



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Fourth Session

Number 9

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable P.J. McNicholas

Thursday

24 March 1988

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a statement in the Throne Speech, I would like to follow up from the Throne Speech with the following statement:

We live in an age of constant technological change. To develop as a Province, we have to do our utmost to keep abreast of that change. We are fortunate, in Newfoundland and Labrador, in that we already have world class facilities and capabilities for various research and development initiatives at our university, at the Marine Institute, as well as at other educational institutions and private sector organizations.

It is widely recognized in both the academic world and the private sector that with this wealth of knowledge and capability our Province can take a lead role in many areas of specialized research and development.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to assert this government's commitment to this principle and to indicate that the direction we are charting for the technological development of Newfoundland and Labrador will bring us proudly and prosperously into the twenty-first century.

And, this direction is not developed singularly or in isolation from the realities of the world. Any decisions which are made with respect to science, technology, research and development in this Province will be pragmatic and appropriately involve a consultation with those who are the leaders in these fields and those who shall provide the employment and other benefits that, by necessity, derive to a world leader in applied science and technology.

With these thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce today that government has appointed the inaugural Newfoundland and Labrador Science and Technology Advisory Council, and to introduce the members of the council to this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The sixteen member Advisory Committee includes: Dr. Lou Visentin, Dean, Faculty of Science at Memorial University, Chairperson; Dr. Linda Inkpen, President of the Cabot Institute, Vice-Chairperson; Mr. Frank Smith, President of NORDCO, St. John's, member; Mr. Scott Parsons, Assistant Deputy Minister (Research), Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa; Ms Judith Maxwell, Chairperson, Economic Council of Canada, Ottawa; Mr. Jim Stanford, President, Petro Canada Resources, Calgary; Ms Leslie Gratton, Biologist, Mobil oil; Mr. John Lee, Manager, Mill Modernization Program, Corner Brook Pulp and Paper Ltd., Corner Brook; Mr. Herb Clarke, Executive Vice-President, Fishery Products International

Ltd., St. John's; Mr. Rex Parsons, President, Newfoundland Design Associates, St. John's; Mr. David Fong, President, RDS Engineering, St. John's; Dr. Joe Carroll, Former Director-General of Newfoundland Region, Canadian Forestry Service, who is presently retired and living here in Traytown; Dr. Ruby Gough, Department of Education, Memorial University; Dr. Chris Campbell, Vice-President (Applied Technology), Marine Institute, St. John's; Dr. Max House, Director, MEDICORE and Telemedicine, Memorial University; and Dr. David Strong, Vice-President (Academic), Memorial University.

This will constitute the first Newfoundland and Labrador Science Technology Advisory Council.

This council will provide government with an independent and responsible view of the major issues involved in the formulation of a comprehensive science and technology policy for the Province.

Given the current increase in research and development initiatives in the Province, and indeed in the entire country, the Advisory Council will serve a vital role in building on and fostering the relationships that are already developing between government, provincial academic institutions and industry. The Council will formulate recommendations respecting aquisition, development and dissemination of knowledge, designed to promote the industrial, economic and social development of the Province.

The Council has been mandatd with the responsibility to gather and organize information on scientific research, technology transfer and

innovation. A major role of the Council will be to facilitate discussions on science and technology policy with other organizations, both inside and outside government, as well as recommending establishment of programmes which encourage development of improved technology and the retention of skilled research personnel in the Province. The Council will also advise government on the impact of technology on business and labour and on the most effective means of dealing with specific areas of technological change.

The Science and Technology Advisory Council will report regularly to Cabinet through my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism, who will chair a special Cabinet committee on science and technology, and it will prepare an annual report which will review the state of affairs of research and development within the Province and outline future actions.

Mr. Speaker, these highly respected and renowned individuals who have agreed to serve on the Newfoundland and Labrador Science and Technology Advisory Council will help us to build on the existing strengths we have in research and development, and help us to focus our attention to those areas where Newfoundlanders and Labradorians can be world leaders and forge new trails in research and development.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a minute or two to express the pleasure of those of us on this side of the House with the announcement made this afternoon by the hon. the Premier. Such an Advisory Council will, of course, be beneficial to all aspects of life in this Province as well as contributing greatly to advice to government and advice to industry generally. It can only be of benefit to the Province and we welcome the announcement.

I do not know individually all of the individuals appointed, but I can say that those who are known to me are clearly excellent appointments and I commend the Premier and the government on their choice.

We enthusiastically endorse the government's action in establishing this Council and the choice of the people on the Council. We commend the government for doing it and we assure the Council of our future support, whether we are on this or that side of the House.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I was going to start off by thanking the Premier for giving me a copy of the statement but since

he did not, I guess I had better not.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It was an oversight.

MR. FENWICK:

I am sure it was an oversight.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It was.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, having listened to the statement, it is very difficult to stand up and say that this is not an appropriate initiative for the Province because it would be like speaking against motherhood. It is obvious that in the future in our development as a Province, as an economy, we do need to make sure that we are at the forefront of any technological innovations, especially those that apply to the industries in which we have a comparative advantage, such as the fishery, forestry and mining, to name three. At that point, it becomes difficult to stand up and be critical of it, but I am going to put at least one critical note into the comments and that is that in listening to the Premier over the last year or two, especially in defence of several projects, such as the Sprung Project and the CHC helicopter simulator, there seems to be a new sacred cow - I think that is probably the best way to describe it - being promoted and that is that if this is a scientific development or if it is a technological innovation, then how dare you come here and question whether it is the most appropriate development.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intensely held feeling that it is not just a technological problem that faces us as a people and as a Province,

it is also a social and economic one, and I would like to see a more balanced approach in the future in terms of development.

I see, for example, tremendous resources going into the natural sciences in the university, and other than the music school and fine arts, there does not seem to be a balance in terms of social sciences, humanities and others. It is a feeling that I and, I think, a number of other people are having, that there is a technological fix being looked for here when, in fact, we may be looking more at our history and the economic development of our Province in terms of our sociological problems and so on, which may give us the kinds of the keys for the future.

So, with that minor criticism, I welcome the Council. I know some of the names on it, and they seem credible. On that basis, I hope they can contribute to the economic development of the Province in the future.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the sealing industry has experienced a very difficult ten year period. The state of difficulty which this industry has recently faced is, for the most part, a direct result of the European Economic Community's temporary ban against the importation of seal products. Mr. Speaker, I need not elaborate on the misinformation that has

been perpetrated by various animal rights groups against our Newfoundland sealers resulting in the decline of our sealing industry. However unjustified the attacks against this industry, we have recognized the reality of the situation and have taken positive steps to rebuild our sealing industry.

I would like to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that this government has remained firmly committed to the orderly and co-ordinated revitalization of the Newfoundland Sealing Industry. Since 1982, we have worked closely with the Canadian Sealers Associations and financially supported this association in an effort to preserve, promote and protect the sealing industry. Since its inception in 1982, we have provided annual grants to the Canadian Sealers Association for seal pelt inventories, market development projects and general administrative costs.

I feel very confident, Mr. Speaker, that this strong bond of consultation and co-ordination which we have with the Canadian Sealers Association will continue to grow to the betterment of the sealing industry in this country.

The formation of the Northeast Coast Sealers Co-Op in 1986 provided a major initiative in the revitalization of the sealing industry. Again my department was there to provide technical and financial assistance.

In 1986, we provided the Northeast Coast Sealers Co-Op with a \$200,000 loan guarantee and an outright grant of \$50,000. In 1987, an additional loan guarantee of \$500,000 was provided by my department. Government is

presently reviewing a further request from the Sealers Co-Op for additional financial assistance for the coming year as this enterprise develops into commercial viability. Our commitment to assist the Canadian Sealers Association and the Northeast Coast Sealers Co-Op is firm and this commitment has been backed up by our continued financial support of these organizations.

