested to submit written comments to us by May 31, so that the three ministers involved can develop and recommend to Cabinet a new and comprehensive policy regarding hunting and fishing camps and outfitting enterprises. We would hope to have such a policy in place before the end of the year.

This Green Paper, Mr. Speaker, reflects government's desire to overcome a number of problems that are common, and to seek ways of taking advantage of the many exciting and potentially profitable opportunities that are available.

While I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, today to cover every detail of the Green Paper in this statement, I want to briefly mention a few of the major issues on which we are seeking extensive public comment.

One policy issue that we feel is especially important involves non-resident big game hunting licences. The outfitting industry

is insisting that they need an increase in the allocation of non-resident licences in order to make their operations viable. This has always been difficult because of the quotas set for the number of animals to be harvested. In the last couple of years, though, licence numbers have increased as has the resource. There is enormous potential in further development of non-resident big game hunting which already creates several hundred seasonal jobs in this Province every year. There are 92 hunting camps in the Province, including 10 in Labrador and in addition to hiring cooks, guides and the like, many of these camps create work for pilots and owners of small aircraft. In fact, the hunting camps along with the 40 or so fishing camps are a main source of activity for operators of small planes throughout the Spring, Summer and Fall every year. Some hunting camps employ between 5 and 10 people during the season and, of course, attract customers from the Mainland, the United States and other parts of the world.

Another important issue explored in the Green Paper, Mr. Speaker, is the growing concern about sports fishing by non-residents, who often arrive with their own supplies, thereby contributing very little to the local economy, and fish in waters used by outfitters for paying guests.

There is some feeling that all non-resident sports fishermen should be required to hire local guides. Under current regulations, non-residents licensed to fish for salmon must be accompanied by a guide except when they are fishing within 400 metres of a provincial highway. One guide is required for every

two non-resident salmon anglers but guides are not required for non-resident trout fishing. In some cases, of course, forest travel regulations may require non-residents to be accompanied by a guide or a resident if travelling in a restricted area. There is growing local resentment against the virtually unrestricted access to trout fishing now enjoyed by non-residents. Many outfitters believe they could extend their seasons and enlarge their business and employment if non-residents were required to have guides for trout fishing.

Another question we must address, Mr. Speaker, is whether operators of commercial fishing, and hunting establishments be allowed to gain long term tenure to Crown lands. At the moment they operate under a policy that allows only one-year permits but outfitters argue that they cannot secure financing from banks and other financial institutions on the basis of temporary title. They need ten to fifteen year permits.

A very important part of a successful outfitting industry, Mr. Speaker, is the quality of the product and the service delivered by outfitters to non-residents. This is an important issue and while we want to encourage outfitters to develop a more businesslike approach to their operations we also recognize that the government should develop policies to support the potential of such enterprises -- and we must.

The freeze on cabin development on Labrador Rivers, imposed in 1975, is as source of constant debate, Mr. Speaker. Outfitters in the area have come to see the freeze as a form of protection against competition while local residents

view it as shielding their traditional hunting and fishing rights against outside exploitation. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the freeze has no apparent justification from a resource management point of view and, in fact, a lifting of the freeze would allow development of the full tourism potential of these rivers, so that is one option.

Throughout the Province there are a number of private camps, Mr. Speaker, company V.I.P. camps, military camps and the like, which have been in existence for years. Some outfitters view these camps as unfair competition, yet any attempt to restrict them may well be viewed by the public as an infringement on their rights. Thus, we have another issue to consider.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is the question of satellite camps, which would give some outfitters an advantage, especially in the case of hunting in remote areas and would be a great asset to the outfitter in catering to the tourist. These are not allowed under the current policy.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that we welcome and are looking forward to comments from the public on all matters discussed in the Green Paper. There is a wealth of information and material in the Green Paper with explanations of how the industry works along with descriptions of the resources, the constraints and opportunities and the policy options that are available.

The Green Paper clearly shows that in this Province we are in a unique position to take advantage

of the growing interest among people in large population centres of the industrialized Western World who are willing to pay for the chance to have the kind of outdoor, wilderness experience that is available in very few other places. We have all the ingredients, therefore, to build a major tourism business based on hunting and fishing in Newfoundland and Labrador.

We look forward, Mr. Speaker, to extensive public input into our efforts to develop a comprehensive policy that will help the outfitting industry live up to its potential and maintain and indeed increase job opportunities.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for giving us a copy of the statement a short while before the House convened. Let me say first, on behalf of the official Opposition, that the process of what used to be the White Paper is a good one. Perhaps my good friend, the former Chairman of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, can enlighten as to how the White Paper got to be green, unless white relates to legislative initiatives and green to others.

MR. SIMMS:
White is government's intention and Green is to seek public input.

MR. SIMMONS:
I have learned something today, and from my own blood, too.

MR. WARREN:
Yes, from your cousin.

MR. SIMMONS:
We like to keep the intellect in the family. Mr. Speaker, the process is a good one and we salute the government for taking this initiative in going this particular route. The process, to be well served, has to be followed through. And I say in all kindness to my friend, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), that I am not so sure that the similar process he has so well launched with the paper on Vocational Education was followed through to its logical conclusion, but that is another item for another day. I hope this one is followed through.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, a matter that is only peripherally related to the subject of today's statement, the method of distributing resident big game hunting licenses: The time has come, I say to the gentleman from Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews), for a review of the whole method, an overall, perhaps a shorter season, perhaps instead of a limited number of licenses a quota system such as we use in the fishery, where those who can bag their big game within a definite period until the quota is taken up can do so. There are some problems with that, too, but we say to him they may not be greater than the problems you have now of having people go into the woods who are only in there every four or five years and are not as proficient hunters as might be the case in the system that I have just

indicated.

Mr. Speaker, tourism is, in this Province, a very underdeveloped resource. When we talk about tourism, we ought to decide tourism - who for? - and it has to be for the benefit of the people who live here twelve months around. We have to measure the success of our tourist industry not in terms of how many people come from outside the Province but in terms of how many dollars they leave here and in terms of what overall benefit accrues to the population which lives here year round. The overriding principle must be the best interest of those who live here when we are deciding the balance between the number of big game licenses for resident versus non-residents, and when we are deciding matters relating to the administration of sports fishing for non-residents.

The minister has indicated in his statement that as a public we have until the end of May, I believe he said, to scrutinize the options outlined in the Green Paper. We in the official Opposition will do our best to aid and abet the process to ensure that people in our respective districts have a look at the options outlined with a view to the government getting the maximum feedback and, therefore, the best set of guidelines as to how to pursue this very important issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not have a lot to say on the statement. I do thank the minister for giving us a copy of the statement in advance. Representing a district in St. John's, I do not have a lot coming my way with regard to regard hunting and fishing, except perhaps people hunting for parking spaces downtown. I would say that I can tell from the content of the statement that this is a very exciting opportunity that is being put before the people of the Province, to participate in the formulation of a new policy.

I noticed the absence of any reference to the Native peoples of our Province and would say that we would have some concerns about their involvement in the consultative process itself, and certainly in the many issues. Because tourism and hunting and fishing are among the limited areas in the Province that present great opportunity for Native peoples, and it is certainly an area we will follow with interest in terms of their integration into this process.

We look forward to seeing the Green Paper, itself, and to following the process through. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Questions

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Finance

(Dr. Collins) and the Premier, I will direct this question to the Acting Premier, the Government House Leader. In the 1985 Public Accounts of this Province the debt increase due to foreign exchange losses as of March 31, 1985, is listed as \$277 million. In the 1986 Public Accounts the figure for the same date is \$227 million. My question to the minister is this: Where did the \$50 million disappear? Is this an example of the cooking of the books of this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, obviously there is no cooking of any books, and indeed the hon. gentleman is well aware that these books are properly kept and appropriately reflect the accounts of the Province. The difference between the \$227 million and the \$277 million, for the hon. gentleman's knowledge, is \$50 million, and that was spent as indicated in the relevant documentation.

MR. BAKER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
To give the minister something else to think about, in the 1985 Public Accounts of this Province last year's infamous bond issue is listed as being an American dollar issue. In the 1986 Public Accounts mysteriously the same bond issue is listed as a Canadian

one. How can a bond issue change from American to Canadian dollars long after the money has been raised? Is this another example of the cooking of the books?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
No, Mr. Speaker, it certainly is not an example of the cooking of the books either. This I would have to check on, but one or the other is incorrect. It could be a typographical error or whatever. Obviously if you are talking about the same amount of money, the same sum, obviously it was not in both currencies. If this is the same sum of money there would have been an error in one or the other. Which I could not say right now, but I will endeavour to find out.

MR. BAKER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
I would suggest it might be an attempt to quash any further comment on forward exchange contracts.

The Auditor General and the Opposition - now this is something that the minister is particularly responsible for - have been clamouring for years, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Would the hon. member please pose his question?

MR. BAKER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will.

- to give the Auditor General greater power and autonomy by giving him his own act, the Auditor General's Act. When is the minister going to bring this separate Auditor General's Act into this House, or is he too busy fiddling around with the books?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the difference the hon. gentleman refers to is based on - I think as explained in the Ministerial accompaniment to the Auditor General's Report - a fixed conversion rate, one currency converted to another fixed at 1.32, and that is the reason. With respect to I think the second question or a part of the question about new legislation governing the operation of the Auditor General, at the present time the government does not feel that it is necessary to alter the legislative framework under which the Auditor General operates.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt), through you. Newfoundland Light and Power's generating plant on the Southside is apparently operating at full capacity. It is spewing an unbelievable amount of pollutants, mainly soot, and making life unbearable for people living in the area. It is probably adversely affecting their health and certainly creating an unbearable environmental hazard.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Rex wrote that.

MR. FLIGHT:

It is my question. Are Newfoundland Light and Power breaking any environmental laws or are they operating that plant within the minister's or his department's environmental control standards?

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. raised a very good question. There is a big problem on the Southside or I should say there were a couple of really big upsets that caused a lot of problems on the Southside and down at Fort Amherst. On the Southside there are a twenty megawatt plant and a ten megawatt plant running at almost full capacity. In fact, the other thermal station in the Province, at Holyrood, is running at full capacity as well. Because of low water in the reservoirs, hydro capability is down considerably.

We had, on a couple of occasions over the past couple of days, a couple of major upsets, one on the twenty megawatt machine when the induced draft fan cut off and soot went all over the place. No question about it, people's houses were contaminated with all kinds of soot. People in the immediate area got it on their clothes, Mr. Speaker, and on them, and it was taken into people's homes. But I understand from my conversations with the company, and I have been in contact with them because of complaints coming to my office and

so on, that they intend, as a public utilities company, of course, to compensate for the damage that was caused during those upsets.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the minister skirted around the question, so I will try it again. The minister boasted about success in controlling or reducing sulphur dioxide emissions, about a success in pollution control. Now how is it he did not have this plant conform to emissions control standards and pollution control standards before it was allowed to poison the atmosphere the way it is today?

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, this plant on the Southside is a very old plant. It has been in existence for a long, long time. It is presently just used for peaking periods or during emergency periods.

MR. CALLAN:

That is not true.

MR. BUTT:

That is a fact, you can check the record.

In the meantime, I have asked the company, as of today, for a complete listing of their maintenance schedule, what they

have been doing with the plant, because it certainly appears on the surface that their maintenance is not up to par. But I would not want to make an irresponsible statement by saying that in the House without checking the facts. I am having that information made available to me so I can take a look at it. I know the industry, I worked in it for twenty years, I can certainly judge that myself without getting professional advice. That information will be forthcoming to me, Mr. Speaker, and then I will certainly be able to make a judgment call on it.

MR. FLIGHT:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the minister says it is just used at peak periods. Well, it is poisoning while it is peaking. What is the minister doing now to alleviate the immediate, very serious problem, and to avoid it happening again even at peak periods?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, I have an option, I suppose, open to me today as Minister of the Environment. I could shut down the plants on the Southside, and then there would be no emissions from them being shut down. But at the same time I would have to ration power in St. John's - I would not but the utilities company would - because even the gas turbines right now, the last source of power in the Province, are being used at this

present time, right now, as I stand here in the Legislature. So I guess my choice is very narrow; to shut down the plant and ration power, or to let the plant go as it is right now. Certainly if you look out the window it is not too bad right now. But if there is an upset on the system, if ERCO comes on and the system, the electrical power, is fluctuating rapidly, then the fans in the furnace likewise and of course you get an accumulation and build-up of soot on the tubes. When they operate their soot blowers, Mr. Speaker, then that goes out into the atmosphere. You are quite correct, it causes a big nuisance, and it could cause a health problem to people who have respiratory problems the same as it would if such people were in a garage with vehicles running and they were breathing in the exhaust. So it is all a matter of degree, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
In the absence of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), I would like to put my question to the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer).

