



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 3

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

3 March 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Before calling for Statements by Ministers I would like to rule on a point of order raised by the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) yesterday. It is fairly long, so I would ask you to bear with me. Since the election of the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) I have been giving consideration to the question of whether the two members of the New Democratic Party constitute a group for the purposes of the proceedings in this House. I felt that this matter should be raised in the House in the first place rather than trying to rule in a vacuum.

Our Standing Orders are silent. Unlike some other provinces, we do not have an Act of our Legislature to cover the matter. For example, Nova Scotia which has the same number of seats we have, recognizes a third party if they have two members and they had candidates standing for three-quarters of the seats and receive 10 per cent or more of the votes officially recorded. I think a qualification on these lines is necessary; otherwise, for example, if two members broke away from either side they could claim recognition as a group or party even though the electorate had not endorsed this move. It would appear that in New Brunswick one member, with certain qualifications, would be recognized as a Party and the numbers for recognition vary from two in the case of Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan, to twelve in the case of Ontario.

On April 20, 1960 Hansard records

that Mr. Duffy leading a party of two (The United Newfoundland Party) spoke in the Address in Reply immediately following the Leader of the Opposition. At that time there was not an item on the Order Paper equivalent to our 'Statements by Ministers.'

Mr. Smallwood leading a party of four responded to a Ministerial Statement on March 4, 1976, (see Hansard of that date, pages 2317 to 2319). On that occasion Mr. Neary asked permission to comment when Mr. Smallwood had finished, but was told by the Speaker that the only person who could make brief comments was the Leader of the Opposition, or the leader of a recognized group or someone speaking on their behalf. Clearly, Mr. Smallwood was recognized as the leader of a third party at that time.

On May 22, 1985, Hansard records that the then President of Council stated: and I quote, "I think there is a ruling that for a group to be recognized as a party in the House it has to have three members. I think that is clear," end of quote. I have had an exhaustive search made for such a ruling but cannot find it.

In the past various Speakers have ruled that a single member does not constitute a group. In connection with making such a ruling on March 10, 1976, and recorded in Hansard on page 2713 the Speaker made the following which I accept as setting a precedent in this matter:

"...in this Legislature the right of the Leader of the Opposition, or the Leader of a recognized group, and group there means, Parliamentary group, a caucus, more than one person, that that

right may be ceded to another honourable member speaking on behalf of that leader."

In particular I would draw the attention of Members to the Phrase "...and group there means parliamentary group, a caucus, more than one person....".

In addition it is characteristic of a group that the members composing it have a community of interest and concern, a common connection, a collective unity and in my opinion on that basis as well, the member for Menihek and the member for St. John's East constitute a group for the purposes of the proceedings of this House.

Does recognition as a group entitle the members to any right over and above that enjoyed by other members?

(1) The rules governing the length of time a member may speak in a debate would not be affected since they are set out in the Standing Orders (S.O.49) and can only be changed by a two-thirds majority of all members, according to our House of Assembly Act.

(2) Consultation on the members for committees appears to be a courtesy and the House is governed in this matter by Standing Order 84 and concurred by the House.

(3) Address in Reply. In the past there has been a response by a spokesman for a third group but this actually is a right shared by all members.

(4) Responding to Ministerial Statements by right is a privilege. The suggestion of the Government House Leader yesterday that the group of two would have

half the time of the official Opposition appears to me to be a reasonable one considering the comparative numerical strength and we will adopt it. I might add that in very short Ministerial Statements it is not too practical and I feel one should not be too rigid in these cases.

I rule that the members for Menihek and St. John's East constitute a group for the purposes of the proceedings of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker..

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon the President of the Council.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform hon members at this time of the first pieces of legislation which will be presented by the government in this Session of the House of Assembly. Notice of these will be given by the ministers within the next few days and the bills, themselves, will be circulated to all hon. members within the next few days. Of course there will be further legislation announced later on in the Session, but this constitutes the first package, the first group of bills. There will be:

An amendment to the Department of Development and Tourism Act, the School Attendance Act, the Conflict of Interest Act, the Unimproved Lands (Redistribution)

Act, a new Occupational Therapists Act. The St. John's Fire Department Act will be in for amendment, as will the Summary Proceedings Act. There will be a Prisons Act and Uniformed Services Pensions Act, a Municipalities Act, a Newfoundland Veterinary Medical Act, 1971, a new Provincial Institutes Act, a new Community Colleges Act, and a new Aquaculture Act.

As I said, notice of these will be given by the relevant ministers within the next few days and the bills will be distributed within the next few days, as well. Also, the government will be announcing the second installment of important legislation in the near future.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, we again welcome what appears to be the co-operation of the government. We would hope, also, that we may be able, at some point in time, to get a longer agenda for debate laid out in the legislature, as the hon. gentleman is now doing with the format of his legislation. In the proposed legislation, in terms of jobs creation I think you could probably look at two of the thirteen. I know it is number one, and possibly number thirteen as well. Of course, we would hope that the government would introduce measures in this House to see that things to create more jobs in this Province, legislation and, indeed, policy statements are forthcoming in this Session of the legislature, as well.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
First I would like to thank the Speaker for his ruling. I would also remind the Government House Leader - well, of course, he would not know whether he should have given me a copy of the list of proposed legislation at this point. The only point I make at this time is that the legislation on the community college and the provincial institutions, we would hope that the minister will give considerable priority to these pieces of legislation. There are people throughout the Province who are eagerly awaiting the institution of both community colleges and provincial institutions, wanting to know what can be in place by September, as, indeed, in my district, and we on this side will be very co-operative at expediting this legislation to make sure it is passed.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, as the Minister responsible for Housing, I would like to take this opportunity to update members concerning an earlier decision made by government and previously announced by me during the last session of the House, authorizing the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation to offer for sale a number of multiple-unit apartment buildings in

Stephenville.

I am pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that the sale of three twelve unit buildings comprising thirty-six apartments has now been finalized by the Corporation. The buildings, located at 10 Alabama Drive and 23 and 25 Oregon Avenue, have been sold to Delco Holdings Ltd. of Stephenville who will officially assume ownership on April 1.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that the sale of these units resulted from an initial expression of interest early last year by several private concerns in the area to purchase a number of these units owned by the Housing Corporation in Stephenville. The final selection of the Delco Holdings bid was made after Corporation officials were satisfied that a fair price had been settled on and that tenants would lose none of the rights they held under the auspices of NLHC. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the monies realized from the sale will be applied to renovations and upgrading of the Corporation's remaining housing portfolio in the Stephenville area.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise members that by divesting itself of these rentals, NLHC is striving to promote a more competitive rental environment in the Stephenville area. Furthermore, where possible, the Corporation will continue to consider the sale of such units on a Province-wide basis. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that individual tenants will now be written immediately advising of the sale of these units. Thank you.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the minister for giving me a copy of his Ministerial Statements earlier. Looking at the press release and the statement, the concerns that were expressed by tenants of the area and myself seem to have been met somewhat, in that it is a small company in the Stephenville area, or a small group of people, who will be purchasing the units. So that concern has been met.

At this point in time I would want to express my dissatisfaction with the way that the co-operative idea was thrown around by the department in government that was handling it. The local people of the area who were trying to put a co-operative group together found that they were having great trouble with getting the full co-operation of government on that.

Also, I am wondering why the Western Tenancies Board's decision has not been announced yet on rental increases, or the taking back of rental increases, against the Housing Corporation. About six months ago, in September, the hearings were held in Stephenville, and NLHC, for the first time, had to bring in new financial information because it was not disclosing proper financial information to the tenants of the Stephenville area. So I am wondering why, since that decision has been in government's hands for the last number of weeks, it has not been announced. I look forward to that Ministerial Statement, also, in the near

future. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate, also, the Minister responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn) giving me a copy of the statement ahead of time. This is one that we had some contention on last Spring, about how it was being sold and the rush that seemed to be occurring. If I remember correctly, we are talking 250 units - was it? - or somewhere in that range, anyway. Only thirty-six of the apartment units have been sold, so obviously a lot more are on a block. The minister was kind enough to inform me that approximately \$15,000 per unit was the going price on the sale, or in that range. What I am hoping will happen, the same as the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward), is that in the future there will be some encouragement to the tenants, themselves, to get together the kind of co-operative that they initially explored last Spring, and hopefully in the future they can take over more and more of this housing themselves. Because there was a fear there that they might end up in a position where they were much worse off than before. Hopefully, they will have the time now to put together their own proposal, and I would certainly hope that the department would encourage that sort of activity.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, for clarification for the hon. the member for Stephenville. He mentioned that the decision of the Tenancies Board has been in government hands for a while and wonders when it is going to be released. That is not correct. I share the member's concern that we would like to have it before this. We are making every attempt to get it, but we do not have the decision as yet. As soon as we get it, we will let it be known.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I had been informed by a source, about two weeks ago as a matter of fact, that it was in the hands of government. That is what I was told. I am sorry if that was wrong. Maybe that Committee is having a tough time making their decision, since NLHC gave the wrong financial information.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. There is a difference of opinion between two hon. gentleman.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to inform members of the hon. the House of Assembly of the appointment of Mr. Arthur Colbourne to the position of Assistant Deputy Minister of Local Government with the Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Colbourne will be replacing Mr. Ronald Corbett who will be retiring effective May 31, 1987.

Mr. Corbett has served the government well and faithfully for over thirty-five years and for the last eight years as ADM of Local Government.

Mr. Colbourne brings with him over twenty-five years of experience in the field of Municipal Administration, including over the decade with the Department of Municipal Affairs. Since 1974 he has worked with the department in the City of Corner Brook as Western Regional Supervisor. Prior to his work with the department, Mr. Colbourne worked as Town Manager in Happy Valley - Goose Bay from 1962 to 1966 and held the position as Town Manager in Marystown from 1966 to 1972. He was also employed as the Town Manager in Burin from 1972 to 1974.

Before becoming involved in Local Government, Mr. Colbourne had worked with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for a period of approximately four years, starting in 1957.

He is a graduate of Memorial University of Newfoundland and in addition to his work experience he served as Chairman of the Newfoundland and Labrador Association of Municipal Administrators as well as having been the Chairman of the Newfoundland and Labrador Rural

Development Council.

The Department of Municipal Affairs welcomes Mr. Colbourne into his new position. We feel that because of his wide experience and knowledge in the municipal field he will be an asset to Municipal Councils all over Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to thank the Minister for giving me this announcement earlier. I extend congratulations to Mr. Colbourne from the members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, the official Opposition. We are quite happy to endorse the appointment of Mr. Colbourne. I think it is a very wise choice. I have known Mr. Colbourne ever since I went to Memorial with him, some thirty years ago. I think he is a fine man. I hope that he will be able to do something in the department to change the way that grants are given out, take them from a political to a straightforward needs basis. This would be my wish and the wish of a lot of Newfoundlanders.

Thank you, very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Just to echo the same sentiments, Art Colbourne and I actually served on the executive of the Newfoundland and Labrador Rural Development Council for a couple of years. I know he is a competent administrator and I believe that he will do an excellent job for the Department of Municipal Affairs in his new role.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before we get to Oral Questions I would like to welcome to the gallery Dianne Forsey and Glenn Rodgers from St. Stephen's School, and the twelve students who are accompanying them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask is the Premier aware that apparently certain if not all vocational schools around the Province have informed their instructors that their salaries are not being paid this week, that there is some delay possible in the payment of salaries? We understand with respect to one school that in fact other employees were paid today but the instructors did not receive their pay at the normal time. Certain

instructors had been alerted earlier in the week that this might happen. I would ask the Premier is he aware of this and does it have anything to do with the Province's financial position as put forth by him not too long ago?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition will not be getting paid next week. No. Of course it has got nothing to do with it. It is the first I heard of it and I will take under advisement the question from the Leader of the Opposition and get an answer for him before the House closes this afternoon.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I find it somewhat amazing that the Premier is not aware if there are problems in departments with meeting commitments to provincial government employees. If the Premier says he is not aware of it I have to take his word for that.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It cannot be very important.

MR. BARRY:

No, only to the several hundred employees who are waiting for their salaries. Otherwise it is not very important.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There must be some reasonable explanation for it.