In April, 1987, my department entered into an agreement with P. Janes and Sons Limited, and the Canadian Sealers Association, to have that company produce a canned seal meat product for the local marketplace. As well, the company was to undertake testing of seal meat in various secondary processed forms. To assist this project, my department provided the company with a grant of \$50,000 to offset the cost of purchasing seal meat. I am very pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that this project has been extremely successful, with approximately 160,000 pounds of seal meat being purchased in 1987. Further funding to continue this project has been tentatively approved for 1988, pending final budgetary approval. This project employed 66 people on a short term basis and provided a valuable market for Newfoundland seal products. This is just one more example of another initiative on behalf of this government to further the growth of the sealing industry.

Carino Company Limited has recently opened a plant in Dildo to process fish and seal silage, and this can certainly be viewed as a very encouraging step towards the revitalization of our sealing industry. Again, financial

assistance has been provided by this government for the set-up and the start-up of that operation.

The Government of Newfoundland has recognized and continues to recognize the seal resource as an integral part of our renewable ocean resources and reaffirms the traditional and future rights of its citizens, under restrictive licences, to harvest this resource at optimum yield levels. Mr. Speaker, this government strongly believes that our seal fishery can and will be revitalized, but we realize that short term fixes are not the answer. On the road to recovery we have seen the need to compromise in the marketplace, which is the basis for any industry. Rightly or wrongly, the present marketplace is telling us that white coats are not acceptable at this particular time. It is, therefore, necessary to tailor our present operation to regain market acceptance. It is not logical to continue to demand that the world accept the traditional seal industry exactly as it was. We must learn to modify and adjust our industry in order to meet present market demands.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this cautious but steady approach to the revitalization of the seal fishery is the best approach. We are steadily rebuilding a sealing industry based on an adult population harvest. In 1985 our harvest was approximately 6,000 adult seals; in 1986 it was 15,000; and in 1987 it was 40,000. The sealing industry is on the rise. We can now finally see some very positive results from our efforts over the last number of years.

The government has invested a

substantial amount of money on the revitalization of the sealing industry and we remain committed to continue our support. A recent federal government announcement to provide financial assistance to a development programme is another positive step towards revitalization. We will continue to lobby the federal government to make available sufficient funds necessary for the re-establishment of the industry.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this government has always been firm in our commitment to the orderly and co-ordinated revitalization of the Newfoundland sealing industry and we fully intend to remain firm in our commitment for the future, and it is with pleasure that I can report to you today some positive results from our persistent efforts in the face of formidable obstacles.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I welcome the announcement by the minister and I thank him for providing me with a copy of his statement just prior to the time of the House opening. It seems to me that the amount of money that government is spending on the seal fishery is certainly nothing to brag about; it is a relatively small amount of money. I think, in the statement, the minister mentioned that last year they made \$50,000 available to the company of P. Janes and Sons, in Hants Harbour, and that

that \$50,000 ended up in the production of 165,000 pounds of meat, therefore providing jobs for around sixty-two people.

Mr. Speaker, I think, when you look at that, that maybe it adds credence to what we are saying with respect to the Sprung operation, for example. Here we have an operation into which government put \$50,000 last year, plus the loan guarantee, to the Janes Company, and by the minister's own statement that \$50,000 provided sixty-two jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
Now, Mr. Speaker, one need not be an expert to realize how much more could have been done if the government had made available to the sealing industry, and to Janes and other companies, maybe one-tenth, 10 per cent of the almost \$14 million that they have now made available to the Sprung operation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
You know, it would boggle the mind, Mr. Speaker, the advantages that would accrue to the economy of this Province if government was to have taken one-tenth of the amount of money that they are now spending on cucumbers and put it into a product that we have here in abundance and for which there is now, obviously, a market developing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, government is making a token effort to rehabilitate and to revitalize the seal fishery. When you talk about \$50,000, and the guarantees that the minister talked about - there are altogether loan guarantees of less than three-quarters of a million dollars - there is still less than 10 per cent of the amount that was made available to the Sprung people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, here we are talking about the seal fishery that the government is pretending to be interested in revitalizing.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. W. CARTER:

May I have a moment to finish up?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The interesting part about this statement is the parts that the minister left out, or at least has tried to obscure with some of the best bureaucratic writing I have seen in quite a while, and I compliment his speech writer or himself, whoever put it together.

Mr. Speaker, this statement, if

you look at it closely, endorses the ban on the white coat hunt put in place by the federal government, and shows that our Minister of Fisheries has been an active participant in stopping that hunt.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Right on! I take full responsibility (inaudible).

Okay. That is very important, because it is not quite as explicit put here as I would like it to be.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at it you see a very interesting line of argument, and I will read one section it there that indicates it. It says: 'rightly or wrongly the present marketplace is telling us that white coats are not acceptable at this particular time' and it goes on to say that they cancelled the white coat hunt.

Mr. Speaker, this is a free enterprise government. What is it doing interfering with the marketplace? If the marketplace was not going to take any white coats it would take no white coats, nobody would go out and hunt them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that under the ruse of saying that there was no market for it, we ended up with governmental action supported by this government to eliminate the white coat hunt.

Now, there may not be any market for it, but surely the boats

should go out there, take whatever seals they can and try to sell the white coats. If they could not sell them that would be the end of it anyway, but surely no action on the part of the Minister is required.

One last comment, Mr. Speaker, and that is, if we look at the comments on the last page 'a recent Federal Government announcement to provide financial assistance to a development programme', Mr. Speaker, as was clearly pointed out when the announcement was made by the Federal Government, the amount of money being put into it is pitiful in comparison to that which was called for by the Malouf Commission in terms of compensation for the sealers who have lost their employment, and for the kinds of money required to build it back up; the amounts here are just a tiny fraction of those which were called for there.

So, Mr. Speaker, my comments are two: This government is the one-

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:
- that in complicity destroyed the white coat hunt and has not put the money in that Malouf called for.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

At this stage I would like to welcome to the gallery fifty Grade XII students from Ralph Laite Collegiate, Lewisporte, with their teachers Merv Anthony, Larry Sheppard and Donna LeDrew.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would like to welcome seven students from the T.I. Murphy Centre with their teachers Phyllis Maloney and Ed Buckingham.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Doyle). How much funding, if any, is provided by his department to the Newfoundland Safety Council in relation to the Motorcycle Safety Training Programme in this Province?

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, we provide an annual grant to the Newfoundland Safety Council to carry on that particular programme. I will have to get the exact figure for the hon. gentleman, but I believe it is in the neighbourhood of about \$35,000.

MR. GILBERT:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

I wonder is the minister aware of any problems with the Motorcycle Safety Training Programme that is being offered by the Newfoundland Safety Council in this Province?

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DOYLE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Motorcycle Safety Programme that is being offered is an excellent programme. It is a very good programme. There have been a few internal problems that I am aware of. And, as a matter of fact, over the last month or so I met with the Newfoundland Safety Council on two occasions and with the Motorcycle Federation on one occasion. There are some problems with respect to the provision of the instructors, the availability of bikes to carry on that programme, and what have you. But I think some of these problems are being worked out and I look forward to another good programme once again this year being offered by the Newfoundland Safety Council.

MR. GILBERT:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. GILBERT:

Well, I wonder is the minister aware that the motorcycle dealers and manufactures have withdrawn their support from the Newfoundland Safety Council? And the reason they give is their

complete lack of confidence in the ability of the Newfoundland Safety Council to administer the Motorcycle Safety Driving Course.

So, I wonder will the minister look into this and give us a report on it?

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the hon. gentleman at the outset, I am aware of some problems that were being experienced by the Newfoundland Safety Council in acquiring bikes from a couple of the manufactures. I have spoken as recently as two or three days ago with representatives of the Safety Council. They tell me they are in the process of acquiring the necessary bikes to carry on the course. We are monitoring the situation at this point in time and I will be meeting with representatives of the Safety Council within the next couple of weeks, before the course starts, to ensure that they do have the necessary bikes to carry it on. I think, Mr. Speaker, everything is going along quite normally in that regard as far as I know.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett). I ask him

to refocus his attention on Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd., and ask the minister is it true that union people wanted to see that particular plant privatized some time ago? I would like to know. I ask the minister were any steps taken by government back then to have that accomplished? Perhaps he could explain to us why he waited until now, when the financial picture is so bleak, to try to sell the plant to the private sector.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for me to restate what I already said yesterday. It is a matter of record. It is available in Hansard and has been certainly well expounded outside the House.