Mr. Speaker, effective on February 19 farmers in this country received a 7.5 cent per liter gas rebate, fishermen and loggers in the country get a 3 cent a liter rebate, a 4.5 cent differential. Is the minister aware of this and what action has he taken with Ottawa to eliminate this discrimination against

Newfoundland fishermen and loggers?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, as I recall the announcement in the federal budget with respect to the rebate, there was a rebate stated for farmers but there was no reference to rebate for fishermen. I understand, then, that representation was made and that the federal regional minister for Newfoundland stated that there would be a rebate for fisherman as well. Obviously it is a federal matter, but my understanding was he gave an assurance that there would be a rebate for fishermen as well. I can only assume his having given more or less an unequivocal assurance to that effect, that that will be the case.

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

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, as of 3:00 p.m. this afternoon the fishermen still get a 3 cent a liter rebate and farmers in Canada still get a 7.5 cent rebate. Has the minister made representation to Ottawa? I wonder would he table any communication he has had with the Government of Canada in this regard?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I know the Minister of Fisheries has made representation, but I cannot say exactly what they were nor can I table them - I do not know if they were oral or what they were - and that would be his responsibility. But there is no doubt that there are unequivocally several statements on the record from the federal government, from the regional minister for the Atlantic Provinces including Newfoundland, hon. Mr. Crosbie, that the rebate will apply equally to fishermen. Now perhaps that has not translated itself down the bureaucratic system of Ottawa, which obviously can take time. Indeed, it appears that there was quite some misunderstanding there. I understand that some bureaucrat, I believe in the Taxation Division, stated after the minister's statement that he was not aware of it. But, whether it has translated itself down through the federal bureaucracy I cannot say. Obviously the assurance of the minister is quite clear and quite unequivocal.

MR. W. CARTER:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. W. CARTER:

I gather from the minister that he is not quite sure whether or not representation has been made. In light of the importance of this, Mr. Speaker - in fact, it is discrimination - would the minister undertake now to make representation to Ottawa in this regard and demand that that differential be eliminated?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, the Minister of Fisheries has already made representations. If there is something whereby those representations and the assurance of the federal minister are not realized, then naturally that will be followed up by the government. But unequivocally I have stated that the Minister of Fisheries has made representations. We are all aware that the federal minister has stated that the rebate would apply. So all I can say is perhaps that assurance from the Government of Canada has not been implemented bureaucratically, administratively within the system. The policy is very clear.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to put a question to the President of the Council in the absence of the Premier. It relates to the upcoming First Ministers' Conference in Ottawa on the subject of free trade with the United States. The Premier had indicated to the House earlier, some months ago, that he was not particularly interested in having a provincial veto apply over the free trade package with the United States. Can the minister indicate to the House what position the Premier is taking to those free trade discussions with Mr. Mulroney on behalf of Newfoundland? Is Newfoundland prepared to go along with a ratification formula without some

trade-off? If there is to be a trade-off, what kinds of demands, if you like, or conditions would Newfoundland place on giving its acquiescence to a free trade agreement with the United States?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, of course, I think it is quite clear that the Government of Newfoundland is among the provinces which are supportive of the federal government initiative with respect to a new liberalization of trade agreement between the U.S. and Canada. It is also true that the Government of Newfoundland does not take the position that a veto is required or that there should be a veto. I do not think Canada is the type of country which really runs on vetos, but has to run on a consensual basis. There is no doubt that the government is very aware of the vital interests of Newfoundland with respect to free trade. I think it is generally recognized, as well, that in many areas - I am thinking of our exports, thinking particularly of fish exports, our pulp and paper exports, some of our mining exports - we are an export oriented economy, and, in general, and very clearly, stand to benefit from a liberalization of trade agreement.

With respect to areas where there could be adverse effects on this Province, then obviously those will be matters of detailed negotiations as they are identified. There are numerous possibilities, as the negotiations flow through, for phasing arrangements, adjustment periods, and all kinds of various

mechanisms. I suppose until the whole package is more or less delineated, nobody is in a position to make a final statement. But there is no doubt that the government is very aware of the whole issue and has identified where possible problems could be, and will do everything possible to alleviate them. I do not think that this kind of a process can really work through a system of vetos. It might have to be a kind of consensual, give-and-take, co-operative approach.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I thank the minister for his response. The Premier of Ontario, by way of example, has said the Auto Pact is not up for negotiation. Others have staked out other particular areas. I ask the minister what particular, specific issues has the Premier and/or the Government of Newfoundland indicated to the Prime Minister are not open to negotiation insofar as Newfoundland is concerned? Are there particular items? Have we made any specific caveats about fisheries jurisdiction, for example, in the trade off, having in mind what just happened between us and France so very recently? Have we attached any caveats insofar as the social security net is concerned, or in terms of job preferences for Newfoundlanders in economic developments? I give those only as examples. But I ask the minister in general has the Newfoundland government indicated to Ottawa, in the same kind of

vein that the government of Ontario, B.C. and others have, any specific matters that ought not to be put on the table in the pre-trade talks with the United States?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, certainly the government has made it very clear that in an area like fisheries, as an example, that the discussions and the results are matters of trade, and not of access to the resource. I think that is what the hon. gentleman was getting at and our position is very clear on that, that within the Canada/US negotiations, and indeed within the GATT round as well that trade cannot be balanced off against access to the resource. The government's position is very, very clear on that matter, a matter which, of course, has within the previous GATT agreement, worked to Newfoundland's detriment because in fact the last negotiations of the previous administration - but it does not make much difference what administration it was - they did in fact balance off, or attempt to balance off, trade with access to the resource. The Europeans, the Common Market got access to the resource and we did not get any increase trade. So that matter in the US/Canada negotiations has very clearly been identified and the Government of Canada is fully aware of that. With respect to regional development, the point has been made very strongly by Newfoundland that these are internal Canadian socio-economic policies, something like equalization in a sense, that they are local

Canadian policies of socio-economic nature and are not matters within the perspective of trade. Within the area of local preference, I think sometimes, probably as Canadians, we are much to defensive about our local preference. It is my understanding that if you look within the US, at their states, the local preference and local procurement policies are far more demanding than they are within Canada and when the crunch comes on that it may well be that the US will not pursue that at all. I understand, for example, that California has a very stringent local procurement policy, so I think that these are matters which the US probably practices to a much greater extent that Canada does. Certainly in terms of regional development, it is very clear that that is a Canadian policy and it is Canada's own governmental policy and is not a matter for negotiation with another power.

MR. SIMMONS:

A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Given that this is the first time, I understand, that the Premier will have the opportunity, if that is the term, to look eyeball to eyeball at the Prime Minister since the Canada/France fiasco, can the minister assure the House that the Premier will raise the issue, either in that meeting or in a separate meeting, with the Prime Minister during the current visit to Ottawa?

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

The member opposite is obviously reading his question, no doubt prepared for him by the staff of the Opposition, and I think this is entirely out of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order. I will turn over the few notes I have in front of me and I will proceed.

MR. J. CARTER:

He has memorized them by now.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

The minister says they will not mix up trade and access to resources, but they just did mix up the two when they traded access to a resource for better relations with the Francophone nations. They just did that to Newfoundland, so I would not get too confident about them not trading access on matters of free trade with the United States.

Can the minister assure the House that the Premier will raise this all-important issue, given that it took him six weeks to get to Ottawa since this matter blew and he has not even talked to the Prime Minister about the matter to this point? And, secondly, Mr. Speaker, and finally, can he assure the House that as a result of the Canada-France fiasco we now have a better understanding with Ottawa that they will not do to us on free trade what they did to us on the Canada-France issue?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt, I would say, in anybody's mind on this side, or doubt in the minds of very few people, whether they agree with the Premier or not, that he will fight vigorously for the protection of Newfoundland's interest.

MR. CALLAN:

And lose!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

He has not been known to be quiet or shy or silent about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

And lose! And lose!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Will the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) calm down! Would somebody slip him a little pill to calm him down over there? Have you got a Dodd's kidney pill for the hon. gentleman? He is beginning to lose his cool.

I can certainly give the hon. gentleman assurance that the Premier, as he has consistently in the past, will in a very unambiguous and unequivocal and clear and strong and forceful manner, speak out for Newfoundland's interests.

The second part of the question: I think basically Ottawa now has a more realistic understanding of the importance of the fisheries access issue in Newfoundland and of the need not to make concessions, as they were talking about doing, to France, and indeed in other contexts. I would say

that Ottawa must be very, very aware now of the importance of this issue to Newfoundland and that they cannot work in that direction without not only upsetting the people of Newfoundland but indeed very many people in Canada, including non-fishing and non-coastal provinces, which in general were very supportive of Newfoundland's point of view when they were made aware of it.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett). I would like to ask the Minister of Social Services if he would explain to the House, and to the people of this Province, why his department throughout the Island is passing out jobs on a patronage basis through community development programmes with no advertisements and no knowledge made available to the general public?

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

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, that is not happening.

MR. EFFORD:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
I would like to ask the minister if he would explain to this House

why in a letter by his own admission two jobs were given to two people on the Great Northern Peninsula with no interviews?

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

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, that was the exception and not the rule. The hiring for community development programmes is done by the regional offices. They are temporary jobs, therefore they do not go through the Public Service Commission. They do not advertise in the paper as far as I know. I do not have anything to do with it, really. I do not see them. I do not know who is hired and who is not hired. It does not come to my desk at all. As a matter of fact I do not even know if it comes into headquarters. But it is my understanding that because the regional officers are aware of who is available for these part-time jobs that in almost every single incident they do interview a number of people and the people in the regional offices make their own decisions as to whom they are going to hire.

Now if there is some accusation from across the way that the five regional managers are hiring all Tories, or all Liberals, or all NDP, then I would suggest that you go out there and ask questions. Because I do not know anything about it. The names do not necessarily have to come into St. John's and they certainly never, ever come to the minister's office.

The two that the hon. member is talking about - and of course I know exactly where that is coming from, I know what office it is coming from. I know all about

that - is the exception rather than the rule, and the regional director or manager involved was advised that this sort of thing should not have happened and we suggested to him that it should never happen again. It is unfortunate, but that is most certainly the exception and not the rule.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

It seems as if the Minister of Social Services can always shift his responsibility to somebody else. Since he has clearly admitted in a letter that these jobs were placed without an interview, and that they were in excess of \$20,000 a year plus car allowance, will he do the honourable thing, cancel those two jobs, and let the general public in that area have an opportunity to apply for the jobs on an equal basis?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

No, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to ask that these jobs be cancelled. I would suggest that that crowd over there cannot make up their minds what they want, because if the minister were hiring these people, if the minister had any say in hiring people for these Community Development jobs, then they would be down my throat saying that I was playing

politics, and I was hiring my friends or the friends of my colleagues over here. So the system that is in place is quite good, it is working well, we are getting good people, and I have absolutely no intention of changing one single iota.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs. In his capacity as Minister of Communications, he will know that 10,000 Canadians could possibly lose their jobs by 1991 if the federal government continues its plan to close post offices throughout the country. In fact by 1991 there will only be seventeen post offices left in this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I would like to ask the minister what representations, if any, he has made to his federal counterpart with respect to protecting these jobs and these post offices throughout the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for St. Barbe has a relatively short memory. I am assuming he was in the House a couple of days ago when this House passed the unanimous resolution condemning that policy. Indeed it was his own resolution which obviously he does not remember.

I would also like to add, Mr. Speaker -

MR. CALLAN:
What did you do?

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker, would the Boo from Bellevue be quiet while I try to answer the question?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker, it also is well known that this government, of which I am proud to be a part, made representation prior to the resolution of the hon. member, telling the Prime Minister and the federal government that we are not at all happy with that kind of policy and do not want to see one single post office closed in this Province.

MR. FUREY:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
That was my resolution, and I am quite aware of it. I wonder could the minister: (a) Table his representation, and (b) orally tell us what response he received from the Prime Minister to his personal representation on behalf of Newfoundlanders?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker, the responsibility

for the post office now lies, of course, with my counterpart in Ottawa, the federal Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre). That does not necessarily translate that any responsibility for the post office lies with me. The government, as I said, through the Premier, has made representation to the federal government on this policy to potentially close some post offices. I suspect that, since the Premier has already done it, any representation from the Minister of Consumer Affairs is not going to have any more effect than the Premier's representation.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. SIMMONS:
On a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PEACH:
You have no privileges.

