



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Fourth Session

Number 5

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable P.J. McNicholas*

Friday

18 March 1988

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before calling for statements by ministers I want to refer to a point of order raised by the hon. the President of the Council yesterday. It was in connection with our procedure here and, of course, the point was in order. I found more problem in dealing with the petition, and I studied that at length last night and again this morning. Going back many years, we have had great problems with petitions. I think probably the best way of dealing with it is to have our Standing Orders changed in some way that it would be much more specific.

Referring to this particular petition yesterday, I am not going to rule on it now because I want to study it further over the weekend, and I want to be quite sure in my mind that everything is perfectly in order. It seems to me there was a copy of a petition submitted with over a thousand names on it, and there was a petition submitted with three names on it, and that particular copy concerns me very much because that refers to a petition submitted by over a thousand people. I do not want to rule at this stage whether it should or should not be accepted, I want to study our precedents, going back as far as is necessary, and Beauchesne and other authorities.

It concerns me that of these three signatures, two signatures were actually of members of this hon. House. Members are perfectly entitled to petition the House. If we want to be very technical, they should get another member to

present that petition for them. But, I do not think that is the important matter in this particular case and I will certainly have a ruling on the matter on Monday.

O O O

MR. WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WELLS:  
With the leave of the House, before we hear Statements from Ministers, I rise to ask the House to recognize the appointment of Dr. Angus Bruneau as Chairman of the National Marine Council. Dr. Bruneau, as all members will realize, is a distinguished Newfoundlander who came to this province many years ago and has worked here ever since. He is recognized for his major achievement in establishing the School of Engineering at the University and for developing it and leading a team that developed it to the point where it is one of two or three well recognized schools of engineering in Canada whose graduates are sought after by people, by firms and businesses, seeking engineers, and that in itself is a remarkable achievement.

I know Dr. Bruneau personally, and I know of his capabilities and his qualities, as I am sure many members of this House do. I had the pleasure as Chairman of Newfoundland Light and Power of seeking his services to accept the post of President and Chief Executive Officer of that

company. I am happy to say that he did so, and has performed very well. I think in this appointment Canada acquires the services of a distinguished citizen and Newfoundland basks in reflected glory.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would also ask this House to recognize the passing of another distinguished Newfoundlander who has had significant involvement in the electrical field, and who provided significant public service to this province.

MR. WINDSOR:

We are doing that later.

MR. WELLS:

In which case I will wait until the minister does it. Thank you.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Just let me, on behalf of this side of the House, associate myself with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells) as it relates to the appointment of Dr. Bruneau to this prestigious organization for Canada. As the leader of the Opposition said, Dr. Bruneau has contributed to the life of this province in an extremely significant way over many years. And like the Leader of the Opposition, I have had occasion to know Dr. Bruneau and also to deal with him since he took over his new position here in Newfoundland and before that, when he was with the University. I guess what Dr. Bruneau has been doing and is doing is something along the lines

that in concert and parallels a lot of the things that government has been doing as it relates to technology in this province, not only in the engineering school itself but in his assistance in the establishment of C-Core, and whose energy and drive and insistence on the establishment of other like agencies in the province to put us on the leading edge of technology has been one of the greatest achievements of Dr. Bruneau.

He will continue to do that, no doubt, not only on the provincial scene but on the national scene. I congratulate Dr. Bruneau. Undoubtedly his appointment is not only good for him personally but it is, as the Leader of the Opposition said, good for Newfoundland and shows us again to be in the forefront person-wise as well as technology-wise in Canada and around the world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

If I may, just ever so briefly, it has come to our attention that the gentleman from St. John's South, the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins), has been recognized for his services. He, together with about another thirty-nine or forty other Newfoundlanders, in the last few days have been singled out for their services on the Murmansk Run, part of the convoys that went on the Murmansk Run near the U.S.S.R. during the Second World War. He has recently received a

commemorative medal from the U.S.S.R. Now, if I were less charitable, we could have all kinds of fun with that, but I rise in all sincerity to say on behalf of my colleagues to him personally and, through him to the thirty-nine or forty other people throughout the Province who have been so honoured by the receipt of these medals, hearty congratulations from us. We salute you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, the versatility of the Cabinet of this government never ceases to amaze me. It was a secret. I did not know anything about it. And no doubt he would not go around boasting about it, knowing the calibre of person the minister is. Congratulations, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, just a very brief word.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
It was something that I was glad to receive, as were the others. We received the commemorative medal for our own satisfaction, I guess, but also, we received it on behalf of the many, many Newfoundlanders who played a much greater part in that unfortunate conflict than I did, certainly.

And there were many, many more who played their part and did not receive a medal. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker, just to add a quick note of congratulations, for our party, as well, and also to make mention that it was not only a special medal for the member, the minister, a senior member of the government, the Deputy Premier of the Province, I think it is also a reminder, in times of international tension, that it was only forty years ago when we were allies with the Soviet Union, and today, it is worthwhile, especially for young people, to be reminded of the history of struggle that happened at that time, and it helps remind us of where we have come from and where we are today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Before calling for Statements by Ministers, I would like to welcome to the gallery a Grade III class from St. Peter's Elementary, Mount Pearl, with their teachers, Mr. Pellerin, Mrs. Hepditch-Vardy, and Mrs. Kelsey.

I would also like to welcome sixty Level II students from Mount Pearl Senior High with their teachers,

Mr. Calvin Button and Miss Susan Shapleigh.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would like to welcome students from the Avalon Community College with their teacher, Cherry Dalley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Statements by Ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The member for St. John's East never ceases to amaze me. I hope he does not want us to match the economic performances of the Russian economy over the last forty years. We would have an unemployment rate of about 98 per cent. I hope he has not aligned himself with the economic policies or other political policies of that Nation. Holy Moses! It is really something! I should give the hon. member a chance to respond, I guess, in democratic fashion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

I thank the Premier for the opportunity to respond. I would just point out that I think we have lessons to learn from the Soviet Union as we do many other countries in the world. I think the message of congratulations to

the minister today is a good reminder of the importance of understanding our history in order, to use the Premier's words, to learn from the past to understand the present, which is a paraphrase of a book by the same name, I think, by the Premier. That was simply the point that was being made earlier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Do you want to go ahead now and congratulate me on my book and how well it has done? It is Friday, Mr. Speaker, and away we go!

Mr. Speaker, the statement I am about to give I can give again in two or three ways. I am still not sure which way I am going to give it.

I would like to respond to a point raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I could do it under a point of privilege, or a point of order or whatever, but it is information and I cannot table it under reports and so. It was not a question but a point made by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, and it is fundamentally very important if we are going to operate this House for the next three or four months in a way which will not lead this to happen again. I would like to respond to a point raised by the Leader of the Opposition with regard to the Sprung complex and the so-called assessed value in Calgary. This is extremely important. Every man and his dog around is having a field day with this project, and with me as a result. Truth and facts I think are important.

In 1986 the Sprung Company applied for a building permit to erect their complex in the city of Calgary. They estimated the value of the non-movable assets at \$3.6

million. They, the Sprung Group of Companies.

MR. SIMMS:  
Non-movable?

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Non-movable. This amount covered roadwork, basements, pad, water and sewer and some other earth works. It did not cover the value of work done by the city of Calgary in preparing the site and removing amounts of petroleum products. Neither did it include the value of the structures themselves or anything in the structures.

In 1987, after the complex was completed and operational, the assessed value, contrary to it being \$3 million from the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, the assessed value of the complex was \$4.3 million.

This value included the items mentioned earlier, just the water and sewer, the road and the basement, but does not include any of the physical assets above ground or any of the movable facilities.

In effect, the assessment did not include the value of the structures, the computers, the pumps, the growing system or the growing lights. Now, that is the facts of the matter, and it just so happens that even on that the cost of concrete here in Newfoundland for this facility, just for the basement, was three times what it was in Calgary - the cost of the concrete just on that. Because, under the laws of Alberta, or Calgary, or whatever, the structures and all of the contents of the building are not taxable and therefore they were not assessed. All that was

assessed was water and sewer, the road and the basement, and the assessed value was \$4.3 million. Now, this is the information and I would just caution the Leader of the Opposition and members opposite. I do not mind if they are opposed to this project, fine, it is a democratic country, but I do and would appreciate when information is being given in this House, which is then carried by the media, which then lends greater negativity erroneously to the project, that they at least check out the information first, because it is extremely important in my view for the proper information to be put forth to the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WELLS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will tell the House in detail exactly where that information came from and exactly what it was. I spoke to one Mr. Kennedy, the Deputy Assessor for the City of Calgary, the man who knows exactly what it was and what was done. Mr. Kennedy advised me in very clear terms that their method of operating is to base the assessment on the replacement cost.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:  
If I can be heard.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

The learned gentlemen will understand something if they will listen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I would ask the hon. members if the Leader of the Opposition could be heard in silence.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The simple fact is, Mr. Speaker, Calgary bases its taxes on the replacement cost. Those figures, as I indicated to the House yesterday, were the 1985 replacement cost of the physical structures, basements and physical structures. The gentlemen opposite can make their judgement after they hear. If they are going to prejudge everything, they will remain as ignorant always as they are now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, if they would only remain quiet they will hear something.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, the simple fact is Calgary bases its tax on

replacement cost. Replacement cost takes no account of whether the ground is an old oily patch or a perfectly clean green meadow. The replacement costs are the replacement costs, and the replacement cost of that total structure, and the assessors advise that it specifically included the forced air furnaces, as well, but did not include any hydroponic equipment, as I indicated to the House yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, you did not.

MR. WELLS:

I most certainly did.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Hansard will record that I advised the House it did not include any of the hydroponic equipment. Hansard will record that, Mr. Speaker. The appraised cost on the basis of replacement cost in 1985 was \$3.428 million. And I remind the hon. the Premier and other members of this House that the \$14.5 million does not include the lights here, either. The lights are to be leased in addition, so that is not a factor. What we are comparing is a cost of \$3.6 million in Calgary plus whatever the hydroponic element cost.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

\$3.6 million was the cost put on it in the building permit, not the assessed value. The assessed value was \$4.3 million.

MR. WELLS:

\$3.428 million, Mr. Speaker, was

the appraised value in Calgary based on replacement cost, in 1985 dollars.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

In 1987 it was \$4. something million.

MR. WELLS:

I am prepared to accept that in 1987 it was 4. something , but -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, if the gentlemen will just remain quite.

AN HON. MEMBER:

His time is up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:

Give him three months and his time will be up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have some silence while I respond to the matter raised by the hon. the Premier. I have not had any time to do so yet.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please!

The Premier had three minutes, and the hon. member - I did not look at the clock - has actually spoken for five minutes. His time has elapsed.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, now I can give it to the press or I can give it to the House. I will go out and give it to the press if they do not want

to hear it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed. He can speak by leave of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No. No leave.

MR. WELLS:

Well, if leave is given I will proceed. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the simple fact is - the Minister of Finance indicated it. He was overruled.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! Order please!

I understand leave has not been given.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I have been trying over the last couple of days to get in a few questions on the Sprung Project but we just do not have enough time to be able to get around to it.

I have to support part of what the Premier said. Back in June of last year when we were investigating the project, we called the Sprung Company that manufactures the structures, the Instant Structure Company, and we asked them how much it would cost for an eight acre project, how



much it would be. The price they gave us was somewhere in the range of about \$550,000 to \$600,000 per acre; on eight acres you are talking about \$4.5 million. So, if that is what they are selling, the structure, and, of course, that would not include the foundations, it would not include the hydroponic stuff and so on, I would suggest quite frankly that the assessed value and the actual value may be somewhat different.

But that is only by way of introduction, because I would like to pose a few questions on the project, if the Premier does not mind. The questions concern this, and this is responding to the cost of the project: If it is a \$4.5 million structure to buy, would the Premier give us some details later on on exactly how much the joint venture has paid for the used equipment being bought from Calgary. Because it is the same structure that was dismantled and so on and so forth. As the Premier knows, the fabric that the Sprung people manufacture is only guaranteed for five years. Since it has been about two years in Calgary, that means it has only got about three years useful life expectancy under their warranty. I want to know, in terms of information that may come later, what kind of a discount we got because we bought this used structure.

The other part of it is: Is it possible to find out how much of the money that went into the original project in Calgary came through the scientific tax credit of the federal government which essentially allowed many companies to write off virtually millions and millions of dollars of investment that they made, written off against other projects. It is

our information that virtually none of the Sprung money went into the original project in Calgary either.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WINDSOR:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome the students from Mount Pearl Central High.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I had recognized the hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. RUSSELL:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this hon. House an item of significance that may well be looked upon by future generations of Canadians as an historic milestone along this country's path towards a quality of life characterized by sustainable and environmentally sound economic development.

I refer to the Report of the National Task Force on Environment and Economy which I table here today. Mr. Speaker, this a concise and highly readable document comprising only eighteen pages in the English text, so I earnestly commend it to all MHAs.

The Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers (CCREM) established the National Task Force on Environment and Economy in October of 1986 to promote a dialogue on environment-economy integration. The Task Force drew

upon the experience and expertise of a wide variety of people...Canada's Environment Ministers, business leaders, representatives from environmental organizations, and the academic community. Indeed, this is the first time that such a diverse group of Canadians has come together to consider ways to promote environmentally sound economic growth. This event constitutes a follow up initiative to the 1984 Bruntland World Commission on Environment and Development. The World Commission Report was completed in 1987 and it advocates major institutional reforms and promotes sustainable development, throughout all countries.