With respect to answering the other question, I would like for the hon. member to be a little bit more time specific as to just what period of time he is talking about in this rather hypothetical question he is asking.

MR. KELLAND:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

I would like to ask the minister to answer: Is it true that sometime within the past five years feelings were expressed to do that? But my supplementary -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the minister of Development and Tourism.

MR. KELLAND:

Well, I have not got my supplementary asked yet, Mr. Speaker, if you do not mind.

The minister said in the public media that he expects the seventy-odd people who are on layoff or will be laid off will be absorbed quite easily into the private sector in employment. Does he have any sort of concrete evidence to indicate that this is true?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I gave it as my view, based on information that came to me from the private sector, that indeed there were job opportunities. The method of disposing of that asset, if, in fact, it does take place - that decision has not as yet been reached, by the way - could very easily see the whole business pass over to the private sector as a going concern. It is difficult to presuppose what might or might not happen if one does not know exactly what, in fact, will happen. I suggest that rather than engage in such frivolous speculation that we wait to see how the thing washes out.

MR. KELLAND:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. KELLAND:

It certainly is a going concern, Mr. Minister, and going very rapidly from what we hear.

I would like, in my final

supplementary, to ask the minister if it is true that most, if not all of the stockpiled, finished product in inventory has already been sold to a private company here in the Province. If so, was this disposed of by the public tendering method? Perhaps the minister would tell us what the estimated real value of that inventory was and what kind of a price the private company paid.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that I am not the manager of that particular plant. My function is not to be involved in the day-to-day operations of that plant, it is one, rather, of policy decisions, and to answer those questions one would have to be involved in the day-to-day operational initiative. That is not my role. But if the member wishes to have the information, I can certainly take it under advisement and see that the information is provided to him.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, one of the major concerns of all people in this House of Assembly, all three parties, should be the youth of our Province, whether it be in education or rehabilitation or whatever aspects. I am quite surprised, Mr. Speaker, the number

of times that I have put questions to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin) concerning youths at the Boys' Home, that he has not come forward with any proposals or any changes to give us any encouragement of improvements taking place.

I would like to ask the Minister of Social Services, Mr. Speaker, if, in the past couple of weeks, he or his department, or anybody connected with the Boys' Home, have submitted a report to him, expressing dissatisfaction with the conditions, not only at the Boys' Home in Pleasantville, but also at the Torbay Remand Centre?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member came into this House, not very long ago, complaining about the fire regulations, got up, in his alarmist way and tried to make everybody believe that it was a centre that was operating twenty-four hours a day, in terms of a life-threatening situation when, Mr. Speaker, in actual fact, it was a centre that operated only for the day period. As it relates to that, the matter has certainly been addressed by the Department of Public Works and our own department. Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is trying to get on with the same type of conduct again today.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely irresponsible for the Minister of Social Services to leap to answer the question without even listening. I ask the minister very clearly, did he have a report as to the conditions of the Boys' Home - where they sleep at night, the snow blowing in through the windows on to the beds, and having to be swept off before the young boys get into bed?

Let me ask the minister, has he received a letter from any of the workers at the Boys' Home concerning the hiring practices at the Boys' Home in the past? In the past the people working with the boys have not been trained to counsel them or to give them any recreational direction. I am holding in my hand a letter from one of the residents. I ask the minister, is he aware of this, or has he received any sort of information concerning the employees and the hiring practices at the Boys' Home?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. TOBIN:

No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that the people involved in the Boys' Home are not qualified to do the jobs they have been hired for.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

It is very obviously that not only does the minister read newspapers while sitting in the House of Assembly, he must do it in his office all day long, because I

will table a letter that I received from an employee at the Boys' Home, in which he expressed very grave concern that the boys are not handled -

MR. TOBIN:

Is his name signed to it?

MR. EFFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

This is a final supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:

It is a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask the minister, taking into consideration the conditions that have been expressed not only by his own employees at the Boys' Home but by other people, the parents, would he immediately, for the satisfaction of this hon. House of Assembly and the satisfaction of the youths, have an investigation done as to the conditions, taking into consideration that last year the former Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) had made a commitment and said that a new facility would be built replacing the one that was partly destroyed by fire last year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, we had the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) come in the House yesterday and attack the social workers of this Province, and now we have the member for Port de Grave casting aspersions upon the abilities of the people who are working at the Boys' Home.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman refers to our involvement in the Pleasantville Youth Centre and in the Whitbourne Youth Centre. If the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, would look at the Interim Supply Bill that is before the House, he would probably get some indication as to what government has been doing. As it relates to the programmes and policies of the Department of Social Services, Mr. Speaker, in all aspects of development of our programmes we are moving ahead and moving ahead in great strides. One 146 per cent increase in the budget in nine years has addressed a lot of the concerns, Mr. Speaker, that have been brought up. What about the MR programme? What about the Youth Services and the Youth Correction workers, Mr. Speaker? What about what we are doing in terms of programmes for group homes and foster homes in dealing with the other people? I can tell the hon. gentleman that we are on the right track, Mr. Speaker, and he can do all he like as it relates to trying to alarm people, trying to come in with this great philosophy, being the great alarmist and trying to get people all worked up over very little, but the fact of the matter is that that probably worked for the hon. gentleman last year but he is now known to the people of this Province and nobody has confidence in him, not even me.

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, I had intended to ask this question of the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental

Affairs (Mr. Dawe) but he has momentarily stepped outside the House, so perhaps either the Government House Leader (Mr. Simms) or the hon. the Premier will reply.

He returns. Yesterday the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs commented that they had a number of legal opinions questioning the enforceability of Term 31 of the Terms of Union, questioning the extent to which it protected the railway or the transportation system in Newfoundland. Is the hon. the minister prepared to table those opinions?

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

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman opposite should realize that government seeks advice from its own lawyers and outside legal advice, over the years, in response to a number of questions that have come up with regard to Term 31 -

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Churchill Falls.

MR. DAWE:
- and a number of questions dealing with Churchill Falls and other issues as well.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have advice from our own Justice Department and others as it relates to the aspect of this particular term that would guarantee a constitutional obligation on behalf of the federal government to continue in perpetuity to provide a railway for this Province. In essence, our advice, and it is very obvious - I was

going to say even the member from Menehik (Mr. Fenwick) realized it from his comments - it is realized by everyone, and the wording is very easy to understand, that there is no guarantee. All the legal advice that we have indicates that that is true. Whether it is possible to table the opinions, I will have to take that under advisement and inform the hon. gentlemen later.

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:
A few years ago the public position of the government, stated publicly by a number of ministers and the hon. the Premier, was that the Term did protect Newfoundland's interests and was enforceable. Presumably, that also was based on legal opinion. Would the hon. the minister also provide and table those opinions on which that position was based at that time, so that we can do a proper assessment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the minister for Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. DAWE:
Maybe while we are tabling and exchanging information back and forth, the hon. member could tell us what his position was and what his advice to Cabinet was when he was a member when the railway really took a downturn in the Province back in the late 1960s.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker, in discussing the matter, certainly we would have to go on to say that our strict legal advice was never that the Terms of Union protected the ongoing and perpetual existence of the railway in this Province. The only guarantees under that particular section related to the financial obligation being taken over by the federal government, thus relieving the Province of that financial obligation that related to the railway.