MR. TULK:

That is an important enough reason.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier if he would inform this House if the Province facing bankruptcy within two years or is it not?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier if he could explain why he made that statement on province-wide television? And I think in *The Sunday Express* it was carried. Why did the Premier make that statement to *The Sunday Express* that the Province was going to be bankrupt within two years, if that is not the case according to him?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I have explained that publicly on a number of occasions, Mr. Speaker, over the last week. I am sure all hon. members are aware of what I said publicly at that time.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I know, Mr. Speaker, this hon. member is not aware of what could justify or explain the Premier of the Province making such a remark. Did the Premier, at the time he made this remark, have any advice from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) with respect to the potential impact of such a statement on investor confidence or on the credit rating of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am quite familiar with those matters, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Finance and myself consult regularly. I am very amazed that on the one hand the Leader of the Opposition expected me to know that some vocational instructors were not being paid this week, while at the same time he was not aware, when they have been in the press for the last couple of weeks, of my statements relevant to the original statement that I had made. I find it rather inconsistent on the one hand the Leader of the Opposition expected me to know about certain payments that were not going to vocational instructors and at the same time he was unaware of public statements that were all over the media for the last couple of weeks.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, would the Premier indicate to this House whether a statement by him that the Province was going to be bankrupt within

two years was considered by him to have any impact on the credit rating or on investor confidence in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

All these matters were considered, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. I wonder does the minister consider these erratic statements made by the Premier concerning the Province's financial position to be rational, prudent and responsible, and whether they will erode Cabinet's credibility with the federal government, with labour, with industry, with the whole financial world, and with the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any erratic statements by the Premier.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I do not know where the minister has been for the past couple of weeks, Mr. Speaker. Anyways, I have a further question to the

Minister of Finance, I wonder if the minister would not admit that such erratic statements by the Premier, or by any other Cabinet minister, could, and will, have a disastrous effect on investor confidence in the economy of this Province and on the Province's already rock-bottom credit rating? Because, if I might add, investors who would invest in this Province, and the rating agencies, would have no way of knowing whether the Premier is espousing reality or whether he is engaging in dramatic exercises of exaggeration, hyperbole, fancy and sabre rattling.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, if there are erratic statements they are coming from members opposite in this regard. But to clarify any doubt the hon. member may have in his mind, I might say that there is an issue of one of the Province's series of debentures in place in Europe now which is being extremely well received. I will be in a position to bring the details to the House very shortly. But there is certainly absolutely no problem in our placing our paper.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LUSH:

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the minister would indicate that after these erratic and impulsive statements by the Premier, and

after his own acknowledged inability to control the deficit of this Province, in view of these factors I wonder whether he has been contacted by any of the credit rating agencies suggesting any changes in the Province's credit rating?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Very simply, no, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. It is now two years since the Offshore Development Fund was established, which provided for an expenditure, cost-shared, of \$300 million over the five year period. Prorated that would mean about a \$120 million expenditure to date. I understand the actual agreements signed total about \$34 million. I wonder would the Premier indicate whether this is up to his expectation on the matter or whether there is some reason why more of the funding has not been committed at this point in time?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I thank the hon. the member for his question. It is a very, very good question, and I am very pleased to answer it. No, it is not up to our expectations, as I perhaps indicated publicly some time ago. We have before the federal government now a range of

new initiatives under the development fund. I am pleased to report that later this week the Minister of Energy, (Mr. Ottenheimer), in consultation with the Minister of Energy (Mr. Masse) and the Minister of the Transport (Mr. Crosbie) in Ottawa, will be making a very substantial announcement on the spending of a large portion of that fund. So, before this week is out we will see a very large increase in expenditures from that fund to very worthwhile projects in the Province which will get off the ground immediately.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the \$34 million that has already been approved to date, I understand with what is being considered now - I would assume these amounts the Premier made reference to totalling another \$60 or \$64 million - assuming it all gets approved in the next few days you are still talking under \$100 million.

I understand from a source in Ottawa that part of the problem is the absence of worthwhile projects from the Province. It has been contended that literally everything the Province has put forward has either been approved or is under scrutiny right now and ought to be approved within the next few days.

I want to ask the Premier, then,

would he respond to the allegation that I have reported to the House? Has there been any shortage of project proposals going up to Ottawa for the expenditure of the Offshore Development Fund?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am very, very happy to answer that. Whatever the hon. member's source is, I would ask him to get another source very, very quickly. One sure thing is that the former Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Ms Carney) in Ottawa, the present Minister (Mr. Masse), plus all of the Cabinet and the bureaucracy that we have dealt with is that they are falling over backwards complimenting us on the quality of the proposals that are going forward. Now may I also add that the federal government has under the Accord and under the Development Fund the right to make proposals too, although they have not proposed any. It has only been us who have been doing all the proposing, which we do not mind at all because we want our priorities to be education, training and research and development and so on. So they have been waiting for us even though they have the right under the Development Fund to do so. But nothing could be further from the truth. All the proposals that have gone forward have been extremely well researched, those from the private sector and the public sector, and from various agencies around Newfoundland and Labrador. We are very, very happy that the federal government has responded in writing complementing us on the level of quality of the proposals that we put forward. I

am sure, later this week when the Minister of Energy (Mr. Ottenheimer) makes the announcement on the additional funds that are going to be going into projects, everybody will see the high quality of the projects that will be undertaken.

MR. SIMMONS:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

One final supplementary to the Premier. The cost-shared nature of this offshore development requires a draw-down of \$75 million by the Province over the course of the agreement. Is the Province's current financial straits, cash flow problems, in any way impeding the progress of the expenditure of this Offshore Development Fund? To say it differently: Is the fund going a little more slowly than would appear to be justified? Three hundred million dollars over five years would appear to be about \$60 million a year, which would mean \$120 million to date. Expenditures to date, plus what is pending approval, total about \$94 million or \$95 million, which is a bit of a shortfall. In view of that, Mr. Speaker, what is the reason? I have no difficulty with the Premier's statement about the quality of the projects, that is not what I said, I talked about the total number of projects and whether there was a shortage of projects. Nobody is alleging that those that have gone up have not been quality projects, that is not the issue. But is it the shortage of good projects, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member please pose his supplementary question?

MR. SIMMONS:

By all means. By all means.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member has posed his question, maybe the hon. the Premier will answer it.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, Sir. By all means I will pose it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If it is a supplementary, you are breaking the rules.

MR. BARRY:

So are you by interrupting.

MR. PATTERSON:

Go back to the Arcade selling socks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

By way of final supplementary, if it is not the shortage of good proposals going up, has it anything to do with the Province's current cash flow problems that we are not getting the expenditure within this fund that would be expected at this point in time, two years into the agreement?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it took a long while for that supplementary. I just point that out to Your Honour because that is not the way we are

supposed to operate in this House, according to the rules.

I dealt with the question of quality. On the question of quantity, no. What we have had to do, because there are so many proposals coming in, is we have had to assess them very, very carefully to try to grade the ones which we thought should have the highest priority put on the table before the government. And then there has been some slow-down in the response time from the federal government. Now they tell us that they have overcome that problem that they had in their system, and that in future projects and proposals that go forward from us will be dealt with far more expeditiously than they have in the past. We have that in writing from the federal government over the last month or so. But we have to first of all high grade, if you will, or go back to the proponents of the various projects and proposals and make sure that what we have going forward is good in quality as well as in quantity.

As far as money goes, no, Mr. Speaker, there has been no question because of our share of the money. Nothing has been slowed down, from our point of view, because of quantity, quality or money.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Premier of the Province. It seems as if the Finance Minister can go around preaching about the Province's money scene being a dismal situation, it seems as if the

Premier of the Province one day can say we are bankrupt and then the next day say we are not. It seems as if one day he can say, 'I am the friend of John Crosbie,' and then the next day 'I am not.' I would like to ask this question of the Premier: Who is responsible for the financial situation of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador if it is not your Minister of Finance and if it is not you? If you could tell us which one of the twenty-two ministers over there it is, I would love to know and so would everybody else over here so we can all find that out for the rest of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The answer is very obvious, Mr. Speaker.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I have a list here of the federal transfers to Newfoundland since 1979. Since this Premier has been existing in this Province, doing so well with our 21 per cent unemployment rate, he has received over \$9 billion from the Feds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

How many?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Nine billion dollars.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would ask the hon. member to pose his supplementary.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

My question to the Premier is, again - and I would like an answer, not a boomerang - would he tell us who is responsible for the expenditures of money in this Province and who is accountable for it? Is it John Crosbie in Ottawa or is it the Premier of Newfoundland down here? Which is it? Tomorrow is it going to be him, or the next day is it going to be the Minister of Finance?

MR. FLIGHT:

What happened to the \$9 billion?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as I said to the hon. member in answer to his original question, the answer is obvious: Everybody knows who is responsible for the expenditure of funds that come to this Province. I would just hasten to say to the hon. member not to be so naive to believe in absolute dollars how much is coming to the Province. The argument that we have been using, and continue to use with the Minister of Transport as with the Minister of Finance, (Mr. Wilson) is that the equalization formula is unfairly applied across Canada as it relates to losing money because of population loss, and it has nothing to do with the needs of the Province or how much it costs to provide services. The inflation factor in equalization for post-secondary education and

health costs is much higher than the increased amount of money that we are getting from the federal government. And over the last number of years, both on equalization and EPF, we have been getting less and less of an increase to cover the larger and larger increases that are being incurred in the public service of this Province, Mr. Speaker, and that is the point.

On regional and economic development, I refer the hon. member to a latest study by the C.D. Howe Institute in 1986, and to a more recent study in the last month by APEC, both of whom confirm the contentions that I have been making.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
A supplementary.

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

MR. FUREY:
Ask about the shortfall in provincial revenue.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, it was \$150 million last week. Two months ago it was \$45 million or \$50 million, now it is \$150 million we have to go to Ottawa for. When are you going to accept the responsibility, Mr. Premier? You do not want to say it is yours. I mean, are you going to accept it when you ask for a mandate in your next election, I would like to know?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as I said, it is obvious. I do not know if the hon. member knows what that means. It means that we are responsible for the expenditures of money in the Province. And I would just say to the hon. member, as I have said to hon. members over there opposite, anytime anything comes up in this House that has to do with expenditures, the members opposite are saying 'Spend more.' They bring petitions to this House. They criticize this government when we went from 7, 6 and 5, to help control our expenditures on the wage side, to 5, 4, and 3, to 0 and 0, and I do not think anybody in this Province wants to go back there. If anything is done to curb expenditures, that crowd over there, Mr. Speaker, criticizes us for holding back. If we spend more -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
- then they are criticizing us because we have a deficit. Mr. Speaker, they cannot have it both ways. We are responsible for how the money is spent and how the money is collected. And we will stand proud, Mr. Speaker, in saying that we are trying to do as good a job as any government in this nation in spending the money fairly and equitably around the Province.

MR. BARRY:
He is a \$9 billion man.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and it has to do with the practice of double dipping.

DR. COLLINS:

What?

MR. FENWICK:

The practice of double dipping. Just to give a bit of background, the practice of double dipping occurs when a M.H.A. or another government official resigns or retires and goes on pension, then is hired back to a board or other appointment and receives an additional salary on top of a pension that he continues to receive. There are more and more ministers of the Crown over there retiring every day, and we now know that Tom Hickey is now double dipping and so is Bill Marshall.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

My question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Finance is, given the dismay state of our finances, does he approve of this practice of double dipping? Is he willing to look at the pension legislation, both for ourselves and in other areas of the government, to see if we can pass amendments to the legislation to prevent this kind of double dipping from occurring again?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

I thought for a minute there, when you mentioned double dipping, we were dealing with sheep or something. I do not know what the hon. member is specifically referring to. I do not know. If he is referring to what I suspect he is referring to, it is perfectly proper and there is nothing unusual, strange, weird or wonderful about it.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek, a supplementary.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance feels that double dipping is acceptable, then why do members of the public service who retire and then are brought back to work in the public service, after they have accrued a full pension, have to have their pension deferred until such time as they retire? In other words, if double dipping is all right for hon. Tory members when they retire, why is it not also a worthwhile and reasonable for all the other people?

The other question that I would like to ask is why did the minister reduce the public service pensions that were received -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

Why were the public pensions of public servants, who retired early and elected to receive an early

Canada Pension Plan payment, also reduced by this provincial government, which does not believe in violating people's rights?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, all these matters that the hon. member is bringing up are quite according to whatever legislation is in place, and whatever regulations and arrangements that have been in place for many, many years. There is nothing strange or wonderful about this. He was referring to the integration of public services pensions with the CCP. I mean, that is common. It has been going on for year to year. Nothing has been changed in that regard. The hon. member has got some kind of hobbiehorse he is rising on there. I do not know what this double dipping is. It is some cute little phrase, I suppose. It is his phrase, not my phrase.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. It is in regards to the labour relations mood in this Province. Yesterday I asked the

Premier a question in the Legislature which he refused to answer. Let me now ask him if he can answer this question in the Legislature, as it is the proper place for him to answer it.

Does the Premier agree with, or, more importantly, is it the policy of government to allow double-breasting in this Province's construction industry?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, let me just say, in relation to yesterday, when I did not answer the question, that I wanted to be absolutely clear on any answer I gave. I have here the document that the construction trades used as their agenda, when they came to the meeting last year, that they later referred to, whereby I was supposed to have promised them that the refinery in Come By Chance would be done with all union personnel. Here is the document from the construction trades which has nothing whatsoever to say about the Come By Chance refinery. It was not raised at the meeting at all. I checked with the other witnesses who were at that meeting and all confirm that the meeting had to do with the agenda as put forward by the construction trades. I have it here as Exhibit A, Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate that what I said was truthful and honest.

On the question of double-breasting, there are a number of reports with a number of recommendations that are before the government right now. As I have indicated already in the last number of days, we will be making our position known on these various briefs and reports,

including this brief that was put to us by the construction trades which had nothing to do with the Come By Chance refinery at all. We will be making a statement on our response to the various recommendations from those reports, which includes the issue of double-breasting.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, what the Premier prints and what the Premier says are not always one and the same thing. As a matter of fact what he says one day is not always the same as what he says the next day.

The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, says, "My government" -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member pose his supplementary?

MR. TULK:

Sure. Is that statement that is in the Throne Speech by the government of this Province, the statement that says the Premier feels "that the current balance of protection of private rights and union rights in the labour legislation of our Province provides a fair and equitable treatment for all" mean, Mr. Speaker - I ask the Premier through you - that there will be no legislative or regulatory change to cure the social upheaval that is being caused by the labour relations atmosphere in this Province? Or does this mean that the Premier was play-acting and

being dramatic, posturing, when he stated that Bill 59, which restricts the right of unions to strike, was bad legislation, and when he promised co-operation to the founding convention of the newly-formed provincial Council of Labour? Which does it mean? Does it mean that there will be no legislation or was the Premier again playacting those few months ago?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the hon. member in reply to a previous question about the issues that are now before us relating to recommendations of the various reports, we will be making our position known on them very, very shortly. As the hon. member's question relates to the newly-formed Council of Labour, they have met with the government on a number of occasions since that meeting. I have met with the head of the organization and the Cabinet committee has met with them on a number of occasions to review various issues that they want to bring before the government. The Federation of Labour every year presents a brief to the Cabinet. Those issues which are now before us relating to the issues that come out of those reports, the Harris Report and others, are being dealt with by government, and very, very shortly we will be making our position known on them. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we do not intend, as we indicated in the Throne Speech, to move in a direction whereby we order every single employer in the Province by law whom they are to hire. We do not believe that particular point of view is one that can be upheld

by the Constitution of Canada. We think we would be violating the individual rights of citizens. What we are trying to say in the Throne Speech is that we have to balance off these rights. The unions have rights, and I would defend to the death their right to organize. They must always have that right, but then that right to organize must also be balanced with the right of individuals. We are not a society of just structures and organizations, or collectives; we are a society which has a composition of groups as well as individuals, and individuals also have rights in a democratic society. That is what we are trying to say, Mr. Speaker, that there must be a balance between the rights of individuals versus the rights of groups. There must also be the right of a union to organize. There is no question about it. That is a hallmark of democracy, a hallmark of North American society, and I would defend it and argue for it to the nth degree. But we must also remember the rights of individuals, the rights of employers and the rights of everybody else. It is that kind of balance that we are trying to strike, Mr. Speaker, in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, in this document the Premier again, of course, says one thing, then he stands in this legislature this evening and says

something else. Let me ask the Premier a very simple question. He has created the worst labour mess in this Province that any Premier has ever seen. Now, I ask him, as the Premier of this Province, when he is going to stand in his place and tell us that he is going to provide the leadership that is necessary to get this Province back to work, and to get it back to work in a fair and equitable manner? Stand up and answer the question and provide some leadership!