The (Canadian) Report of the National Task Force on Environment and Economy was endorsed by CCREM ministers in October, 1987 and by First Ministers at their November Conference. The Report's main objective is to promote environmentally sound economic growth through private and public sector co-operation and the document contains ideas and recommendations for bringing Canada's environment and continued economic development into harmony. In so doing, it highlights the fundamental belief that environmental and economic planning cannot proceed in separate spheres and indeed are interdependent in that environmentally sound and sustainable economic development requires the technology and wealth that is generated by continued economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, the Report's key recommendations center around finding incentives for change leading to more informed decision making as a result of enhanced

understanding of the linkages between environment and the economy. In this regard, I will highlight the substance of the key recommendations as embodying the following:

A proposal for a new co-operative initiative to integrate economic and environmental planning through the participation and debate of senior decision makers in every province and at the national level. To facilitate this process, the Task Force has called for the creation of "Round Tables" on Environment and Economy to provide a forum for these decision makers to work towards a consensus on this fundamental issue.

The development of "Conservation Strategies" in every Canadian jurisdiction. The idea here is to use such strategies as a basis for development which ensures that the utilization of resources today does not damage the prospects of future generations for maintaining or improving their use.

CCREM, in co-operation with the Task Force and the proposed Round Tables, should design and implement a major communications/public participation program to promote understanding and initiate a national dialogue on the importance of environment-economy integration.

Mr. Speaker, I have here summarized but a few of some 40 recommendations and I would note that this report has been recognized internationally as a major achievement. It was presented to the United Nations General Assembly in New York last October 19th and is now being

widely distributed throughout Canada and around the world. Considered by many environmentalists as one of the most progressive environmental initiatives in decades, it deserves the widespread support of all Canadians.

To this end, I will be distributing copies of the Task Force Report to industries, labour groups, municipalities, universities, environmental interest groups and various associations across the province with a request for their review and comment by May 31, 1988.

Further, I would invite all members of this House to give thoughtful consideration to this excellent report and to advise me of their comments on its many worthwhile recommendations insofar as their implications for the future growth and well being of this province and Canada in general are concerned.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
The minister sent me a copy of his statement and the report of the Task Force on Environment and Economy earlier today and I thank him for that.

The report does represent an important initiative and I congratulate the minister, and I believe more appropriately, his immediate predecessor, who would have been involved during much of the period in question. I congratulate them both for the role they played in facilitating

the findings herein and the recommendations that flow from the report of the National Task Force.

The minister says in his statement that the document "may well be looked upon by future generations of Canadians as an historic milestone along this country's path toward a quality of life characterized by sustainable and environmentally sound economic development."

First of all, that is quite a mouthful, and secondly, it may well turn out to be true. The minister who saved rural post offices is now moon-walking. Whether or not it becomes an historic milestone, I say to him, depends not so much on the colour of the paper or the work that has gone into it, as it does on something else altogether: The will of the individual provincial administrations to implement it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:  
In that respect, Mr. Speaker, the question is will this report be implemented? Will it be ignored or will it be flagrantly undermined? The report has some good recommendations which would integrate concerns of environment and economic development. Every objective contained in the report is laudible, and I had a few minutes, thanks to the minister's prior delivery of it, to read a bit of it.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, what hope is there that this government will do anything but what it does with the kind of thing it does now with its Environmental Assessment Act where it stands idly by? No, worse than

that, it becomes a co-conspirator in a deliberate breach of The Environmental Assessment Act. I will come to that later.

The minister says that is not true. I am going to give him a full opportunity later today to respond to that very point. I am going to show him and show the House that the minister is a partner in a deliberate breach of The Environmental Assessment Act. But I will come to that separately.

I raise it now only in this context, Mr. Speaker: I do not have a lot of faith that this will be the historic milestone the minister portends when I see his record and the record of his administration on other environmental matters. If he wants a recent example, has he heard the word 'Sprung' lately?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Unlike the other party on this side, I would take the statement the minister presented in good faith. I welcome the statement by the minister today and thank him for a copy of both his own statement and the report in advance.

Given that there is a new minister who is still, I am sure, finding his way around the issues in his department, I think we in this

House and the public of the Province have to give the minister the benefit of the doubt on what is a very critical issue of concern to the people, namely the protection and promotion of our environment.

I think the Task Force Report does represent a very important opportunity. I would have some concern that the minister has given notice that there will be a two month period in which people can respond to this report. I would simply hope that the Department of the Environment in the Province will do everything it can to make the report available and to remind people of the deadline to invite submissions. I think what is going to happen in this next two month period, when we are hoping that people will have a look at the report and respond to the minister, has the potential to illustrate what is a real problem with discussion of environmental issues in this Province and that is the lack of an independent, non-government environmental community. There is not a strong independent environmental lobby in this Province. I think it is very difficult for the public to understand the processes of environmental review, impact statements, preview reports and so on. I would hope that this period of the next two months, and following on some of the recommendations in this report, we can take the opportunity to strengthen the ability of the public to understand environmental issues and to have input, both in terms of industrial development and public policy.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by making reference to a number of concerns

I hope the issuing of this report can allow the public to deal with more clearly in this Province when we are talking about integrating economic development and environmental issues. We in this party would have a concern that the dictates of economic development would compromise environmental concerns. There are a number of issues.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker, by way of conclusion, there are a number of outstanding economic development issues in this Province that will demand closer attention and I hope we can look forward to the minister continuing an open process that he has begun today by bringing his statement in.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WINDSOR:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WINDSOR:  
Mr. Speaker, before I make my statement, I would like to also take this opportunity to welcome the students from Mount Pearl Central High and St. Peter's. I am pleased that they are here today when we are debating some issues of great importance to the Town of Mount Pearl.

I might suggest, Mr. Speaker, perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite would like to ask these students what they think of the project and whether they have trouble sleeping at nights. They do not look too sleepy to me this morning. They look pretty bright.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:  
Maybe the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) would like to ask them if they think their homes have been devalued, Mr. Speaker.

Anyway, on a less pleasant note, Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. George Pugh Hobbs, who was recognized by many as the architect of the Province's hydroelectric system. Mr. Hobbs, of course, passed away on March 9 at the age of seventy-one. He was a native of Heart's Content, Trinity Bay. He was appointed Chairman of the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission in December, 1963 and held that post until his retirement in 1974.

Beginning in 1964, Mr. Hobbs guided the Province's electric power development from a series of isolated systems to the integrated system we now have in place. He oversaw construction of projects such as the Province-wide electrical power grid, the Bay d'Espoir hydroelectric development and the thermal generating plant at Holyrood.

He attended Memorial University and McGill University in Montreal, where he graduated in 1940 as an electrical engineer. He joined the Bowater organization at Deer Lake in 1946 and organized the hydroelectric power expansion and development at Deer Lake and Corner Brook. He is survived by his wife, Annie, two sons, John and Robert, who works at the hydro station at Bay d'Espoir, and two daughters, Evelyn and Marion.

As a fellow engineer, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in paying

tribute to one of the finest engineers that this Province has ever seen. He made a tremendous contribution, particularly to the electrical system in our Province.

I would ask, Your Honour, on behalf of the House, that we send a letter of condolence to his family.

MR. WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker, I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. minister. At the outset, I must apologize to him. When I started to make the remarks, I really did not realize that he intended to make this statement, and for that interference, I apologize to him.

Mr. Speaker, in associating myself with those remarks, I should tell the House that I knew Mr. Hobbs very well. He was the fine gentleman that the minister says. He did make the significant contribution in the electrical field to this Province that the minister says, and he did a terrific job in laying the foundation for what is, in this Province today, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation. He did a terrific job in the building of Bay d'Espoir originally.

This is an opportunity for the Province to publicly express its gratitude for his contribution to the betterment of the Province. I am happy to join with the minister in asking the House to extend condolences to the family.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, once again, I have to rise in my place on providing some information that has been misconstrued by the Leader of the Opposition opposite and the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick).

I would like to address some misconceptions concerning the economy of our Province, espoused by the leaders of the Opposition parties in the media last night.

The hon. the Leader of the official Opposition, contrary to his contrived image of reasonableness, voiced opinions on the current status of the unemployment rate of this Province that demonstrate either an abysmal ignorance of the economy or an intention to misconstrue the facts that borders on irresponsibility. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is fond of comparing current unemployment rates to those when he was a member of the Liberal government of Mr. Smallwood in the 1960s. What he does not seem to be aware of is that while he was removed from the public life of this Province, the world did go on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
The late 1970's and early 1980's saw the unprecedented combination of high inflation and high unemployment throughout the Western world. This followed after 1982 by the worst recession

since the great depression. It was because of the misguided economic development policies of the Liberal Government that he was a part of that we were hit harder and more severely than we should have been.

Contrary to the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition's comments last night that the unemployment had only dropped in the last couple of months, the fact of the matter is that unemployment has decreased for two years in a row and is now at its lowest since recessionary levels were encountered in 1982. The unemployment rate for 1987 was 18.6%, a drop of 2.7% in two years.

Contrary to statements made by the Leader of the NDP Party, who contended last night that our economic indicators are no longer tracking the national figures, we are in fact leading them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

From 1987 to 1987 our unemployment rate dropped 1.4%, the largest absolute decline of any Province, and with the exception of New Brunswick, the only Province to have its rate drop by more than 1%.

Clearly, we must continue to narrow the gap between the unemployment rate in our Province and the rest of Canada, but clearly, under our government's programs and initiatives we are doing just that.

The Economic Development - Job Strategy policy outlined in the Speech from the Throne spells out the reasons for this progress, Mr. Speaker. We are reactivating and

revitalizing our resource-based industries, pursuing new resource initiatives and attempting to correct the inequities put into place by others and by that Liberal government so fondly remembered by the honourable gentleman opposite. We are promoting diversification, supporting small business development and putting the education and training and research and development programs and facilities into place that will ensure a prosperous future for our Province.

May I refer the hon. Leaders of the Opposition parties to the independent forecasts for our Province's economic prospects made by the Conference Board of Canada? Have the leaders read the material from the Investment Dealers Association of Canada, and Atlantic Province Economic Council and our own Economic Council? As we will be outlining in The Economy publication on Budget Day, 1987 continue the sufficient improvements in gross domestic product - that is a factor - improvements in the document for 1987 will be published here in this House for the honourable members to read. The document, entitled The Economy, will show significant improvements in the gross domestic product, employment - up 10,000 - retail trade, construction and other indicators achieved since 1986.

This Province is enjoying, Mr. Speaker, a new found confidence and optimism as our economic prospects continue to improve under this administration. I would hope that the hon. Opposition Leaders would take note of these figures and those to come so as not to make the same errors that they so conveniently made

last night.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WELLS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the House that the only figure that I recall using - I assume the hon. the Premier is talking about the On Camera program - the only figure that I recall using with the hon. Government House Leader opposite is the figure of 2.3 per cent and over 10 per cent. What I was saying was that on average over the last five years, because he had said to me that when I was a minister before the unemployment figures were just as bad as they are now, I pointed out to him that during the period I was a member of this House, which included a couple of years as a minister and three years sitting as an independent Liberal, the unemployment rate in Newfoundland was 2.3 per cent higher than the national average. Over that five year period it averaged 2.3 percentage points higher than the national average.

In the last three years it has averaged more than 10 per cent points higher than the national average.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Shame, shame.

MR. WELLS:  
That is the figure that is

irrefutable. It is there. The statistics establish it and it establishes the record of the economic performance of this government. What I may also have said is that every single economic indicator indicates that, by comparison with the Maritime Provinces in the eight years that this government has been at office, Newfoundland's performance has diminished and every single economic indicator indicates that that is so, that our performance in this province has diminished by comparison with the other Atlantic Provinces, whereas prior to that, including the period when the hon. Mr. Moores was Premier, including that period, we were doing better than the other Atlantic Provinces. The figures show that clearly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker, the Premier reminds me of a die-hard Toronto Maple Leaf fan who says -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:  
- who says, Mr. Speaker, 'This year we are two points ahead of where we were last year, however, we are still last in the whole league.'

Mr. Speaker, I cannot possibly understand how the Premier has the political, and quite frankly, political stupidity to go and argue about our unemployment



rate. It is the worst in the country, it has been the worst in the country since he has been the Premier and it has not gotten any better whatsoever. I am not going to get into the fine details.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker, can I have a little bit of protection here?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:  
Be honest.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker, if that were not bad enough, if it were not bad enough by his own admission that our unemployment rate is in the 18 percentage point, several points ahead of the next worst province, and at least 10 percentage points higher than the rest of the country. It that were not bad enough, Mr. Speaker, over the last five years our census figures were so out of wack because of the thousands of people leaving the province who, if they were here, would make the numbers even worse, that I cannot see how the Premier could possibly get up and say he is doing anything credible in terms of unemployment.

It is like the doctor used to say, the operation was a success, our job creation is working, unfortunately, the patient died, nobody is working. That is the problem and I find it absolutely

incredible that a Premier would stand up here and start putting that argument for us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker, our unemployment rate is a shame, it is a national shame. It is not only the responsibility of this government, it is the responsibility of the PC government in Ottawa and of the Liberal government that preceded it, because they were there for a period of the time as well.

The fact is we have not found a way to create employment on a meaningful basis in this province and the policy that the Premier is following are not doing it and the ones that the the Leader of the Opposition promises are, quite frankly, no different and they will not cure it either.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Are there any further statements by Ministers?

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Just on a point of order with reference to a comment made by the Leader of the Opposition a little earlier in one of the exchanges.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the President of Council.