But there was no indication, either in the Terms of Union or outside that we can gather, that would indicate that it intended to continue with that forever and a day. But there is and has been, certainly, an understanding and an argument that has been put forward by this administration and by many Newfoundlanders, that we would have really liked the Terms of Union to have been more specific and provide us with that guarantee, but they do not. Certainly, we have argued, in the face of the strict legal advice and interpretation that we have gotten with regard to that particular clause, that there is still what we believe to be a substantial moral obligation - an understanding and desire of all Newfoundlanders, I think at that time and now - that there would be a definite commitment on behalf of the federal government to provide the necessary funding. And that has been our argument right through the whole process, to continue the operation, and we have argued that very strongly and very successfully since 1978 - 1979, when there were a number of issues related to closing out the railway. We have used that

argument, moral suasion and our ability to discuss that issue with the federal government, to keep the railway going to this point in time, and, hopefully, keep it going for much longer. But strictly speaking, there is no legal obligation on behalf of the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, if you might look at the clause as I remember it, there are a number of things listed in that particular clause. Perhaps my colleague, the Minister of Transportation may have a copy of the Terms of Union there. But there are a number of things that are listed in that particular clause, and they include the Newfoundland Railway, Hotel Newfoundland, and, as well, Terra Nova T&E, steamships, and other things. The ones that are covered identically by the same clause in the Terms of Union have now been privatized or are about to be privatized in the same sort of way. So the railway is in that category, and it is obvious to everyone. You do not even have to be a legal beagle to know that that particular issue is fairly straightforward. From what I have been told I would have to question very seriously the abilities of any legal expert who would tell this administration or anyone else anything different.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WELLS:

Is the minister prepared to receive and use, to the Province's advantage, a variety of other legal opinions, to the contrary,

that indicate that there is a constitutional obligation on the part of the federal government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to receive that kind of advice and those kinds of suggestions, but I just might point out, Mr. Speaker, that the situation we are in today, with regard to the possible lessening of the railway's influence and impact on transportation in this Province, is no different than it was in the 1960s. It is no different than when the passenger train came off. The obligation for retaining the passenger trains in this Province surely must have been under this particular aspect of the Constitution just as legal as what the hon. gentleman and the resolution for the past few days have been dealing with. Certainly the kind of downgrading from somewhere in the vicinity of 3000 people working with the railway in this Province in 1949 down to the point where there were just a little over 1500 in 1968, surely that aspect of the railway and its decline then had implications legally just as much as they do today.

So to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who served in a Cabinet of this Province during that period of time, I just wonder why the legal advice that he is now propounding to be able to give this House was not given at that time. Perhaps if he had we would not be in this situation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:
My question is for the Premier, who was just up until recently, the Minister Responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs, and no doubt, in any case, continues to co-ordinate intergovernmental issues. My question concerns an issue that is of great concern in my own district and, indeed, to all people in the city of St. John's, and is becoming an issue of great debate in the city, and that is the possibility of the Province being awarded, or certainly at this point being given the promise of being awarded, nuclear powered submarines.

I would like to ask the Premier if he could, to the House today, state the policy of the government with respect to this issue. In light of the fact that the city of St. John's has passed a motion saying that they are not interested in the promise of nuclear powered subs, and in light of our federal Cabinet minister giving his support to the undertaking, as has the Board of Trade in the city, would the Premier, on behalf of the government, enter this debate, in particular with reference to the city of St. John's?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will be very pleased to give the hon. member the position of the

Government of Newfoundland, which was relayed over the last several months now - it goes back quite a few months, if not a year - by myself when I was Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, and latterly by the member for St. George's (Mr. Dawe), who is now the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, and who just recently had meetings in Ottawa with the Minister of Defense and with our representative from Newfoundland in the Federal Cabinet: Our position is we want nuclear powered submarines in Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
In the same way as we announced today a Science and Technology Advisory Council, in the same way as we have pursued NORDCO or C-CORE or Sprung, we want everything we can get for this Province to create economic development and economic expansion and, at the same time, to participate in the ongoing ability of the Canadian government to explore in the Arctic by having nuclear powered submarines.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
It is extremely unfortunate that the Mayor of St. John's or the Council has taken the position that nuclear power is somehow an enemy of our future when we should be embracing it as another mode of energy, another vehicle for expansion and development and prosperity.

And I say to the City of St. John's: Pooh, pooh, pooh on the City of St. John's and on the

mayor. We have said to the federal government that we are examining several sites around the Province that could be the best sites for nuclear submarine location.

MR. BAIRD:
Freshwater Bay.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, there are many. We can just say good-bye to St. John's if that is the way the City Council feels. We will have to see how the people of St. John's feel, of course.

MR. SIMMS:
There is Placentia.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
There is Argentia, for example, which is a very excellent place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
There are all kinds of them.

The other part of the argument is, as we all know, defense expenditures in Newfoundland per capita are the lowest in all of Canada. Yet everybody from Vancouver Island to Bonavista and from the North to Southern Ontario keep telling us that we are in a very strategic location geographically, and yet we are getting the lowest amount of defense expenditures. This is one way we are arguing with Mr. Beatty and Mr. Crosbie and the Prime Minister where they can redress a great historic wrong since 1949. There is Navy now and other things in Halifax, in Greenwood, in Shearwater.

MR. DINN:
In Summerside.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
There is Summerside.

New Brunswick has gotten their share. It is time for Newfoundland to get its share. We are out in the middle of the ocean. It is ships we are talking about, they are nuclear powered, so we are going to go after it with all guns blazing.

MR. WINDSOR:
Not nuclear armed.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Not nuclear armed, nuclear powered. It is nuclear power we are interested in, not nuclear arms. We will come to that another day if things get very hot. But we will put that on the back burner for now. We are interested in having nuclear submarines located in our Province. And if the City of St. John's is speaking for St. John's, pooh, pooh on the City of St. John's. There are many places in this Province that will be only too happy to be a part of a future technological advance for Canada through Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I doubt that many of the citizens of the Province or many of the people who live in the city of St. John's will be so quick to applaud such a speech in which the Premier so flippantly applauds his own

rather cavalier attitude to what is going to continue to be a very serious issue for a lot of people.

My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is in light of the fact that most recent independent estimates of the cost of this purchase of a nuclear powered submarine fleet have it upwards to \$15 billion - \$15 billion is what the latest independent estimates say - does the Premier not realize that in face of the recent history of cutbacks in health and education spending, which the Premier has been speaking out against and denouncing very clearly, that the struggle that this government has had to raise money from the federal government for essential public services such as roads and water and sewer-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I ask the hon. member to state his supplementary.

MR. LONG:

My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is does the Premier not think that the city and the Province will have a more difficult time raising the necessary funds to clean up the pollution in the harbour when the Federal Government, if it gives us this nuclear powered submarine programme at billions of dollars, is going to say, We have given you billions of dollars of infrastructure and that is all the money available for infrastructure? We are giving up the possibility of getting money for the Harbour because of this.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, what is all this about?

It is about the harbour now. We are on the Harbour now Mr. Speaker. Let me see what I can say about the harbour of St. John's.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why Newfoundland and Labrador as a Province lags behind some of our neighbouring provinces, if you look at the per capita earned income and so on, is because we have not had as significant economic activity in our Province as in other provinces. These other provinces only have had significantly more economic activity because of the way the federal government has spent the defense dollar.

Now, if the federal government decides, in its wisdom or lack thereof, to allocate \$15 billion over the next ten or fifteen years for defense expenditures in this country, and I am not in the federal parliament, but if they make that a programme available to Canada, then as Premier of this Province I am going to go after Newfoundland's share, and try to get it up. And if we can get more defense dollars we will get more economic activity, and more taxation to clean up the Harbour..