MR. FLIGHT:
Specifically as it applies to Come By Chance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, as the Throne Speech outlines we are going to expand the Rural Development Authority. He has asked for some specifics, so we are going to expand the Rural Development Authority so that people can borrow from the Rural Development Authority for the service sector as well as the resource sector.

MR. TULK:
When are you going to answer?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I am answering the question: How are we going to get this Province moving?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
We are going to expand the mandate of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation so that people all around the Province can apply for loans in the service sector as well as in the resource

sector. Mr. Speaker, we are going to, through tourism, parks, fisheries and agriculture this year, provide hundreds and hundreds of jobs, 6000 all told, to various Newfoundlanders and Labradorians around the Province. We are going to institute a programme with the private sector whereby any new job created by a company over last year will have 50 per cent of the wages paid for by the Government of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. That is how we are going to get this Province moving. We are also going to have a new youth entrepreneur programme that we are going to be bringing in this year, Mr. Speaker. We are also going to have a new business equity programme that we are going to bring in this year, Mr. Speaker, and expand the Venture Capital Programme. These are the measures we are going to use to get this Province going, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is just time for a short question and answer.

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier how does the presence of out-of-Province workers at the Come By Chance refinery jibe with the Premier's long-touted local preference policy? How is it that with so much unemployment in this Province that we have out-of-Province persons working that that refinery?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on every Liberal project that was ever created in this Province there were ten times as many outside people coming in to work than there are now in Come By Chance, where we have 192 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, and 5 from outside who are refinery specialists that they cannot find in the Province, Mr. Speaker.

I am very proud that the member for Bellevue brought that up. One hundred and ninety-two versus five, and we are still paying off \$49 million for Liberal mismanagement at Come By Chance, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the member for Bellevue should hang his head in shame when he talks about it when we look at what happened in the Liberal days. Not only did they bring in more from outside, Mr. Speaker, but they put the Province down in the hole.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

There are rules with respect to misleading this House. When the member for Bellevue gets up and asks about outside workers and the Premier gets up and says, 'They are specialists,' we would like to know who established they are specialists. Your Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) has not yet established they are specialists.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the Premier, to that point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Here is my learned friend on the other side of the House who does not know the rules of the House yet. That is not a point of order, and the Leader of the Opposition knows it. Why does he not ask that question during Question Period, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BARRY:
They are not specialists.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
They are specialists. We have 192 Newfoundlanders working there. It hurts, Leo, I know. It hurts! It hurts!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Notices of Motion

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would ask hon. members on both sides to please have some silence.

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Development And Tourism Act."

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

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting Occupational Therapists."

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills: "An Act To Amend The St. John's Fire Department Act, 1972," and "An Act To Amend The Prisons Act and Uniformed Services Pensions Act."

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
I have some information in answer to a question that was asked yesterday with respect to safety inspections and monitoring practices at the refinery project in Come By Chance. I would like to table that, Mr. Speaker.

There was a second question that was asked by the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) and I thought I had the information with me, Mr. Speaker. I do have it and I will have it sent up to the House and produce it before the close of business today.

Orders of the Day

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Motion 1.

MR. SPEAKER:

This debate was adjourned by the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter). I think he spoke for about two minutes so he has almost an hour.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I welcome the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to take part in this very important debate over a very important resolution. I think I should make it clear at the very outset of my few remarks exactly where the members of this side of the House stand in terms of the Canada/France fishery agreement.

We, Mr. Speaker, are absolutely opposed to that agreement. Make no mistake about it. Let the word go out today to members opposite and to all of my fellow Newfoundlanders that members of the Liberal Party are absolutely opposed to that Canada/France agreement.

We do not accept the principle, Mr. Speaker, that there should be one pound of fish, indeed, not even a tom cod, given to France or

indeed to any other foreign country in the Northern waters within our Continental Shelf. Mr. Speaker, not only are we against the allocation of quotas from the areas 2J+3KL - and that is area now referred to in the resolution - not only are we against the allocation of quotas from that area but we are against the allocation of cod quotas from any area of the Northern waters, and that includes the areas 2G+2GH.

It is regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that the government members opposite agreed with their federal counterparts to the allocation of a quota in the 2GH area because that fish is as much Northern cod as is the fish that swim within the 2J+3KL area. What members opposite are saying by virtue of their agreeing to that allocation is that fishermen who fish the inshore stocks in Northern Labrador are less important than fishermen in other parts of Labrador who fish the stocks that migrate to their particular areas from the 2J+3KL area.

We believe that the fish stocks in the 2GH area are equally important to this Province and to our fisheries and therefore we oppose any allocation of any stocks, as I said a moment ago, including the 2GH area. I am at a loss to understand, Mr. Speaker, how the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and the government opposite can differentiate between the two issues. We on this side of the House certainly do not.

We support to a point, Mr. Speaker, this resolution I suppose. Indeed, we requested back as early as January 27 that the government call the House together and present this resolution and maybe even hand

deliver it to the powers that be in Ottawa. Indeed, in our letter to the Premier, signed by our leader, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and dated February 13, the leader without doubt, Mr. Speaker, agreed to the calling together of the House for the presentation of a resolution dealing with the Canada/France agreement. In that letter we offered to support any such resolution.

We had certain reservations, Mr. Speaker, about the contents of the resolution, the draft of which was forwarded to our leader by the Premier. For example, the third "WHEREAS" states that "the Government of Canada deliberately excluded the Province of Newfoundland from participation in, or knowledge of the Paris meeting contrary to the established practice." Today we have some reservation about that particular "WHEREAS".

I will be moving an amendment, Mr. Speaker, to the resolution in the course of my remarks asking that the words "or knowledge of" be deleted from that "WHEREAS".

I move now, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), that the words "or knowledge of" be deleted from the third paragraph of the resolution presented by the government. That "WHEREAS" should then read:

"AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada deliberately excluded the Province of Newfoundland from participation in the Paris meeting contrary to the established practice."

That is an amendment, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move to the resolution. I have a hand written copy here,

Mr. Speaker, which I will be happy to give the Speaker. I am sure he will get a copy.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I want to ask the hon. gentleman, is the amendment - am I correct - to delete a phrase?

MR. W. CARTER:

To delete three words in the third paragraph, and the words are, "or knowledge of".

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Okay.

MR. W. CARTER:

I make that amendment, Mr. Speaker, because we are far from convinced. I am not suggesting that the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) is lying. I have too much respect for the hon. minister to even suggest that he would deliberately misled or lie to the House.

But what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, the fact that maybe he was not briefed on that proposed meeting by his officials and by other highly placed officials in the present government, is no excuse.

We have a telegram, we have a communication from the Minister of Transport, Mr. Crosbie, who clearly states that a number of senior officials within the Provincial civil service were notified well in advance of that Paris meeting. In fact, in Mr. Crosbie's telegram to the Premier he lists some of the people who were contacted by officials of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and by others to the effect that the Paris meeting was to take place.

Indeed, the Minister of Fisheries himself yesterday in his speech

left no doubt at all in the minds of the House that he was informed of the proposed meeting I think as early as January 20, when in fact the meeting was planned for January 24. So he was given notice. I believe that is what he said. If not, he can correct me, Mr. Speaker, but I seem to recall that the minister did in fact state that he was informed of the impending meeting on January 20, and that on January 24, the meeting was in fact held.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that being the case, and I am quoting the minister - I am assuming that is correct - that being the case, if the minister had four days notice of that meeting and having been warned that Northern cod would, in all probability, be a bargaining item on the bargaining table, then surely the minister should not have waited four days before raising a public outcry.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have to rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. RIDEOUT:

I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman but this is too important an issue from my perspective as an individual to be misquoted. What I said in the House yesterday, and if the hon. gentleman has the Hansard in front of him, Hansard will bear me out, was that I was called on the 20th and asked what our position would be if Northern cod were placed on the table in the next round of negotiations. I went on to say there was no hint, question or otherwise about any proposed meetings to take place in Paris.

The only question was what would Newfoundland's position be if Northern cod went on the table? Not that 'there is a meeting planned' or 'what do you think about putting it on the table at a meeting on a certain date,' I made that all clear yesterday. I do not want to be misquoted because it is too important from my perspective and neither do I want to interrupt the hon. gentleman in making his remarks, but that is clearly what I said, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have Hansard either but if I have misquoted the hon. minister, then I apologize. It was clearly my understanding when the minister spoke that he did state that he was in fact telephoned by an official of, I think he said Fisheries and Oceans or maybe External Affairs, and made aware that Northern cod might very well be a bargaining chip at the forthcoming Paris meeting. That was my understanding of what the hon. minister said.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it does not change the matter. If the minister was warned well in advance, four or five days in advance, that a meeting was to be held and that maybe Northern cod would be one of the bargaining tools used by the negotiators, then surely the minister, realizing the importance of that issue and the seriousness of that suggestion, should have raised a public outcry against it. I suggest to you that maybe if that were the case, if a public outcry had been raised, I am sure that the powers that be in Ottawa, especially the negotiators and the ministers whose departments were

in the process of conducting negotiations, would have taken notice and maybe this debate would not have been necessary.

In Mr. Crosbie's communication or telegram to the Premier he clearly states, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Newfoundland and of Canada, that Barbara Knight, for example, the Assistant Deputy Minister in the Department of Development or Intergovernmental Affairs, was informed of the impending meeting on January 20. In fact, a telephone call went forward to Miss Knight on that date "to inform her that Canada was considering a potential offer of a limited amount of 2J+3KL cod to France in exchange for a guaranteed written commitment to submit the boundary dispute to arbitration. She was informed that a meeting for the federal officials was tentatively scheduled in Paris on January 23. In addition," I am again quoting from the minister's telegram to the Premier, it says, "your Minister of Fisheries" - and these are Mr. Crosbie's words - "was telephoned on January 21 by the Chief of Staff of Mr. Siddon and given the same information. Mr. Bowers also called your Chief of Staff, Wayne Clark, Ray Andrews," who was the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, Mr. "Fred Way", a highly placed official of the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs and again "Barbara Knight to pass on the same message."

Mr. Crosbie, in his telegram, Mr. Speaker, reminded the Premier that "there were at least six telephone calls before January 24 to indicate what was being considered."

Now, I am not standing in my place today to defend the action of Mr.

Crosbie or those of the federal government, far be it for me to do that. I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and the Premier and other ministers opposite can hardly claim that they were unaware that the issue was to be discussed and that Northern cod would be a key bargaining element in the process that was about to take place. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we on this side find it difficult to accept that third WHEREAS in the resolution, and that is why we have, today, moved an amendment suggesting that the three words, in particular, be deleted from that resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I concur with the statement made by my colleague opposite, the Minister of Fisheries, yesterday in his description of the actions of the federal government. There is no doubt about it, the Government of Canada had no right whatever to use Northern cod as a bargaining tool in their negotiations with the French. When you realize and read some of the press reports that have come out of Ottawa and out of the offices of ministers opposite as to why that action took place, then that makes it all the more despicable. To think that the Leader of the government of this country would use Newfoundland's most important resource, the lifeblood of this Province, Northern cod, just to ingratiate himself with the French government and to make himself look good in time for the proposed Francophone Summit Conference to take place sometime in September, I think, then that makes the actions of the government that much more difficult to accept.

There is one thing, Mr. Speaker,

that the government of this country must accept, one very simple and very straightforward fact of life, that Northern cod is to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador what the wheat fields are to the Prairies and they dare not do anything that would have the effect of interfering in anyway with the rehabilitation of those fish stocks, or interfering with the rights of Newfoundlanders to them. That is the lifeblood of our Province, that, Sir, is the foundation upon which the future social and economic well-being of this Province must be built. It is our past, it is our present, and it is our future. Codfish is just that, and officials in Ottawa, bureaucrats and politicians, must come to learn that very early in the game and that we are not going to put up with it, and we are not going to stand by and allow anybody to tamper with it.

I have a few words I want to say this afternoon concerning the actions of our federal minister in the Mulroney Cabinet. Mr. Crosbie, in the course of the big debate that occurred in the House of Commons, the special debate that occurred, stood in his place and tried to act as if he knew nothing about what was happening. In fact, he tried to wash his hands of the whole deal. In fact, he finished off his speech that night by demanding that the Government of Canada apologize to the Government of Newfoundland, and to the people of Newfoundland for their actions, for refusing to have representatives from the Newfoundland Government take part in those negotiations. Mr. Crosbie got up and demanded that the Government of Canada apologize to Newfoundland. Did he not realize, I wonder, that Mr.