MR. SIMMONS:
The gentleman from Carbonear is just about right, I have no privileges in this House after what I just saw and what I want now to bring to the attention of the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, underlying the proper operations of this House is the premise that we will get proper information from the ministry, and, at the very least, not deliberately misleading information from the ministry. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services a minute ago -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Is the hon. member saying that there has been deliberate misleading information given? Am I to take that from the comments of the hon. member?

MR. SIMMONS:
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Well, the hon. member will have to withdraw that comment.

MR. SIMMONS:
If it helps anybody, I will withdraw.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw without equivocation. Of course, Mr. Speaker. Why would I not, dealing with a bunch of angels like we are.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman for Trinity North just misled the House. He knows full well, Mr. Speaker - and in misleading he has breached my privileges and the privileges of every member of this House - that a well-established practice by a number of ministers on that side of the House is to evade the Public Service mechanism of having applicants go to the Public Service by hiring them for ostensibly temporary periods of thirteen weeks and then renewing it and renewing it and renewing it again. There are some people down in those departments who have been down there for five years on the pretext of being there for a temporary period of time. That is the way he and other ministers get around the Public Service regulations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I felt duty bound to bring that to your attention, because it is wrong information and, in getting that

kind of wrong information, my privileges are being breached. I cannot do the job I was sent here to do if we have ministers coming into the House covering their tracks by giving us, deliberately, false information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, I would submit that there is no case of privilege. There is obviously a difference of opinion with respect to hiring practices, and these are matters which can be debated at an appropriate time.

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

The time now is four o'clock, and it is Private Members' Day.

MR. W. CARTER:
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, my point of order concerns a motion that is on the Order Paper, presented by the House Leader, having to do with the Canada/France fish deal. That motion was put on the Order Paper on February 26. We discussed it for a few days, and there has been no debate on that motion since, I believe, last week sometime, last Friday. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that that motion has been left in abeyance now for practically a week, and

the fact that the Premier is now in Ottawa meeting the Prime Minister, at which time he should have hand delivered -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. the member this is Private Members' Day, and I now call the motion in the name of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. The hon. the member for Gander, I think, adjourned the debate.

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege, then, if that is permissible?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate, on a point of privilege.

MR. W. CARTER:

I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, because I am the member who moved an amendment to that resolution and the resolution is not being dealt with. I think the fact that this resolution has been left in abeyance proves just what a charade it is on the part of the government.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I have already ruled on that point.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I wonder if I could just inform the hon. House because, perhaps, the hon. gentleman is not aware. We opened on a Thursday, we had three days on the fisheries resolution, Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday, and we had three days then on the Address in Reply, that was last Friday, Monday and Tuesday, and today is Private Members' Day. I have had discussions with the hon. gentleman's House Leader with respect to the timing of the bringing on of the resolution. I mentioned it to him yesterday and he is going to get back to me later today or tomorrow, one way or the other. So really it appears to me that there is not much sense having discussions on something when the matter is going to come up. In any case, this is Private Members' Day and it really has nothing to do with any other resolution which is on the House. The Standing Orders are very clear.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, on that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) rose on a point of order, and the fact that it is Private Members' Day and four o'clock has nothing to do with his right to rise on a point of order. He rose on a point of order as to why this fisheries question has not being debated for the past four or five days, and we have the Premier in Ottawa with an urgent resolution sitting on the books here. Why was it not debated some days ago? Why was it not carried up to Ottawa? That is the point of order. Are you

bluffing again over there? He has a right to make that point of order.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

On the point of order, the hon. the House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

There is absolutely no point of order. It is really entirely inconsistent. I mean, one of the hon. gentleman's colleagues asked very perceptive and intelligent and worthwhile questions with respect to the Premier being up there now and the need for Newfoundland's case on free trade. So the Premier should not be there discussing free trade or, if so, he had to bring this letter in his pocket. I suppose there is mail and other ways. I mean, the Premier if he is delivering a letter does not have to bring it around. He is not a postman. There are other ways of getting it there rather than carrying it up.

MR. TULK:

Well, where is the emergency?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

The Standing Orders are quite clear, and it is four o'clock.

MR. SIMMONS:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To the point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, two points: First of all, let us not let the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) misconstrue the point made by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). Of course the Premier ought to be in Ottawa on the important issue of free trade. Our concern is that if the government side had done its homework properly and had gotten this resolution before the House, he would be better armed in Ottawa than he is right now, he would have the collective voice of everybody in this House on the issue of fish insofar as Canada/France is concerned.

The second point is this, Mr. Speaker. Of course at four o'clock you call Orders of the Day, but I defy anybody in this Chamber to find anything in that rule book that says that I as a member, or the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) as a member cannot raise a point of order or a point of privilege at any time. And if we are getting to the point where we are going to cut the legs from under him on that basic right, we are wasting our time being here and we are getting no protection from the Chair on that point, no protection from the Chair whatsoever.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Name him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

It is shameful. It is shameful!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage will withdraw the remark 'he is not getting protection from the Chair', and he will also withdraw the remark 'shameful' and I ask him now to do it without equivocation.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, without equivocation, the protection we get from you, Sir, is admirable, absolutely admirable.

MR. SIMMS:

Name him, Mr. Speaker. That is not without equivocation.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not admirable. What do you want me to say? It is admirable, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would you please sit down.

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Whatever you say.

MR. SPEAKER:

About questions of order, questions of privilege, if there are legitimate reasons for bringing them, and I am not suggesting for a moment that the reasons have not been legitimate today, they can be brought up, of course, at any time. The point that I am making now is that it is Private Members' Day and it is past the hour to call that, and I am calling on the hon. member for Gander.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, we understand - I will do it slowly this time because it was not understood the first time - full well that on four o'clock on Wednesday afternoon it is Private Members' Day. We want to ensure, Sir, that it is understood by all in the House that our right to raise points of order, such as my colleague from Twillingate tried to do, is not in any way undermined by the ruling you just made, or your invitation to the gentleman from Gander to proceed with the Orders of the Day. We have the full right and we exert it here again today. And this is my point of privilege: We claim the full right to raise points of order at any time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of privilege, I do not know what the hon. member is getting uptight about. Just before he got up, I made it perfectly clear to him and to all other hon. members that a point of privilege and a point of order can be brought up at any time. I made that perfectly clear.

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. SIMMONS:

One further point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I thank you for that clarification. Number one, this

member -

MR. BAIRD:

Your fingernails are dirty.

MR. SIMMONS:

At least my dirt is visible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

- Mr. Speaker, I am getting uptight about nothing, and secondly, Mr. Speaker, even if I do, it is not the right of the Chair to lecture me on that point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, to that particular point.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

We have heard from the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage today, and on a lot of occasions in the past, similar kinds of comments directed at the Chair. Now, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, we in this Parliament, in this House, cannot allow individual members to get up and make attacks or snide remarks, whatever way they are made, towards the Chair, whoever is in the Chair. I, for one, resent that kind of direction.

The hon. member is a veteran of Parliament and he should know better. But the point I want to make in this particular case, Mr. Speaker, is that you have already indicated that the point of order

or point of privilege, whatever is being raised, is no big deal. Unfortunately, the hon. the member for Gander is the one who is suffering, because the motion was called and the time spent on debating these points of order is now taken out of his remaining eleven minutes and he, unfortunately, will not have enough time to finish his comments.

MR. J. CARTER:

And there will be no leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no prima facie case of breach of privilege. I now call on the hon. the member for Gander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I first of all would like to say that I was not particularly suffering.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ha, ha!

MR. BAKER:

The main point of the first part of my speech with regards to this rather timely resolution on federal/provincial relations had to do with the callousness of members opposite and the Premier and the way that they follow polls to determine what their attitude is with regards to federal/provincial relations. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that since I started this speech we have had one more monumental example of exactly what this resolution says.

On Friday we had an announcement by our federal minister (Mr. Crosbie), by the Minister of

Energy (Mr. Masse), by the member for Bonavista - Trinity - Conception (Mr. Morrissey), and I think the member for Burin - St. George's (Mr. Price), the South Coast area was there as well, although I did not hear anything from him, an announcement that is of immense importance to this Province. The Premier of this Province was notified twenty minutes to a half an hour ahead of time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let us get this clear: This announcement that there would be a couple of step out wells or a couple of delineation wells drilled at the Terra Nova discovery has to do with the Atlantic Accord. It has to do with the document that has been hailed by members opposite as the greatest thing since the invention of the safety pin. It has to do with provincial control that members opposite claim has been given by the Atlantic Accord, provincial control has been given over this development offshore. But what do we see?

Mr. Speaker, we see an announcement, first of all, of drilling and, secondly, the minister indicates an announcement of production with no reference made to the federal/provincial board or to the provincial government, no reference at all. The announcement, Mr. Speaker, also included very definitive statements about the mode of development.

Now, all through the Atlantic Accord debate members on this side, myself included, pointed out to members opposite in no uncertain terms that they were selling the shop with regards to control of the offshore. The Premier and members opposite would

always come back, Mr. Speaker, with, 'But we have control over the mode of development. We have our concrete platforms!' Can you not see all those concrete platforms, Mr. Speaker? Can you not see them sprouting all over the place, all those concrete platforms? 'We determine the method of development, the mode of development!' That is the one thing that this government holds out as the last vestige of control they have left over the offshore and what do we have? We have Mr. Crosbie, the federal minister, Mr. Masse, the Minister of Energy and Bill Hopper of Petro-Canada, coming down here and saying, 'We have decided on the mode of development. It is not going to be a concrete platform. We have decided on the mode of development. Sorry, Newfoundland and Labrador, you have nothing to say. The mode of development is Petro-Canada's business. It is no longer the business of this Province.' What a mess, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. BAKER:
By leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:
He has two more minutes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PEACH:
No, he has not got two more minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:
I am sorry, the hon. member's time is up.

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. J. CARTER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A few peripheral remarks first directed towards the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker).

MR. FUREY:
It is the 'Strait' of Belle Isle.

MR. J. CARTER:
He happens to have left the Chamber, but I am sure he is still within earshot. In Britain, and the British tradition under which we operate, what is not expressly prohibited is allowed. Now, in Russia what is not expressly allowed is prohibited, and I believe in China what is not expressly allowed or prohibited is not permitted. I will begin by reading Standing Order 52. "No member shall speak disrespectfully of Her Majesty, nor of any member of the Royal Family" - we are not allowed to do that - "nor of the Governor or Administrator of the Government of Canada; nor of the Lieutenant-Governor of this Province" - I have no intention of speaking disrespectfully of them - "nor use offensive words against any member of this House. No member may reflect upon any vote of the House except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded." Now, Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, I believe it was, the member for the Straits of Belle of Isle (Mr. Decker) -

MR. DECKER:
The Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. J. CARTER:
No, it is the Straits of Belle Isle. You do not speak about the Narrow. I would not speak about the Narrow. The only terms I would use narrow in is if I were referring to the hon. gentleman's mind. Then, I would use narrow. Otherwise, it is the Narrows and, therefore, it is the Straits of Belle Isle. That puts that in perspective, I think.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member suggested, in fact he made it part of a point of privilege, that there were certain things that one could not mention in this House. Now, I object to that. I object most strongly. I was reserving my remarks for the second time that I spoke on the Speech from the Throne, in the Address in Reply, and that is a device that can, perhaps, be used. However, the Chair disallowed that, and with some reason. I do not dispute it. I felt and I still feel it is a point that could perhaps be argued, Standing Order No. 53 (a), but I will not go on about that. I could have risen on a point of order, but I figured I would have a slot to speak today so I would mention it then.

It is a sad commentary on this House if a member cannot get up and say whatever, within the limits of good taste, comes to his mind. If, for instance, there should be a slip of the tongue that members find offensive, well, maybe we can be called to order, but it is the Speaker's job to call us to order and not other members. While I am on that particular hobbyhorse, Mr. Speaker, I would note that this resolution, itself, is probably inadmissible in that the language of it is argumentative and insulting. I have no objection to

the rough side of one's tongue being used in debate.

MR. FLIGHT:

Could we please have a quorum call, Mr. Speaker?

Quorum

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

We have a quorum present.

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, if I cannot get up and speak my mind in debate, or if any of us cannot get up in this House and speak our minds without some ignorant schlemiel getting on and trying to prevent us from saying what we have to say, then I think it is a sad commentary on this House. I hope it will not happen again.