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. LONG:

My final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, concerns the

environmental hazards posed by these nuclear submarines. I simply ask the Premier is he aware of the literature on the subject of environmental hazards posed by nuclear powered submarines and does he have any concern at all with some of the issues that have been raised by the Mayor and other experts on the question of environmental concern?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am aware there are environmental concerns related to fish plants around the Province. I am aware that there are environmental concerns about almost everything we do. They may even be some environmental hazards right here in this House, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There may even be some environmental concerns right here in this House, I do not know, and they might come in the form of a homo sapiens. I do not know that either. But do we suddenly condemn a new technology like nuclear power because there are obvious problems with environmental things? Let us see if we can work them out. Let us see if we can work them out and make it an acceptable way to go in the future. Everything has its positives and its negatives, and I am not at all convinced by the hon. member's argument that there are more negatives in an nuclear powered ship that there are in other kind of ship. If we are going to explore the Arctic and have sovereignty over what we believe to be ours, whilst all the rest of the nations of the world

are into nuclear powered submarines and ships our sovereignty will not be all that strong, Mr. Speaker, unless we get into this kind of technology. So I say to the hon. member, I do not deny, I do not try to minimize that there are environmental risks, but I am not prepared to throw out the baby with the bath water. There are, obviously, nuclear powered ships around the world today that are operating very acceptably environmentally. As I see it, Mr. Speaker, whilst I understand that there are environmental concerns I do not think they are of sufficient import for us as a Province to say, 'No, we are not going to have nuclear powered submarines. Let Halifax, Moncton, PEI, Quebec, or British Columbia have them.' There are, sure, real concerns, but in my view they are not so significant as to outway the positives as we look at how far nuclear power has come over the last twenty or thirty years.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Young). Last year we warned the government that the passing of Bill C-22 in the House of Commons would cause the price of prescription drugs to increase anywhere from 20 to 30 per cent. We now learn that in some cases they have jumped 50 per cent. I would like to ask the minister what action he has taken, as the minister charged with protecting consumers, especially senior citizens and those on fixed incomes, to protect these people

from these outrageous increases in the price for prescription drugs?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I have written the minister who is responsible for it and expressed our concern. I am sure the hon. gentleman knows that when it was introduced this government was dead opposed to the Bill and the increase in drug prices.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is just time for a final supplementary.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

I am glad to see that the minister was dead set against these high increases. Perhaps he could tell the House and the people of Newfoundland what representation he has made to the Minister of Finance to have a programme in place for senior citizens and those on fixed incomes to offset the significant increases in prices caused by Bill C-22?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel I can reply on behalf of the Minister of Finance. I am sure he can speak on his own behalf.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Section 8.1, subsection (2) of the Government - Kruger Agreements Act, I have the honour of tabling an amending agreement to the Government - Kruger Put Agreement. This amending agreement was executed on August 21, 1987. It provides government consent to Kruger's borrowing of the additional \$30 million to expand and accelerate the mill modernization programme at Corner Brook. The increase in the cost of the modernization programme over that originally projected has led to the need for additional capital borrowing by Kruger of \$30 million.

The banks, through the lead bank, the Royal Bank, have agreed to provide the funding to the company without any involvement by government. However, because the Put Agreement, included as part of the Government - Kruger Agreements Act, 1984, is tied into the loan agreement between Kruger and the banks, government's consent is required in order for the amount of capital borrowing to be increased from \$80 million to \$110 million.

Given the performance of this company to date in Corner Brook, and the fact that there is no change in the security provided by government, we are, of course, prepared to provide our consent for this agreement.

I would like to have the opportunity to agree to many more such things.

MR. SPEAKER:
Are there any further reports?

MR. TWOMEY:
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TWOMEY:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to table the following reports: The 1985-86 Annual Report and the financial statements of the C.A. Pippy Park Commission; the 1986-87 Annual Report and the financial statements of the C.A. Pippy Park Commission; a government funded body reporting for 1987 under the Public Tender Act, 1974-84; and finally, the government funded body reporting for January and February of 1988, under the Public Tender Act, 1984.

Notices of Motion

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means to consider the raising of supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

I also give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of supply to Her Majesty.

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Teacher Collective Bargaining Act, 1973". (Bill No. 27)

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, on the Order Paper of Tuesday, March 15, Question No. 115 from the hon. gentleman from Twillingate, asks the Minister of Fisheries to table the following information: Is the vehicle the minister currently drives purchased by the department or leased by the department? In either case, did it go to tender? Part (b), provide a list of the companies who tendered on the vehicles and the amounts of their bids.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is the vehicle was purchased by the department, through the Government Purchasing Agency, and thirteen companies were asked to submit bids for a full-sized car. Part (b) of the answer, Mr. Speaker, is the vehicle was purchased on February 11, 1985 from Hickman Motors Limited for the amount of \$13,897, which was the only bid received for a full-sized car.

Petitions

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of some 550 residents of Davidsville/Main Point, in the Gander Bay area. Mr. Speaker, I will read the prayer of the petition into the record:

"To the hon. House of Assembly, and the legislature assembled,

"We, the undersigned residents of Davidsville and Main Point areas of Gander Bay, do hereby humbly request your support and intervention with the Government of Canada to help alleviate some of the problems we are experiencing with mail delivery; and

"Whereas we would like to have a separate mail truck to travel from Gander to go to Musgrave Harbour, Carmanville, Noggin Cove, Aspen Cove, Ladle Cove, Frederickton, Davidsville, Main Point and Gander Bay post office only; and

"Whereas the mail truck which now leaves Gander early in the morning and goes to Gambo, down the Loop Road along the Strait Shore and Gander Bay" - Mr. Speaker, these are all geographical terms in Newfoundland - "in the late afternoon before returning to Gander, invariably reaches Gander Bay too late in the day for us to receive our mail that day; and

"Whereas we would like to have the hours changed at the Main Point

Post Office to closing at 4:30 p.m. or 5:00 p.m. each day, as the case in many other communities, this would enable the people of Davidsville/Main Point to get their mail on the same day it arrives instead of the following day, which is always the case."

Mr. Speaker, you will note that the petition recognizes that the matter being dealt with here is a federal matter, and what they are petitioning in the provincial government for is support with the federal government in seeing that their problems are solved.

Mr. Speaker, in view of that, I would ask that the petitions, and I would ask the Government House Leader to pay some particular attention to this, that what is being asked for is not the expenditure of provincial government funds here, but indeed what is being asked for is the support of the government of this province to go to the federal government to see this problem solved. It is to most of us, I suppose, a minor problem, but in the minds of the people of Davidsville and Main Point, this is a major problem to them. The use of one truck rather than two to deliver mail, and the hours of closing of the post office is a major problem to them. So I would ask the Government House Leader to see the type of support requested here is given.

What all too often happens to petitions is they lie on somebody's shelf and gather dust. I hope the Government House Leader will see it does not let it happen in this case, but rather that he, as the House Leader for the government, will see that the kind of support that is necessary to solve this problem is given.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to point out that what we are seeing here is a further deterioration of service by the post office in this province. I believe that the government and ourselves are on record from last year in the last sitting of this Assembly in pointing out that we are both - I believe there was a unanimous resolution passed in this legislature - against the downgrading of postal services in the province, and this is another example of what is happening.

Originally, in this particular case, some years ago there were two trucks that served this area. Now, instead of two, you have got one truck that must go, I think something in the order of 160 miles in order to deliver mail, so that you do not have any mid-points. You have a point which stems around the Bonavista North Loop from Gander all the way around. Consequently, those people do not get their mail. The mail is not delivered before late in the evening and, because of hours of closing of the post office, we do not get mail sometimes until a day after.

I would ask that this petition be placed upon the table of the House and referred to the appropriate department. I would also ask the Government House Leader to take some serious note of this and indeed support it with his federal PC colleagues in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am only too happy to support this petition by the people from the Gander Bay area. As my colleague from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) pointed out, it is another example of an erosion of services we have seen happen in this Province over the years. In this case it pertains to Canada Post.

We all know that Canada Post has plans, plans that into the future we would see the close down of every post office in Newfoundland, with the exception of seventeen. Mr. Speaker, this is something that the House has spoken on in the past, as my colleague also mentioned.

When you see this sort of thing happen I wonder whether this is not part of a deliberate plan, because, Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland Railway was handled in exactly the same manner. What happened was, they took a service that was good and gradually removed it piece by piece, and gradually made the service worse and worse and worse, so eventually they could say people do not want it. This is what happened over a number of years with the Newfoundland Railway.