Crosbie is that Government of Canada, he is a very important part of that government, and that the Government of Canada is made up of Mr. Crosbie and the other - what? - forty-odd Cabinet ministers? So for him to get up and try to disclaim any responsibility for what happened and to act as if he were an innocent bystander without any special responsibility at all to the Province, I think was the height of hypocrisy and certainly something that Newfoundlanders should not forget. Mr. Crosbie, as I said, is the Government of Canada. He and the other ministers are the government, and it is not enough for him to just get up and wave his arms and demand that certain things be done, because that is not good enough.

Mr. Speaker, the whole business of the Canada - France fishery deal, I think, pretty well speaks for itself. I think it pretty well sums up the sorry state of federal - provincial relations. When the government of our country, our national government can, in the first instance, for example, go to Paris to negotiate a trade-off of one of our most important resources without even a reference to Newfoundland's minister in the federal Cabinet, that, in itself, is unforgiveable. To think that those negotiations would take place without Newfoundland's representative in the federal Cabinet being invited does not say very much for the esteem in which the hon. member is held in Ottawa or just how seriously he is being taken.

I think it is equally serious and unforgiveable that the Government of Newfoundland was not invited. They were told about the meeting,

yes, but I will accept their word that they were not invited to take part at the meeting. That too, Mr. Speaker, in my view, is inexcusable.

There are a lot of Newfoundlanders, certainly people in my district, who are having some serious doubts as to why the Premier is making the charges he is making against Ottawa and raising the type of furor he is raising over this issue. They are not questioning the need altogether to object to what happened, but I am afraid a lot of Newfoundlanders, and I think members on this side are no different, will have to agree that it appears that the Premier is doing probably the right thing but for a very wrong reason.

We all know that the fortunes of the party opposite are at an all time low in this Province. We know that the fortunes of their soul mates in Ottawa are at an all time low, probably the lowest in the history of this country in terms of a party in power as opposed to the other two parties. There is a strong suspicion in the Province that the present government, the present Premier, is using the issue as a means of bolstering their own stock in the hope that maybe they will get back into the good graces of the Newfoundland electorate. Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, and we have strong suspicion that it is, then I repeat that the Premier is doing the right thing but, obviously, for the wrong reason.

Another very important thing that came to light in this whole scenario, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the Premier of the Province, at the height of the so-called Canada-France fish war, did not

have any dialogue whatever with the federal minister in Ottawa. It has come to light in the course of correspondence and statements coming out of Ottawa and out of Confederation Building, the eighth floor, that there was absolutely no communication whatever between the head of this government and Newfoundland's minister in the Federal Cabinet. That, too, Mr. Speaker, is a sad state of affairs, I think, and one that most Newfoundlanders would take a very dim view of.

A few moments ago I made reference to the allocation of cod from the area of 2GH to France, the fact that the government opposite agreed to that giveaway. Now the Minister of Fisheries went public shortly after this matter became a live issue and admitted that he was party to a meeting wherein it was agreed that the Government of France would get 1,000 metric tons of cod from the 2GH area - 1,000 was in the minister's initial announcement.

That subsequently has been changed, I think, where the minister now agrees - I believe he did in his speech yesterday - that he and his colleagues agreed to a 2,000 metric ton allocation. Now Mr. Bowers, who is, I believe, the Executive Assistant to the Federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, has stated publicly and privately, certainly privately to members of the Opposition in a briefing session, that the minister did in fact agree to the entire 3,000 metric ton giveaway.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The second time he is wrong.

MR. W. CARTER:

The minister says, 'the second time he is wrong.' Well, I recall

the story, Mr. Speaker, of a mother's only son who joined the CLB which, as we all know, is a church organization here in St. John's. She went out to watch the young son at his first parade and apparently as the members of the CLB were passing, the young fellow was the only chap out of step, he was out of step with the other members of the brigade but the mother, of course, she wanted to believe that the whole brigade was out of step with her son. Well, that is like the Minister of Fisheries now. It appears that Mr. Bowers, again a highly respected member of the federal bureaucracy, executive assistant to a very influential and powerful minister in Ottawa, a former executive assistant I believe to the hon. the Premier, it appears now that he is not telling the truth and that the Minister of Fisheries is the only person who is.

Mr. Bowers made no bones about it, Mr. Speaker. In his briefing of members of the Opposition, and he had no axe to grind, there is no reason why he should try to mislead the members of the Opposition in the course of his briefing session, he made no bones about it that the hon. minister opposite and the union, something else that was rather surprising; it is rather surprising that the Fishermen's Union would sit quietly by at a meeting, as did the minister, and allow 3,000 - let us say the minister is correct in what he is saying and that he only agreed to a 2,000 ton allocation, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that by making even a 2,000 ton allocation available to the French it was establishing a very serious, disastrous precedent and, in fact, that could very well have been the

thin edge of the wedge. And because the minister and the federal government and the union agreed to that 2,000 or 3,000 ton allocation in the Northern part of our waters, the 2GH area, then that might have been the lever that they subsequently used to extract from the Government of Canada a further agreement an allocation, under certain conditions, from the 2J+3KL area would be made available to them.

It is a sad situation, Mr. Speaker, that the government of this country, in terms, again, of the 2GH allocation, with the concurrence of the Government of Newfoundland would dare entertain any kind of a proposal from a foreign power, and that an allocation be given that power from that area, from the 2J+3KL area or the 2GH area. It is all the more despicable, I suppose, if that is the right word, Mr. Speaker, when you realize that it was only a month prior to that Paris meeting, maybe less than a month, that the federal authorities unveiled their 1987 management plan for Northern cod and that Newfoundlanders, Canadians, were told that their quota would be reduced in that area by 10,000 metric tons. We were told, the Newfoundland Government, the Newfoundland people and other Atlantic Canadians, that the fish stocks were in such a sad state of array that time would be needed in order to rehabilitate those stocks and that a reduction of 10,000 metric tons in the offshore quota would be necessary. We accepted that. In fact a lot of us said, and I think I am on record, too, as saying that maybe that allocation should have been greater, that instead of 10,000 metric tons it might well be that there should

have been probably a 20,000 metric ton reduction. I hold to that now. I still believe, in terms of the offshore quota, that there should have been an even greater reduction in the allocation.

Be that as it may, as I said, the ink was hardly dry on the offshore management plan before our heroes in Ottawa saw fit to disregard the need for reduction of quotas to allow the stocks to rehabilitate and again gave the Government of France certain rights. I am not suggesting that they were given any specific quotas, we all know the terms of that agreement. Certainly the door was left open, the door was left ajar whereby the French government could, in fact, be the recipients of a fairly substantial quota of Northern cod, plus the 2,000 or 3,000 metric ton quota they received from the 2GH area.

Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, the fishing industry in Labrador is vitally important to the future social and economic well-being of people living in that part of our Province. I do not think we can afford the luxury of tampering with that resource or doing anything that is going to jeopardize the rights of our fellow Newfoundlanders who depend on that resource for their livelihood. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we wanted to get this resolution to Ottawa. The fact that it is being done now, I think, again speaks for itself. When we received that letter from the Premier back on February 13, there appeared to be a great deal of urgency attached to it. In fact, the Premier, in his letter to my leader, suggested that the House would reopen within a few days to debate the issue. As I said, we asked that the House be

opened back on January 27, but to no avail. We wrote the Premier again on February 13 agreeing to a special Session and the adoption of the resolution, only to have it brought to the House on March 2, more than a month after we initially requested that the House be called to debate the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, while the Minister opposite, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), can get in his place and he can in very loud and clear terms condemn the Government of Canada for their actions, and we join him in his condemnation of that government in that respect, I do not think we can allow him to just wash his hands of the whole affair and disclaim any responsibility for what happened. As I said a moment ago, the minister was clearly made aware of that proposed meeting four or five days in advance and it was then that he should have raised a public outcry.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up any more time in this debate. I welcome the opportunity to say these few words. I can only say again that this party, members on this side, stand absolutely opposed to any giveaway to the French, or, indeed, to any other foreign country, of our Northern cod stocks.

Again, getting back to the 3000 ton giveaway in 2GH, it has been rather interesting to hear the excuse of members opposite for their actions, the excuse being, of course, that these are surplus stocks. Mr. Speaker, how can you say that we have a surplus of codfish within our waters, within our jurisdiction? How can you say, Mr. Speaker, that we have a surplus when we have fish plants operating on the Northeast Coast

of our Province, in Labrador and on the East Coast at about 30 per cent or 35 per cent of their actual operating capacity? How can you say that we have surplus stocks in our Northern waters, whether it is 2J+3KL or 2GH?

MR. TOBIN:

We do not have the technology.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite says, 'We do not have the technology.' I would suggest to the hon. member that we do have the technology, that the only reason we are not harvesting that resource to its total allowable harvest, or catch, is that we have never been told to do so by the powers that be in Ottawa, nor have we been encouraged by the government opposite.

MR. TULK:

They could catch it off your district and mine.

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes. The reason for that is obvious, the old greed factor comes into play, a factor that is not unknown to the fish merchants in this Province. They find it, Mr. Speaker, a lot cheaper, they can save a lot of money by fishing on the Funk Island Banks and by raping the resource on the Northern Grand Banks.

MR. TOBIN:

Not true.

MR. W. CARTER:

The hon. member says it is not true. Well, let me remind the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that in the years 1985 and 1986, 99 per cent of the total offshore effort was caught on the Funk Island Banks and on the Northern Grand Banks, the two Banks that supply

the inshore fishery on the East Coast and on the Northeast Coast of our Province. Ninety-nine per cent of the total harvest by the offshore was conducted on the Funk Island Banks and on the Northern Grand Banks, one per cent was taken on the Belle Isle Bank and on the Hamilton Bank.

Now, of course, again the reason for that is quite obvious. The reason, of course - I repeat - being that it is much cheaper. It is much easier to prosecute the cod fishery, for example, on the Funk Island Bank where you do not have to contend with ice infested waters, and where you have short distances to steam to and from the fishing banks. Consequently, it is much cheaper to fish in that area than to press on into Northern waters to fish in the 2GH areas. That, Mr. Speaker, is the only reason. It is not that we do not have the technology. If the French have it we have it. If not, we can get it. What nonsense! Why would the French want an allocation of 3000 tons off the Northern Coast of Labrador if they could not harvest that 3000 tons? I do not think the French, Mr. Speaker, are just going through the motions of trying to get an allocation without any prospect of harvesting it. The fact of the matter is, we are not harvesting that resource not because we cannot but because we do not want to, and, of course, the reason why we do not want to is because it is a little more costly than fishing, as I said a moment ago, on the Funk Island Banks and Northern Grand Banks. It is as simple as that. If the big fishing companies were told that they had to find their way into Northern waters, North of the 2J+3KL area to fish, then, I suggest to you, they would find

it. Mr. Speaker, we have the boats, we have ice-reinforced trawlers in this Province.

MR. GILBERT:

If we do not, we should.

MR. W. CARTER:

We do. FPI have a number of ice-reinforced vessels, and National Sea have a number of ice-reinforced vessels that could quite easily penetrate the ice-infested waters off Northern Labrador. We do have the capability, the technology, but we do not have the will to do it, and we do not have the will because it is more expensive fish to catch than what it would be, as I said, in the Southern waters. That is what makes it all the more important, Mr. Speaker, that we not look upon that resource as being surplus. Surplus, yes, but only because we have not even tried to harvest it. I would have preferred, for example, to have seen a bigger concentration of effort in the 2GH area than we are seeing, for example, on the Funk Island Banks and the Northern Grand Banks. I would prefer that there be a greater effort put into harvesting that resource as opposed to the Southern Banks.

Mr. Speaker, the government opposite and the Minister of Fisheries especially, seem to be hung up on the designation of Northern cod. Now, they talk about Northern cod as that cod that is in the areas of 2J+3KL. There was a booklet put out by the government some time ago called *Strength From The Sea*. It is a publication of the present administration, and in this booklet, Mr. Speaker, they talk a lot about the Northern cod stocks and its migration patterns. In it they have a map, in colour, and it

shows Newfoundland and Labrador, of course, and the entire coast line of Labrador. It is not written on the map, but I suppose Nain would be the most Northerly point on this map, as it is probably the most Northern point in the 2GH area. I think I am correct in saying that. In this booklet they talk about the Northern cod stock migration, and in it they have shown the entire coast line of Labrador. They have also included little arrows to show the way the fish migrate. They show the Northern cod stock migration. That stock that is available to the Northern Labrador fishermen comes from the 2GH area, and there it is here.

Now, the question, of course, that must be asked is why do the fishermen in places like Punch Bowl, or some of the fishing communities North, say, of the Hamilton Inlet, deserve less attention or less consideration than do the fishermen in the Southern part of Labrador? That is the question, I think, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite must answer. Why are they saying that fishermen where the inshore fishery migrates from the 2J+3KL area are deserving of that much more consideration than fishermen in the areas where the stocks migrate from the 2GH area? It appears that the government opposite, for whatever reason, appear to have written off that stock and are content to allow foreigners to rape it, to take it, giving them allocations without consideration of the effect it can have on the small inshore fishermen in Northern Labrador.

Not only are these stocks important, Mr. Speaker, to Northern Labrador fishermen, they are equally important to fishermen

from the Twillingate district and, I presume, from Fogo district, and Bonavista North. Fishermen from my district last year, in Summerford especially, and Twillingate, went to Northern Labrador and prosecuted the cod fishery. When they could not get a decent catch or decent harvest inshore, in the Notre Dame Bay area, they packed it in and headed for Northern Labrador where, I might add, they did very well. That is why it is so important that that particular cod stock be protected and preserved for the use of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and not be used as a bargaining tool by the Government of Canada in order to ingratiate itself with the Government of France, especially in view of the forthcoming Francophone Summit Conference.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to stress that we, on this side, are against the giving away of any codfish anywhere within the Northern areas, 2J+3KL or the 2GH. Again, I say that we will be asking that the resolution be amended to delete the words that I have indicated this afternoon.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
With respect to a question asked earlier today by the Leader of the Opposition in Question Period concerning vocational instructors' pay, whatever problem existed, as the Premier indicated during Question Period, was apparently an administrative problem. The operative point is that the problem no longer exists and, in

fact, the instructors will be paid on tomorrow, as usual, which is the normal payday.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, that is not what the Premier indicated. As a matter of fact, the Premier indicated he did not know what the problem was. I still doubt that it was an administrative problem rather than a financial problem of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

Before I recognize the hon. the Minister of Education, I would like to welcome to the gallery Mayor Hank Shouse, Councillors Dennis Conway and Herb Brett, and Town Manager Al Durno from the Town Council of Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words on this resolution, seeing that it is extremely important to the social and economic well-being of the Province. We have, this past year or so, perhaps this past two or three years, been concentrating fairly heavily on offshore development, but when we talked

about offshore development, basically we have been talking about offshore oil development. We have been accused, perhaps, of putting all our eggs in one basket. Now, anybody who really knows what is going on realizes that is not exactly true.