MR. SIMMS:

If he would be kind enough to point out for us where he made reference yesterday, as he said he did, that the hydroponics was not included in his estimates, I would appreciate it. We had a quick look through Hansard, but if he could check it out for us and pass it over, we would appreciate having it.

MR. WELLS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WELLS:

I thought I had said it in Hansard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

The members opposite will continue in their abysmal ignorance as long as they do not hear anybody else other than their own noise.

Mr. Speaker, I feel confident I said it in Hansard. I am absolutely certain I said it in the news media, and I pointed it out clearly, but I will check it and I will advise the hon. gentleman.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

DR. COLLINS:

For clarification purposes, Mr. Speaker, I have read through Hansard and there are just two little bits in Hansard on that. One bit says, "The assessors in the city of Calgary assessed this property for municipal tax purposes on the basis of replacement cost in 1985 at \$3.4 million, including the heating," and it then goes on with other stuff. In another place it says, "The City of Calgary appraised this on the basis of replacement cost at less than \$3.5 million," and then goes on with other stuff. There is nothing that I can see in the Hansard account that related to the exclusion of the hydroponic thing.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. I think it was a point of clarification on each side.

### Oral Questions

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House we had the latest chapter of 'yes we did,' 'no we did not,' 'yes we did.' On the first day the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Russell) created the truth, on the second the Premier got creative about the truth, and yesterday the former minister decided to go back to the original truth. It is now the fourth day, so will the Minister of the Environment tell this House, once

and for all, is he right or is the Premier right? It can only be one or the other. They have made contradictory statements on Tuesday and Wednesday. Is he right or is the Premier right? The question is this: Has there been a registration of the Sprung undertaking? What is today's version of the truth? Will the minister tell us was the proposed Sprung undertaking registered as an undertaking for purposes of The Environmental Assessment Act?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment and Lands.

MR. RUSSELL:

My predecessor in this department, I think, answered that question honestly and truthfully yesterday.

MR. LONG:

Finally.

MR. RUSSELL:

Will the Muscovite please be quiet?

Mr. Speaker, my predecessor yesterday indicated that meetings were held and for the reasons he gave it was decided there was no environmental assessment needed and the project was not registered.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something else. I do not mind hon. members opposite questioning me or any minister of this House on things. What I do take objection to, Mr. Speaker, is members opposite cornering a public servant in some part of Confederation Building and asking him, Do you think the minister was aware of this? I say to public servants in this Province, Mr. Speaker, be wary of members who do that kind of thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. RUSSELL:

Public servants in this Province, unless they were part of a conversation to advise me, or in my presence having heard that I was or was not told of something, certainly would not know. I think it is grossly unfair for members of this House, on either side, to be sneakily and deviously asking public servants, Do you think the minister was aware of this? Ask me!

Let us have it all upfront.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the minister has performed two services to the House in his answer. One, he has given a categorical no, the project was not registered. I had asked him for a yes or no answer, and I thank him for giving me that answer. Secondly, he said something that we profoundly believe in here too, that what he says took place ought not to take place. I am not sure he should have used an answer to a question to make the point. It is a sufficiently important item that he might have wanted to make a Ministerial Statement about it to give us an appropriate opportunity to respond. But we identify with him, that that is an improper activity and we are not engaging

in it and do not intend to engage in it.

Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the minister. His predecessor yesterday said, "The effluence and the discharge from that project is so miniscule that it does -

MR. RUSSELL:  
Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, the minister is having difficulty hearing because of the other minister there.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
I say again, the quotation from his predecessor in yesterday's Hansard, "The effluent and the discharge from that project is so miniscule that it does not really come under assessment regulations." Now, Mr. Speaker, apart from the abysmal ignorance of the regulations embodied in that statement, is the minister not aware that the Act provides very clearly in the definition of the term 'environment' that environment includes 'the social, economic, recreational, cultural and aesthetic conditions and factors that influence the life of humans or a community.' More to the point, Mr. Speaker, why -

MR. WINDSOR:  
It is a supplementary. Get on with your question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Why, I ask the minister, in view of the publicly expressed concerns about property values, about

hordes of insects, about daytime lifestyles in the middle of the night, was no environmental preview report done and why was Section 6 -

MR. BAIRD:  
This is shocking!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
- of The Environmental Assessment Act openly breached in not requiring registration, because that section says 'every proponent shall' register? Why was it breached? Why?

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

MR. RUSSELL:  
Mr. Speaker, again I have to say that my predecessor answered that question yesterday. It was not considered, after meetings were held, because the project was going on property that was already designated as agricultural property. So it was not considered necessary.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have it implicitly that time, but quite explicit in the previous answer that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

- there was no registration. The Act says there shall be one, so the Act was breached.

So I come now in my supplementary to Section 38 of the Act, which provides that 'Every person who contravenes any provision of this Act' is liable to certain penalty. And I ask the minister, as indicated in the definition, being responsible for the administration of this Act, what action has the minister taken or what action does he propose to take? Or, to put it very specifically, has the minister exercised or will he now undertake to exercise his responsibility under the Act to initiate proceedings concerning this contravention of The Environmental Assessment Act by the Sprung people?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, it has been clearly obvious in this House for the past few days that the people opposite, the hon. members opposite would like nothing more than to see the project go down the drain. That is their one main wish and objective, to destroy this project, for pure, unadulterated political purposes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is right for their own political benefit only. That is all they care about. And people are becoming aware of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RUSSELL:

To destroy jobs, to destroy high technology. They just do not

want, Mr. Speaker, to see anything in this Province succeed.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins) and it is concerning his responsibility as Health Minister to ensure that the people of this Province, number one, get the best possible medical and health services available to them. And also to ensure that they are protected against any person or persons coming to this Province, professionals or otherwise, either qualified or unqualified, to make sure that they do receive the best possible health and medical care.

For that reason I ask the Minister of Health why, after several years of people from the Chiropractic Association making representations to provide that there is an act governing the Chiropractic Association in Newfoundland, have the department and the Minister of Health not made this act available so that the people of this Province could be at least protected?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is absolutely correct that the chiropractors have made representations for their own

act. Some of them have made representations to bring in an act this year, this sitting. Others have made representations, not with me but to the people in the department, saying, 'Do not bring it in this sitting.' That is one area which we are studying, why some chiropractors are saying, 'Bring it in this sitting' and some chiropractors are saying, 'Do not bring it in this sitting.' We have to clarify this point.

There is another point that still has to be clarified. There has been some clarification obtained with the operators of x-ray facilities in the Province. And as hon. members know, most x-ray facilities are operated in hospitals. Not all of them, but most of them are. There has been some clarification obtained from the operators of those facilities about how chiropractors, if under their act they have the right to use X-rays in the assessment of their patients, will achieve that. We have received some clarification on that, but not complete clarification. Some of the comments are at odds with one another. That is another area that has to be clarified.

There has also been the question, and I suppose it was bound to come, that if chiropractors have their own act or are regulated by government, will they be paid from the public purse. There has been almost no clarification in that area. I need to get clarification on that area because it could, of course, take a lot of expenditures from the public purse. I do not know how much. It might be fifty dollars a year. It might be \$10 million a year. I have no idea. We do not have clarification on it.

So I am working to get clarification on those three important points, as well as other points, before I will be in a position to go to my colleagues in Cabinet and say, 'What about bringing in an act.' I hope that clarifies matters for the hon. member.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that certainly does not clarify matters to any degree. It shows the lack of responsibility the Minister of Health has towards the people of this Province. My question was very clear. Every other province in Canada has an act to protect the people. We are not talking about protecting the chiropractors, we are talking about protecting the people of this Province. Because the way it is situated in Newfoundland today, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, why is it the Minister of Health is allowing the situation to go on in Newfoundland today that anybody, even the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), who is not in his seat today, can hang out his shingle and become a chiropractor, and probably that is what he is doing. There is absolutely no protection for the people of this Province. You cannot have it both ways. Either you can practice it in this Province or you cannot practice.

Will the Minister of Health look at the guidelines from New Brunswick, P.E.I., all other provinces of Canada, and the fifty-two States? He does not need to bring in Medicare or any X-ray technicians. He can do that afterwards. Protect the licensing board. Will the minister ensure this Province that legislation will be introduced this year to at least protect the people of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member misunderstood me.

MR. EFFORD:

No, I did not.

DR. COLLINS:

The matter is under consideration. There are a number of very important points outstanding that we have to get clarification on, and we are proceeding in that direction as rapidly as we can. I am sure the hon. member does not want me to bring in any old act. Shall we go to some country and just say, 'Let us have your chiropractor act,' and we scratch out their name on it and put Newfoundland on it? Is that what the hon. member wants? I am not going to do that. I am going to suggest to my colleagues an act that is a sensible act, that has been adequately researched, that we know the implications of, and when that exercise is over we will be bringing in an act.

MR. EFFORD:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

I suggest to the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker, that the acts in every other province of Canada are not any old acts, and the minister should just take lessons and read at least one of two of them.

I would ask the Minister of Health, does he condone the advertising, as I hold here in my hand, by certain chiropractors in this Province? Does he think that is the professional way that any doctor or any medical practitioner should follow in this Province? Is it a thing that the people of this Province should be subjected to? It is because there is no licensing or act to protect the people of this Province. Does he condone this sort of thing?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am not exactly certain what is in that but I would be interested in seeing it. I am sure the hon. member will table it. I cannot really comment on it. I think I probably know the area he is getting in and that is that there may be some claims for benefits from chiropractic practices that just cannot be substantiated. I suspect that is what he is referring to and if it is I do not suppose anyone can condone advertising which is not totally accurate. I will study this and I will perhaps respond if it seems appropriate to the hon. member later.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to could direct a question to the Minister of Northern Development, or the junior Minister of Rural Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Warren), whichever is the correct title. I use the three titles, Mr. Speaker, because I am not sure which one actually applies, and perhaps he can correct that when he stands or gives us the information. He has been called a number of things since his appointment, some quite applicable, Mr. Speaker, so when he rises he can give the -

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

MR. SIMMS:  
I know the Leader of the Opposition wants all his members to get their questions in, but they will not get them in if hon. members carry on with that kind of nonsense. The hon. member should be ordered to ask his question. He is entitled to a preamble to his question, but nothing to do with the title of the minister. It is nonsense.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, I ask the hon. member to get to his question as soon as possible.

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:  
Well, actually I was asking a question, Mr. Speaker, because I was asking the minister what his

correct title is. That was not the main question, but put simply so that I could address him properly in future. As I said, he has been called a number of things, some quite applicable, and want to make sure I have the correct title.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. KELLAND:  
The main question, Mr. Speaker, is shortly after the minister's appointment to Cabinet he made fairly strong public statements in Labrador that he would come down here and change Cabinet's mind on the application of double daylight time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:  
Now, I ask the minister what representation he made to Cabinet. What did he actually say to Cabinet and what were the results of that?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

That question is not in order. The advice about Cabinet is a matter that is out of order.

MR. KELLAND:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, perhaps I could rephrase the question. Why did your attempts to convince Cabinet fail, Mr. Minister?

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

MR. WARREN:  
I would like to thank the hon.



gentleman, who is still on the backbenches over there, for the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I feel from the question he asked he is going to be there for a long time.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, knowing the report card that the leader gives, I would say he is roughly a C- so far.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. gentleman's question, I am one member of Cabinet and I discuss a lot of things in Cabinet.

MR. KELLAND:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:  
I would like to suggest to the Minister responsible for Northern Development that he can take the money and I will maintain my integrity. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. KELLAND:  
Could I ask the minister a very simple question?

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is trying to be humorous and is doing a terrible job of it. What he just said then is clearly an imputation of the hon. minister's motives. I suggest that Your Honour should look at what that member said and order that hon. member to withdraw or else Your Honour should name the hon. member and ask him to leave this Chamber.

MR. KELLAND:  
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:  
I would be quite happy to withdraw any remarks that might have imputed anything to the hon. minister. May I continue my supplementary?

MR. SPEAKER:  
That point of order has been taken care of.

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:  
Would the minister tell the House, does he think double daylight savings time is good or bad for Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister responsible for Northern Development.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for his supplementary

question but I think the hon. gentleman's supplementary question has brought him from a C- to an F-. Mr. Speaker, talking about money, I was not paid \$125,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

The taxpayers are paying you.

MR. WARREN:

That is right. I am paid by the taxpayers of the Province including Labrador. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that whether it is double daylight savings time or not there are still only twenty-four hours in a day.