Now, for the resolution: I think I will refer to this resolution, because it is so insulting and provocative, as the dirtbag resolution rather than the first resolution that has been made. We will call this the dirtbag resolution so that when we refer to it in debates in future this is the way we will refer to it, and I think it is a very apt way to describe it. It is insulting, argumentative and unnecessary.

"WHEREAS federal/provincial relations have never been at a lower ebb and the promised great new era of co-operation and consultation has never appeared." Mr. Speaker, there is example after example of co-operation that has occurred between both levels

of government. Now, admittedly we do not agree on every point, and it would be a very dull world if we all thought the same way, but I think it is remarkable the extent to which we have had agreement. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for members to wave papers to make a point.

MR. SIMMS:

Have you seen this? You might want to table it.

MR. J. CARTER:

Oh, yes, I have been given something to table. Mr. Speaker, if the Clerk will table this. It refers to a very unfortunate incident that occurred before Christmas, I believe, and it should be drawn to the attention of all hon. members.

I think there has been more example of co-operation than non-co-operation. Admittedly we do not agree on every point and, as I say, it would be a very dull world if we did.

"WHEREAS the economic situation in Newfoundland and Labrador and the financial position of the Province calls for the closest possible co-operation, etc., if prosperity is ever to be inflicted on this Province." Well, I do not think we can disagree that the economic situation in Newfoundland does call for such agreement.

"WHEREAS the Premier has not been keeping our representative in the federal Cabinet adequately informed of provincial issues and the Province is suffering as a result." Mr. Speaker, I think that is untrue, or certainly a great exaggeration. My understanding is that only last weekend our federal representative in the Government of Canada and

our Premier, and a couple of other members, not only had supper together but had lunch together the following day. If they are going to eat every meal together, I think that is certainly an example of co-operation, or at least of consultation.

"WHEREAS the fiscal mismanagement already demonstrated by the present administration causes it to need every friend it can get in Ottawa if it is to obtain more money." This is what I say, Mr. Speaker. I did not get up on a point of privilege or a point of order, but I do not think that this kind of language should be allowed in a resolution. Now, when we debate the resolution, I think the Marquis of Queensbury Rules do apply.

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman has spoken longer than usual, so I will ask for a quorum call to see if we can get some members in here.

MR. J. CARTER:

Oh, for heaven's sake, Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

Quorum

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

We have a quorum present.

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I do think what the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is trying to do is extremely

discourteous. I would even almost go so far as to say that he has the manners of a pig.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, if that were anybody else I would -

MR. J. CARTER:

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw it. He does not have the manners of a pig.

MR. REID:

Do not insult the animals of Newfoundland.

MR. J. CARTER:

"WHEREAS the Province needs a Federal Government that is more sensitive to the need for great regional development funding, better formulas for equalization payments and more appropriate economic policies." Mr. Speaker, the problem started with Term 29, or with the Terms of Union which stated, and I am paraphrasing, that the Province should not have to resort to taxation more burdensome than the average taxation in Canada in order to give the kind of public services that are considered to be the average in the Nation as a whole. Using that argument, which is loosely defined and capable of various interpretations, then it is a continuing source of argument and dispute as to what are acceptable levels of public services and what is taxation more burdensome than usual. This will always be an argument, and will always be a sore point, and I would argue that this is the way it should be, because you can never decide absolutely, yes, we have now arrived. There will always be concerns that this municipality or that municipality has not got the services that it is entitled to as a fully fledged

part of Canada, so I certainly do not dispute the fact that we should always fuss and fume and negotiate and go on and on with Ottawa about the need for greater financial support.

"WHEREAS the Premier of this Province has failed in his promise to obtain the assistance of the Prime Minister in bringing about a settlement of the Upper Churchill power dispute, etc., etc., etc."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we know that this is one of the thorniest issues that is possible and that has arisen since Confederation. We blame the former, former administration for it, because it was largely due to the giveaway policy that they had that we have been brought to this pass, and a little bit of back-of-the-envelope arithmetic would suggest that it is something more than \$500 million a year that is being lost, far more than enough not only to meet our expected annual deficit but to pay the interest on our indebtedness.

Unfortunately, we are bound up in a contract. I think there are things we could do, but it is not going to be easy. Perhaps the only solution is to bring the power back to the Island. My reading of the contract is that if we could use the power for domestic purposes, not by building huge aluminum plants and industries that are entirely dependent upon power but as our genuine, legitimate domestic needs increase, if we could use that power then we could get it. But the catch is, of course, that we cannot get it in order to use it because we cannot finance the transportation of the power back to the Island; we cannot finance the transportation of the power

back to the Island because we cannot get assurance of that power without being able to transport that power back to the Island. It is the classical Catch 22 situation and, therefore, what we really need is for a third party, namely Ottawa, to guarantee us the enormous quantity of money needed to bring the power back to the Island. And it is an enormous quantity, because in order to get security of supply you have to build two power lines, one coming down the West part of the Great Northern Peninsula and the other coming down the Eastern part of the Great Northern Peninsula. Because it is a very stormy coast and you cannot rely on any power line, no matter how well designed, not to fail under the stress of severe weather. So this is what we need, this is what we perhaps will get some day but, obviously, Ottawa has to balance off backing us for this tremendous amount of money with the needs that exist in the rest of Canada.

So, I certainly cannot vote for this resolution as it is put together. I have categorized what I think the resolution is, I have named it and I stand by what I said, and I look forward, with relish, to voting against it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

After listening to the eloquence of the member who just finished,

you are in awe when you stand up to make a speech. One of the interesting things he said was that a couple of the ministers over there had had lunch and dinner with some of the ministers in Ottawa not too long ago. It is interesting to note that there was an article in the paper in October, 1985 about the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) having tea with his counterpart in Ottawa. He really expected great things to come out of that, but I would like to assure him that very little came out of it for the 120 workers in Bay d'Espoir who are still unemployed because they could not get a F.E.S.P. agreement signed. So, I do not think that having tea is really the way that we should negotiate.

I think the resolution so ably put forward by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has a lot of meat in it, is worthy of debate in this House and should be passed unanimously by all members. In every "WHEREAS" you have many, many reasons and you have visual proof that there is a very serious problem in provincial/federal relations, and I think something has to be done about it.

The first one says, "WHEREAS Federal/Provincial relations have been at a lower ebb and the promised new era of co-operation and consultation has never appeared."

Now, if we go back to The Throne for 1986, we will find that the lead paragraph was that this great spirit of co-operation was there between the federal and provincial governments. This was the thing that all other things in The Throne Speech are based on, this great spirit of co-operation,

which never really materialized.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. GILBERT:

If I could have some silence, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Could we have silence, please, while the hon. member is debating?

MR. GILBERT:

The 1986 Throne Speech promised that this great spirit of co-operation was going to come, but we notice that the one for 1987 did not promise any spirit of co-operation. Looking at the Throne Speeches for the three years I have been in this House, it seems to me that they are like wish books filled with what the government would like to have happen. I can assure you, I am sure, that all of us on this side of the House, when we hear and read the Throne Speeches that have been put forward in the last three years, would like to have those wishes come true; it would be to the benefit of Newfoundland if they did. If the Throne Speech was meaningful, if it had any weight to it, it would be a real thing and not a tooth fairy wish, or a wish book.

The second WHEREAS in this: "WHEREAS the economic situation in Newfoundland and Labrador and the financial position of the Province calls for the closest possible co-operation and consultation between the Federal and Provincial Orders of Government if prosperity is ever to be inflicted on this Province." Now we go back to 'prosperity is ever to be inflicted on the Province.' That is another fine statement that came out of the election in 1984, in the crusade for prosperity that

went across this great Province of ours. At that time, the two Brians were not going to be afraid to inflict prosperity on our Province after so many years of being in the dark. I am sure that everybody in the Province looked forward to this infliction of prosperity. Many of us feel that in this great country of Canada Newfoundland has possibly not gotten its rightful share from Confederation. There was a time, back some years ago, when Ontario was the only province that really was a have province. But during the governments that have ensued since the 1950s, the 1960s, the 1970s and down to the 1980s, we have seen the rest of the provinces of Canada achieve a degree of equality within Confederation, all except the Province of Newfoundland.

Now, the Province of Newfoundland has been continually dragged behind, and moreso since the present administration has taken over. There were some joint leaps into the twentieth century during the Liberal Administration of Mr. Smallwood, but since the Tory Government has taken over it seems that we have fallen farther behind in the equality we are supposed to be achieving in Confederation. We hear from members over there the salient cry any time anyone stands up on this side of the House, who gave away our industry? I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, who gave away our industry, members opposite by not taking the approach that they should have taken, and by not being able to sit down and negotiate and develop what we have here now. This is the deal: Do not be locked in history. Get out of that syndrome of being locked in history and come out and plan. You see, the government was elected but what I

think members opposite have forgotten is that they were elected to govern, not to reflect on the past.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. GILBERT:

May I have silence, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

I am making a great speech here and I do not want interruptions either from my colleagues or those over there. Government is elected to govern, not to reflect on the past but to look to the future and to bring Newfoundland into the twentieth century and into equality with the rest of the provinces in Canada. We are not getting this from that government and this is why we have put this resolution forward, because we know that this government has a problem negotiating with anybody. We have heard it continuously from the last five administrations that there is no form of negotiation as far as this government is concerned.

The third WHEREAS: "WHEREAS the Premier has not been keeping our representative in the Federal Cabinet adequately informed on Provincial issues and the Province is suffering as a result." Now that is, I think, fairly obvious. You do not have to worry about that. We know that the Premier has not been keeping the federal minister informed at to what is really going on.

MR. MITCHELL:

Give us some facts.

MR. GILBERT:

The member from LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) would not be able to digest facts if he had them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, would you ask the member who contributes so much to debate in this House to shut up?

MR. SPEAKER:

I ask members on both sides to please be silent.

MR. GILBERT:

We know the Premier has not been keeping his federal counterpart informed, the man who was to have helped us bring Newfoundland into equal status with the rest of the provinces of Canada, and we find that those two gentlemen are not even talking to each other now. Now, I think that this is really a crime, but again it shows that the Premier is unable to talk to anyone for any length of time. Here is this man in Ottawa, our representative in Ottawa, the Premier's mentor, the man the Premier patterned himself after, and all of a sudden - he is the man who is going to represent Newfoundland's interests in Ottawa - the Premier is here, his friend, and they are unable to agree, you find them engaged in political one-upmanship. We hear the federal minister coming out and talking about blowing your mind, a phrase the Premier used when he talked about something back in September, when he was getting ready to plan another election and try to blow Newfoundlander's minds with an announcement over a project the Liberal Government had put in place and which he is now claiming as a success, and which is going to create 200 jobs. He was going to sell it for scrap but

now it is a good thing, it is creating 200 jobs.

And we had the federal minister come out and sort of mimic our Premier in saying that he was going to blow our minds with an announcement. He certainly did. He made an announcement that Petro-Canada was going to develop delineation wells off the Terra Nova field on the offshore. The only thing about it he neglected to tell our Premier that there was going to be an announcement on the offshore, which again sort of shows that this resolution is a very apt and should be acted upon by all members of this House.

Every day there is evidence that there is certainly a need for a new approach for members opposite in their dealings with Ottawa if we are ever going to achieve this equality within Confederation that we set out to do in 1949, and did so well for about twenty years. But we have fallen behind in the last fifteen years and I wonder why. I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. It is because of the state of the relationships between the federal government and the provincial government. No matter what form of government we have had in Ottawa, and we have gone through five administrations, two of them the same stripe as members opposite, there was continuous fighting, and now it seems we have reached a point where that administration over there has burnt its bridges with Ottawa. Now, by passing this resolution maybe we can get down and have established some common sense in our dealings with the federal government and get Newfoundland back on track again to come into equality with the rest of the provinces of Canada.

"WHEREAS the fiscal mismanagement already demonstrated by the present administration causes it to need every friend it can get in Ottawa if it is to obtain more money."

I think fiscal mismanagement is proven every day. The Minister of Finance does not know if there is a \$50 million deficit, if there is a \$250 million deficit, or if there is \$1 billion deficit. This is the kind of thing we hear. Then we hear more figures coming up every day. We really have not gotten anything straightened away, and the Finance Minister has not been able to come out and say in this House what exactly the deficit is, whether it is \$4 billion or \$5 billion?

MR. FUREY:

Joey had it at \$700 million.

MR. GILBERT:

It was \$700 million, now we are into all sorts of things. My colleague from St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) is telling me what it was. I would rather the Finance Minister told me exactly what it is, you know, with straightforward facts. My colleague, I am sure, has a rough idea, maybe a better one than the Finance Minister has, who probably does not know what it is anyhow.