There are a couple of other major renewable resources that will have and have had and are having a tremendous effect on the future of this Province. One is the fishery and the other is our hydro resources. Sometime ago, at the hands of a previous administration, we saw what poor management would do or could do -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Not true.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
Order, please!

MR. HEARN:
- with a resource. We saw a renewable resource given away without any protection for this Province and today we are suffering drastically. One of the reasons why the Province is in a poor economic state is because of a giveaway in the past. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, what \$600 million or \$800 million a year could do to the economy of this Province.

So consequently when a second resource, another renewable resource, the fishery, was seemingly headed in the same direction of a giveaway, then it was time for us to stand as we would if we had been in the seats of the gentlemen opposite some years ago.

However, what happened was that during the past few years Canada have had negotiations with France

to try to settle the dispute off the South Coast, specifically overfishing in an area known as 3Ps. I suppose Newfoundlanders never had a better or a clearer indication of the various fishing zones because when we talked about 2J+3KL or 2G, 2H, or 3Ps it meant nothing to most people. Now, most people you talk to sincerely define the various fishing zones and can tell you who fishes there and how much is caught, etc. However, the 3Ps area where the French have been greatly overfishing because they claim jurisdiction over a large territorial area around the Province off St. Pierre et Miquelon has caused a severe problem to the various fishermen and fish plants on the South Coast of this Province.

In order to settle this dispute a committee began negotiating, a committee comprised of several members from the federal scene and members from the Department of Fisheries and Intergovernmental Affairs here. During all the meetings that were held to negotiate and to discuss the problem, our people were notified. They took part in all discussions. When we talk about a lack of communications, as had been mentioned, there was no lack of communications up to then because, as each meeting took place, our own members were directly involved, reported back to the respective departments of the government here, and everyone was fully aware of what was happening.

But suddenly, out of the blue, our government, our Department of Fisheries is notified indirectly by somebody from the private sector that there is a meeting taking place which should be

attended by our representatives on that respective committee. Then we find out from our federal member that no, there is no such meeting because he was advised by the Minister of External Affairs (Mr. Clark) that there was no meeting taking place. So everybody thought it was a false alarm. Then it was discovered that, yes, some people were over in France, but once again the message was delivered 'do not worry, they do not have the power to sign anything binding.' That was said publicly on radio by our representative in the federal Cabinet.

MR. FLIGHT:

That is your friend, your buddy-buddy.

MR. HEARN:

He did not know either. I mean, he was only saying what he was told, as you would do. Quite often you would probably say a lot of stuff you were not told, but anyway.

Then we find out that there was an agreement signed, an agreement which could lead to a giveaway which could be comparable to the giveaway of our hydro power in Labrador. It was an agreement which not only could be a giveaway, it is an agreement which has given away a vital resource. As my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) pointed out yesterday, already the French have been given access to 3,000 tons in 2G and 2H.

Along with that, a more serious implication is the fact that in that very agreement on the table they have laid the promise that, in effect, if they sit down to negotiate an agreement, there will be cod from 2J+3KL on the table.

Whether or not an agreement is reached, if it goes to binding arbitration, just by that cod being on the table we have set a base from which they will negotiate. It is there, it will be pointed out that you already agreed in the agreement of such a date to give cod from 2J+3KL and consequently, we presume then that we will build on that base. In any arbitration usually you build from a common base. So right away we have lost, unless that agreement is rejected, torn up and just put away in the files to be forever forgotten.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would permit a question?

MR. HEARN:

Sure.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I would just like to ask him if I heard him correctly. I want to ask who it was and when did he say they informed the provincial government that there was a meeting in Paris but they did not have the power to sign anything that was binding? Who said that and when?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, he did not hear me correctly. I did not say anything about the provincial government saying that we were informed. I said that the federal minister said that they were informed that there was a meeting in Paris, but that the people who were over there did not have the authority to sign anything binding. I did

not say who informed the federal minister. I do not know who informed the federal minister, but I do know that the federal minister was informed not to worry about it because they are not empowered to sign anything binding. Apparently it was on the weekend of the meeting in France or while the meeting was supposed to be going ahead in France.

MR. BARRY:

So why are you lashing into Crosbie then?

MR. HEARN:

Who is lashing into Crosbie?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HEARN:

This is the point. If you go back, go back to what has been said by everybody, look very carefully at the criticisms and any of those that were directed directly at the federal minister and question yourselves as to whether the federal minister was singled out, and ask if he was criticized in that manner for not advising us of the agreement, of the team not being over there, etc. Just look up the facts and you will find out that no criticism was levelled at Mr. Crosbie in that regard.

However, Mr. Speaker,-

MR. TULK:

He does not want to be confused by the facts.

MR. FUREY:

And Tom Siddon is not a liar.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I wonder if the Minister would consider a short question?

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue with my remarks.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Question Period is tomorrow. They will have half an hour to ask questions, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I wonder if the Minister would indicate whether his provincial riding falls within the St. John's West federal riding of Mr. Crosbie?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

It is very unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition, who gets sixty minutes to speak in this debate, would do such a thing as he just did now and take away the time of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) who only has thirty minutes. The hon. minister would like to continue his speech

and he should give him the courtesy.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order -

MR. BARRY:

The minister and former Speaker makes a valid -

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I have heard enough on that point of order and there is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. BUTT:

Sit him down.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to -

MR. BUTT:

Sit down!

MR. TOBIN:

Name him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say I did not intend to interrupt the minister. He is making a very fine speech but we cannot take ourselves too seriously from time to time and I think it is a little humorous that the minister would try to backtrack when perhaps he recognizes that his constituents have a lot of respect for Mr. Crosbie who happens to be the federal member for some of the same people that he represents.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member knows very well where my district is. The hon. member also knows that I worked very hard during Mr. Crosbie's campaign. The hon. member knows that I, with my organization, won every poll in that federal riding for Mr. Crosbie even despite the fact that the former Minister of Fisheries was running against him, a former member of the area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, during this past year around the Province of Newfoundland many areas suffered greatly due to a lack of resource. It was mentioned earlier by the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), the affects on his area for instance, the affects on Fogo, the affects on the whole East and Southeast coast of Newfoundland, in most places. You had little bits and pieces here and there that were not affected perhaps because of a small bunch of fish that managed to get to shore or whatever. Generally speaking the fishery was a disaster on the East and Southeast Coast of Newfoundland.

It has been pointed out by people in the know - not by the biologists or the so-called experts - but by the fishermen of the Province that perhaps - in fact in their mind it is not perhaps, it is a definite yes - the poor fishery was caused by overfishing in places such as the Funk Island Banks and the Northern Grand Banks. Statistics will show that their theory seems very, very reasonable. I do not think there is doubt in anybodies mind that that could easily be a fact behind

why the fishery was so bad this year.

Last Fall I had the opportunity with a few of my colleagues one evening to meet with Mr. Siddon, the federal Minister of Fisheries, and we discussed the disastrous fishery in the Province. We pointed those facts out to him. A little later on the federal government cutback on the offshore fishing effort by 10,000 metric tons in the respective areas, but above and beyond the cutback which reduced the offshore fishing effort, they suggested, in fact they said they would monitor, the fishing effort of the offshore companies to make sure that it was not concentrated on the Northern Grand Banks and the Funk Island Banks but it would be spread out over the major fishing areas, including the Bell Island and Hamilton Banks. Consequently, this would offer a fair amount of reprieve to the inshore fishery and in a few years we would see if the stocks returned to shore.

Personally I have no doubt that this is the case. I agree wholeheartedly with what the fishermen are saying because we have always said, Who knows more about the fishery than the fishermen around the coast of this Province?

The area, however, not necessarily affected by the overfishing in 2J+3KL, was St. Mary's Bay. Our stock somewhat, perhaps, comes from that area, but we are also affected by the 3Ps stock. That is a concern to our district. Even though during this past couple of years we have had a very successful fishery with all plants going, a fair amount of the resource is brought in from outside. But, if the continued

overfishing effort takes place and keeps taking place in 3Ps, then certainly areas such as St. Mary's Bay, the Burin Peninsula, all the Southeast - Southwest Coast, will be affected by that.

An effort has to be made to reach an agreement. France, undoubtedly, is going to hesitate to sit down to negotiate. They are going to hesitate to go to arbitration because in a previous case, the Channel Island case, they, themselves, won the case which undoubtedly would set a precedent for the area of St. Pierre et Miquelon. In the case against Britain where Britain was trying to claim fishing jurisdiction around the Channel Islands, France, of course, took them to court and France won. I think the court basically said that small islands could not expect to claim large areas of jurisdiction around the island themselves. Undoubtedly such a precedent would also apply to St. Pierre et Miquelon. I do not think anybody doubts that. So the longer France goes without going to arbitration, then the longer it can continue to claim, on its own merits, jurisdiction over large areas of the fishing grounds off the shore of St. Pierre et Miquelon.

However, in order to facilitate an agreement, one of the things that the Province did agree to, as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) has already said, was to put 2,000 metric tons of cod from an area where there is little or no fishing effort, as he demonstrated yesterday, by the Newfoundland fishing companies; cod which has been classified as surplus cod. I do not think any of us will agree that there is any such thing as surplus cod because

cod does move. However, it is an area that could perhaps, in light of the fact that the French have certain fishing rights anyway, handle the effort if, by giving that 2,000 metric tons - this was the only reason it was put on the table - France would reduce its effort in 3Ps, the effort which last year saw them catch somewhere in the vicinity of 25,000 metric tons, if they would reduce their fishing effort in that area and if there would be no fish from 2J+3KL on the table.

So what happened? We saw no reduction in the fishing effort. We saw no agreement to reduce the fishing effort in 3Ps. We saw a promise, a commitment, to put cod from 2J+3KL on the table. So, consequently, because these two giveaways were listed in the agreement, it automatically meant that the Province did not agree to give the 2,000, and as it happened, to become 3,000 tons of cod from 2GH to the French. So, consequently, we can say that we did not agree because we only agreed to give 2,000 metric tons if, and only if, there was an agreement to reduce the effort and if there was no cod from 2J+3KL on the table.

So, consequently, the Province did not give away any fish at all or did not agree to give away any, under the circumstances. So, consequently, we have then an agreement which certainly compromises our position in relation to developing the fishery around the Island. It certainly compromises the future of the fishery for people who fish on the South Coast, in particular, and not only that, certainly all the Northeast and Southeast Coast if cod from 2J+3KL becomes part of the final bargaining.

So, consequently, Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that the Province was upset, it is no wonder that the Province took a strong stand on this matter because this is our future. It is a motherhood issue and, I presume, that the resolution is going to pass unanimously.

The question, I suppose, is why are we saying in such strong language "that this House of Assembly record its unanimous condemnation of this infamous agreement made in callous disregard of the livelihood of Canadians dependent on this fish resource and the deliberate denial of the legitimate participation of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador: and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that we urge the Government of Canada to take all necessary measures to have the boundary issue resolved without compromising the vital interests of the Province of Newfoundland." That is what it is doing.

What happened shortly after the Province took such a strong stand in relation to the fishery, when every person in the Province, with few exceptions, some of them being the members opposite who procrastinated on the issue, but with very few exceptions, when individuals right across the Province stood together on this issue?

What happened when the federal budget came down and the announcement was made that there would be an exemption of taxation for farmers in the West, an exemption of 3 per cent? No mention was made of fishermen. Right away when the question was raised, where are the fishermen,

we were told automatically, bang, the exemption is there.

Now, I ask, Mr. Speaker, if we had not stood up so strongly on the previous issue against the federal government, just shortly before, would we or would we not have gotten the exemption for the fishermen so quickly? It is a question that perhaps bears some consideration.

However, Mr. Speaker, my time is just about up.

MR. FUREY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

On a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker. The member says that it was his lobbying and their vociferous complaints to Ottawa which allowed fishermen to be included in that rebate, as I understand it, that is what he said.

MR. TULK:

That is what he said.

MR. FUREY:

Now, it is interesting to note that fishermen will only get three cents per litre rebate while farmers will get 7.5 cents a litre rebate. So will the minister undertake to insure that he will be even more vociferous to pick up the extra 4.5 cents a litre for Newfoundlanders?

MR. HEARN:

That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and certainly that step has already been taken by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and others because when it comes to dealings for the

fishermen of Newfoundland or any other person in this Province, this government has never, never hesitated to stand up for what is right and what is proper. Consequently, when the vote is called a little later, Mr. Speaker, I, along with the others, will only be to glad to stand up to support the resolution so ably presented yesterday by my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries.

Thank you.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have stood by, listened and watched patiently for the last six months and I am sick and tired of hearing the French issue over and over by the government members who are supposed to be responsible and looking after the affairs of this Province, opening their mouths and absolutely nothing coming out but false statements with no basis, no substance or anything else.

Here I am asked to support a resolution that if you value up the total of the ink and the the total of the paper it is written on, it values about ten pennies and that is about the value of this if I support it and it goes of to Ottawa.