MR. KELLAND:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the minister does not intend to answer his position. Does he think double daylight savings time is good or bad for Labrador? If he thinks it is bad now, and he did think it was good, or he thinks it is good now, and thought it was bad before, what happened to change his mind, and why is he now going against better than 90 per cent of the people in Labrador on this issue?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Northern Development.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think the hon. gentleman should

realize that government has brought this project in on an experimental basis. It has been said publicly that if it does not work, come October 31 it will be changed if they wish. I believe if the hon. gentleman would talk to a lot of the people in Labrador, he would find that the 90 per cent has diminished considerably.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and it concerns the recently signed Canada - Newfoundland Inshore Fisheries Subsidiary Agreement. Mr. Speaker, given the fact that 73 per cent, or approximately, I suppose, 12,000 to 15,000 fishermen in Newfoundland use fishing boats of less than -

MR. PATTERSON:

No heckling from the benches, now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, given the fact that 73 per cent of Newfoundland's -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, can I have silence?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Minister of Fisheries a question concerning the recently assigned Federal/Provincial Fisheries Subsidiary Agreement. Given the fact that 73 per cent of our Newfoundland inshore fishermen, roughly 12,000 to 15,000 use boats of twenty-five feet in length or less, can the minister tell the House what provision is being made to help that large number of Newfoundland fishermen overcome some of the problems they have been encountering because of the poor fishery these past few years? I ask the minister the question now because soon they will have to gear up for the fishery. And my understanding of it is that in many cases these people do not have the necessary financing, working capital, to buy the nets that they are required to buy, and if something is not done they are going to be driven to the village merchant or the fish plant owner and have to obtain credit. Now can the minister tell the House is there anything in this report that I have missed, or does he have plans to accommodate that large number of Newfoundlanders?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for his question. His observation on statistics is obviously correct. But, I mean, there are other statistics that the hon. gentleman should be aware of. For example, the repayment schedule to the Fisheries Loan Board this year, if you want to talk about how bad inshore fishery has been all over Newfoundland and

Labrador, if you want to talk about doom and gloom, the repayments of loans to the Fisheries Loan Board this year is over \$3 million more than we budgeted. So fishermen's incomes have obviously, and their earnings, obviously, must have gone up or they would not have been able to pay. That does not mean to say that everything is rosy, that there are no problems out there. But the fact of the matter is that incomes to fishermen have gone up and that they have been repaying their loans more so than was projected. There are some provisions in this particular agreement that will be beneficial to fishermen. And, secondly, of course, I will not put a date on this, but there will be a significant major announcement coming within the next few days regarding the debt of fishermen in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the minister's answer. Maybe the Loan Board's repayment is up. But I suggest to him that it is because of the good year last year that was experienced by the larger vessel owners in some cases, the longliner operators.

I go back to my question, Mr. Speaker. What is the minister planning to do for the small boat fishermen, the man and his son or his neighbor, who fishes off Puffin Island in Bonavista Bay or

Peckford's Island or off White Bay South, what can that small boat fisherman expect to get this year by way of help when he goes to gear up for this year's fishery?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, presently, by leave, I will be making a fantastic announcement for every inshore fisherman in the Province.

MR. W. CARTER:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, in the background report of the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment, there is a quote here from a fisherman from the minister's own district, and when he was asked by the authors of the report what he thought of the fishery, he said, "This year it is very bad. I have seen happier faces on turrs on the Funks." That was signed by a small boat fisherman in White Bay.

Now, my question again to the minister, Mr. Speaker - and I appreciate what he is saying about the statement forthcoming but let us not forget that statement has been promised now for more than a year - is: What is the minister going to do within the next month to maybe put a little happier smile on that fisherman's face than what was on it last year when he compared it to a face on a turr on the Funks? What is he going to do for them?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will no doubt wait and maybe the smile will change. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that for the 450 or 500 years there has been a society called Newfoundland and Labrador the fishery has had its up and it has had its downs. The smile disappears some years and it will reappear other years. And he said it has been promised for a year. Let me tell the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that when you are dealing with the accounts of 3500 people at the Loan Board alone, as he well knows as a former minister, you just cannot walk through that and say we are going to do this without consulting the fishermen, without consulting the unions, and without putting it through the proper channels through Cabinet. So it has been a very difficult, detailed, complex piece of business. But, Mr. Speaker, it is done. It has been done in consultation with the fishermen. The fishermen's advice has been listened to. The announcement, Mr. Speaker, which has taken a year or so to come, will be a better announcement because it was done right, and it was done properly. It will be a good programme, and I hope it will be welcomed by the hon. gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Social Services

(Mr. Tobin), if someone can find him back there. It has to do, Mr. Speaker, with a recent legal decision that was given in a court in Grand Falls, in the Newfoundland Provincial Court, which ruled effectively that the Young Offenders Review Board that was established by this government about a year ago is, because of its procedures, unconstitutional.

My question to the Minister of Social Services, if we can get him back, or to the Government House Leader or whoever else wishes to answer it, is: Since it is now clearly been seen that the board itself and its procedures are unconstitutional, would the government give us some indication of whether they are considering disbanding the whole procedure and going back to using provincial court judges, as is the case in every other province in Canada?

Mr. Speaker, the minister just returned so I will repeat the question.

The question concerns the Young Offenders Review Board which is under the auspices of the Department of Social Services. It is my understanding that a recent court decision in Grand Falls has indicated that the board and its procedures are unconstitutional. The question for the minister is, since that is the case, is the government now considering disbanding the board and going back to the procedure used in the other nine provinces, and that is to use provincial court judges to review these sentences?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, we have just received, I believe it was yesterday, a copy of the judgement that was rendered by the judge. The officials from my department, as well as the officials from the Justice Department, are now making an assessment of what the ruling was. At this point in time there is nothing else we can say until such time as the officials have the opportunity to go through it and see how the judgement was made, what it was based on, if the whole committee was struck down or various parts of it. That is basically being dealt with right now by the departments.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My supplementary is for whoever in the government can answer it. Since the Minister of Justice, the Solicitor General (Ms. Verge) is not here, it may be apt to be the Government House Leader (Mr. Simms). It is my understanding that that judgement was made two or three weeks ago and under our legal system you have to appeal within thirty days. Could the government give us some indication if it intends to appeal the decision? Of course, if it appeals the decision we may end up in court for a long period of time. A corollary question to that is that in the time we are appealing it, what is the status of the Young Offenders Review Board? Is it legitimately empowered to deal with these cases, or should young offenders in custody now go back to provincial court judges? Can we get a clarification of that from

the minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, just to really corroborate what the Minister of Social Services has already said, the whole matter, the entire matter is presently being assessed, the questions that the hon. member asks will be answered in due course, but we cannot provide him with an answer yet because we have not made the decision yet. The question of what happens to the board is also another matter that is presently under consideration and being assessed.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. FENWICK:

Could I just have a final supplementary, because it is very important?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave has not been granted.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, what happens to the people who are in custody? That is the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

I would like to welcome at this stage to the galleries Grade V students from St. Patrick's Hall School with their teacher Brother Conti.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present the Annual Report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services for the year 1986-87, ending March 31, 1987.

### Petitions

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in rising to present a petition on behalf of some forty people from the Bay St. George Foster Parents Association who are very concerned about the layoffs "that will critically affect the services that are needed for our children

and all those who live and are enriched by the service of social workers.

"Children who usually come to live in our homes are children who have either been abused mentally, physically or sexually.

"The social worker is the link between the child and the system.

"Their services to the children are vital to the well-being of the child, and as a Province we must increase our service by approximately 150 new social workers.

"As citizens we feel that we cannot permit the reduction of this service."

Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions last year the former Minister of Social Services was presented with a number of petitions on behalf of the people in the Stephenville area and the people all over the Province. Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we keep presenting those petitions because the Department of Social Services, under the guidance of the new minister, has not come forth with any policy or anything to ensure the people of this Province there are going to be any changes made whatsoever to protect the people in this particular environment.

Constantly you talk to people, the management, and the social workers and all the departments in district and regional offices around the Province and everyone of them will indicate to you on a firsthand basis that they are overworked. They cannot in no way substantiate or handle the cases and the number of calls they receive day by day.

Mr. Speaker, the present policies that are now set forth and operated under in the Department of Social Services are the same policies that have been in since Newfoundland joined Canada. We have not had any major change in the policy developed by the Department of Social Services.

All we have had in those number of years is just a few new policies added on and the policies that have been added on in the last few years by the former Minister of Social Services do not deal with the problems of this Province. I can give you an example.

Just yesterday I had a call from my district where an elderly gentleman has just received an open heart operation, had been returned to his home and found that his lights had been cut by the Newfoundland Light and Power. It was the responsibility of the Department of Social Services, to whom he had made several representations, to have that paid for him. Back in January they had agreed on a monthly basis to ensure that this would be paid, and that amount of money would be deducted from the amount of money he was supposed to be receiving from the Social Services Office. Because of the overworking and because of the number of caseloads that each social worker has had in each particular area, they cannot do the job effectively and properly, and as a result the man's lights were cut. This is just a very small, isolated case, but it is what is happening all over the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

You may put a request in to have a social worker visit one widow or somebody in a particular community and it takes several weeks before

that social worker can get to go around to visit that person to see what their needs are. In many cases there are emergency needs. An emergency cannot wait two, three or four weeks. They need to be looked at on that particular day.

I expected the new Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin), when he took over his department, he would immediately start changes because he said very clearly in a television interview that he had the experience of being a former social worker and that he was looking forward with great enthusiasm to improving the conditions of the social recipients of this Province.

Since that date we have not seen anything whatsoever to change the policies or change the environment or the conditions they are working under since last year or the previous years, absolutely no change whatsoever.

The people of this Province are living far, far below the standards of the rest of Canada. In fact, the widows, for example, are still living about \$8,000 or \$10,000 below the poverty line in Canada. We have widows living in this Province with an income of approximately \$250 per month. They make a request for some repairs, some oil, or something, from a social worker and it takes the social worker two, three or four weeks before they can get around to see that individual.

It is impossible, Mr. Speaker, under the conditions that the social workers are operating now and because of the people that were laid off last year, for any department, any regional or district office in this Province

to effectively do their job. They can not even do their jobs under the present policy, so if the minister has any concern whatsoever for all the people of this Province and not through their own fault, it is through the lack of ability of this present administration to create jobs and to get people away from the social services environment that they are living into that they are reduced to this form of living, through no fault of their own. If we are going to reduce them to that type of living, then we can at least provide them with the essential services.

A family of five, Mr. Speaker, living in this Province today has to live on a total income of \$510 per month, not a week, but \$510 a month. We know that those people from day to day, from week to week, because of the low income they receive, they have to make numerous calls to the Department of Social Services. A very important fact, Mr. Speaker, is that that is why the social service workers are overworked because of the conditions all the social recipients are living under. The case load is piling up and up.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I ask the new Minister of Social Services to take this petition very seriously, unlike he did with the one presented by some of the people in the district of the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Long). Look at this very seriously and ensure that something is done about this immediately to protect all the people all around the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.



MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker, I did not get to see the petition but I heard the hon. gentleman. As usual the hon. gentleman spoke the way that he usually speaks, with very little knowledge while making out he knows a whole lot.

He said there have been no policy changes in the Department of Social Services since Confederation. Mr. Speaker, that will tell you what the hon. gentleman knows about the Department of Social Services.

Was there a Division of Employment Opportunities with approximately \$40 million being spent a year to put people in the workforce, Mr. Speaker, during Confederation or under the Liberal regime when his leader was there? No, Mr. Speaker. What about our other programs? What about the Division of Homemaker and Day-Care Services, Mr. Speaker? Was that there? No, Mr. Speaker, it certainly was not. What about all the other divisions we have going in mental retardation and rehabilitation and all of these division, Mr. Speaker? Was that there? No, Mr. Speaker, but what was there and is not there now is the segregation of people who were on social assistance.

When people needed social assistance in this Province, Mr. Speaker, under the government that his leader and others over there espoused to be part of, people had to pass in their license plates and line up in order to qualify

for social assistance. They were not permitted to drive their cars or their trucks. If something happened in this Province, Mr. Speaker, where somebody, through no fault of their own, had to receive social assistance, under the Liberal regime in this Province they had to line up, bring in their license plates, park their cars, Mr. Speaker, and be segregated in society. That is what happened. The member says nothing has changed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I can also say to the hon. member that this segregation has stopped. People used to have to line up to get social assistance and there was no such thing as receiving a cheque and going to the bank and changing it the same as anyone else would do if they were working. That was not the process, Mr. Speaker. People had to go and get an order where they were segregated again. They had to line up, Mr. Speaker, in a store with an order segregating them from the other people. That day is over in this Province as well.

Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the operations of the Department of Social Services, I did practice social work for ten years and I can say that I am proud of those ten years. I worked with a fine group of individuals. A lot of my former co-workers, Mr. Speaker, are still working in the field. A lot of new ones have come in that period.

I can say to the hon. gentleman that they are one of the finest, dedicated groups of individuals who are committing themselves to working for people who are less fortunate than the rest of us, with a great sense of pride. I do know as well, Mr. Speaker, that

the social workers who are out there in this Province do work hard. There is absolutely no doubt about that.

I can further say, Mr. Speaker, that whatever concerns the social workers have in this Province they do have an avenue to me. I can tell them that. I have travelled since I became minister of this department. I have met with every social worker in the City of St. John's and all of the offices. I have been over in Exon House, Mr. Speaker. I have visited other offices outside the overpass. I have done, Mr. Speaker, what the social workers in this Province would like me to do, and that is to go out there and to listen to their concerns and to see what we can put in place.

They have concerns. I do not throw that away lightly. They do have concerns, the social workers in this Province. I have made myself available to go out and to listen to them. I have made myself available to go out and to talk to them. I can say to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, the people who work for this department can work there with pride and the people who have to avail of our services - if the hon. gentleman was to look at the breakdown of the number of people who avail of the services, the people who are employable versus the people who are off for other reasons, such as sickness or whatever the case may be, the long-term assistance versus the short-term assistance and so on, then I think, Mr. Speaker, he would know where we are coming from.

As it relates to the case that he mentions -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. minister's time has elapsed.

MR. TOBIN:  
Could I have just a second?

MR. WELLS:  
Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:  
By leave.