This is, I think, a very important 'WHEREAS' in this resolution because it has been demonstrated that there is a serious problem with the finances of Newfoundland and with the budgets that are presented. I think it is very important that the government opposite sit down and negotiate with Ottawa. There is an old saying, 'Do not raise your voice, reinforce your argument', and I think that is what should be done

by the administration over there. We have seen too much raising of voices and the media being brought in to incite the people of Newfoundland: "We are not getting a good deal from Ottawa." You do not have to get the media to do that, the thousands and thousands of unemployed Newfoundlanders know we are not getting a good deal from Ottawa. But is not the reason we are not getting a good deal the administration over there? Is this the reason, because of the inability of those people to negotiate?

MR. TULK:

Have they got a good deal over there?

MR. GILBERT:

We know they have not got a good deal over there. The ability to negotiate has been lost, and this is where we have the problems, and this is why we are speaking on this resolution. This is why it was put forward, to highlight the fact that there is a very serious defect in the relationship between members opposite and the federal government, no matter what political stripe.

I feel that there is certainly a time to raise your voice, but it is not in public. When you sit down in negotiations, then you are able to raise your voice and then you are able to make your points. I am sure you will be heard an awful lot better, Mr. Speaker, than if you do it for the media. The only people to hear it then are people who really cannot make any decisions. The people who are going to make decisions are the people in Ottawa.

I will be locked in history a little bit right now, and I will go back to the Diefenbaker -

Smallwood days. I think that everybody will remember that Mr. Diefenbaker and Mr. Smallwood really did not like each other publicly. They got out and shouted and screamed and went at each other hammer and tongs. But if you look at the situation, you will find that there were agreements signed all the time regardless of the relationship between Mr. Diefenbaker and Mr. Smallwood in public. It was the time that the hospital deal, the trade schools, the Trans-Canada Highway, all those programmes were signed. These two fellows fought each other publicly, but people realized what it was: it was political rhetoric and they were quite prepared to accept it. But they knew, at the same time, that there were people going back and forth to Ottawa and negotiating deals, which is what should have been done since this administration came to power.

MR. W. CARTER:

I think Moores and Jamieson did that.

MR. GILBERT:

Yes. As my colleague from Twillingate just pointed out, Frank Moores and Don Jamieson seemed to have gotten together and worked out some pretty good deals between Newfoundland and Ottawa, yet the Premier of this Province and his political mentor in Ottawa are not able to get together to work out a deal for Newfoundland.

I have heard the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands say this year that he was unable to get a subsidiary agreement signed for forestry, I have heard the Minister of Transportation say he was unable to get a subsidiary transportation agreement signed, and they cannot get one for

agriculture.

You know the whole deal about it is those people have said they just cannot get an agreement signed with Ottawa. Now there is something wrong. I have had occasions to write the federal minister concerning the transportation agreement. He comes back and tells me that he has an agreement signed for \$180 million and I write the provincial minister and he says he is working on another agreement. The federal minister denies it. Then in the \$180 million agreement that is signed, there is a subsidiary agreement in there for \$10 million to be spent in the federal minister's riding where the rest of the unpaved roads in Newfoundland still remain unpaved, 3,300 kilometers of them.

I asked the minister the question last year and I got the answer that there was 3,300 kilometers of unpaved road in Newfoundland in May of 1986. That was also a question that was taken from the transportation budget committee meetings in May of 1984 and I got the same answer. So in other words there had not been much progress made. Then I get the posturing on the part of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) that he is not able to get an agreement signed with Ottawa.

MR. FUREY:

I wonder why. Ask crooked mouth.

MR. GILBERT:

Why are they are not able to get an agreement signed? This is the whole deal. There is a negotiation process which everybody realizes in politics. Yes, there is a very serious part of politics aside from the bluster and the shouting and the

screaming. There is a part where you sit down and do the job that you are elected for, and that is to govern. This is the thing that this government has not done and obviously has no intention of doing.

AND WHEREAS the Premier has, in an attempt to excuse his own mismanagement and incompetence, passed blame to and burnt bridges with five successive Federal administrations.

Now the thing about this is the Premier continues not to accept responsibility for anything himself. He passes the blame to the Trudeau Administration, the Clark, the Trudeau, the Turner and now the Mulroneys. It is interesting to note that the Premier passes on the blame for everything. He does not take any responsibility. He does not have the will to govern and he passes the blame.

When someone gets up and asks him a question on labour relations in the Come By Chance thing, the first thing, as he stands to his feet in this House, he says, "I am bailing out the former Liberal administration who left a bill of \$47 million or \$48 million that would have been there but for the fact that I got this going. I am going to create 200 jobs." The only thing he does not say, Mr. Speaker, that it is there and at one time the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) wanted to give it away. It was junk anyhow, he has told this House. Now we find that the Premier is now taking responsibility and saying, "Yes, it is there. But I had \$45 million that was owed by the former Liberal Government, I took over that," he is talking very proud and he stands and he sticks

out his chest and says, "200 jobs I am creating now." As I say, Mr. Speaker, if the Liberal Government had not put that Come By Chance thing there, there would not be any problem about the 200 jobs. There would be another 200 Newfoundlanders unemployed, but they are employed because of the forward thinking of the previous Liberal Administration. There is nothing that that administration over there has done. They sit, fingers in their mouths and do not do anything, no negotiations with anybody.

The whole reason for this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that this government over there has lost the power or the will to negotiate with anybody.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. GILBERT:
Thank you.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
Yield to the hon. the member for Grand Falls.

MR. WARREN:
By all means, the hon. member for Grand Falls. I would kindly yield to the intelligent member for Grand Falls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Forest

Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I will try to be brief and then the hon. member will still have time.

I just want to speak for a few moments on the resolution, Mr. Speaker, because I took great delight in reading the wording of the resolution. I think the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), in fact, made an interesting point today when he spoke about whether or not this resolution should have been accepted by the Chair to begin with, because it is full of some pretty nasty things and normally a resolution should not be that provocative.

Mr. Speaker, over the years in the development of our parliamentary system -

MR. WARREN:

He is calling for a quorum again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

A quorum call, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order.

MR. EFFORD:

I did not stand on a point of order. This is a quorum call, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I asked if you had stood on a point of order.

MR. EFFORD:

I did not hear you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

Quorum

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is a quorum present.

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, it was not the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) this time, that is one thing I will say.

MR. EFFORD:

Yes it was.

MR. SIMMS:

It probably was his suggestion.

I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, but I think we have a reference somewhere in our practices that might indicate - I am not sure, maybe the Clerk could check it out - that a member, if he does not have the floor, cannot stand on a point of order to call a Quorum Call. That is my understanding of it. Maybe I might be wrong. Check it.

MR. TULK:

You should not question the Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

I am not questioning him. I am offering some advice.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, as I said, over the years in the development of a Parliamentary system it has always been traditional for the

Opposition, in particular, to put forward resolutions that are critical of the government. In fact, it is more than tradition, I guess, it really has become the right of any member of any Parliament on any side of the House to move resolutions on matters of public interest or public importance.

However, Mr. Speaker, in exercising that right to present resolutions, members are expected to base the content of that resolution on solid facts and sensible arguments that are likely to be able to stand up to some pretty vigorous scrutiny and examination. This is as it should be, because otherwise, of course, presenting a resolution simply becomes an opportunity for members to make political points, cheap political points at that, not sincere political points.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the resolution that is presently before us, offered by the Leader of the Opposition for our consideration. One thing we can perceive immediately is that the resolution follows tradition in one respect. It does indeed criticize the administration, or more specifically, the hon. the Premier, in each of the nine 'WHEREASES' contained in the resolution. Now, let us see how well the resolution stands up to the other expectations, such as whether it is based on solid argument and solid facts and so on.

The first 'WHEREAS', Mr. Speaker, in this resolution which says, 'WHEREAS federal - provincial relations have never been at a lower ebb, and the promised great new era of co-operation and consultation has never appeared,' means, Mr. Speaker, that obviously

members have very limited memories. I cannot believe that their memories are that short. Because, in fact, Mr. Speaker, over the years there have been some pretty low ebbs in the federal - provincial tide since we joined Canada back in 1949. I do not need to remind hon. members of all of those.

I am sure everybody remembers the days of the gun slinger, the days of the finger, the days of fuddle duddle. So, to say that federal - provincial relations have never been at a lower ebb than they are today is obviously a fallacy. It is not fact. It is a fallacy.

One of the other items, Mr. Speaker, that comes to mind -

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want the hon. gentleman to stand up here, make a fool of himself and mislead this House. He is not misleading the House, he is contradicting the Premier, his leader, who said the very same statement and that in fact he had had better relations with the former Liberal government, and that included the Trudeau Government, the gun slinger, from the last two years of that administration than he has ever had with the present Mulroney Government so it must be lower than it was then.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) will have his opportunity to put his points. I respectfully ask him to give me the ten minutes that I have or so to try to put forth my particular points. I mean that is a difference of opinion, obviously, but all I am saying is that it is not a fact or it is not based on fact, which traditionally these types of resolutions should be based on.

Mr. Speaker, he also goes on to say in the second WHEREAS, 'WHEREAS the economic situation in Newfoundland and Labrador and the financial position of the Province calls for the closest possible cooperation and consultation between the federal and provincial orders of government if prosperity is ever to be inflicted on this Province'.

Mr. Speaker, what does the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and members opposite think that we have been doing in the past? What does he really think we have been doing in the past? There are all kinds of examples, Mr. Speaker. Ministers here on this side of the House are in contact every day with Ottawa or their officials are, every day to consult on one thing or another.

A good example is in my own case of forestry. It was only a year or so ago I had the honour of signing a \$48 million forestry agreement, the largest one ever signed in this Province which delivers 1,200 jobs a year. There is an \$180 million highway

agreement. All of those things were done in consultation and cooperation. So, Mr. Speaker, obviously we have been fulfilling our responsibilities in that regard.

In the WHEREASes three and four, if there is any such word, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition says, 'WHEREAS the Premier has not been keeping our representative in the federal Cabinet adequately informed on provincial issues and that the Province is suffering as a result'.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to speak for the Premier. He is more than capable of addressing this unsupported claim but it must be obvious to the Leader of the Opposition that there has been constant dialogue with Mr. Crosbie over the last number of years since he has been the minister. A lot of that dialogue, in fact, Mr. Speaker, has been in public. So to ignore that is obviously just doing it for their own purposes and nothing else. You can hardly mention the others name without it being on television or in the newspapers and so on. So there is dialogue, private, public and otherwise. So obviously the Leader of the Opposition has not been paying attention. I guess he has been too busy trying to find out what it is really like to be an ordinary worker in this Province over the last few months.

So, Mr. Speaker, those kinds WHEREASes are not based on solid facts or even good arguments for that matter. There are other points in the resolution, Mr. Speaker, dealing with fiscal matters. I will leave that to other hon. members such as the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) who has a great deal of

experience and knowledge in those matters and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) might have an opportunity hopefully.

However, Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition states that 'the Province needs a Federal Government that is more sensitive to the need for greater regional development funding, better formulas for equalization payments and more more appropriate economic policies', he is simply using a basic motherhood issue to try to make political points in this particular debate. All that is true. We have been saying that for years.

We have been saying it when there was a Liberal administration. We say it now. We have been saying for years and we are pleased that the Liberals are finally supporting our position on that particular issue. It is the first time they have ever had anything to say about it. Does he sincerely think that the Liberals, under Mr. Trudeau, were more sensitive to this Province? Surely, Mr. Speaker, they are not that naïvé. I do not think they are, at least.

Mr. Speaker, the accusation in the resolution that the Premier has blamed five successful federal administrations for his alleged failings is the cheapest kind of shot that you could put forth, especially in a resolution so significant as this, the first one put forth in this House by any particular party. He suggests, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier is burning bridges.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you there is a big difference in burning bridges and standing up for the rights of the people of

this Province and that, Mr. Speaker, is what we have been doing as a government and clearly what the Premier has been doing. He would probably prefer that we would be quiet on these matters and not speak out on behalf of the people. I suggest that is the converse of what he is trying to say but obviously the people of this Province do not agree in any event with that kind of a comment. They have elected the Premier and this government three times and the comments that the hon. member makes in his resolution obviously do not hold any water, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, once again the Leader of the Opposition, if you look at WHEREAS number seven, is trying to blame this administration for the mess left by the Upper Churchill sell-out. Mr. Speaker, we have been trying to clean up this particular issue ever since the last Liberal administration was kicked out of office by the people of this Province. It was in fact the mishandling of the Churchill Falls deal by the predecessors of members opposite that created this problem in the first place. The hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) knows full well what I am talking about. They did such a good job, Mr. Speaker, of creating a problem, in fact, that they left precious little in the way of openings for us to try and solve the problem.