Here, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation with the federal government, the same stripe as what we see across from us, the same blue, demoralizing stripes up in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, who are supposed to be looking after all

Canadians. One of the greatest disappointments that came out of Ottawa since the federal election is the fact that there is one goal in mind, one set goal and that is to demoralize and to take away all the rights of the Newfoundland fishermen. They cannot come out in one statement or one bill or one legislative law and say, "We are going to do away with the inshore fishery, we are going to do away with the rights of Newfoundlanders," but they can take it away in small pins. Stick the pin in, and eventually, after a period of time, they will demoralize them and discourage them enough so that the people will just fall away from the fishery. The newer generation and the younger generation will not get into it. That is the long-term attitude of the federal government and that is the way they intend to do with what we have going in this Province.

MR. FUREY:

The death of a thousand cuts.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the situation with this French issue is not what is being told by members opposite. Here is an example of where they are covering up and blindly leading Newfoundland people. Political and hypocritical statements are being made by the Premier every day, every time he comes on the news media. Back in November, December and January, when all of this was going on, we did not even have a Minister of Fisheries, he was not heard. After the damage was done, he then comes out of the woodwork and starts making statements, statements to no avail, statements to no effect. The point is, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Premier and every

member opposite, and every person in this Province, whether we send an all-party resolution to Ottawa, or whether we send it to France, or wherever we send it, it will have no effect on the decisions that are going to be made. The rights of the Newfoundland fishermen are going to be taken away and there is nothing that the government of this Province is going to be able to do about it.

There are a number of reasons, Mr. Speaker, why this is continuing. One of the main problems is the fact that our government, our provincial government, is not responsible and is not able to manage the affairs of this Province, neither financially, nor health-wise, nor education-wise, nor in any other aspect of their ministerial departments to do the job that would ensure protection for Newfoundlanders. Since 1979, this has been more evident than ever it could be in any political system. We have seen our financial situation go from \$855,000 to over \$4 billion in debt. What have we seen for it? Absolutely nothing. We have seen the financial strain on the common people growing even larger and larger. We have seen no concrete platform for the creation of jobs. Absolutely nothing whatsoever. We get false promises, yet billions of dollars are spent year after year.

MR. J. CARTER:

Talk about concrete platforms.

MR. EFFORD:

Concret platforms for your savoury farm, that is about all we will get.

Mr. Speaker, the situation here is more serious than just the overfishing by the French or the

fact that they got an allocation of 3,000 tons of Northern cod. The situation here is the way in which our Newfoundland fishermen are being treated. If members opposite were half as serious about fighting for individual rights and protection of our inshore fishermen in Newfoundland, we would be a lot better off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

The situation now is that most of the fishermen who have \$1 million boats, with bank payments totalling \$50,000, \$60,000 or \$75,000 a year, and who had a licence in 1985-1986, they have received letters in the mail saying, 'Your licence is no longer valid because you did not fish on your boat last year. Because you had another skipper on your boat, your licence is no longer valid. The only way you are going to be able to operate now is on a day to day or a week to week permit.'

I have not heard once, in all of the arguments put forward over the last four or five months, the Premier or any member of that government, or the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), make reference to the way in which our Newfoundland inshore fishermen are being treated. Why was there never an all-party resolution sent to Ottawa to have the rights of our fishermen placed in the proper hands? Decision should be made by people who know the industry best, not by bureaucrats in Ottawa who never saw an ocean, who never say a codfish, or fish of any species, except on a plate in a restaurant? We have never heard one member opposite say anything, or do anything, to get the decision-making back here. When

decisions and regulations are made affecting our inshore fishery, let us have input from the local fishermen in this Province. Let us have private input. No, we cannot get that because it is not the Tory attitude. The Tory attitude is not toward people, the Tory attitude is toward business, the large corporations, the multimillion dollar corporations, all dollar signs. I have heard so much talk about our Mr. White Knight it makes me sick to my stomach every time I read the paper. The great Mr. White Knight was given \$300 million to develop the fishery. By God, I will tell this House and I will tell any House, if someone gave me \$300 million, I would perfect any business.

MR. SIMMONS:

You are talking about cousin Vic, are you?

MR. EFFORD:

Yes, our great Mr. White Knight. What has he done for the inshore fishery? As was stated earlier, he is destroying the inshore fishery. We do have not got the technology to catch the Northern cod. The French has the technology. We were given \$300 million and a brain equal to none in Canada, Mr. White Knight, and we cannot develop the technology to catch the Northern cod. A great statement by the Minister of Fisheries and by the members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the situation with our fishery is growing even worse. Now we have reached the point where we cannot expect any co-operation from our federal counterparts in the way of economics, in the fishery, or in any way at all for 1987.

The provincial attitude is even worse, even more pitiful. Because, as far as I am concerned and as far as the public is concerned, the general perception is that they have no understanding, no knowledge, no idea of exactly what is taking place. We have seen Germans, Russians, the French, and all foreign countries, continuously overfishing ever since the agreement was made for them to fish on the Grand Banks. One issue comes up because the financial situation is so bad in this Province, the labour relations are so bad in this Province -

MR. FUREY:
Unemployment.

MR. EFFORD:
Yes - and the unemployment situation is so bad in this Province that the Premier sees no way out, and the only way to cover up is with the Canada - France deal; a shell game, a blindfold, to take people's minds away from things that matter most right now.

The statements that have been made have no concrete basis whatsoever. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), the Premier, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and every member of the government, knows full well that what we are doing here is just a complete waste of time. No way are they going to change their minds.

If this administration was serious about doing anything about changing the negotiations, the House of Assembly would have been open the first time that this issue was brought to the table, when the Minister of Fisheries, when members of the union and when

members of this House of Assembly were sitting at the table and knew that they were beginning those negotiations. That is when the House of Assembly should have been opened -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
That would have been in the Fall. The House should have been opened in the Fall.

MR. EFFORD:
- not after everything was given away and everything was gone beyond repair. It is too late now to go crawling on our hands and knees and begging for change. We know that the people in Ottawa have no respect for members of the provincial government, and that is exactly what we are being told.

Then we see the Premier come out and make a statement, "We are going to call the House into a two day session." Real serious! Everybody in the Province thought the Premier was serious.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I was.

MR. EFFORD:
Oh, yes, quite serious. Because a letter was not worded right, that was significant enough to keep the House of Assembly closed. Everybody in this Province knows full well that opposition parties cannot open or close the House. The Premier could have called the House together regardless of how that letter was worded." Go out and talk to the people around the Province and notice the attitude of the fishermen and the people on the street toward the foolish statements made by the Premier of this Province. Let him go out to

the community of Port de Grave, where you have one of the greater fishing villages in this Province, and see the amount of money they have tied up. They know that we have a Premier who is leading them down a path of no return. You were elected to be responsible for the people, and during your term in office you are supposed to do that. If you are not competent to do that, you should bow out. And you should realize that what you are doing is just hideous, stupid mistakes, yet you are trying to portray the attitude that you care. No such thing comes from the Tory attitude. All Tories care about are the high profits on a corporation's financial statement at the end of a year.

If Newfoundland Light and Power, for example, cannot make \$20 million, then they are all discouraged.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries's performance in this whole issue - I suppose one could say he is serious when you take into consideration the fact that he knows no better, he does not know how to be any different. A serious attitude is not enough in this. Publicity is not enough. You can play the political game and you can try to get your name up in the polls, but that is not enough.

MR. FLIGHT:

When are we going to get the caribou? Buck Rogers.

MR. MATTHEWS:

(Inaudible) spray them.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, when Buck Rogers and the other gentleman are finished shooting caribou, I will continue with my speech.

Mr. Speaker, the attitude of members opposite, lying back reading the paper or making jokes about the situation, is the reason why the Province is in the sad state it is in today.

MR. WINDSOR:

Not true.

MR. PATTERSON:

I am looking at a picture of a fellow kissing a pig.

MR. WINDSOR:

What does a pig look like?

MR. EFFORD:

If the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) would look at his face in the mirror each morning he would know what a pig looks like. I would not, Mr. Speaker, poke fun at children down in the Janeway Hospital for whom that money was raised and donated, for little children. You should be ashamed, the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) and the member for Mount Pearl, to make any comment about it at all. If I had to kiss a dozen pigs I would do it for the children at the Janeway, because I consider helping the children at the Janeway much more important than kissing a pig.

MR. PATTERSON:

That pig died of hoof and mouth disease.

So, tomorrow morning, when you look in the mirror, just think about what you just asked the member for Placentia, 'What does a pig look like.'

Mr. Speaker, I will think seriously before I even stand to support a resolution that is going nowhere. I will think very seriously. I will listen to the debate, but it is going to take a

lot of convincing, Mr. Speaker. We know it is a piece of paper and we know it has to go to Ottawa, but it will have no impact on changing minds. With the attitude of members opposite and the Premier of this Province, the words he has been using, the posturing and the political talk that has been pouring out of his mouth with no substance whatsoever, it is going to take a lot of convincing before I stand on my feet to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have here in front of me letters from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, as far as licensing is concerned, telling fishermen in this Province that they are not allowed to go out and catch fish on the Grand Banks, yet other countries are out there raping our stocks. Again, I refer to the Minister of Fisheries being made aware of this time after time, of the unions being made aware of it, and of the federal people being made aware of it. But it is not serious enough, not once is it serious enough, for the Minister of Fisheries to bring it up in this House of Assembly and call for an all-party resolution to protect the fishermen of this Province.

"WHEREAS the Government of Canada deliberately excluded the Province of Newfoundland from participation in, or knowledge of the Paris meeting contrary to the established practice." Mr. Speaker, it has been made quite clear by all members of the federal government that the provincial people did have knowledge thereof. It is true, from the very first time anybody sat down to the table in negotiations. It was true that negotiations were taking place,

and whatever was taking place affected everybody in Newfoundland. Here again I go back to the point that that is when the House of Assembly should have opened. It has been closed so long now that it is hard to remember when it was open last. But that is when something as serious as this should have been brought to the attention of the House of Assembly. You do not let the water flow out of the barrel and then try to put a cover on it, you stop it before it flows out, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, many times the question is going to be asked over the next several months, as our 1987 fishing season gets underway, about the rights of Newfoundlanders. When are the rights of Newfoundlanders going to be protected? When is the federal Tory government and the provincial Tory government going to realize that people in this Province are a part of Canada, that they are Canadians, and that they have rights, as any other Canadians do, to be protected and to be given rights to the natural resources around this Province?

A clear example was stated by the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) just a short time ago. When the federal budget came down, benefits were given to farmers out West, they would get rebates on their gasoline and they would get rebates on their diesel fuel. The fishermen of Newfoundland were not once mentioned in that budget.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The budget has not been brought down.

MR. SIMMONS:

The federal budget.

MR. EFFORD:

And where have you been, Sir? Where have you been that you do not know the federal budget has been brought down?

AN HON. MEMBER:

That does not matter.

MR. EFFORD:

Oh! So the federal rebates do not matter.

During the whole of 1985 and 1986 we were told that the best thing that could happen to this Province was have a Tory government in Ottawa. Now, it does not matter. Now, you do not even listen to the budget. So you are telling us that the budget does not matter to the Province. That is worth quoting to your constituents.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the attitude taken by the federal Tories in the recent budget is that Western farmers were going to get the rebate. There was no mention of the fishermen in Newfoundland. That is exactly one of the problems that Newfoundland fishermen have been having with the Tories in Ottawa, they have them presently and they are going to continue. Until we get a change, until we sweep out of both governments, Mr. Speaker, I say there is going to be a lot of despair and desperation for all people belonging to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I take pride in speaking on this very important resolution. Representing a fishing district on the South coast of the Province, this matter is very vital to us, and to the whole the Province.

Listening to the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) speaking you would almost think that he was not aware that the Mulroney government has only been in power for two years. Since 1979 this administration has consistently fought and stood up for more control and extended jurisdiction over fisheries for the people of this Province. We have consistently done that. For sixteen years Mr. Trudeau was Prime Minister of this country and he gave us nothing. Now, I want to go on record, Mr. Speaker, as saying that I do not agree with what the Mulroney government has done on this fishing issue. I do not agree with it. Let us not lose sight of the fact now that from 1979 up to September, 1984, this administration was dealing with a Liberal administration in Ottawa and we got nowhere, we got no further on fisheries jurisdiction in this Province.

MR. FUREY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to interrupt the minister early in his speech, but just for the record I would ask the minister to point out where such an act of treachery as we have seen from the Tory Conservatives in only two

years - thank God the mandate is only five years - was seen during the sixteen years the Trudeau government was dealing with Newfoundland fish.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order. The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, this fisheries deal with France strikes at the backbone of all of Newfoundland, in particular the South coast of the Province, because in the district that I represent, we are getting it both ways.

MR. FLIGHT:

From the member and from the policy.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, could the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) please be quiet? I think he was driven out by the spray for the budworm? So, would you please be quiet?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have order while the minister is debating, please?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, the people of the South Coast are getting it two ways. We are getting it because Northern cod is being put on the table for France, where our trawlers fish Northern cod. I guess the biggest problem with the agreement is that the overfishing by France in 3Ps affects, as well, the fishery on the South Coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN:

And the two collage hospitals, the one in Grand Bank and the one in St. Lawrence.

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, Mr. Speaker. Being a little more effective MHA than the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), I do not have to worry about my hospitals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:

Did you approve the way we killed the caribou?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Did the Minister personally approve that?

MR. SPEAKER:

Could we have silence while the minister is debating please?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, we, on the South Coast of this Province, went through a fisheries restructuring crisis and agreement that this Province had to stand up and keep plants open on the South Coast of the Province when a member of the House, sitting in the Opposition, was then in the Government of Ottawa and went along with the Government of Canada to close down plants. We had to stand up for that. We have kept the plants open, Mr. Speaker. But, as a consequence, of course, we have seen the hours of work, the weeks of work, the months of work per year, reduced.