I am wondering if because Canada Post received so much negative reaction because of their announced close down that now they are going through the backdoor and saying, 'Well, we will provide less and less and less services to the existing post offices; the people will complain and will complain and, eventually when we do close them down, there will be not too much of a fuss kicked up because the people would then prefer the super mailboxes to the

post office. Then we could say we will put super mailboxes in Main Point or any other communities, and we will then speed up our delivery to these super mailboxes and, therefore people will be getting better service.' When, in fact, Mr. Speaker, they have deliberately created the bad service in the first place. I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells) refers to this procedure as setting up straw men to knock them down. It is the similar kind of situation.

There are many other kind of services, Mr. Speaker, that are also eroding in rural Newfoundland, the part of Newfoundland outside of St. John's. I was shocked to find out just a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, that in order to send monies by telegram, that that service is no longer available in centres outside of St. John's. It used to be automatic. You could send money to somebody through the telegraph service very easily.

Now, all of a sudden I find out that that is no longer available to residents outside of St. John's. In order to do that, they have to actually physically come in here to St. John's and present money down on Duckworth Street in order to telegraph money. This is an abominable degradation of service that has happened under our very eyes without us knowing about it.

That is why it is so good to hear from residents of Gander Bay pointing to a lessening of service that is to their detriment. This is probably happening all over the Province. Maybe we will get further petitions from other areas of the Province.

It is a degradation of service, Mr. Speaker, that we should not put up with. So I am very happy to support the petition so ably presented by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment on the petition from the residents of Davidsville, Main Point, and those particular areas of Gander Bay and just a general comment on the whole topic and the whole issue with respect to postal service.

I guess we have in this Legislature, as recently as last year, taken a unanimous approach to expressing our dissatisfaction with some of the things that have been happening in the delivery of postal service. I suspect that that frustration still exists among members on both sides of the House, forgetting the partisan nature of the House. It still exists.

I know in my own community, by the way, which is, I suppose, dubbed urban, even though it is only a community of 9,000 or 10,000 people, there is difficulty with postal service there because people cannot get postal delivery to their homes and these sorts of things. I know that is a different concern than the people of Davidsville and Main Point are expressing in this petition, but, nonetheless, it is all relative to the overall problems and

criticisms that are being experienced.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we have much difficulty on this side in supporting the suggestion by the member for Fogo, who so ably presented this petition on behalf of his constituents. We have no problem in supporting the request that the federal government or the appropriate federal government department, perhaps be notified by Your Honour on behalf of the House, that this petition has indeed been received and perhaps attach the comments from Hansard that were made in discussing or debating or questioning the petition, as presented.

I thank the hon. member for giving me a copy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there any further petitions?

MR. FENWICK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

This petition is from 914 individuals, 912 of which are my constituents in Labrador West, and the other two are myself and the member for St. John's East. I will read the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

More than three this time.

MR. FENWICK:

Oh, yes. Infinitely more than three.

Mr. Speaker, I have been assured by the individuals who circulated this petition that there are many more, but because the budget is coming up on Tuesday, I thought it appropriate for it to be entered into the record prior to the budget coming down. It reads as follows:

"To the hon. House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador.

"We, the undersigned residents of Labrador West, urgently petition the provincial government to establish a first-year university programme in Labrador West commencing in September of 1988.

"Five years ago our first-year university programme was discontinued when the mining companies ran into financial difficulties. This programme was highly successful. It operated for many years and gave many Labrador West residents the opportunity to go to university in an economical manner.

"Now that the Province has endorsed the concept of having first-year programmes in remote areas, we feel that our programme should be reinstated this year given the major transportation difficulties faced by our students in getting to and from the campus in St. John's and other places."

Mr. Speaker, the petition which has been circulating in my district for the last month or so, was started prior to the announcement in the Throne Speech that the first-year university programmes in the community colleges would be deferred. As a result, it was an initiative taken by my district with the understanding that there would be first year university programmes

in place this year.

Mr. Speaker, there is a convincing argument for going there. One of the reasons that I enter the petition, knowing that the government has made a policy decision otherwise, is that I am not satisfied with the reasons given in the Throne Speech, that they wish time to evaluate the Grand Falls and Lewisporte programmes.

Mr. Speaker, the first-year university programme was in Labrador West for thirteen years, ending only when the mining companies took back the amount of money required in order to fund it on a year by year basis.

Mr. Speaker, not one cent of provincial government money went into that programme. It was totally funded by the companies in the area, as a benefit to the individuals there. Unfortunately, it has been cancelled, but it has proven to be highly successful at bringing more individuals into the university stream and giving them more of an opportunity for a university education that would normally be the case.

As the member for Grand Falls will fully admit, the university programme in Grand Falls is bringing into the university situation students who normally would not attend campuses in Corner Brook or in St. John's.

When we look at the present figures for the individuals who are going to university in those other locations, we find that a very high percentage are the sons and daughters of professional people or university graduates. When we look at the representation in the remoter courses, it is

clearly shown that it is a much broader social spectrum that is represented. More of the sons and daughters of the people who work at the mill in Grand Falls and others working in situations who normally cannot afford to send their children to university are taking advantage of it.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask both the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) and other members of the government to stand up and explain why they use such a flimsy excuse for deferring the first year programmes, not only in my district of Labrador West, but the ministers for Marystown and Grand Bank, explain why that area, which wants a programme, is turned down; explain why the Carbonear area, which is very much looking for one; explain why Gander is denied, which is very much interested in getting one; explain why the people in St. Anthony are turned down while they are also interested in the programme; also the people in Stephenville; why all of these individuals are disappointed by a policy change that clearly is not in the best educational interests of the future of this Province.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will sit down and hope to hear a response from the government side.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to support the petition presented by the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), who is

attempting to be the future member for Port au Port. I support his petition on the basis that I feel that Memorial University of this province should be moved out around as much as possible to rural areas.

Stephenville is the location of the Western Community College and the headquarters there. It serves St. Anthony and it serves Port aux Basques and I feel that the programmes, in especially the first year of university, at the minimum, should be offered to those areas, and other areas on the Southwest coast of the Province and also Labrador.

Labrador is an area which has been left out, Mr. Speaker, and for many years always seems like it has been left out in my many programmes. I think it would have been a good gesture on part of the Career Development Department to go up there as soon as possible, but that has not happened. The indications, which are alarming, Mr. Speaker, are that the administration looks like they are going to put the expansion of these programmes on hold.

I would ask the minister to reconsider this request from all the rural parts of the Province who are looking for this programme. It would be a great benefit to the first year students in saving on expenses to travel to the other two centres.

I was driving down the parkway today and I noticed another huge building going up in the middle of a parking lot at Memorial University. I do not know how many floors there are, but there is going to be no parking space left down there soon. I think the new Minister of Career Development

(Mr. Matthews) should undertake to look at these requests very seriously and to decentralize and distribute these type of services to young people in the Province and also other people who are trying to start new careers.

I ask him to undertake it and I support wholeheartedly the petition presented by the member for Menihek.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I feel obliged as the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies to speak in response to the tabling of the petition by the hon. the member for Menihek, and just to say that the key word of what was said in the Throne Speech is 'deferred'. It was not cancelled or eliminated forever.

As well, I would like to say that it is this government that is offering first year university courses at Grand Falls and Lewisporte for the first time. They were not offered there before.

We are looking at some logistical problems that have been encountered and associated with offering first year courses in Grand Falls and Lewisporte. As well we are doing an evaluation of elementary and secondary education in the Province, but it in no way indicates that this government has

terminated expansion of first year university courses and, of course, other brokering of courses through the institutes to the various regions of the Province.

Now the hon. member, of course, is very interested in Labrador West. But I am a little surprised that he did not table this petition a couple of months ago or a couple of weeks ago because he knows full well it has been announced by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor) that the Budget will be brought down on Tuesday. It is kind of late now. If he hoped to have any impact on the budgetary decisions, he would have at least done it a bit sooner.

As well, I would like to say to the hon. gentleman that when the Budget is brought down on Tuesday, I do not know what the results of it will be, but as a department we have been pursuing monies for capital construction in a number of our campuses. Even if we had money approved a month or so ago, it is going to take a fair amount of time to go to tender, to get the necessary work done and completed and we have to look at standards that have been set by the university in offering courses in other regions of the Province. It is going to take quite a bit of time before capital construction is completed, if monies are in the Budget for it.