The reference in WHEREAS number eight, the WHEREAS on the Hibernia development, Mr. Speaker, barely deserves a mention. This is a major project surrounded by very complex issues, as anybody knows. It covers a wide variety of interests and bringing the final Hibernia deal together, under the capable leadership of the new

Minister of Energy (Mr. Ottenheimer), will be a major accomplishment. But, I predict, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition will have to bow down and congratulate us one of these days when we pull this off and I predict that it will come in my own opinion.

Mr. Speaker, just to move on to the last WHEREAS before the resolution, it deals with the \$150 million that we are seeking from the Government of Canada. We have difficulties. Everybody knows we have difficulties. We always have and have for 400 years. We have been in a period of restraint. It is nothing new or eye opening but there are reasons and explanations and I suggest the hon. Leader of the Opposition wait for the budget to come down.

To get to the crux of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I do not want to be too long because my colleague for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) does want to have a few words on this. The resolution calls for the establishment of 'a civil relationship with the Federal Administration and fully involve our representative in the Federal Cabinet in discussions on all provincial issues.' That, Mr. Speaker, is about as hollow a point as it is possible to make. We already have a civil relationship with the federal administration. We are certainly striving to ensure that our cabinet representative is involved in provincial issues. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that given the events of the last month or so, in fact, we can be sure that from now on our federal cabinet representative will be sure he is in constant and close touch with the provincial issues.

So the first part of the resolution really is redundant because it is in fact being done now and the second part and final part of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, is seeking unanimous support for his efforts to defeat the Mulroney government in the next federal election. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask members opposite: What kind of a world do they really think we are living in? Does the Leader of the Opposition, I wonder, really believe that hon. members are going to throw in their lot and campaign vigorously against the present government simply because we are having a difference of opinion now on a particular issue?

MR. FUREY:

The Premier has not decided yet.

MR. SIMMS:

Did they ever hear of the secret ballot? It will be up to the public to decide whether or not this particular government stays in office. They will make their choice and it will not be done with the help of the Leader of the Opposition.

Therefore, the whole resolution is nonsensical. It is silly, it is an embarrassment. It must be an embarrassment to members opposite that this would be their first major resolution to be presented in the House of Assembly. It is so insincere it is not even funny. They are trying to score cheap political points without any doubt. I presume the converse would be true, that if approaches between the federal and provincial governments improve, if the situation improves, is he suggesting then that we should immediately join together and put out lot in with the Liberals to try to defeat the Liberal Party

federally in the next election? That is about as silly as the suggestion he makes in this resolution, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker.

In any event, bearing in mind that my friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) wants to have a few words, I just want to say this: The long and short of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, is that you cannot as a government lay down, roll over and play dead.

You have to speak up on issues that are important to this Province. You have to fight. You have to be stand up and be counted. All the things that the members opposite have not been noted for doing in the past. But contrary to the myth that they are trying to exploit in the public's mind, contrary to that myth, everything in this Province does not stop and it does not mean that everything is on a bad course simply because we have the intestinal fortitude to speak out on behalf of the people, Mr. Speaker, which is something that members opposite clearly have no idea of and have never done in their lives.

I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if they will ever have the opportunity to do it as long as they take the negative, critical approach that they have been noted for taking in the last six or seven years, Mr. Speaker. I certainly will not be supporting this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I did not particularly intend to get into this debate. But having listened to the drivel and the twaddle that I just had to listen to, Mr. Speaker, from the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), I could not resist.

Mr. Speaker, he talks about the gun slinger. Now I will tell the member for Grand Falls there is one thing different about the gun slinger era than the era we are seeing in Ottawa today and that is the country respected and believed in the ability of the gun slinger to govern. In Mr. Mulroney, we have mistrust and suspicion. This man, Mr. Speaker, who was elected two years ago with the biggest majority in Canadian history, is going to set a record. He is going down to defeat simply because the people of Canada know they cannot believe him.

Now I would like to be kind to the Premier and suggest the reason the Premier has gone and taken on Mulroney and company is because of the kind of a corrupt administration they are running, but that is not the real reason, Mr. Speaker.

This Premier has got a thought process, and here is the thought process:

MR. REID:

That is more than you are showing.

MR. FLIGHT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid) got mad and was going to come across the House swinging his big fist

because of something I said. I will tell the member this: I will not say anything to provoke him, because, well, he should just sit there. Keep quiet! Mr. Speaker, protect me from the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. SIMMS:

You should practise what you preach.

MR. SPEAKER:

Could we have silence, please?

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I suspect the Premier of Newfoundland has a thought process. There are three processes, an issue is raised and the first thing he thinks to himself, he says, 'How will my handling of this issue impact on my image? In handling this issue, how will my image be perceived by the people of Newfoundland?' And secondly, 'How will my action in this issue impact on the image of the P.C. Party and his government?' The third thought process is, 'What will be my actions here mean substantively to Newfoundland?'

Now that is the way this Premier thinks, Mr. Speaker. That is doing a grave injustice to the people of this Province and to the people of Newfoundland. The reason that Mr. Peckford has gone to Ottawa and taken on Mulroney is not because he is so concerned about the substantive issue. He realizes that Brian Mulroney is going down the drain, Mr. Speaker, and he is going to go ahead of him. He realized that in Ottawa he has a Tory Government that he helped put there that is doing a disservice in this country to try to govern that cannot govern, that the people are going to flick out, and he suddenly sat back and said,

'I cannot be seen associating with that crowd. I have to go. Politics is more important to me than the issues.' He went, Mr. Speaker, and he started to fight. Mr. Speaker, talk about provincial/federal relations.

Can anyone in this House stand and tell me since 1949 when the Premier of this Province openly and in public called the Federal Minister of Fisheries a liar? I will yield my seat here if somebody can tell me when any previous politician in this Province called the Federal Minister of Fisheries a liar.

Can anyone tell me, Mr. Speaker, when any member of this House of Assembly since 1949 said that our regional minister from Newfoundland was betraying Newfoundland?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

MR. FLIGHT:

Name one. Name me the member of any party in this Province, on any side of this House, who said that our provincial federal member, whom we look to and respect, irregardless of party choice, was betraying Newfoundland? Name me a politician from this Province, Mr. Speaker, who said the federal government of whatever party, whatever stripe, is more interested in taking care of France's needs than they are of Newfoundland? No wonder John Crosbie is taking off the gloves and you guys are going to know what it is to make John Crosbie mad. That was the first indication of what is to come ladies and gentlemen. It is too bad the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) is not in here.

Mr. Speaker, it was no coincidence that John Crosbie bought Masse and Hopper and Mr. Lundrigan into St. John's and on twenty minutes notice, called up the Premier to make the biggest announcement that has ever made in this Province for the last ten years. Do you think there was a coincidence in that? Do you know what the message was? The message was to Peckford that, "You mean nothing to me. I send the money down. I call the shots and you will pay the price." Month after month after month, announcement, after announcement, after announcement until John Crosbie is vindicated, you are going to get it. You will get it on issue after issue after issue until John Crosbie feels that he is vindicated, that he has defeated the people who called him a betrayer of Newfoundland, that called his colleague a liar, until he feels vindicated against those people, and the kind of people who would do that. They did it for their own political benefit. That is all it was done for.

Mr. Speaker, we have good provincial/federal relations. We have three Federal Cabinet Ministers, Siddon, Crosbie and Clark trying to decide between them who is supposed to have notified Newfoundland on the French deal.

Mr. Speaker, there is something else that has not gone unnoticed in this debate either, in this cod war. Our Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) on public television said that he had heard from Siddon on a Wednesday and the Paris meeting did not take place, Mr. Speaker, until Monday. Well now, I have had some people who are not plugged in that well and they said to me, 'Well, if the concern was purely putting

Northern cod on the table, if that was the only concern, then would not the bells start to ring? Would not the antennas start going up? How come the Minister of Fisheries or the Premier did not raise the alarm publicly on Thursday? Mr. Crosbie would have been notified. He would have realized what was going on.' He admitted after that he did not know.

Mr. Speaker, one can make the argument that they were not interested in taking the cod off the table. They were not interested in the substantive issue. They were interested in getting an issue they could build on politically. A lot of people in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, are noticing. Now, that may not be possible but I am telling you the people are wondering about it, people in the hon. member's district are wondering.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mine?

MR. FLIGHT:

Yes, yours. Mr. Speaker, standing up for the rights of Newfoundlanders. I will tell you one thing the people of Newfoundland have done, Mr. Speaker, they have seen - it has taken three elections - but they have seen through the bluff. They have seen through the bluff of standing up for Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. The Premier wrapping himself in the flag and calling elections, standing up for Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not start getting some good government from this Premier and this Cabinet that stands up for Newfoundland, there will be no one left in Newfoundland to stand up for. Mr.

Speaker, there will be no one left to stand up for. They will be all in Alberta and British Columbia and Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost 20,000 and some odd people in this Province, mostly young people, since this Premier has been governing this Province, if you want to call what he is doing to this Province governing. I can think of a better word but it would be unparliamentary.

No, Mr. Speaker, provincial/federal relations have never, never, never gone to a lower ebb. It cannot! There is no way! When you have a federal regional minister attempting in every way possible to undermine the provincial government of the Province he comes from and has come very close to saying so publicly, how can you have relationships between a federal and provincial government at any lower point? These people here, the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, may feel there is some political gain by setting up this kind of an atmosphere, but it is the people that they represent out there who are going to pay the price.

Newfoundland is caught in the middle of the fight, Mr. Speaker, between those two parties, between the Premier and his federal minister. He went on T.V. one night and he said, 'I do not know how to say this.' He said, 'I supported him. He brought me into politics and it hurts me to be critical of his performance.' How green and how stupid do the ministry and the Premier and anybody else think that the ordinary Newfoundlander is to believe that tripe when they see what has happened.

Mr. Speaker, tell me, maybe the hon. the Minister of Development, who has been so involved with the development of this Province -

MR. TULK:

He is Treasury Board President now.

MR. FLIGHT:

He is with Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) now, he was in Development. That was when we had some great development in this Province. You know, he was going to deliver an aluminum smelter.

MR. TULK:

Oh, yes. What happened to that?

MR. FLIGHT:

Maybe the President of Treasury Board will tell us about the aluminum smelter he was suppose to deliver as a result of this great relationship between the federal and the provincial governments.

MR. WINDSOR:

We are working on it.

MR. FLIGHT:

He is working on. It is an expensive study, Mr. Speaker. A lot of jaunts to the mid East, to China, Korea, all over the world, but I am not aware yet there is an aluminum smelter on the drawing board.

MR. TULK:

He is a rickshaw minister.

MR. FLIGHT:

The rickshaw minister.

Mr. Speaker, when the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) stands up and tells us how great we have done and how great we are doing, somebody referred to the provincial debt one day in this debate.

MR. WINDSOR:

You are relevant. Do you realize that?

MR. FLIGHT:

Sure I am relevant.

MR. WINDSOR:

It is the time first ever.

MR. FLIGHT:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I tell you that that minister has not always been relevant. I have been in this House, Mr. Speaker, when that minister has not been relevant. When he came back from his jaunts, Mr. Speaker, and talked about the great things that will flow from the fact that he had been on a jaunt around the world, he was relevant about his trip, but he was very irrelevant in what he had accomplished, Mr. Speaker.

I have made all of the points I wanted to make on this. I just want to draw this to the attention of, particularly the Minister of Treasury Board: When I got elected, Mr. Speaker, in 1975, we talked about the results of good federal/provincial relations. We talked about the development of the Lower Churchill, one of the greatest assets this Province has or will ever have, far more valuable to Newfoundland than ever Hibernia will be, far more valuable than ever Terra Nova will be. The capital cost of developing the Lower Churchill that will pump \$500 million a year into the economy of this Province, the capital cost was about \$1 billion. That is what it would have cost. In 1987 it will cost in excess of \$5 billion to develop the Lower Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, there are some experts, including Newfoundland Hydro, who suggest that on its

own, by itself, it may not be economical feasible to try to develop the Lower Churchill at that kind of a capital cost. Now, because of the procrastination of this crowd, because of the inability of that Premeir and his ministry, Mr. Speaker, we have allowed one of the greatest resourses of this Province to go undeveloped. It may never be developed. There is no indication, Mr. Speaker, that they have the desire any more to develop it. How about that for a performance? Is that a great performance?