My biggest concern, Mr. Speaker, with the France - Canada agreement, particularly as it pertains to 3Ps, is that with the French overfishing in 3Ps, which everyone knows is taking place there - they are only allocated 6,400 metric tons, we know they are taking at least 25,000, it maybe as high as 40,000 - in this agreement and negotiations, if Canada goes on in the process to negotiate the total allowable catch in 3Ps, my real fear is that they legitimize and legalize the French overfishing. That really bothers me because that stock in 3Ps cannot take that. What that will then mean is that plants on the South Coast of the Province, their months of work will be further reduced.

I guess the further irritant in all of this is that we saw in January our own domestic catch reduced by some 10,000 metric tons. The people in my area of the Province accepted that very reluctantly in the name of conservation and the future of the fishery. Then a month of so after that, we see this agreement come through with France where fish was going to a foreign country, which really meant that there would be less work for the people of this Province.

These are the major problems I have with the France - Canada agreement, Mr. Speaker. Of course, it is why I so strongly support the resolution so ably put forward by my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, it is great to hear the hon. gentleman talk about that wonderful restructuring agreement that the federal Liberals put in place, but I cannot allow him to go on, as a gentleman who stood in this House some years ago, himself, and -

MR. DAWE:

Where is this in Beausheerne? Is this a point of order?

MR. TULK:

The minister should be in Beausheerne according to the mess he has on Fogo Island.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. gentleman would tell us who tore up the restructuring agreement, whether it was the Mulroney Government or not, and if he is now going to get out of the Tory Party the same as he wanted us to do on this side of the House? Is that what he is going to do or is he going to mouth off down here the same as the Premier?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any reason to leave the Tory Administration. I would suggest to the hon. member and others over there that they will not need a reason to leave the Liberal Party in the next election because they are going to be wiped out anyway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Could we have order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

You do not have a commitment to stand up for the people of this Province and put the people of this Province first. That was your problem when the Liberals were in Ottawa as the federal government. It is your problem now. You will not put the people of the Province first, which this administration has done since 1979. Regardless of the issue, whether it has been the fishery, whether it has been the offshore, or any other issue in this Province, this administration puts Newfoundland first. We do not care who is in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Our first commitment is to represent the people who elected us. They happen to be Newfoundlanders. We do not play politics with those in Ottawa. We stand up for the people of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, we came in here on Monday and all sides of this House agreed that we would try to operate here in a spirit of co-operation so that when someone was speaking we would have co-operation from the other side. Here we see now the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) over there trying to disrupt the House, taking it on his back as he did in the last session, and create chaos. Of course, what he is trying to do is deflect the issues of the day because he is so guilty about the stand his party is taking once again on this issue of not putting the Province first. That is his problem.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) talked about licences. The real concern that I have as it pertains to licences, Mr. Speaker, is that if we do not control the overfishing off our shores and if we continue to give fish to foreigners, then there will not be any need for Newfoundlanders to have licences because there will not be any fish out there for them to catch. That is the real concern on the matter of licencing.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave as well talked about jurisdiction, harvesting is a federal jurisdiction, quotas and allocations are federal jurisdictions. We have consistently, Mr. Speaker, stood up for this Province to try -

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible) the big, bad Liberals.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, will you ask the ignoramus for Fogo to leave the House, please?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, we have consistently stood up for extended and more jurisdiction over fisheries for the people of this Province from harvesting, licencing, all the way to processing, of course, which is totally a provincial jurisdiction. As I have said, we have dealt with Liberal Governments in Ottawa. We are now dealing with the Tory Government in Ottawa and on fisheries issues, we have certainly, as this issue fully demonstrates, that one has

been no better than the other. I am not ready to applaud the Mulroney administration on the France-Canada fisheries agreement. I totally object to it. I have said that publicly. I want to go on record in this House as saying it again today.

As I have said, the real fear for me, representing the district of Grand Bank on the South Coast of the Province, is that when you get into negotiations with France and the total allowable catch in 3Ps, Canada will in essence legalize, legitimize overfishing by France in that zone and the stocks will be totally depleted. Instead of ten or twelve months work a year on the South Coast, we will be reduced to six months. That is my real big concern.

The other things, Mr. Speaker, of course the hon. member talked about the Grand Banks and overfishing.

MR. FUREY:
(Inaudible). When was that?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:
This administration has consistently lobbied Liberal, and now Tory Administration in Ottawa and asked for extended jurisdiction over the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks. We have consistently done that. We have as yet not been successful with either administration. Unless we get control over the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks, we are as well, of course, we know there is gross overfishing outside that line of the 200 mile limit and until we extend that to these very important areas, then we will not really have control because as we

all know fish swim in and out. The great overfishing is taking place in the Nose and Tail. We have consistently done that as an administration, Mr. Speaker, lobbied Ottawa, asked them, wrote them, telephoned them to get the process in place to extend jurisdiction to the Nose and Tail.

Mr. Speaker, I think really this matter is far too important for any of us to go play partisan politics with it. It is certainly important to every one that I represent in the district of Grand Bank, the people of the Burin Peninsula, the total fishing area. I have seen, Mr. Speaker, the length of employment for people reduced because of the restructuring agreement. As well, Mr. Speaker, we have gone to the factory freezer trawler issue which we violently opposed on this side of the House. And now, of course, we see this very flagrant and very wrong fisheries agreement with France that I think is going to have very detrimental effects on the people of the South Coast and, of course, a lot of the Northeast Coast as well.

As I said earlier, we are getting it both ways in my area, Mr. Speaker, because we are having cod in the Northern zone 2J+3KL which will now be harvested by France while there is overfishing in the 3Ps zone. So it is going to affect my area of the Province both ways. You cannot catch the same fish in 2J+3KL as France can catch and, of course, the deepsea fishery on the South Coast as well of course as the inshore fishery, which is very negatively affected over the last two to three years in 3Ps, where we really last year in the area from Lawn to Lamaline had a very poor inshore fishery, and it was felt then, of course,

that one of the main reasons for that was overfishing in 3Ps. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

If the overfishing continues there is no doubt that the inshore fishery will be completely wiped out. The trawler catches in 3Ps will be significantly reduced which, of course, will mean less earnings for trawlermen, less earnings for inshore fishermen, less earnings for plant workers. So either way, Mr. Speaker, it is a very bad agreement.

MR. EFFORD:

Will the hon. member permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, I will permit a question. Sure, go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Recreation and Youth has very clearly, and I commend him on his fine speech, very clearly stated, and this has to do with the fishery -

MR. SIMMS:

Thank him for his courtesy.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you for your courtesy by permitting me to ask a question. But you very clearly stated that your government could not work with the former Liberal Government as far as anything related to fishery.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I did not say that.

MR. EFFORD:

You are stating very clearly that you cannot work with the government of the day as far as anything to do with the fishery related to Newfoundland. The question is is the minister then saying that they have failed and they are not capable of working with any government in Ottawa?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, to answer that question, I did not say we could not work with a government in Ottawa. What I have said is that we have consistently since 1979, asked for more jurisdiction over the fishery in this Province so that we as a Province and as a people, have more control. I have consistently said that. As an administration we have asked for that from the Liberal Government and the Tory Government, but neither government has seen fit to give us more jurisdiction, more control control over our most important resource.

Did you ever stop to think that maybe these people in Ottawa who do not realize the importance of the fishery to this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would ask my hon. friends on the right, please give the minister an opportunity to speak in silence.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, we have had this problem since Confederation. I just want to highlight for the gentlemen over there that we have gone to two administrations, different stripes in Ottawa, and if by chance, which I do not see any in the next short while, that the New Democratic Party forms the government in Ottawa, then we will have the same problem. I am sure we will have the same problem. It will not change because I think we have seen demonstrated fully that the governments of the day, and the government previous to this one, are totally controlled by the population base of the country which is Central Canada, and I do not think they realize what the fishery really means to the people of this Province, that it is the backbone.

The other problem about the agreement, Mr. Speaker, is that really to get France to agree to arbitration on the boundary issue, they did not have to offer fish, they could have offered anything else. We trade with France in any other number of commodities. We do not know why it has to be fish all the time. It is fish, fish, fish, why was it not something else?

MR. FUREY:
Like what?

MR. TOBIN:
Helicopters?

MR. MATTHEWS:
Liberal members, helicopters, anything with France we would trade, but the point being of course that -

MR. TULK:
How about Tory members?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

- I do not think that they realize the importance of fish to the Province. I do not think really that they had to negotiate fish in the agreement to get France to arbitrate a boundary dispute about St. Pierre and Miquelon.

Of course the other thing as well that I must comment on is that I was really scared that the people of St. Pierre and Miquelon, and of course the Government in Canada, was going to take the Leader of the Opposition seriously when he talked about annexation of St. Pierre, because of course if that was the case then they probably would have been in my district of Grand Bank and then I would have to become bilingual.

MR. FUREY:

Not like the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder).

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

I think it really goes to illustrate what the Opposition thought about this issue and how well thought out they were and how to approach it when we had their Leader come out and his suggestion was to annex St. Pierre and Miquelon. Now what a suggestion. What good would it have done for the people of the South Coast? It would have done nothing, so I think really that you people on the other side have to realize that. You have to put the people of the Province first.

I honestly think still that the agreement with France because of this resolution, we all have to work together to try and get the

federal government to rethink what they are proposing to do on this issue because I still think there must be a way found to get out of it without us again giving up some of our very valuable fish resource and stocks to a foreign country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record as supporting the resolution that my hon. friend, the Minister of Fisheries, has put forward and as the people of the South Coast and one member representing a totally fishing district, that I am totally opposed to giving France this 2J+3KL access and as well to the overfishing in 3Ps because I am scared, Mr. Speaker. I go on record once more that all we are going to do is legalize overfishing in 3Ps, which will totally wipe out the stocks and will mean nothing more than total unemployment for the people of the South Coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure today to rise and make my first speech since, I cannot remember when, in the Newfoundland House of Assembly.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You have not made your maiden speech yet.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

My maiden speech and every other speech I will make will be much better than the speech of the

Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), I can tell him that.

MR. TULK:

At least we will have some sense.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, at the very least, and besides I should not be bothered by him right now.

I want to say that I think all of Newfoundland and Labrador, all individuals of this Province are all thinking in the same way, expressing their regret and also their condemnation towards the federal government's decision to go and leave us out of negotiations on that historic flight to France where they decided to sign away the rights of this Province. I do not think there is any problem with that. I do not think that any member of this House of Assembly will vote against telling them exactly what they think of the federal government. As a matter of fact, I would like to even word it stronger and I will probably do that on my own. I think that you will get unanimous consent and rightfully so.

It is the first time that we in the House of Assembly have had a chance to, at the very least, put our opinions forth on the issue, to express that condemnation as strong as we can and hope that maybe up in Ottawa - it is probably a vain hope - that we might get hearing from somebody up there and that the Prime Minister of the country would consider us more than just a dot down in Atlantic Canada.

MR. FUREY:

The orphans of Confederation.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

The orphans of Confederation as my colleague from St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) puts it.

I have had problems since this federal government got in. As is obvious at the present time they are falling apart piece by piece, day by day, and really do not have any sense of direction as to where they are going. I think one of the things we should bring into this is that not only is the fishery being given away and sold off and bargained away, but we have free trade talks going on and we do not know exactly what is going to happen again with our fishery there. The way they are handling that, God knows, that maybe gone next week so.

In this Province I do not know how strong we can express it. I think we should have expressed it a lot earlier and if the House had been open we probably could have done that. Also, the Premier should have met with the Prime Minister to at the very least put his feelings face to face with the hon. gentleman. It is unfortunate that this did not occur.

So we are now stuck with something that this Province should never have had to put up with and have to live with for the future. I have to read this because what really poisons me is when you say something and you put a position forward and you are saying what you think of a group of people and you are telling us what they are going to do for you, then a little while later you decide that 'I am not going to accept that responsibility.' You forget what you said and also going to forget you job and what you are supposed to do.

I am going to read this little thing from the Throne Speech of March of 1986. "Perhaps one of the most positive events to occur has been the significant change in attitude brought about by the election in late 1984 of a new government in Ottawa. A new spirit of federal/provincial understanding and co-operation has clearly emerged across the nation since that time. We now have a federal government that is sensitive to the circumstances, needs and aspirations of all regions and walks of life in the country. Acrimony has given way to harmony, flexibility has replaced resistance and co-operation characterizes this new rapprochement that the federal government is now espousing. This bodes well for the future especially for Newfoundland which in the place has been unjustly relegated to second-class status in the Canadian federation."

MR. TULK:

Who wrote that?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I wonder. "There will, of course, continue to be differences of opinion with the federal government." Well, this comes from our Throne Speech of the Newfoundland House of Assembly put forward by the present administration. I believe that is the Tory administration, I do believe. Is that right? Last year as a matter of fact, twelve months ago.

MR. FUREY:

What are they talking about?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

They are talking about the federal government, their treatment under the federal government. They are talking about the negotiations and

what they are going to do and how they are going to treat us. That is what I think of that whole thing. The thing is they said to go along with them. They said, no problem. They have the feelings of Newfoundlanders, they have all the rights of Newfoundlanders in their hands and it is no problem because they are of the same stripe.

MR. TULK:

Did we have a prosperity crusade?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

We had a prosperity crusade that said, 'come along with us and we are going to ride the wave.'

MR. TULK:

Who put that on?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I do not know. I think it was the hon. Premier and his caucus. They went and they built up this hype for the Province, and then they let negotiations go on.

They also did not open the House of Assembly, to my amazement. I was befuddled. People were asking me why. I said, 'Well, what is the value of the House of Assembly?' They had something to hide maybe. You really could not get at the problems. You could not get at the questions, you see. Maybe it was because we would ask questions about the negotiations. Maybe we might find out what some of the problems were. We might find out about Hibernia. We might find out about the negotiations for the fishery. We might get some answers, you see. That is dangerous because in Newfoundland and Labrador you are not supposed to get answers any more. You can see the Premier today getting up and not answering any questions. He has been doing

that for the last seven or eight months, and doing it on a one way street.