This is all tied into a decision, Mr. Speaker, to defer first year university courses, not to cancel or terminate, to defer.

I would like to re-emphasize that it is this that for the first time has offered first time university courses at Grand Falls and Lewisporte. It is this government that made a commitment to expand

first year university courses to other regions of the Province. So the key word is 'defer'. The department, of which I am a new minister for the last couple of months, has been doing a very close evaluation and reassessment or what is happening in Grand Falls and Lewisporte.

As one minister of government and as Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, I am committed to expanding the programme in other regions of the Province at some time in the future, but when we do it, we want to do it well and we want to offer good quality programmes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 172 residents in the town of North West Brook in the district of Bellevue. I will read the prayer, Mr. Speaker. It says,

"We, the undersigned, hereby request the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to upgrade and pave the gravel road in the community of North West Brook, Trinity Bay. This road is very heavily used and services approximately 100 families in the town.

"Activities that lead to high vehicular use are: three churches that serve four towns, community wharf and boat launch used by surrounding towns for fishing and recreational use, five school

buses using the road four times a day, a general post office, a community hall with an office for rural development serving Southwest Arm, frequent use of heavy vehicles, such as grocery trucks etc.

"Historically this road has received minimum attention, only after complaints of a few residents."

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would like to draw the attention of the hon. House to that petition because it is not correctly worded. If we are going to have them presented strictly, that should be addressed to the House of Assembly. I understood that was addressed to the Government of Newfoundland. As it presently stands, it is not in order.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, have you seen a copy of the petition?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! I have been listening to the petition as read by the hon. member.

MR. SIMMS:
Would it be purposeful, Mr. Speaker, to at least ask for a copy of the petition perhaps before -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! I have already ruled on the matter. I have been listening.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
That petition is out of order. Is that what Your Honour said?

MR. SPEAKER:
The petition, as worded at the present time, is not strictly in order, according to our rules.

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

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

MR. TULK:
Before we move to Orders of the Day, I would like to get the attention of the Government House Leader, if I could. Yesterday afternoon the Government House Leader started to present a matter he considered to be of urgent and public importance, and I think he was, under Standing Order 23, going to ask for a debate on a certain resolution.

We did not get a chance to hear all of the resolution because the hon. gentleman was completely out of order in doing it yesterday on Private Members' Day at one minute after four. For that reason, we did not hear his resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the hon. gentleman now, and I hope he is listening, because I want to say to the hon. gentleman quite sincerely, that this side of the House wishes to debate all matters that might be of an urgent nature to the public of this Province. If he has a resolution that he wanted to present yesterday, when he was not in order to do so, if he wants to bring that resolution in this afternoon, and if the Speaker rules, of course, that it is of urgent and public importance, I say to him that we would be only too glad, on this side, to debate that matter or any other matter that is of an urgent and public importance to the

public of this Province, and I say it to him sincerely.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I do not think there is any point of order. I think the hon. member just made an observation at that particular time.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, before you call Orders of the Day, I would like to rise under Standing Order 23. I regret having to do this. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is such a fine gentleman. However, I rise under Standing Order 23, Mr. Speaker, to ask that the regular order of business be set aside today to debate what I consider and we consider to be a matter of urgent public importance, and urgent public business.

I will briefly state my reasons for it. These are as follows: The Leader of the Opposition stated publicly the day before yesterday, I believe it was, that "It would be madness if Newfoundland had more legislative jurisdiction over our fishery."

In addition, the Leader of the Opposition said in this House, certainly implied in this House on Opening Day, in reading Hansard and the comments that he made in response to the Address in Reply, that the federal government was justified in not doing anything to

stop the Upper Churchill deal in the 1960s.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame, shame!

MR. SIMMS:

Of course, Mr. Speaker, there are other quotations that I could use, which I do not need to, because I am only presenting my case in as brief a way as I possibly can.

It is, in our opinion and our view, that such statements are really injurious to the public good of Newfoundland and Labrador. It is urgent public business in our view, and the Opposition House Leader has already confirmed that they must feel the same way, because they are quite prepared to debate it. It is certainly in the interests of the public good that this House discipline the hon. the Leader of the Opposition for making such comments.

Should Your Honour rule in favour of this particular request, I, Sir, am prepared to move a motion of censor against the Leader of the Opposition so that all members of this hon. House would have the appropriate opportunity to disassociate themselves from these kinds of statements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would like to just point out in our Standing Order 23 Section (c) that a member moving such a motion, "He then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to the Speaker" and I would like to have that.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
I say to the hon. gentlemen quite sincerely that if the Speaker, having looked at this, sees that this is a matter of urgent and public importance, I say to him quite sincerely that this side has no objection whatsoever to debating the false statements that he has just read.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, to the motion or the advisability of taking the motion, clearly, in listening to it, it is obviously the interpretation of the House Leader for the Government side in saying that these are dilatorius or dangerous statements or so on and so forth. They are clearly statements made in debate which they have an opportunity to respond to at many different opportunities. Those opportunities are on the Order Paper and clearly they are not important enough to do that since we do have the opportunity to debate them at another time.

Quite frankly, I find it despicable that the Government House Leader would stoop to this kind of tactic in terms of trying to simplify the arguments made by the Leader of the official Opposition.

I do not agree with his statements but I know, in listening to them that there has been a gross distortion of them by the Government House Leader and they should not be entertained, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LONG:
Well said.

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
I am just going to recess the House for a few minutes, but I will hear the hon. the Leader of Opposition before. I will then recess the House for five minutes.

MR. WELLS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Where it involves me personally, I have a little difficulty in using words like despicable to describe the action, but I am grateful to the Leader of the N.D.P. for using it first.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has the floor and I would ask that he be heard.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is clearly the kind of despicable action that the Leader of the N.D.P. and the member for Menihek has referred to. We are allowed to have and to express our opinions here. The

fact that I believe the government's action and their position with respect to a certain direction to be a silly absurdity to try and get public attention and emotion -

MR. MORGAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, for the clarification of the House, are we now going to agree to debate the motion put forward by the House Leader? If we are, surely it is not just going to be the Opposition Leader allowed to speak.

I understand your ruling is right now, that only the leader of the Opposition is allowed to speak, then you go to recess to make a decision. He is now debating the motion, Mr. Speaker, and if that is the case, we all should be allowed to speak.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have heard the hon. the President of the Council briefly, and I have heard the hon. the member for Menihek. I said I was going to recess for five minutes. But I did recognize the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I think that he should be heard briefly, and I want to hear him, briefly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I recognize the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista South on a point of privilege.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, the situation is that so far the Opposition House Leader has spoken on behalf of that party, the House Leader over here has spoken on behalf of that party, and our House Leader has spoken as well. Why another injection from another member of the House, unless we are all allowed to speak as well? Why?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The simple fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, one of the two statements to which the hon. gentleman referred has been made several times over the last six months. The other statement, relating to Churchill Falls, was made in this House in my response to the motion to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. There can be nothing of an urgent nature in relation to it, and I am prepared to debate the issue now, on the Meech Lake issue when it arises, during the Throne Speech, and on any other number of occasions when Churchill Falls issues are being debated in the House, during Fisheries debates and any other matter.

This is a silly, despicable effort on the part of the government.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House will recess for five minutes.

Recess

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The motion is not in order.

I would like to read for hon. members Beauchesne, Page 92, Paragraph 287: "Urgency within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but means 'urgency of debate', when the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the House do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately."

We have on the Order Paper, Order No. 1, Address in Reply. We also have Motion No. 2, which could deal with that particular matter, and also Interim Supply. So the motion is not in order.

Orders of the Day

MR. SIMMS:

Motion 3, Mr. Speaker, first readings.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act To Incorporate The Newfoundland And Labrador School Trustees' Association," carried. (Bill No. 9)

On motion, Bill No. (9) read a first time, ordered read a second

time on tomorrow.