Mr. Speaker, in the process of doing nothing, absolutely and totally nothing to improve the way of life in this Province, this hon. crowd has taken the public debt of this Province from less than \$1 billion in 1971 to in excess of \$5 billion today.

The new member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) knows what it is to keep a ledger. Let us take the ledger in 1971 and let us put on one side of the ledger \$1 billion debt, and it was less than \$1 billion -

MR. TULK:

\$825 million.

MR. FLIGHT:

- and let us put on the other side of the sheet the assets acquired by running up that debt. We will talk about all the schools that were built between 1949 and 1971, the electrification system, the water and sewer systems and the hospitals. You can call Come By Chance a lemmon, but it is there. If the \$2 million was spent, it still counts. If I give my son \$100 today and tell him to buy a car and he buys a lemmon, I will chastize him because it is a

lemmon, but at least he has accounted for the \$100.

Now, let us put everything, the linerboard, the Upper Churchill, the electrification systems, the schools, the hospitals, the roads, down on one side of the ledger. That is what we have. It cost us \$1 billion. Now let us do the ledger from 1971 to 1987. Let us list the \$5 billion debt. Let us start listing on the other side of the ledger what we have to offset the debt. What did we get for \$5 billion?

I understand the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) is going to speak next. Maybe the member for Torngat will take a look at the example I raised, and take a look at the ledger. The debt is fixed. It is there. It is practically \$5 billion more in 1987 than it was in 1971. That is fixed. That does not change.

Will the member for Torngat stand up and list for me, on the other side of the ledger, what we have to show for that debt? If he does, and if it is even close, Mr. Speaker, to what was accomplished for the \$1 billion prior to 1971, then I will concede that this government has done a good job, that this government may well have had the interests of Newfoundland at heart, they may well have done a good job governing. This government has done nothing for the people of this Province.

MR. TULK:

Five minutes.

MR. FLIGHT:

I do not even need five minutes. I have made my points, Mr. Speaker. I now allow the member for Torngat Mountains to get up, and I would like for him to go

with the ledger.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In reading The Telegram today, I understand the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) has a new position, effective today. He is now in the shadow cabinet for environment. I would like to congratulate the hon. member on his new appointment.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by cluing up what he asked me to do, to try and balance up the ledger from 1971 up to now. I would like to tell the hon. member that three years ago, when a famous Canadian politician by the name of Jean Chretien came down to this Province and tried to sell the offshore to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, this government said no, but the Liberal Party said yes. This issue alone will balance out the ledger. If we had listened to Jean Chretien at that time, we would have given away the offshore.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the hon. member, if ever the ledger can be balanced, there is our chance to balance the ledger. We have got Hibernia. We are going to develop it at our pace.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman also wants to talk about federal - provincial relations, let us look at the number of years that Mr. Trudeau's Cabinet ministers were coming down, back and forth, to St. John's. I am

surprised that the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans today did not get up and say at one time, on any occasion, that he ever disagree with the Liberal Government in Ottawa. Did the hon. member ever say to Mr. Chretien, to Romeo Leblanc on the fishery, did the hon. member ever say to those guys in Ottawa that we do not agree with you?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member also mentioned the polls. The Premier has picked on this fishery issue to save himself at the polls. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will tell the hon. gentleman that I can understand why some members are upset over there. The hon. gentlemen opposite had the opportunity to unite with the other two parties in this House for a unanimous resolution and, for some reason, three members opposite decided that it must be debated and other issues must be raised.

Subsequently, the Leader of the Liberal Party, the House Leader of the Liberal party (Mr. Tulk) and the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) decided to go up to Ottawa. They decided to go to Toronto first to meet with Mr. Peterson and his bunch of colleagues. At the same time, I was in Ottawa and there was a request came to meet with the PC caucus in Ottawa. So, Mr. Speaker, you can understand that the gentlemen opposite are very, very upset because they knew the population in Newfoundland and Labrador were against the political charade that they were advocating. They wanted Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to believe that they were supporting Newfoundland and Labrador's cause on the French cod deal. You know what, Mr. Speaker,

not one over there had the gumption to say publicly that they would come out and unanimously support the government. Not one of them, Mr. Speaker, not one of them.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), with all due respect to him, I have to say to the hon. gentleman that if there is ever a politician over there that wished he was over here with us and wished that we would accept him over here and is waiting for the call, it is he. Mr. Speaker, I do not see why the hon. gentleman, with his calibre, could not find accommodation on this side.

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. BAKER:

I would like to point out something that the hon. member does not know in relation to what he has been saying now in the last minute or so and that is that the offer was already made to me about six or seven years ago by a previous Premier and I turned it down. I think the offer was a lot attractive than the hon. member got when he crossed the floor.

MR. MITCHELL:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

I find that the hon. member from Gander was very presumptuous in getting to his feet when my good friend here had not mentioned which member over there he was talking about. I thought it was pretty presumptuous for him to jump up on that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, to conclude on the hon. gentleman's remark, I would like to say to the hon. gentleman, to make sure that everything is clear, I will say the offer was much more attractive because there was a bunch of men on this side of this of the House that are fighting for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

That is the reason, Mr. Speaker. The crowd over here are not fighting for political aims. They are fighting for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, who they represent. I am sure the hon. gentlemen opposite if they would put aside their political ambitions and think about those people who voted by secret ballot, they would have come out in fullfledged support of this resolution and we would not be going back to the House tomorrow and debating the French cod war resolution again. In fact, the resolution would have been all taken care of three weeks ago if the hon. gentlemen would have agreed. Mr. Speaker, the Leader

of the Opposition -

Oh, I got to stop, Mr. Speaker, already the hon. gentleman is over here. It did not take very long at all, Mr. Speaker.

It is also noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, to see this garbage resolution that the Leader of the Opposition has presented and to know that the Leader of the Opposition is not here to close off the debate on his own resolution. The Leader of the Opposition has to be ashamed of the garbage in this resolution. He is not here at twenty minute to six to close off the debate. So you can see, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution cannot be as important as hon. members may think.

Mr. Speaker, where this resolution is so varied, there are a couple of items that I think I want to bring to the attention of hon. members. I am sure, if we look through that resolution, we will find that I will not be out of order, Mr. Speaker. There is a concern of mine that has been happening in Labrador for the past week or so. It does concern our natural resources. It does concern our human resources. Mr. Speaker, that is the illegal hunting of caribou.

On Sunday night past I was hand delivered a petition signed by some 200 members of the hunting society in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. However, Mr. Speaker, I cannot present it in the House because the petition is not worded for the House of Assembly. Hopefully, in due course, I will have one. I could not present it in the House because it is not worded in the proper manner, and subsequently, it could not be

presented. Like this resolution, it does concern human and natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to note, four or five years ago the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans made a trip along the North Coast of Labrador and they met with the Inuit fishermen. They advised them that if they do not slow down or catch less char in the various bays and coves, that in a number of years it would be overfished and, subsequently, there would not be any char available. So, Mr. Speaker, what did the Inuit people do? Naturally, for a while they thought it was pretty hard. Up until today not one Inuit fisherman has disobeyed this regulation, disobeyed this law, because they were looking at tomorrow.

On the other hand, we have another Native group in the Province, the Innu, who have decided to defy the law. I do not condone any laws that are broken, whether it is speeding, as I do sometimes myself, or other things, Mr. Speaker. I do not condone laws being broken. Subsequently, I do not condone the actions that were taken by the Indians in the Mealy Mountains at the present time. So I thought, Mr. Speaker, I may not get the opportunity again to express my views.

I am concerned that this herd has been built up to a point that we were almost ready to have a controlled cull and now, not only the Innu, but other people in Labrador are going to suffer as a consequence.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is shameful, on the other hand, to know the hon. gentleman from St. John's

East (Mr. Long), who is not in his seat now, has shown support for a group of individuals in our Province who are breaking the laws of the Province. I think it is disgraceful that any member could come into this House, being elected by people in this Province eighteen years and over - I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if the people in St. John's East knew that that hon. member - I would say the same thing if he were here now - was going to support the breaking of the laws of this Province, they would not have sent him here. I am sure they would not, Mr. Speaker. I think this is disgraceful for any one of the fifty-two members in this House to agree with breaking the laws. If the laws are bad, so be it, they have to be changed.

MR. FLIGHT:

You have a lot to change then.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. member opposite, 'Does the hon. member agree with hunting illegally?' If he does, why does he not get up and say so?

I should say to the hon. member that when I was sitting back in the same seat he is sitting in now, I presented a petition in this House from the people of Rigolet that wanted a caribou killed in the Mealey Mountains. The then the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) now, came up and said, 'No, I cannot support a kill.' I went back to my constituents in Rigolet and told them so and they agreed. They obeyed the law.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

I stood up in the House and I will stand up now and say that the laws must be obeyed. If the hon. gentlemen opposite -

MR. FLIGHT:

Hire more game wardens, boy.

MR. WARREN:

It is not game wardens that are needed in this instance, it is common sense, Mr. Speaker.

I only have another five minutes. I see the hon. House Leader over there laughing and that but I am sure the hon. House Leader knows what transpired between Mr. Chretien and the hon member here. I would think the hon. gentleman knows. Now, the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) was not around at that time but I am sure they know that Mr. Chretien could not twist my arm to follow a path that was complete destruction for this Province. Now, the Opposition House Leader did not object to Mr. Chretien at the time and, Mr. Speaker, he is not objecting against Mr. Chretien or Mr. Turner today.

Mr. Speaker, I have to laugh at the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). Does the hon. gentleman remember the time that we really got upset with our federal colleagues? My friend for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) told me today that a particular minister came down and gave us all little gold pins to keep us quiet. My colleague for Port au Port knew he could not go out and bluff his constituents in Port au Port and, Mr. Speaker, I could not go up and bluff the people of Torngat Mountains, that the Liberal Party were the best for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I can go on and on.

I have to tell the hon. gentlemen before I close that there are three things the Opposition have to do before they are overtaken by an official opposition from the NDP. The first thing, and I do not want to say this to loud, but I am getting the word all around Newfoundland and Labrador, do what you are doing now behind the man's back and get rid of your leader. Three or four groups of your people are ganging up on your leader. The word is out there and we can name who they are. You drove the knife in your previous leader's back and the previous leader's back before that.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the only outstanding leader that they had over there for some time, the late 'Don', and even with him they were driving the knife in his back. I should say to the hon. gentlemen, if they want to keep in opposition, and maybe increase your seats, is get rid of your leader, number one. The second thing, I am sure the caucus over there, and there are bright individual members of the House of Assembly over there. I can see the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) looking very attentively and I would not doubt at all if the hon. member for Naskaupi would not mind sitting over on this side either.

I should say the Liberal Party has betrayed the people of Newfoundland and Labrador over and over again, but the biggest mistake they made was when the Leader of the Liberal Party wrote back to the Premier and said, 'We will not agree with opening the House unless you get the electronic media here, and unless we debate other issues.' He was more or less saying there were more issues in this Province than

the French cod war. Now I would say it is disgraceful, Mr. Speaker, where we could have all the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and all parties in this House unanimously agreeing with a resolution.

With all due respect to my hon. colleague the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), in ten minutes today we unanimously approved a resolution about the olympic torch, a good resolution. All we are asking for is one day extra for the torch to go to other parts of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Here we had a resolution on the French cod war that effects every Newfoundlander and Labradorian, and the Leader of the Liberal Party would not give consent to debate such a resolution.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would suggest to the hon. member who is going to close up this debate, that he get up in shame and say, "Mr. Speaker, we will have a vote."

Thank you, very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It is now twenty minutes to six and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition normally would have the right to conclude the debate. Since he is not present, I would recognize the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I have listened over the years to the unquestionable wisdom and

council of the gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). I have almost always taken his advice. The very rare occasions on which I did not take his advice was to my pain and dire consequence, and so I shall again today take his closing advice that I, in closing the debate, ought to abjectly apologize to the House for this particular resolution.

You see, Mr. Speaker, as you will be aware, in this House you take members at their word and the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) has told us in the last hour that there is nothing wrong at all with the relationship with Ottawa. He said that and I take him at his word. Particularly what I take at his word the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) who also told us that the relationship is absolutely hunky dory and very savoury in every respect. The gentleman from Torngat Mountains also assures us that everything is okay.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, the only difficulty I have is not with my good friend from Torngat Mountains or the gentlemen from Grand Falls or St. John's North, not at all with that, what I have a concern with, Mr. Speaker, is the vile misrepresentation of the facts being perpetrated on the Newfoundland people by a fellow by the name of John Crosbie. He is actually, Mr. Speaker, going around this Province saying terrible things like this. He is saying, 'the Province has to clean up its act.' Where does this person, Mr. Speaker, get the right to go around this Province and contradict gentlemen of the stature of the gentleman from Torngat Mountains and Grand Falls? Where does he get the

gall, Mr. Speaker?