MR. TOBIN:  
The leader said yes. As it relates to the case that the hon. member mentioned here, Mr. Speaker, about someone in his district, if he wants me to check that out, I can go up behind the curtain and get the name and I will check it out and get back to him with the information. If we did make a commitment that we were going to be responsible for it and have it paid and that broke down somewhere, I would certainly like to know about it and check it out. If the hon. gentleman would like to do that, I would be more than willing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, just a minute or so to comment on this petition presented by the member for Port de Grave, it is fascinating to listen to the Minister of Social Services stand in his place today and give this litany of how we have suddenly come upon enlightened times.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that his predecessor, if

you want to talk about enlightened times and crawling out of the dark ages, and correct me if I am wrong, any hon. member, was the one who stated in this House that somehow because working mothers had to go out and work, their children were juvenile delinquents. Now, was that stated by this side of the House or that side of the House? Enlightened times is what we have come upon, Mr. Speaker, and it is interesting that all of the Cabinet Ministers and the members opposite, in their silence, consented to what the minister said.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to talk about enlightened times, there is an obvious example of where the Tory policies have really stuck us in archaic times, even though this is thirteen years from the 21st Century.

Mr. Speaker, just for the record so that this new young minister understands where the idea of issuing cheques came from, the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) can tell him, as he has told us, that it was a former Liberal Minister, Mr. Neary, who piloted the project in Fogo of issuing the first cheques and offering dignity to those people who are caught in the social safety net, through no fault of their own. So let the record be clear on that.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of enlightened times, we have to ask ourselves where we have come in the nearly eighteen years of this Conservative administration. Have we seen people given every possible single break, every opportunity or have we seen cutbacks? I submit to the House that it is a question of priority when a widow has to choose in my riding, as she told me herself,

between buying groceries and paying for her light bill, and she had to pay half on her light bill and buy half of her groceries, while this administration runs around on a \$1,400-a-day limousines. It is pretty darn hard to look into her eyes and say that this administration has its priorities straight.

Mr. Speaker, there were eight parliamentary secretaries for twenty-three ministers last year. Did they look at that in reality and say, 'Look, we should cut back. This is not necessary because we had the Newfoundland Information Services.'

MR. TOBIN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. TOBIN:

I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but if he is going to be getting up like this, he should be truthful, Mr. Speaker. When he talks about people on social assistance who have to take part of their cheque to buy fuel, that is the case. When they get their cheque, it is for food and fuel. It is called regular assistance. One time there was so much for food and so much for clothing and so much for fuel, but now it is all regular assistance, Mr. Speaker, and it is all on the one cheque. That is what they should do.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the minister is correct, nobody is denying that. It is just when the lump sum lands on the widows table and she has to look at the incredible amounts of money that have to go out to heat her house and the incredible amounts of money that have to go out in other bills, she has to make some fundamental decisions. That is the only point I raise to the minister to take note of.

Then when this same particular person looks at me and says, 'Why can I not have a little bit more from this government if they can send people all around the world, twenty-three globe-trotting ministers, and that has been established, there is no question about that, why can I not have a little bit more?' Instead of eight parliamentary secretaries, not parliamentary secretaries but press secretaries to get their press releases out, instead of cutting back, what do they do? They increase it. We have the Newfoundland Information Service downstairs. All they have to do is sent it down there and it will be distributed properly, as is the case.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the entire problems in social services, nobody wants to be on social services, nobody in this Province. To take credit because between 1979 and 1988 the budget has doubled, My God, I mean that is something that you should be ashamed of. It is directly related to the economic performance of this government and the economy in the Province.

MR. TOBIN:

That is not true.

MR. FUREY:

People have three choices.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

They can either collect social assistance or -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FUREY:

May I conclude, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no leave.

#### Orders of the Day

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, some first readings, if I may.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1978," carried. (Bill No. 10)

On motion, Bill No. 10 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Insurance Companies Tax Act," carried. (Bill No. 11)

On motion, Bill No. (11) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Mineral Holdings Impost Act," carried. (Bill No.

12)

On motion, Bill No. (12) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation Act And To Repeal The Harmon Corporation Act, 1966-1967," carried. (Bill No. 6)

On motion, Bill No. (6) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fish Inspection Act," carried. (Bill No. 15)

On motion, Bill No. (15) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Social Services to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Young Persons Offences Act," carried. (Bill No. 26)

On motion, Bill No. (26) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fatal Accidents Act," carried. (Bill No. 22).

On motion, Bill No. (22) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Legal Aid Act, 1975," carried. (Bill No. 23)

On motion, Bill No. (23) read a first time, ordered read a second

time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Conveyancing Act," carried. (Bill No. 21)

On motion, Bill No. (21) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland Hospital And Nursing Home Association," carried. (Bill No. 20)

On motion, Bill No. (20) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, we adjourned debate on Motion 2.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion 2. That debate was adjourned by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I had barely gotten started yesterday when our time had elapsed. I was starting to say that to really assess whether or not the Meech Lake Accord is good for Newfoundland, which is our primary concern in this House, we have to stop and think, stop and consider the real nature of a federal state and what the position of a province is in a federal state. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier's treatment of it is a very superficial one and has not really considered the position of a

Province like Newfoundland in a federal state. And while a federal system is ideally suited to a country like Canada, with a number of diversified provinces, it depends upon having a proper federal system and proper federal institutions functioning.

I share one comment with the Premier, that the Premier made, completely: 'Each province is juridically equal and must be juridically equal.' but I am not prepared, Mr. Speaker, to simply make the words and give no meaning to them. We have to take a look at what it really means to be juridically equal. It is not enough to be called a province or to have a Lieutenant Governor or have a Premier and a House of Assembly to achieve juridical equality in a federal system. Even the recital in the Accord itself starts out with that assumption. It says, "And Whereas the amendment proposed in the schedule hereto also recognizes the principle of equality of all of the provinces."

I will show, Mr. Speaker, that what the resolution in fact does is denies the equality of all the provinces and gives some provinces a special status. It is fundamental to a federal system that has a breakdown on the basis of a division of powers, as we do, that the powers that the provinces have can be exercised by this Legislature without interference by the federal government, and we can do in this Province things that are different in other provinces; we can have different local laws. And that is the beauty of the federal system. But, Mr. Speaker, the exercise of federal legislative powers, that is the passage of laws affecting the whole country and not just a

province or a group of provinces, must have the approval of the two basic majorities in a federal system.

One majority is the majority of the people, and you measure the acceptability of the exercise of federal legislative power by taking a vote in the House of Commons where, for example, Ontario and Quebec together have 60 per cent of the voting members.

But you must also, Mr. Speaker, recognize that there is another majority, and that is the majority of the ten juridical equalities that the Premier talks about. And unless the federal power is being exercised in a way that is acceptable to that majority, it should not be passed. Every federal law that is passed ought to be acceptable to the majority of the provinces, not just the majority of the people. That is the only way a federal state can work fairly.

As it stands at the moment, Ontario and Quebec dictate what is to happen in this country. And if we are to have a true federal state, where the provinces are truly equal as provinces, then we have to have a second Chamber where there is an equal voice for each province.

Canadian federalism has been deficient for a 120 years in that we do not have a proper Senate whose function it would be to allow the provinces to vote on the exercise of federal legislative power so as to ensure that every law passed nationally meets with the approval of the majority of the provinces and not just the people of Ontario and Quebec as it is at this moment.

We have heard the phrase frequently, Mr. Speaker, 'a Triple E Senate'. That Triple E Senate means a Senate that is equal, with equal numbers from each province, a Senate that is elected, where its members are elected, and a Senate that is effective. In other words, it has the same powers to approve legislation or disapprove of it as the House of Commons does.

The Premier says representing regional interests is one of the most important functions of a Senate. I take issue with him, Mr. Speaker. In a proper federal system, it is the single major function of the Senate. That is what it is there for. That is why it exists in that way in Australia, where there is an equal number of senators from each province. That is why it exists that way in Switzerland, where there is an equal number in the second Chamber from each canton. That is why it exists that way in the United States, where there is an equal number of senators from each state. Wyoming, with a population smaller than the population of Newfoundland, has two senators. California, with a population of 27 million, has two senators. And that is the way it should be if a federal system is to work properly, and those words that the Premier used a half a dozen times yesterday, 'juridical equality for the provinces,' is to have real meaning.

It is no good to spout those words in this House or anywhere else and not understand what they mean or not give effect to them, which is what Meech Lake causes.

Clearly, the Senate must have an equal number of representations from each Province. In that way,

Newfoundland would have 10 per cent of the voting power. At the moment, we have 2.5 per cent of the voting power of the House of Commons. We would be equal with every other Province and we would then have juridical equality. Until that occurs, there is no juridical equality amongst the Provinces of Canada.

Just look at the present situation in the Senate for a moment. When you look at it, Ontario, with a population that is 40 per cent greater than Quebec, has the same number of Senators, twenty-four. Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba each have six Senators. Yet, Alberta has more than twice the population of either Saskatchewan or Manitoba. How does that make sense? British Columbia, with four times the population of New Brunswick and nearly four times the population of Nova Scotia, has six Senators - Nova Scotia and New Brunswick each has ten. Is that juridical equality? Of course it is not. Newfoundland has six Senators, with nearly five times the population of Prince Edward Island which has four Senators. That is not juridical equality.

The system that is in place now is not a system at all. It does not work. Everytime the Senate decides to do something or express an opinion, everybody jumps on the Senate - 'You cannot say that'.

They were challenging this Drug Law recently, Bill C22, and the Senate was expressing concern about the impact on Canadians of changing the law that increased the period for which patten rights exist. Everybody jumped immediately on the Senate and said, 'You cannot do that. You are not elected.'

Well, to be fair, Mr. Speaker, fortunately most people in Canada recognize, and the Senators themselves recognize, that they have no political legitimacy. And it is not really right for a group of people who are appointed to be salted away, largely, which has been the practice of the past, should exercise major political power. But the correction is not to prevent the Senate from speaking but to cause the Senate to be elected, which is what we should be doing.

Third, Mr. Speaker, the Senate must be effective. That is where the Triple E comes from. It must have equal voting power with the House of Commons, as it did from the beginning, except money bills could not originate in the Senate and tax bills could not originate in the Senate. Other than that, it had the same voting power as the House of Commons, and it has to if it is going to work properly.

I suggest to members of this House, Mr. Speaker, that the lack of a proper functioning Senate has been the major cause of difficulties and dissension in Canada for a hundred and twenty-five years. It is the major cause of the dissatisfaction in the four Western Provinces, because they do not feel they get a fair voice at the national level. And they do not. They feel that everything is determined in the East.

In the Atlantic Provinces we are complaining constantly of regional disparity, because all the wealth and opportunity is concentrated in Central Canada. And that is, in fact, so. The reason it is so is we have not yet developed in Canada a balance to the overwhelming voting power of

Ontario and Quebec in the House of Commons. Their wishes always carry the day. And if we want a clear example of how we have been adversely affected in this province and other Atlantic Provinces, we have only to look at the variety of efforts that have been made over the last 20 years to correct regional disparity. None have ever worked. The economic disparity between the Atlantic Provinces today and Ontario is as great as it was 20 years ago. Yet, we have had ADA and ARDA and DREE and DRIE and a whole host of other things that have been put forward as means to correct the regional disparity. All, Mr. Speaker, have been abject failures. Every single one of them has failed and now, Mr. Speaker, the ACOA programme, the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, is on the way to failing, too.

If I can just find the budget speech of Mr. Wilson given a little while ago, it is clearly indicated in that. What has happened, you see, they will develop this great idea that ADA or ARDA or DREE is going to solve all our economic problems and they will apply it to the Atlantic problems. Then, without exception, within 12 to 18 months every single one of them has been applied to the rest of Canada. Now, not only does that not correct regional disparity, it aggravates it, because now rich Ontario and Quebec have another means of assistance and people there have a better opportunity to take advantage of it than we do. And they have just recently done exactly the same thing with the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. Here is what Mr. Wilson said in his budget: 'In the Atlantic region, local



entrepreneurship and small and medium business development is being promoted by the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. In the West, diversification of the economic base will be assisted by the western diversification office. In Northern Ontario, increased private sector activity is being assisted by the federal economic development initiative in Northern Ontario. The government has also announced its intention to respond more effectively to the real development needs of the less prosperous outlying regions of Quebec.'

So much for Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. It will do absolutely nothing toward relieving regional disparity because the same approach is now applied universally across the country. Why? There is only one reason why. Ontario and Quebec have absolute control over what happens in this nation. They have 60 per cent of the voting power in this country and we have no effective Senate to protect the interests of the provinces. That is the major concern that I have with Meech Lake, the major concern. Because, Mr. Speaker, while we were slowly working towards correcting it and getting a proper Senate, and Premiers, particularly in the Western Provinces, were making real progress towards implementation of a so-called Triple E Senate, along comes Meech Lake and Meech Lake will, I believe, end forever any prospect of effectively and properly reforming the Senate. I must state at once, it does not make it impossible. It is still possible that there will be unanimity on reform of the Senate. That is theoretically possible, but the chances of getting all 10 provinces to agree

are far, far less than the chances of getting seven provinces having more than 50 per cent of the population to agree, which is the basic amending formula. And that is the primary dastardly deed that Meech Lake does to Newfoundland and the smaller Atlantic provinces and, for that matter, the smaller Western provinces. Ontario and Quebec will forever dominate this country. We will never correct regional disparity as long as we proceed along those lines.

Now, superficially, Meech Lake looks attractive, because everybody said, 'Oh, yes, we will be statesmen, we will bring Quebec into the constitution. Quebec has been into the constitution from day one, all that has been missing is the political approbation of the legislature and government of Quebec. But the whole constitutional process is as binding on Quebec as it is on any other province. And it is beneficial to Quebec, as it is to any other province. Mr. Speaker, that is the real problem with Meech Lake.