No wonder this tragedy has occurred with the lack of seriousness of this administration to deal with it. If the House had been open, at the very least questions could have gone back and forth and exchanges of information would have happened, and we might have had a co-operative effort from the Newfoundland House of Assembly in dealing with the issue. Obviously, that was not allowed to happen. Obviously, democracy was not allowed to reign. Now we have to live with the results of an administration which is not serious.

Here is a good one now. We are talking about telephone calls. We are getting telephone calls all over the place. One ringy-dingy, two ringy-dingies, and I am not home. It seems as if, you see, when somebody calls me up and says, "It might go on there. It might be there. We are just thinking about it now, and I have a federal minister up in Ottawa," well, I would be concerned. At the very least I would be concerned, and maybe I would either phone that gentleman or get up there somewhere and try to find out what is going on. It seems as if we are going to say, 'Well, we said no and you will get it anyway.'

MR. TULK:

It is called long distance negotiations.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Well, I will tell you, the long distance negotiation is not what that was going to be there. That was supposed to be close negotiations, and it was supposed

to be sitting down at the table, eye to eye, trying to negotiate agreements -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Cheek to cheek.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Cheek to cheek, yes - with the federal and provincial governments, with Newfoundland's rights in hand.

MR. TULK:
All we got was a bum steer.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
That is what we have, we have a stare all right. The only thing is we could not stare at each other from 2,000 miles away. That is the only problem we have.

So, the situation was allowed to occur. It does not matter now, I suppose, who is to blame. It does not matter, as the Premier says. It was Ottawa. Obviously we are going to tell Ottawa, and we have been telling them for weeks and weeks and weeks, what they have been doing. The Liberal Opposition has been telling this government what they have been doing in Newfoundland for the last two years, and they have not been listening. They have now decided to wake up, and they have now decided to wait for something tragic to happen to this Province.

So finally, when it happens, well then, "Boys, we believe you now." I say it is about time. You deserve a good bawling out, to tell you the truth. If it had happened to me when I was growing up, my mother would have bawled me right out, and properly so. When you go and tell them that maybe the Opposition might have some comments to make, "You cannot do that, you are not allowed to do

that. You are not allowed to ask questions of the Premier of the Province, because they are the Almighty." Everything is no problem to do. We are right! We are right! We are right! You are right, all right. You are right for 21 per cent unemployment and going up.

The thing is, we have Northern cod - I find this hard to believe - up top, off Labrador. It is too bad the cameras are not here. It would be nice. There is a line here, an imaginary line drawn, 2J+3K1 is on the bottom and 2GH is up top. What they decided to do was the 3,000 tons up top - anyway it was 1,000 and it worked up to 3,000. So we decided that, 'You can have that because the fish are not going to go across the line and neither are the boats.' I was told this a long time ago. I have caught a few trout in my life.

The thing is, you see, I find it incomprehensible that we would allow them to have that fish up top and then go right foolish and say that they have taken away our fights, and they have done this without our knowledge, when we have already signed away 3,000 tons up top. That is a question I have and I have not gotten a really good answer to it yet. I am looking forward to it, because it tells me really about the intent, or whether or not we actually knew what might happen. We cannot say we knew what would happen, and I will not say that the Province knew exactly that that meeting was going to take place. There are hints, there are suggestions that are made, and that you should be able to take if you are concerned about the Province.

I say it again, and I have to

bring it up, the House of Assembly was not open. So there was no way to question anybody. Obviously there was a good reason for it, was there not? Because you were not allowed to question them, you see. So that is all you can do.

I find it incomprehensible that they are going to go up and they are going to stay along that line. We have already said the French are overfishing. We already said they are overfishing all over the place. We are going to give them 3,000 tons up top and, yes, that is all they are going to take. There is no doubt in my mind that they are going to go up there and that is all they are going to take. I can see it and there is no problem with that.

That is called Strength from the Sea, another one of the vaunted papers from the Newfoundland provincial government, another one of the ones that tells us again the government's role, the government's story and its hard work and effort.

We are going to give every bit of support we can to getting this provincial government to do something about the situation. The only thing is is that they could have acted, we feel, probably a lot earlier, a lot faster and they could have negotiated a lot better. Then again, it is very difficult to negotiate with a government that is up in Ottawa that has scandals erupting every day about everything under the sun. That makes it kind of difficult to understand exactly where their priorities are, especially for Atlantic Canada because we feel like we have been cut adrift down here since the last two years and

it is getting no better. It is getting worse as a matter of fact. I find it incomprehensible that this federal government could have done such a thing but then again they have done some radical things lately that I suppose leaves you to no surprise.

Where does it leave the provincial government? Where does it leave the Newfoundland House of Assembly in trying to deal with this problem? It is a real good question. We obviously cannot get a meeting with the Prime Minister to discuss the issue. We cannot get a meeting to put our points of view across and to sit down and try to see if there is a negotiated settlement that will go over and we will take on France or whatever. None of those things can probably be done now because we have seen the Premier of the Province decide that again, 'It is my way or no way.' We have got no problem, it is his way. He can go do it his way. The questions I have is the success of his way has not been a whole lot to brag about over the last few years. I have some major questions about it.

Again, we have got a new book. It is called, Secret Sellout of Northern Cod and it is four pages long. It gives again the view of the Province, and, rightfully so, it can. But when you ask a few questions about what actually occurred and when did it occur, all these behind the closed door meetings. My I tell you it would be a good book for somebody to write up, especially on the other side. You will sell a lot especially when you get turfed out next time, you are going to need something for an income.

The thing is you are sitting here and you are wondering where are we

going to go from here? We have got the federal minister up there writing other blue booklets from the federal government telling us down here that everything that we are saying, that the Premier is saying, is not worth the paper is written on. Mr. Peckford said that but that is not it, that is not right. Mr. Peckford said this, that is not it either. I have got to wonder about exactly where we are going in the Province. I think it is about time the Newfoundland House of Assembly was opened. I think we should all pat our desks here to say thank you, Mr. Premier for opening - come on gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you for opening the House and at least giving us an opportunity to present our views. It is triumph of democracy in this Province to now see the House of Assembly open again so that Newfoundland members of the House of Assembly and Labrador members can get up from their chairs and speak, especially if you are not of the other side. I must say it is a real pleasure."

I hope that we do not lash you too strongly and you close it down again in another couple of days because we are hoping to be here for a while since there are a lot of issues in the Province that need to be debated and that need to be addressed.

These documents are going to keep coming out I suppose until there is tea party set up for the Premier and the minister, the federal minister involved, so they can sit down and work out their differences. Meanwhile,

Newfoundland can go sink and go away.

MR. TULK:

I wonder do they want us to do that?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I do not know. That is a good question. Is it another one of these mandates that he is looking for to go and call another election I wonder?

It is time to get serious about tackling the business of the Province and that issue, this issue was allowed to occur and it might not have had the tragic end that it is having right now if this House of Assembly had been opened. You ask that question and, 'Well, we are right all the time, we tried our best and so we do not make mistakes, we do not run up a \$150 million deficit and not know where it came from, we do not do that kind of stuff you see.' I have some questions about that. I have some real questions about that. I think that they should have a little look inside and try to figure out exactly where they are heading in this Province. It is obvious that they are not going to far, I will tell you that.

Now we have got to settle it for now anyway because we have got to try to figure out how we can get Ottawa to go and beat France over the head or negotiate with France or whatever they got to do to get back what is rightfully ours, to get back what we should have and to get back our economy in this Province to a level that we have not seen in about fifteen to sixteen years. Back in the 1960s, at the very least we had people working where we do not have them now. A thing that bothers me -

one of many things - is the strategy of where we go from here. There is no doubt that we are going to get this resolution.

Let us send it to Ottawa. As a matter of fact, let us send all fifty-two MHAs to Ottawa which we suggested a long time ago. Go up there and protest this outrageous agreement.

But you know we are not going to get to do that because that might be too dramatic or we suggested the idea.

MR. TULK:

And the Premier would not be the showpiece.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

No, that is the problem you see. That would be us playing partisan politics. If they suggested it, it would not be partisan politics. It is the Provincial Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. FUREY:

It is too costly.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, that is right, and we would probably have to pay our ticket to get up there.

But the thing is it is unfortunate because where are we going to go from here? It is a good question. How are we going to negotiate other agreements? How do we trust a federal government that does not even tell us about a meeting where you write off Newfoundland and Labrador? How do you trust them? How do you deal with them? You do not, I suppose, and you let the Province go away and wither away and let its people wither away. It is an unfortunate thing that has been allowed to

occur and they have to be condemned. I do not know what other action we could take. I would like to get them to come down and sit here in the House of Assembly, a few of the Members of Parliament up there in the Tory Government which we were told to all vote for by the members opposite. I wish we could get a few of their members down here sitting in the House of Assembly now during this debate.

I happened to be up in Ottawa at the time of the fisheries debate. I was sitting in the House of Commons when the Minister of Fisheries federally and also the Federal Minister representing Newfoundland were debating the resolution. What they were saying was 'Newfoundland knew this and they knew that and they should have know this and they should have known that and we have their concerns all taken into consideration when we went away' and did not bother to tell us. To hear all that stuff I was a personally set back because I was thinking that these people for some reason or other, because some people have told us this, that they were concerned about what we were doing down here and our economy.

I think that is so obvious now that it is not true and that is something that I do not know how we are going to deal with it. I think it is something that is going to have to be debated over the next few weeks in the House of Assembly, and maybe the provincial government could get a new Intergovernmental Affairs Minister instead of the Premier who is going to now be - if you can believe that - the Intergovernmental Affairs Minister.

Now that is going to improve federal/provincial relations, I know. That is going to really help. That will probably be another one tomorrow. It will probably be out of that and into something else. But the thing is where do we go from here. I am looking forward to other people who can give us strategy about where we are going, about trusting the members in Ottawa again.

As it approaches six o'clock, I would like to adjourn debate, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

Okay, stand up and go.

MR. SIMMS:

Is he finished?

MR. WARREN:

No, his time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

He adjourned the debate.

MR. TOBIN:

He has only got three minutes left.

MR. BARRY:

Okay, keep her going and we will be back tonight.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I am looking forward to seeing this resolution go to the House of Commons in Ottawa and I am sure -

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

order.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we were being chastised by the Government House Leader because at three minutes to six my friend from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) would not agree to move the adjournment. Now the government side is playing games with my friend from Stephenville. He has, in good faith, put a motion to the Chair that the debate be adjourned and before Mr. Speaker got an opportunity to act on it, the several would be speakers on the other side decide they are going to direct the affairs of the House. Now the question is, does my friend from Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) have the right to adjourn the debate or not? If not, why does not Mr. Speaker, indicate that to him and instruct him to either take a seat or continue speaking. I think that is a fair motion that he put to the Chair, given it is two minutes to six.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, just to clarify.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Grand Falls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

No, I did not say no, Mr. Speaker, I asked if the hon. member was adjourning the debate, was he finished speaking or not because we had another member over here who was ready to adjourn the debate. That was all, Mr. Speaker. If he wants to adjourn the debate and he is still speaking, that is no problem. Sure we have no problem with

that. A total misunderstanding.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for
Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

If I could now, Mr. Speaker, I
would like to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for
Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to
adjourn the debate and continue my
remarks later.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is agreed.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the
Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Before we close, as I understand
it the Premier committed himself
to bring in information with
respect to why salaries were not
being paid vocational
instructors. The Minister of
Forestry (Mr. Simms) came in and
stated merely that there was an
administrative problem, as I
understand it.

MR. FUREY:

That is right.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, that is not informing
the House or the people of
Newfoundland and Labrador why
instructors were not paid. An
administrative problem: There

might be no money. The Minister
of Finance (Dr. Collins) might
have told them to cut off that
department because they have gone
over budget. It is ridiculous!
Is the member going to answer? Is
the Premier going to give the
information he guaranteed he would
to the House? And could we stop
the clock, if you like, Your
Honour, in the meantime?

MR. SIMMS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, again it is a
misunderstanding.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Unfortunately, the Leader of the
Opposition (Mr. Barry) was not in
the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It is now 6:00 o'clock. Is it
agreed to stop the clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest
Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Unfortunately, the Leader of the
Opposition was not in his seat
when I passed on the information
that was given to me. The
operative point was whether or not
they were going to be paid
tomorrow, on their payday? I
indicated that they will be paid
tomorrow, and that is surely the
important point.

MR. TULK:

Why were they not paid today?

MR. SIMMS:

I do not know what the administrative problem was. But they are supposed to be paid tomorrow, as usual, and they will be. That was the information I passed on.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m.

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

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

March 3, 1987

*Tabled by the Hon. the
Minister of Labour,
3 Mar. '87*

QUESTION

What is the position with respect to safety practices and monitoring of such practices at Come By Chance?

ANSWER

A general safety inspection of the site was conducted on 12 February, 1987. The inspector reported the work site is well within the safety standards under The Occupational Health and Safety Act. Two directives were issued during the inspection:-

1. That all compressed gas cylinders are to be stored and used in upright positions.
2. All bench grinders were to have guards and tool rests properly adjusted.

Follow-up inspections will be carried out on a regular basis.

1 called by
Minister of Labour,
3 Mar. '87

QUESTION

Tabling of information concerning number of employees on site at Come By Chance.

ANSWER

Employment statistics released on February 27, 1987 indicate the following number of employees were on site at the refinery project:-

Labourers	89
Electricians	19
Carpenters	4
Operators	5
Foremen	16
Mechanics	4
Boilermakers	2
Staff	6
Supervisors	14
Pipe Fitters	10
Welders	5
Millwrights	10
Millwright Helpers	7
Instrument Technicians.	5
Consultants	5

TOTAL 197

NON NEWFOUNDLANDERS ON SITE

Supervisors	3 Americans
Supervisors	1 Canadian
Supervisors	1 Scottish
Project Manager	1 Canadian
Supervisory Personnel	3 Canadians