This one time Newfoundlander who immigrated to Ottawa going around saying, 'We should clean up our act!' Why does he not clean up his act?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Why does he not get his facts together? Listen to him, Mr. Speaker!

On February 26, according to this newspaper report, he took the gloves off and came out swinging at the PC Premier and his government. I say in defence of that PC Premier and his government, why would he do a thing like that, Mr. Speaker, when we have the unquestioned word of the gentleman from Grand Falls and St. John's North and Torngat and others who tell us that everything is absolutely hunky dory?

So yes, Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, of course, I apologize. In the absence of the gentleman who moved this, who put down this resolution, I apologize on his behalf and on behalf of every member here for even suggesting, Mr. Speaker, for a second that everything was not hunky dory. Here we are, Mr. Speaker, poor Liberals that we are, playing into the hands of this fellow Crosbie. I mean how stupid can we be!

MR. WARREN:

Who is the author?

MR. SIMMONS:

The author is Pat Doyle of The Evening Telegram, another man of great reputation. I do not doubt what he says. He is just reporting the vile comments of

this fellow Crosbie. That is all he is doing. You cannot hold it against him. The villain here is this fellow Crosbie.

Here it is again. "Crosbie accused Premier Peckford and his Finance Minister, Dr. John Collins, of making 'untrue, unfair and unprecedented statements.'"

I mean where is this fellow Crosbie getting off? This is absolutely shameful! Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent what we ought to do is withdraw this resolution and put down another condemning this fellow who immigrated from Newfoundland to Ottawa. Perhaps that is the problem, perhaps that is the sore we got to get rid of, Mr. Speaker, perhaps that is the problem because he does not stop there, he goes on and on and on. See where he went. Here we are. 'Crosbie fed up with the Premier.' Fed up! Fed up with this fighter for Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, he says -

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, not content with having insulted Your Honour earlier today and not really adequately, in my view, withdrawn his comments, he is now insulting a person who is not even present here. I suggest to him that since he is speaking by leave of this House, he should not try our patience too much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ha, ha!

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Sir.

I have always operated under the threats of the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), sometimes with some success and I will try my chances again today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this fellow Crosbie goes on to say that he is not going to take Premier Brian Peckford's "mean minded criticism of the government of Canada lying down." He says, "How it can be felt to be in the Province's interest is beyond me." Then the reporter, and there is no byline on the story so I am not sure who it was but it is a clipping from The Evening Telegram, the reporter said in the story, "Mr. Peckford dedicated much of the speech to more Ottawa bashing."

Now, I do not want to take umbrage of that because I do not know who the reporter is but obviously that reporter could not have known what he was talking about. Obviously, he does not have the kind of information that the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) has you see because he says that everything is civil, you understand. So this reporter must have had his hearing aid turned down. Something must have gone wrong that day. He was allowed a mistake and there it is, Mr. Speaker. Everything is absolutely hunky-dory.

Here we are, here is some more hunky-dory. What is this one? Mr. Crosbie also says, "Day after day of unfounded accusations is

bound to have its effects."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe, Sir, that we in this House, proud Newfoundlanders all, ought to take this fellow Crosbie to task once and for all. He has gone out, taken apart publicly the gentleman that I had the good sense to hire as a teacher, the gentleman from Green Bay (Premier Peckford) -

MR. PEACH:

You hired him?

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, and I am very proud of that. He was a good teacher.

He is out, Mr. Speaker, publicly maligning the reputations of every man and woman on that particular side of the House. I believe as Newfoundlanders we out to band together and send a strong message to John Crosbie that enough is enough. You might have immigrated to Ottawa, John, but that does not give you the right to attack our Premier, because everything is okay. Everything is fine in the State of Denmark, thank you very much. Now, Mr. Speaker, how fine?

Mr. Speaker, we were told by the Premier in, I suppose, an unguarded moment - not that he has many of those - one day that the Province will be into bankruptcy in a couple of years. But thanks be to God, Sir, he recovered quickly, and that unguarded moment soon passed, and two days later he had the facts straight. He assured us of what we already knew, that this place is in marvellous shape, thank you. We have only got \$4 billion in debt. We have only got \$3 billion more than we had when the Tories took over. It was \$900 million at the time. It has only gone up in fifteen years from \$900 million to

\$4 billion. So, Mr. Speaker, everything is okay. There is no problem, and, luckily for us, Mr. Speaker, the Premier, though he had that unguarded moment, recovered quickly and assured us of what we already knew, that we are living in a Paradise.

MR. J. CARTER:

How much is your personal debt?

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the gentleman with great care, to one of the most profound speeches he has ever given, which says volumes. I now say to him, that if he wants to spar, he can do that, or he can use his time more productively by just sitting there or going back down to Dominion and Sobey's and stacking up his savoury, whichever strikes his fancy. But in the meantime, I intend to put out a few more thoughts on this issue. If he wants to babble on, if that entertains him, so be it.

MR. J. CARTER:

You are boring.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier, at another time, had one of those rare, unguarded moments about the railway. But he recovered quickly and he assured us that he was just exaggerating to make a point, 'posturing' I think was the word, to make a point. So once we again we see in this Premier not only a great leader but one who makes a mistake occasionally. Nothing serious, just that the Province might go bankrupt, or something like that, or that he was not telling the truth to Ottawa or something like that, nothing very

serious, Mr. Speaker. But he recovers quickly, admits his human failure, and gets back to his usual perfection.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier also, by the way, told Peter Gzowsky one morning on Morningside on CBC, he actually said on the public airwaves, for all Canada who listen to CBC to hear, he actually told them, Mr. Speaker, in this other unguarded moment, that having been Premier of Newfoundland when the Liberals were in power in Ottawa and now when the Tories are in power in Ottawa, he had to allow publicly that he got more satisfaction from Ottawa when the Liberals were in power than when the Tories were in power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, another unfortunate, unguarded moment that I am sure he recovered from quickly.

Then the next day, Mr. Speaker, in another interview, twenty-four hours after that one, when he was asked on the As It Happens CBC programme in the evening, six-thirty, whether he would work for the federal Tories in the next federal election, he allowed that it would be difficult to do so, and then, in a second response, said no, as things presently stood now, he would not.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, I put before you a gentleman who has had a few human flaws, all of them forgivable; nothing bigger than saying the country is bankrupt; nothing bigger than saying that we were not putting a truthful story to Ottawa on railways; nothing

bigger, Mr. Speaker, than saying that the Liberal Government in Ottawa dealt more fairly and squarely with Newfoundland than the Tories are dealing from Ottawa these days; nothing bigger, Mr. Speaker, than saying that this crowd in Ottawa are so abominably bad that he could not even get out and work for them as a fellow Tory; these are the only mistakes, Mr. Speaker.

I ask you, Sir, as a fair arbiter, to overlook those small, miniscule human failings, and to look at the larger picture because this gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and the government he leads has done some wonderful things.

For example, Mr. Speaker, they had been in government from 1972 until 1982 and, lo and behold, do you know what they discovered, Mr. Speaker, to their credit, do you know what they discovered in 1982, that they had been in government for ten years and had forgotten to get a mandate from the people to create jobs!

Do you know what they did, Mr. Speaker? Boy, they fixed that immediately. They said, this cannot be. We have been here ten full years without a mandate. So they rushed out and got the mandate. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is democracy, Sir. That is real democracy! When it dawned on them they did not have permission from the public to create jobs, to get rid of this terrible 19 per cent unemployment, they fixed it right away. They ran out and got the mandate.

Then, Mr. Speaker, to their credit, not only did they get the mandate, Mr. Speaker, they created jobs. If you do not believe me, ask the gentleman for Port de

Grave (Mr. Efford) because he was talking about the kind of jobs they created today. He gave concrete examples and the minister himself confirmed it. He confirmed it. We have it in writing from the minister.

Then, Mr. Speaker, in 1982 the unemployment rate was only 17 per cent, Mr. Speaker. That is nothing at all, Mr. Speaker, 17 per cent. So, Mr. Speaker, after a couple of more years, since they got their mandate, lo and behold, the unemployment rate has decreased, that is right, decreased by a minus 3 per cent. It is gone down, Mr. Speaker, from 17 to only 20!

So, Mr. Speaker, do not let anybody out their malign this Premier, Mr. Speaker, that is leadership! Let us talk specifics. They wanted, Mr. Speaker, not only a mandate to create jobs, they wanted to inflict some prosperity on this Province with their cousins up in Ottawa. So, Mr. Speaker, they got in bed on a federal/provincial job creation programme. Then, Mr. Speaker, almost as soon as they got in bed, they were out of the bed again. To their credit, Mr. Speaker, they had discovered that they had been sold a bag of goods by Mr. Mulroney and so they decided to go it alone, to their credit.

Mr. Speaker, let us give credit where credit is due. On this Canada-France agreement, here is a Premier, Mr. Speaker, who, to his credit, took the phone call that said, he said this publicly, accepted a phone call that said, around the middle of January, 'By the way, Premier, do you know that we in Ottawa are thinking about the idea of putting on the table

some access to fish in the Northern cod stocks.' He has told us that publicly in press conferences, to his credit. And to his credit also, Mr. Speaker, he told Ottawa what he thought of that idea.

Then, Mr. Speaker, not only did he do that, but he then engaged in an act of wilful blindness, because I put it to you, Sir, that whether that meeting in Paris took place on Friday, Saturday, Sunday or the following Tuesday, the Premier as sure as he dresses in the morning, knew that if Ottawa called to say we are going to put it on the table, he must have known there was a table somewhere, therefore a meeting somewhere at sometime soon. They do not call about things that they are going to do three years down the road. They call about things they are about to do.

But to his credit, Mr. Speaker, not wanting to unnerve unduly the complacent electorate, he kept it all to himself. He saved me the burden of worrying about that for another couple of weeks. Now that is leadership, Mr. Speaker. How long did he save it, Mr. Speaker? He saved it until he knew the thing was done. Then, Mr. Speaker, he started waving his arms, in true Newfie style, Mr. Speaker. He started waving his arms not to undo, because if that were his intention, he would have waved the arms or done something more intelligent weeks before, but the intention was different then, Mr. Speaker. The intention was to create the same kind of charade he was trying to create on railways, the same kind of charade that he was trying to create, Mr. Speaker, on the issue of the bankruptcy of the Province and so on and so forth. Again, Mr. Speaker, in

keeping with my theme, this speech, if you want a title, is called 'In Praise of Famous Men and Woman', 'In Praise of Famous People', because, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be critical. A government that has created those diversions for us from the brute reality of living on this rock deserves our unfettered thanks, Mr. Speaker, our unbridled appreciation for what they have done to make life so wonderful here in this Province on this particular rock.

That is why I say, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution which says in part, "that the present administration be instructed by the House to establish a civil relationship with the present Federal Administration," etc., I say to you that we have been perhaps misguided by the babblings of this fellow Crosbie. Perhaps there is no problem out there at all. Perhaps the relationship is entirely civil.

And I say to you secondly, Sir, where it says, "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House unanimously seek the defeat of the present Federal Administration," what we were doing there, Mr. Speaker, was following the lead of the Premier who said on that As It Happens national radio show that he was not going to work for them. By that he meant that he was going to work against them. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is known widely in this Province that if the Premier is not behind an initiative such as getting the job rate down from seventeen to twenty, it has not got a hope of success, but with his amiable help on jobs, on the financial picture of the Province, on our relationships with Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a

paradise. What kind of paradise?
A fool's paradise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I now put the resolution. All those in favour of the resolution please say 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:
Those against the resolution 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:
I declare the resolution defeated.

MR. TULK:
Division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Stop the clock.

MR. SPEAKER:
Stop the clock.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:
All those in favour of the resolution please rise:

Mr. Flight, Mr. Tulk, the hon. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Lush, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Aylward, Mr. Baker, Mr. Kelland, Mr. Decker.

MR. SPEAKER:
All those against the resolution please rise.

The hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), the

hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge), the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), the hon. the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn), the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell), the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Ottenheimer), the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), the hon. the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt), the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), Mr. Baird, Mr. Patterson, Mr. J. Carter, Mr. Peach, Mr. Parsons, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Warren, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Woodford.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I declare the motion defeated.

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 12, at 3:00 p.m.