We were slowly working toward juridicial equality and a proper federal constitution, where we would have true federalism, where two populace provinces having 60 per cent of the population cannot tell the whole country what is going to happen as we have at the moment. We were developing and had developed an excellent Charter of Rights, mobility rights and language rights throughout the province, and this has now been jeopardized as well. There was a provision requiring equalization, or committing the federal and provincial governments to supporting equalization of regional disparity, and what we have done with Meech Lake, to

achieve a little bit of political gratification in the next year, or two, or three, is we have destroyed the opportunity to do anything beneficial to this country in the long term future. And when you are talking about constitutions, you are not talking about the next general election, you are talking about the next decades and century. That is what we have to plan and provide for.

The recital, Mr. Speaker, in the resolution proclaims the equality of the provinces, but the clause immediately after it denies the equality of the provinces. Here is what it says: The Constitution of Canada shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with (b) 'the recognition that Quebec constitutes within Canada a distinct society.' Now, that alone you could probably live with if it made people in Quebec more comfortable, because it does not recognize or confer upon Quebec any additional constitutional or legal powers. It might just be a kind of a nice statement that might be beneficial in Quebec and you might as well go along with it. But subsection 3 of the first clause says, 'The role of the legislature and Government of Quebec to preserve and promote the distinct identity of Quebec referred to in paragraph (1) (b) is affirmed. Now, we all know in this House, and if we do not nobody else does, that the role of a legislature is to make laws and the role of a government is to enforce and apply those laws. Well, if they had that role to make laws and enforce and apply the laws that will promote the distinct French identity of Quebec, that means they can make laws that prevent the fair use of English in Quebec; they can make laws that prevent the mobility of

English-speaking Canadians into Quebec, or any Canadians, until they have acquired their standard in French. And that is wrong, Mr. Speaker. That sets out immediately to establish that none of the other provinces are equal to Quebec. Despite the proclamation that the provinces are equal, it denies it clearly. The Constitution is to be applied differently in Quebec than it is in any other province, and for a federal system that flies in the face of the basic principle of juridical equality that the Premier talked about, and he and I share the view that there must be juridical equality if every province is to have its proper place in the federation. But those are not just words. They have to be real. It is no good just writing those words unless they have substance. Special status by any other name is still special status. Whether you hide it behind the euphemism of distinct society or anything else, it is still special status, and special status for any province in a federal state is wrong in principle and flies in the face of the basic principle of juridical equality that the Premier talks about.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether members of this House are aware or not, but the Francophone Association in Newfoundland opposes Meech Lake.

Now, we have not provided an opportunity for people in this Province to be heard and that is one of the things that I am going to ask the government to consider, delaying the vote on this Resolution until there has been an adequate opportunity for various interest groups in this Province to be heard, and for the real

effect of Meech Lake on this Province to be made known so that we can properly judge it. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that that is too much to ask.

Here is what the Francophone Association says is wrong with the concept of recognizing Quebec as a distinct society and conferring on Quebec this additional power, or recognizing the role of the legislature and the Government of Quebec to promote that distinct society. They say, 'If Quebec is going to enact laws that gives French a higher priority in Quebec and diminishes English or prevents the use of English in Quebec, we are afraid that the rest of Canada is going to react and prevent French from developing and prevent the use of French as an official language in this country.' And, they are quite right. They are absolutely right. Because one of the things that usually happens is if I punch you in the nose the probability is you are going to punch me back. And that is exactly what is likely to happen in this situation. If you recognize and accord to Quebec the role and responsibility to promote and protect that distinct French society, then other provinces are going to assume the same role in English Canada. That is what they are concerned about, and they are quite right. It is understandable that it would be so, because, Mr. Speaker, in a true federal state the provinces will seek juridical equality anyway, even though the Constitution may not specifically provide for it, just as we are seeking juridical equality as far as the Senate is concerned. The senate is failing to discharge its proper responsibilities, but what has been happening is that the Premiers have been seeking that role through the Constitutional

conferences. They have been seeking to control the exercise of federal legislative power in that manner, and that is wrong, because provincially elected politicians should not be exercising federal legislative power anymore than federally elected politicians should be exercising provincial power.

When you stop to look at what is in that clause that recognizes that special role and status of the legislature and Government of Quebec, you have to ask yourself the question, why it is there if it is not intended to be exercised? Of course it is intended to be exercised. It is intended to cause the law, and the Constitution states specifically that the Constitution is to be so interpreted as to recognize that. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it means that the Government and the Legislature of Quebec is clearly determined to have the Constitution interpreted in such a way that they can control and promote within Quebec the use of French and the mobility of people. Under the Charter of Rights we have mobility rights. What happens to those? Will English speaking Canadians no longer be able to go to Quebec to work unless they can meet a certain standard of linguistic ability in French? That is wrong as a matter of principle, because our Charter of Rights clearly recognizes mobility rights and the right to move to any part of this Country. But if the Constitution, without stating clearly that the Charter of Rights overrides all, gives that kind of power and role to the legislature and Government of Quebec, clearly our mobility rights under the Charter is affected. No other province has those kind of rights recognized;

clearly it is special status. And, as a matter of principle, if the Premier believes in the juridical equality of provinces that he espouses, he cannot possibly support that.

Mr. Speaker, the second section of this Meech Lake motion provides for Senate appointments - Senators to be chosen from a list submitted by the provincial governments. 'It is intended to be temporary', it says, 'until the reform of the Senate that is contemplated is completed.' But when you bear in mind that we are requiring unanimity for reform of the Senate, such reform may never take place and this could well continue to be the permanent practice.

Now, I agree also with the Premier when he says it is not right, if the Senate is to protect the provincial interest, to have the members of the Senate chosen by the federal government. He is quite correct when he says that, and I support him in it.

But it is equally wrong to have them chosen by the provincial government. Patronage is wrong who ever practices it, or whichever government practices it. We cannot be assured of having in the Senate the people who will protect the interests of the whole province if they are appointed by the government for political reasons.

There is another principle that the Premier did not recognize or treated the wrong way. Federally elected politicians, elected to discharge and exercise the powers of the federal institution, should not be exercising provincial powers. I agree with that. But neither should provincially elected politicians be exercising

federal powers or impacting on the federal institutions. There should be direct elections by the people.

The present situation is intolerable, but it should not be replaced with this one. It should be replaced with an election process. This may well be the place to start so that, instead of appointing from lists submitted by the provinces, we should do as others have suggested, elect the Senators from here on in, cause an election to be held and elect them directly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

The third section, Mr. Speaker, deals with immigration. Now, here is another area where I take issue with what is happening. I have no problem with the federal government entering into agreements with the various provincial governments on an equal basis to provide for management of immigration into the country. That seems reasonably sensible.

But it is a bit hollow when you stop to think about it, because as soon as you have mobility rights in the country, you cannot possibly have an agreement that will limit the ability of people to move back and forth. So an immigrant comes in and as soon as he is established and has a permanent visa or becomes a citizen, he has the right to move anywhere in the country he wants to anyway. So these immigration agreements are not of great significance in that regard.

The thing that bothers me most about it is the provision in the Constitutional Accord. It does

not show up in the motion that is before us, but it is part of the Meech Lake Accord. It specifically provides that,

"The Government of Canada will, as soon as possible, conclude an agreement with the Government of Quebec that would

"(a) is incorporate the principles of the Cullen-Couture agreement." I will just skip over that for the moment.

Here is the key item: (b) "guarantee that Quebec will receive a number of immigrants, including refugees, within the annual total established by the federal government for all of Canada proportionate to its share of the population of Canada, with the right to exceed that figure by 5 per cent for demographic reasons."

What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? That means that the Government of Canada must guarantee to the Province of Quebec that if Quebec has 25 per cent of the population, that 25 per cent of all the refugees will go to Quebec. Not only that, but to increase that by a further 5 per cent. How can the Government of Canada guarantee that?

The only way the Government of Canada can guarantee that, if enough people from other parts of the world do not want to go directly to Quebec, is to present immigration to the other provinces. Now, if we enter into that agreement, that is what we will be doing. Is that the juridical equality that the Premier is talking about? Those are just words unless you give effect to them. It is no good spouting those words without

making them work. He clearly does not understand the meaning of it or the significance of it in a federal state.

DR. COLLINS:

Or the other Premiers and the Prime Minister?

MR. WELLS:

Many of them do not. Well, when they do things for political gratification in this circumstance, they do.

There are a lot of people in this country who have expressed their opposition, including the former Prime Minister, who had the misfortune to act most improperly in his dealing with Prime Minister Mulroney. That is regrettable because the real merit in what the man had to say, and it had real merit, was lost in his unjustified personal attack on the Prime Minister. That is regrettable because the real value in what he had to say has been missed and overlooked, and that is what has been highlighted.

Section 6, Mr. Speaker, deals with the Supreme Court of Canada. It provides constitutionally that there will be three judges from the civil bar of Quebec. I do not really object to that because it, in fact, reflects only what has been the practice from the beginning and nobody is really objecting to it.

But it also provides that the judges are to be appointed from lists generated by provincial governments and that I do take issue with. I think it will result in our having a poorer quality Supreme Court in the long-term. The Supreme Court has served Canada very, very well on the whole. I do not mean to

suggest that every appointment was perfect but, on the whole, the Supreme Court has served Canada very well and there is no real cause for changing that system. The present system is better.

It is not of great significance to Newfoundland anyway because, as a matter of practice, three judges are appointed from Quebec, three judges are appointed from Ontario, although occasionally there may be a slight variation for a period of time, but they very quickly go back to getting a third judge from Ontario, two from the Western provinces and one from Atlantic Canada. There has never been a judge from Newfoundland on the Supreme Court. So what impact a list provided from the government of this Province is going to have, or what benefit, is very questionable indeed.

Section seven of the Meech Lake Accord, Mr. Speaker, talks about compensation for opting out. I disagree with the Premier's opinion there, that there is any significant benefit to Newfoundland. Experience will show that the provinces that will be opting out are not the little provinces like Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and P.E.I., who may want to do things differently because we have different concerns here than they do in the large cities. Experience shows that every opting out that has taken place is in the major provinces, Ontario and particularly Quebec.

The real effect of this is to reduce the likelihood that the federal government will spend money on programs where the provinces opt out and take the cash. It reduces the likelihood that the federal government will start to develop programs dealing

with health to overcome the health problems that we have. With our serious education problem in this Province, it greatly reduces the likelihood that the federal government will contribute or develop a program to equalize educational opportunity across the country because Ontario or Quebec will say, 'We want to opt out,' and if they are going to spend \$100 million in Newfoundland, Quebec will say, 'We want \$1 billion,' so the federal government is therefore not likely to do it.

So far from providing Newfoundland with an opportunity to do things differently, what it is going to do is greatly reduce federal initiatives to correct social problems in this Province. That is the real effect of that and not the situation that the Premier suggested, and that is another reason why Meech Lake is not good for the smaller provinces and, in particular, not good for Newfoundland.

Section 8 deals with the conference on the economy. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is any point to be gained by institutionalizing federal/provincial conferences - no benefit at all is to be gained by it. What do you gain when you say you must meet and negotiate?

You cannot force people to agree unless there is a goodwill there to begin with that indicates at least a possibility of agreement. There is no point meeting to insult one another. Institutionalizing federal/provincial conferences on the economy and on the Constitution will not achieve anything unless the basic goodwill for agreement is there in the

first place and if that goodwill is there, you do not need enforced meeting. They will meet anyway, as a result of the goodwill. Nothing is really to be gained by that.

It does not hurt terribly, but let us not fool ourselves. There is no benefit to Newfoundland, except maybe a Premier who holds office and likes to be in the national spotlight may get some political gratification out of it. But there is no direct benefit to a province like Newfoundland. Again, you should not be having provincially elected politicians exercising federal legislative power or exercising control over matters that are, under the Constitution, matters of federal jurisdiction.

Section 9, Mr. Speaker, is the one that causes us the real problem. It provides for the amending formula. I cannot argue with compensation for the provinces where, as a result of an amendment, what is presently in the exclusive jurisdiction of the provincial Legislature is transferred to the federal Parliament. That seems proper and fair. So I have no quarrel with that.

But what I do quarrel with is the revision of Section 41 of The Constitution Act which provide that amendments can now be made to the Constitution with the approval of the Legislatures of seven provinces having more than 50 per cent of the population.

The Premier deprecated this yesterday and said it is only a few minor matters. Let me tell you what will now require unanimity: It appears under Section 9 of this motion. The

Office of the Queen, the Governor General and the Lieutenant Governor of a province; the powers of the Senate and the method of selecting senators; the number of members by which a province is entitled to be represented in the Senate and the residence qualifications of senators; the right of a province to a number of members in the House of Commons, not less than the number of senators by which the province was entitled to be represented on April 17, 1982, which virtually makes impossible real reform of the Senate. That says New Brunswick and Nova Scotia must at least have ten senators and it says that Ontario and Quebec must have twenty-four. With that kind of entrenchment where there can be amendments, expect with unanimity, it virtually insures there will not be an amendment.

As well, unanimity will be required for the principle of proportionate representation of the provinces in the House of Commons. I do not have any great quarrel with that because that has to be anyway. The House of Commons has to be on the basis of proportionate representation.

"(f) Subject to section 43, the use of the English or French language." There cannot be any changes made with respect to the use of either the English or French language without unanimous agreement. Now Newfoundland or PEI could stop any changes that nine of the ten provinces wanted and 95 per cent of the population wanted. Newfoundland could stop that because unanimous agreement is required. As a matter of principle, that is clearly wrong.

Others on the list are: "(g) The Supreme Court of Canada; (h) the

extension of existing provinces into the territories." The Yukon or Northwest Territories cannot become a province unless Newfoundland agrees. That is what it says. Newfoundland has a veto power.

The next one: "(i) notwithstanding any other law or practice, the establishment of new provinces." Let me tell the House, Mr. Speaker, that if that were part of the Constitution of Canada in 1949, Newfoundland would not have been a province because Quebec opposed the entry of Newfoundland into Canada. If that were the case in 1949, Newfoundland would not be a province because Quebec coveted Labrador, and the only basis on which they would have agreed is that the Labrador territory was ceded to Quebec. That is what the situation would have been.

The final item is any amendment to this particular provision can only be done with unanimity. Those things are wrong, Mr. Speaker. It will hog tie this country forever so that we will not be able to make the proper changes that need to be made as we go on into the next century and the next because of this.

As a matter of principle, no general amendment that affects all of the provinces should require unanimity in a federal state. The amendment should be based on the regular amending formula.

Section 13, Mr. Speaker, deals with constitutional conferences. I have dealt with that so I will not go over it again.

The Premier indicated in his comments yesterday that the official Opposition here are out

of wack with the federal Liberal party; that the federal Liberal party supported Meech Lake.

That, Mr. Speaker, is not correct. That is not correct. The federal Liberal party had a list of amendments. They did not support Meech Lake. They felt Meech Lake ought not to be passed in the form in which it is because of the impact on the future of this country and they tried to move amendments.

Now, where we are different from the federal Liberal party is that we recognize the futility of doing that where this Meech Lake process is being used. It is as futile as the amendments that are being proposed by the NDP in this House. It is just for show. It does not really achieve anything, it puts on a good show, and it will enable them to say 'Oh, we were opposed to this, we opposed this, and we opposed that,' but they did not.

If, in the end, they are going to vote for the Accord with no amendment, they know, we know, everybody in this country knows that no legislature is going to amend it because if it is amended, it is not going to go through. Amending is in effect saying no, because it has to be approved by all of the legislatures as it is, or not at all. So, it is a yes or no proposition.

I consider the proposing amendment really to be substantially a charade, because we all know what the ultimate result is going to be. Now, that was the position of the federal Liberal party. It is also the position of a great many other parties and groups across this country, that they do not accept it, but some say Meech



Lake, as it is, or no Meech Lake, we will take Meech Lake. I believe that essentially the position of the Liberal party and that may well be the position of the NDP in this House. But, I say, Mr. Speaker, it is pointless to propose amendments because nothing is going to be achieved by it anyway.

Mr. Speaker, the final thing that I want to deal with is the question on the fisheries. I want to, again, correctly state our position on the fisheries and deal with the comments made by the hon. the Premier yesterday.

The position of this party, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the fisheries, is in response to at least a half a dozen statements by the hon. the Premier, starting last May 4, as to what they were seeking, and I quote from it and they are available, if they wish them to be tabled. This is a Ministerial Statement by the Premier on May 4 of last year.

"For the past ten years, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has strongly advocated that the Province must have some legislative jurisdiction." That was May 4. On May 7 he was still talking about legislative jurisdiction. In June, he was still saying, "As a result, we may now move on to consider constitutional issues of concern to other regions such as fisheries jurisdiction." What I was addressing and addressed today is the Premier's position with respect to jurisdiction.

I have expressed the opinion, and it is the view of this party, Mr. Speaker, that this province does not have the financial capacity to pay for the jurisdiction we have

now, let alone seeking jurisdiction to manage 200,000 square miles of the North Atlantic. It is a charade, it is a sham!

What the Liberal party says was passed in a resolution in this House last June, Mr. Speaker, when I was the Leader of the Liberal Party and playing my part from the other side of the rail. Here is what the resolution said:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador assert its faith in the inshore fishery by continuing to pursue a comprehensive program of revitalization and development such as the Inshore Fisheries Agreement, debt restructuring and an appropriate provision for provincial involvement in the management of the fisheries."

That is our position, that the government of this province ought to have input in the management of the fisheries because the fisheries is too important for us not to have input.

To hear the Premier make the statements that he did is clearly wrong and clearly an attempt to distort and misrepresent and it needs to be corrected.

MR. SIMMS:

The press are distorting (inaudible).

MR. WELLS:

No. I will table our position. It is there. It is part of Hansard. I am quoting from Hansard.

MR. SIMMS:

Sure, you were not there then.

MR. WELLS:

I was there then guiding this caucus from the other side of the rail.

MR. BAIRD:

You were the outhouse leader then.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I also want to address the Premier's comments about Canada - France. He has equally distorted, and he was doing the same thing last Fall, so much so that it became necessary for me to state publicly the position, and I will quote it now to the House. This is dated October 29 and I would like to table a copy of it so it is part of the permanent record of the House.

Here is what it says, Mr. Speaker. "As he has done in the past, Mr. Peckford is again misrepresenting the Liberal Party's position on the Canada - France fisheries dispute. Nobody in this Province, especially me, is proposing to give to France or anybody else Northern cod. Whenever you hear Mr. Peckford say so, you can rest assured he is again misrepresenting our position," as he did in this House yesterday.

"France, by treaty, and in international law, has some basis for claiming a right to catch fish in Canadian waters. That is indisputable. The object is to restrict that right as much as possible, and eliminate it altogether within three years or so.

"We also want to get a final definition by arbitration of the limits of French fishing boundaries around St. Pierre in the 3PS zone.

"I believe the Canadian negotiators could have achieved this by reasonable negotiations that would have given France a portion of the 9,500 tons of Northern Cod that the EEC is giving up this year.

"Unfortunately Mr. Peckford's irrational shouting, fighting, and withdrawal of the Newfoundland Government representatives have made it virtually impossible. As a result, the French broke off negotiations." Then the threats of battle and war and everything else followed and that is covered in the press release.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other release, and I do not intend to quote extensively from it, but I will table it. It is dated November 18. It again deals with the situation and spells it out, but it also deals with something else, the comment he made about Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, or New Brunswick and Quebec companies wanting access to Northern cod.

As that document that I have just tabled indicates clearly, it is the position of this party that no other province should have access to the Canadian waters around Newfoundland for catching fish as long as the plant facilities and the fishermen in Newfoundland do not have an adequate supply of fish. There is no justification for giving a license or a permit to any other province in this country as long as there are fishermen in Newfoundland who cannot get an adequate supply of fish to provide a living for their families and there are unemployed fish plant workers and fish plants working at part capacity. Now, that is the position we have taken.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

If there is fish, then for so long as there is fish surplus to Newfoundland, we cannot be a dog in the manger about it. We have to provide access to other Canadians. We have to, as long as there is surplus fish today.

MR. SIMMS:

That is what we wanted to hear.

MR. WELLS:

If there is no surplus fish next year, then it ends. It is fairly simple. There is no trouble to control that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

If the hon. gentlemen opposite are not capable of putting into place a plan to effect that, we will. There is no problem to do that.

MR. SIMMS:

Who decides what is surplus?

MR. WELLS:

Well, you have to have a reasonable standard. So let there be no doubt.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, I invite the Premier to go from Nain to Burgeo and tell that story as it is filed in this House, not his version of it. Tell the real story.

MR. SIMMS:

Have you been to Nain?

MR. WELLS:

Yes, and Davis Inlet too.

The Premier's comments, Mr. Speaker, are a total misrepresentation of our

position. It is consistent with his basic approach of concocting a straw man to knock down. Anybody can knock down a straw man, but it takes a real man to knock down a real man. That is what he has got to deal with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, our obligation in this House is to consider first and foremost the interest of the Province of which we constitute the Legislature; consider first and foremost the interests of the people that we represent; and to consider first and foremost the impact of Meech Lake on the people and our life and our future as part of this country. We cannot forget the country of which we are a part. We must consider also the interests of Canada, but our primary duty is to this Province. We should base our decision in this House upon a cool, logical assessment of the impact of Meech Lake on this Province and its people, and the impact of Meech Lake on the future of this Province as a province of Canada. We should not base our judgement on what is politically expedient to solve a political problem to make a particular Prime Minister look good. That is wrong. That is the wrong approach to it. We should put this Province's interests first.

If the Premier claims juridical equality for the Province of Newfoundland, as he proposes, as he says here in this House he does, then let him look at what juridical equality really means and ensure that the Constitution of this country is amended in such a way that we will indeed have it.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, with the exception of one hon. member, the hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, all of the members on this side of the House will vote against Meech Lake. We will not go through the sham, we will not go through the charade, of proposing amendments to have them knocked down, knowing they are not going to be approved anyway and that Meech Lake is a take it or leave it proposal.

What we are doing is saying to this House, put the interests of Newfoundland first and vote against this amendment. That is exactly what we are doing.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we have seen in recent history in this House one leader in such a short period of time, in four days that we have been in regular session, discounting the day that His Honour read the Speech from the Throne, who has done so much to destroy himself, to destroy his party, and to lose the credibility of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

This hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, has spent four days apologizing. He spend four days apologizing for saying he was a fool. He said that, not us. He is four days apologizing and hauling his backbenchers down for talking about things he did not want them to talk about. All the hon. gentleman has done in the four days that this House has been in session is apologize. That is all he has done.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot engage in the learned, legal debate on Meech Lake. I do not profess to. I am a lay politician. I can only talk in layman's language. I am just an ordinary Newfoundlander. I am not learned in the law.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

But, Mr. Speaker, for the Leader of the Liberal Party, the man who aspires to be the alternate Premier of this Province, to try to read into the public record of the Legislature his position on fisheries and to challenge us all to go from Nain to Wild Cove to La Scie to Cape St. Mary's defending his position on the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, what kind of baloney is that hon. gentleman getting on with?

Everybody knows you can go to the smallest nook and cranny in Newfoundland and Labrador and that hon. gentleman can get up in this House and say it until he is blue in the face, or red in the face, which he has been most of the last four days, and nobody will believe him. Talk about surplus! The hon. gentleman is on the public record, it cannot be eradicated, it cannot be erased by any

official legal statements in this House, that the hon. gentleman and his party are in favour of trading away non-surplus Northern cod. That is the record.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

You cannot take it back once you say it, Mr. Speaker. It is in print. It has been on the airways with the electronic media. You cannot take it back. There is no good of getting up in this House and saying, 'I did not mean to say that. I apologize again, for the tenth time, in the last four days.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, wants decorum and everybody to be like they are operating in the Supreme Court in downtown St. John's or Ottawa, but that is not politics, Mr. Speaker. We are politicians. The real world is here and out there.

The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, has said in his legal fashion that France has legal rights to something that is still non-surplus and out off the other side of his mouth he says we cannot give away something that is non-surplus. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not a lawyer, I am not trained in the law, I am not trained in that kind of logic, but it seems to me that that kind of logic is for the birds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

He says, Mr. Speaker, he is in the public record as saying, and he

cannot take it back, that France somehow or another has the legal right to expect fish in the waters adjacent to Newfoundland and Labrador. Codfish, Mr. Speaker, non-surplus, Mr. Speaker. Has the hon. gentleman read the 1972 Treaty?

The 1972 Treaty says that France is entitled to fish. How many times do we have to say it? F-i-s-h, not c-o-d. France was offered several thousand tons of turbot. That is f-i-s-h but it spells with a 't'. That is f-i-s-h, that can satisfy the conditions of the treaty. What did the French say, Mr. Speaker, to this hon. gentleman who now is in essence in detriment to the public interests of Newfoundland, supporting their position? The French said, 'That is fish that stinks, we do not want it.'

It is unbelievable that you would have a person, the leader of a party, who aspires to be Premier of the Province, out in the public saying - I mean, what you say in the public in this Province or anywhere else in Canada is very soon passed on through the diplomatic channels to the government in France. The alternate Premier of Newfoundland, the man who may become, God forbid, may lead the government in Newfoundland, says, 'You have legal rights.' He acknowledges it. That hon. gentleman and the position of that party, Mr. Speaker, has done untold damage to the position and the best interests of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Shame! Shame!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Then today, when our House Leader

asked him the question, 'Oh, we are talking about surplus.' Mr. Speaker, there is not one cod's head surplus in 2J+3KL, not one, so if you are talking about surplus you have to be talking about turbot, red fish, you are talking about something else, or you are talking about the fish that stinks. Mr. Speaker, you cannot sustain that position.

I heard the hon. gentleman say today, again, in his tenth or eleventh time apologizing through the House to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, "You cannot use the jurisdiction you have." Mr. Speaker, that is a position of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador. I would not say it is the position of the gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), or not the position of the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) whose leader has already said he is going to vote for the Meech Lake Accord.

The Leader of the official Opposition saying to the public of Newfoundland and Labrador, to a public that depends in 400 or 500 communities on the lifeblood, the soul of Newfoundland and Labrador, the fishery, you have too much jurisdiction now. You cannot use it. The Leader of the same gentlemen's party in Nova Scotia just the other day was saying, 'I wish we had Premier Peckford up here. Our Premier must have been asleep.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Another case of apology. But the leader's confrere in this province says, 'You have too much jurisdiction. You cannot use it. What do you want any more for?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is worth going from Nain to Wild Cove to La Scie and to Cape St. Mary's. It is worth going, and we will do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, we will make sure that every fisherman, that every fish plant worker, no matter where they are, in the smallest village and hamlet in Newfoundland and Labrador, knows the real position of the Liberal party. Not the apologized position, not the speaking-out-of-the-other-side-of-your-mouth position, which hopefully would get carried, but the real position. And here it is. It is been reported already. The real position of the Liberal party is that France is entitled to non-surplus fish in Canadian waters adjacent to Newfoundland and Labrador. They are also entitled to non-surplus fish. And, you have too much jurisdiction now. That is the real position of the Liberal party of Newfoundland and Labrador, and every member on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, will carry that message to every fishing community in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Come behind us with your truth squad, Mr. Speaker. That was another great Liberal innovation. Maybe the present Leader had something to do with it. Come behind us with your truth squad, because everybody wants to know the real position of the Liberal party of Newfoundland and Labrador. Not the official legalese linguistic position that you take in the House, but the

real position. That is what the people of this province want to know. Mr. Speaker, it is terrible. It is really, really terrible.

I do not think there is any doubt, Mr. Speaker, where the people of this province will stand on that kind of an issue, no doubt whatsoever. This Meech Lake Accord is an historic constitutional document. It has been a foundation of this government, since its inception in 1979, that for every reason you can think about, legal, economic, and otherwise, we ought to have more say, more control over the resource that is most important to the lives of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. And any politician worth his salt, I do not care what party he is in, I do not care if he is any party, any Newfoundlander and Labradorian that is worth his or her salt cannot disagree with that. It is a fundamental objective, or should be, of any political movement to regain what we gave away in 1949. I am not an anti-confederate; I was born a few months before it. But in 1949 we gave up the control, the jurisdiction, constitutionally and otherwise, of the resource that is the lifeblood of Newfoundland and Labrador. There would be revolutions in the streets in Saskatchewan if they gave up that kind of jurisdiction over their agricultural industry, or over their oil and gas. There would be revolutions in the streets. You would not have a politician, a man aspiring to be Premier in the legislature of Saskatchewan saying we do not need any more jurisdiction. You would be flung out. You would not get a chance to have an election to vote for you, you would be flung out. You would be flogged. How the

Liberal party, Mr. Speaker, and there are good hon. gentlemen representing fishing communities and districts in that party, can allow themselves to be manipulated - talk about trained seals!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

At least there is one hon. gentleman saying he is not going to be manipulated on this, he is going to vote as he sees it. It is totally unbelievable that you could adopt this kind of political position in a Province like Newfoundland and Labrador.

I heard the hon. gentleman say in his brief remarks yesterday the kind of Canada that he envisions - this great visionary - is the Trudeau kind of Canada, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:

The kind of Canada that he envisions is that strong, central government that controls everything out of the centre. That is the kind of Canada that he envisions.

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, knowing, Sir, your insistence on impartiality, I am sure you will want to ask the hon. the Minister of Fisheries to withdraw the remark that he made about trained seals, given the incidence in the House yesterday where I was asked to withdraw.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Your Honour, I am totally in your hands, as always, but I think the record will show that I did not call anybody trained seals. I said, 'Speaking about seals.' The accusation of trained seals came from the other side a day or two ago.

MR. SIMMONS:  
To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
The minister can squirm as much as he wants on this as he is squirming on the other issues. He is shouting loud because there is not very much substance to what he is saying, but that is another issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

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

MR. MORGAN:  
You are all going.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:  
One by one.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:  
All new candidates.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member in the back row there, I have asked him three times to be silent.

MR. MORGAN:  
I am sorry, Your Honour.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I apologize too. It was not just the member you referred to, I am very sorry. I take it all back.

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, I thank the Premier for his apology. But he will realize he is in violation of the dictum from his minister that you should not apologize in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the point I raise is that the minister cannot say indirectly what he is not allowed to say directly. I was specifically instructed by the Chair yesterday to withdraw the term 'trained seals' as being unparliamentary, and I ask that the same rule be applied to him as applied to me yesterday.

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



MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

It is pretty obvious what has transpired here in the last fifteen minutes. The Minister of Fisheries has been giving a superb speech. He is burning them to pieces over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

He is tearing strips of them. The Leader could not take it. He had to swivel out of the House, or skibble out of the House, whatever it is he does. The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage was not even in the House when the so-called comment was made and he comes marreling in through the backdoor, rushing up hopefully to try to curtail the Minister of Fisheries from finishing his dynamic speech here today; just to kill time, nothing more, nothing less. The Minister of Fisheries, I am sure, is quite capable of addressing the point made by the member for Fortune - Hermitage, which is nothing but a point of foolishness.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I did hear that comment made. I considered it at that time and I do not think it was referring to anyone either directly or indirectly, unless hon. member wish to consider it that way. I do not consider it that way, and there is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, yes, there has been a lot of squirming in this House this week. There has been a tremendous amount of squirming this week, but the squirming has all been over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

There have been all kinds of apologies in this House this week, Mr. Speaker, but the apologies have been over there.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And more to come.

MR. RIDEOUT:

More to come.

We are four days into the session, Mr. Speaker, and you have a half dozen or more apologies from the person who wants to be Premier of Newfoundland. You have all kinds of squirming going on in the Liberal caucus. They are muzzled. They are kept down. They cannot get up and say what they want to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

They cannot smile. They cannot be human in Question Period, Mr. Speaker. They want to get up and go for the political jugular, but they are being hauled back over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, this is Friday. The

report cards will be done up this afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Nobody wants an F on their report card. In case any of them do not want to go out of town without getting their report card, Mr. Speaker, I will adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, I would just like to inform hon. members on both sides of the House what the House will be dealing with next week. There is a very strong likelihood, I suspect, that the Meech Lake debate may go on for a bit longer than we had anticipated.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Absolutely, if I have anything to do with it.

MR. SIMMS:  
Nonetheless, next week, for certain - the Premier, of course, has an hour to conclude the debate on the resolution. We must not forget that possibility coming up - we will be on Monday doing the Interim Supply Bill which, I believe, has been distributed. We have given it to the hon. members two or three days ahead of time, by the way. In the past it had always been given on the day of the debate. So members opposite will note the co-operation there. We will be doing Interim Supply

Monday and Tuesday, Private Members' on Wednesday, and on Thursday and Friday we will be continuing with Meech Lake, and we will likely be continuing with Meech Lake, as I said, the following Thursday and Friday, too. There is a good possibility of that happening.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, may I take the opportunity, on behalf of members on this side, to wish all members opposite a happy and enjoyable weekend.

I move that this House adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at three of the clock and that this House do now adjourn.

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

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR  
Fourth Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. P. J. McNicholas, Speaker

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C., Premier

Hon. Clyde Wells, Leader of the Opposition

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Aylward, Kevin (Lib)	Stephenville
Aylward, Hon. Robert J. (PC)	Kilbride
Baird, Raymond J. (PC)	Humber West
Baker, Winston (Lib)	Gander
Barrett, Hon. Harold (PC)	St. John's West
Barry, Leo (Lib)	Mount Scio - Bell Island
Blanchard, Hon. Ted. A. (PC)	Bay of Islands
Brett, Hon. Charlie (PC)	Trinity North
Butt, Hon. John (PC)	Conception Bay South
Callan, Wilson (PC)	Bellevue
Carter, John A. (PC)	St. John's North
Carter, Walter C. (Lib)	Twillingate
Collins, Hon. John F. (PC)	St. John's South
Dawe, Hon. Ron (PC)	St. George's
Decker, Chris (Lib)	Strait of Belle Isle
Dinn, Jerome W. (PC)	Pleasantville
Doyle, Norman E. (PC)	Harbour Main
Efford, John (Lib)	Port de Grave
Fenwick, Peter (NDP)	Menihek
Furey, Chuck (Lib)	St. Barbe
Gilbert, Dave (Lib)	Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir
Greening, Glenn C. (PC)	Terra Nova
Gullage, Eric (Lib)	Waterford - Kenmount
Hearn, Hon. Loyola (PC)	St. Mary's-The Capes
Hiscock, R. Eugene (Lib)	Eagle River
Hodder, James E. (PC)	Port au Port
Kelland, Jim (Lib)	Naskaupi

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR  
Fourth Session - Fortieth General Assembly

...2

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Long, Gene (NDP)	St. John's East
Lush, Tom (Lib)	Bonavista North
Matthews, Hon. William (PC)	Grand Bank
McNicholas, Hon. Dr. P.J. (PC)	St. John's Centre
Mitchell, Calvin (PC)	LaPoile
Morgan, James (PC)	Bonavista South
Parsons, Kevin (PC)	St. John's East Extern
Patterson, William G. (PC)	Placentia
Peach, Milton (PC)	Carbonear
Peckford, A. Brian, P.C. (PC) (Premier)	Green Bay
Power, Hon. Charlie (PC)	Ferryland
Reid, James G. (PC)	Trinity - Bay de Verde
Rideout, Hon. Thomas G. (PC)	Baie Verte - White Bay
Russell, Hon. Maxwell James (PC)	Lewisporte
Simms, Hon. Len (PC)	Grand Falls
Simmons, Hon. Roger P.C. (Lib)	Fortune-Hermitage
Tobin, Glenn (PC)	Burin - Placentia West
Tulk, R. Beaton (Lib)	Fogo
Twomey, Hon. Dr. Hugh Matthew (PC)	Exploits
Verge, Hon. Lynn (PC)	Humber East
Warren, Garfield E. (PC)	Torngat Mountains
Wells, Clyde (Lib)	Windsor-Buchans
Windsor, Hon. H. Neil (PC)	Mount Pearl
Woodford, Rick (PC)	Humber Valley
Young, Hon. Haig (PC)	Harbour Grace

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR  
Fourth Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C.	Premier Energy
Hon. Robert J. Aylward	Forest Resources
Hon. Harold Barrett	Development and Tourism
Hon. Ted A. Blanchard	Labour
Hon. Charlie Brett	Municipal Affairs
Hon. John Butt	Culture, Recreation and Youth
Dr. The Hon. John F. Collins	Deputy Premier Health
Hon. Ron Dawe	Intergovernmental Affairs
Hon. Jerome W. Dinn	Mines
Hon. Norman E. Doyle	Transportation
Hon. Loyola Hearn	Education
Hon. William Matthews	Career Development and Advanced Studies
Hon. Milton Peach	Responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Housing

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR  
Fourth Session - Fortieth General Assembly

-2-

Hon. Charlie Power	Rural Development
Hon. Thomas G. Rideout	Fisheries
Hon. Maxwell J. Russell	Environment and Lands
Hon. Len Simms	Executive Council President of Treasury Board Government House Leader
Hon. Glen Tobin	Social Services
Dr. The Hon. Hugh M. Twomey	Public Works and Services
Hon. Lynn Verge	Justice
Hon. Garfield Warren	Responsible for Northern Development
Hon. H. Neil Windsor	Finance and Minister Responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro
Hon. Haig Young	Consumer Affairs and Communications

## CONTENTS

Friday, 18 March, 1988.

<u>Speaker's ruling on Petition</u> .....	0210
<u>Appointment of Dr. Angus Bruneau.</u>	
Mr. Wells, Premier Peckford.....	0210
<u>Congratulations on Commemorative Medal</u> <u>presented to Dr. Collins.</u>	
Mr. Simmons, Premier Peckford, Mr. Long.....	0211

### Statements by Ministers

<u>Sprung Project:</u>	
Premier Peckford.....	0213
Mr. Wells.....	0214
Mr. Fenwick.....	0216
<u>National Task Force on Environment and Economy:</u>	
Mr. Russell.....	0217
Mr. Simmons.....	0219
Mr. Long.....	0220
<u>Commemorative Comment on the late Mr. Hobbs:</u>	
Mr. Windsor.....	0221
Mr. Wells.....	0222
<u>Economic matters:</u>	
Premier Peckford.....	0222
Mr. Wells.....	0224
Mr. Fenwick.....	0224

### ORAL QUESTIONS

<u>Sprung Project:</u>	
Registration for the purposes of the Environmental Assessment Act. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Russell.....	0226
Section 6 of the Act breached by non-registration. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Russell.....	0227
Proceedings to be taken against those who contravene Section 38. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Russell.....	0228

Chiropractors:

Governing act requested. Mr. Efford, Dr. Collins.....0229  
Governing act demanded this year. Mr. Efford,  
Dr. Collins.....0230  
Chiropractors advertisements. Mr. Efford,  
Dr. Collins.....0231

Double Daylight Time:

Minister's representation to Cabinet.  
Mr. Kelland ruled Out of Order.....0232  
Minister's failure to convince Cabinet.  
Mr. Kelland, Mr. Warren.....0232  
Good or bad for Labrador. Mr. Kelland, Mr. Warren.....0232  
Claims Minister acting against the interests of  
Labrador. Mr. Kelland, Mr. Warren.....0234

Inshore Fishery:

Assistance to prepare for season.  
Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Rideout.....0234  
What help can be expected?  
Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Rideout.....0235  
Actions within the next month.  
Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Rideout.....0236

Young Offenders:

Future of Review Board. Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Tobin.....0236  
Will government appeal decision?  
Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Tobin.....0237

**Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees**

Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services  
Annual Report for 1986-87. Mr. Simms.....0238

**Petitions**

Social Services Policy:

Mr. Efford.....0238  
Mr. Tobin.....0241  
Mr. Fury.....0242



Orders of the Day

First Readings of Bill No. 10,  
Bill No. 11, Bill No. 12, Bill No. 6,  
Bill No. 15, Bill No. 26, Bill No. 22,  
Bill No. 23, Bill No. 21 and Bill No. 20.....0244

Motion 2, The Meech Lake Accord:  
Mr. Wells.....0245  
Mr. Rideout, adjourns debate.....0260  
Adjournment Motion.....0266