MR. SIMMS:

Motion 2. The Meech Lake Accord.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion 2. The hon. the Minister of Fisheries adjourned the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I had a few minutes to speak on this most important resolution on Friday of last week. In particular, in my remarks, of course, I was concentrating on the particular provision of the Meech Lake Accord that requires that fisheries related issues and jurisdiction be a topic for constitutional consideration by the First Ministers, And I was attempting to make the point to the House, and I guess it was being made again today in the motion put forward by my colleague, the House Leader, that for some reason or other, and I do not know if it is because the Leader of the Opposition believes it, although I cannot foresee a set of circumstances where he would draw the conclusion that it is good politics to be against it, but, for whatever reason, the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks on Meech Lake a few days ago to this House made it abundantly clear, as he has done on numerous occasions now throughout the Province, that not only does he not support the Meech Lake Accord, which is another issue, but he does not support the particular clause in the Meech Lake Accord that would at least provide an avenue - we do not know if it will happen - for the province of Newfoundland and Labrador to try to gather for itself some further, broader,

wider, more definitive constitutional say in our most important resource industry, the fishery. That, to me, Mr. Speaker, is amazing.

I mean, how as a Newfoundlander you could justify being against it I just cannot understand. I am worried about the politics of it. If he is naive enough to draw the conclusion that it is politically popular to be against it, that is another question. But how you could be against it as a Newfoundlander, I just do not understand. I mean, there is stunnedness, and there is stunnedness, and then there is absolute stunnedness. And that is what this is all about.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, let me say this, as well, makes a great show during the public procedure of the House of being been calm, cool, almost whispering, soothing, trying to keep everything quiet and in decorum, not raising his voice, a courthouse atmosphere, then, when something happens in the House that he does not like, he goes outside the House and calls every member here clowns.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you cannot have it both ways. You cannot have it both ways. If you are going to be the perfect model of a gentleman in here, then you are going to have to be the same person out there. Because the point I made in the debate on Friday is that we have a responsibility, this government, this party, has a responsibility to ensure that the people of Newfoundland are exposed to the real Leader of the Opposition. And we are going to do it. We are going to do it. We will do it in this House. I do not care if it is liked or not by

the people on the other side, but we have a responsibility to make sure that the voters of Newfoundland and Labrador know that the person who wants to become Premier of the Province is against any further legislative jurisdiction in the fisheries. We have a responsibility to make sure that the people know that. We have a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the people of this Province fully understand that the Leader of the Opposition's official position, and I assume the position of his party, it is enunciated by the Leader, is that we should trade away non-surplus fish to a foreign country to settle a national sovereignty boundary dispute. The people have to know that. The people should know that, Mr. Speaker, and it is the responsibility of members on this side of the House to make sure that they know that. And that is exactly what we are going to do.

I mean, I was flabbergasted - I think it was the night before last I saw the hon. gentleman being interviewed. I believe it was on NTV - when he said it would be madness - madness! - not that it would be illogical, or you cannot support it constitutionally, or some rational, intellectual argument, but it would be madness if Newfoundland had greater legislative jurisdiction over the fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Shame! Shame!

MR. RIDEOUT:
That is totally unbelievable.

I mean, if the Leader of the Opposition said that about agriculture in Saskatchewan, he would be flogged, he would be

driven out of the Province. The Leader of the Opposition in Nova Scotia - the same party - is looking at it from the other side of the coin, accusing his premier of being asleep while First Ministers at least agreed to have a look at it. You know, at least the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Liberal Party in Nova Scotia, it seems to me, at least sees the political reality of it, he understands the politics of it. But the Leader of the Official Opposition here does not even pretend to understand that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think there is something more fundamental here, too, and that is the view that one has or does not have of Canada. I happen to believe and be comfortable with a relatively decentralized federation so that there is room for the individual uniqueness and resource development cultural heritage of the regions to grow and prosper and continue. That was not the case under the previous administration in Ottawa. It is the case under the particular administration in Ottawa today, and I think Meech Lake reflects that. Meech Lake is not the answer to all the constitutional problems of Canada. It might take another hundred years and you still might have an imperfect document. But I think what we have today in the Meech Lake Accord is better than what we had yesterday, and certainly better than what we had four or five years ago.

There is a significant region of the country that can now play its constitutional part in Canada, and I think that is important. You have to make some compromises and some adjustments for that to happen, but I think it is

important. And a region like Newfoundland, we will see. I mean, there are doomers and gloomers all over the place. We know that some provinces are adamant against further provincial fisheries jurisdiction. We have never gone to the Government of Canada in the past or the present and said we want 100 per cent control over the fishery. We never said that. People have tried to make believe that we said that. Our working document, *Towards The Twenty-First Century Together*, is a public document. I had people in the media call me about it two or three months ago and I said, 'Did you not read it? It was presented at the constitutional conferences in 1982. It is public. Have you not looked at it?' 'No, I have not looked at it.' 'Well, I will send it over to you so you can have a look at it and you will see clearly...' - and I made the case again before the Parliamentary Committee on Fisheries a couple of years ago; I believe the gentleman from Fogo was there as well - 'that we never had been looking for all of the jurisdiction.' What we have been looking for is a share, the constitutional right to have some say, however small that might be, over a resource that is fundamentally important to this Province. That is all we have ever said. We have never said that the federal government should be out of it and it should be balkanized among four or five provinces. We have never said that. The federal government will always have to, by necessity and reality, play a vital and, in some areas, a predominant role in fisheries matters in this country. They will have to.

Other provinces have different views for different reasons. In

Newfoundland and Labrador one of the retorts of the Opposition previously was, 'You cannot handle the jurisdiction you have now.' Their reasoning is to be against it because government is for it. That must be what it is. I mean, if we had the right to have some say over the setting of quotas, the federal government would not be able to unilaterally say we are going to give 2,000 or 2,500 tons to France. Right now we have a right to be consulted, and the final say is somebody else's call.

You can get up here in this House every day and you can go up one side of me and down the other in terms of Fisheries, but the fact of the matter is, that until the fish get out of the water and onto the stage head, somebody else has 100 per cent say over it. Now, we are not saying we ought to have that 100 per cent say, either, but we are saying we ought to have some right to share in making those decisions. Not the right to be consulted, common decency dictates that. We are talking about a constitutional right to have our say, and in some areas our say could be predominant, like in licencing of fishermen and licencing of vessels, for example. There is no reason why the Province could not do that. The federal government delegated that to the Government of Quebec in 1931. In 1931, they told the Government of Quebec they could do that for their fishermen, yet you cannot do it here in Newfoundland and Labrador.

So how an Opposition can take a fundamental position on a policy issue that is so important to hundreds and hundreds of communities, thousands and thousands of people -

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is madness.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is where the madness is. The madness is not in trying to fight to improve your constitutional position, which means you are improving, in this case, your economic position, that is not where the madness is, the madness is in not being able to see beyond the politics - because the government is for it, I have to be against it, and then go out and try to perpetrate that in the coastal communities of Newfoundland and Labrador. It is shameful!

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly going to support the motion. It might not bring everything that all of us want in fisheries or in Senate appointments or in Supreme Court appointments - it is not a perfect document - but it is an improvement over what we have now, and it is something that I think is worth supporting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. member for Stephenville I would like to advise you of the three questions for the Late Show:

The first one is to the Minister of Social Services with regard to the Young Offenders Review Board and is put forward by the hon. the member for Menihek.

Number two question is for the hon. the Minister of Transportation in reference to the Safety Council and is put forward by the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

The third one is for the hon. the Minister of Transportation with regard to the railway, and that has been placed by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. TULK:

I just want to point it out to Your Honour in case he did not see it - you may have seen it - but there is a fourth one, I understand, that has been submitted by the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford). Perhaps you have made your choice, but you said there were three.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order raised by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), I have three questions which were just delivered to me, number one, two and three and a selection has been made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

It is a pleasure today to rise and speak on the Meech Lake Accord that has been brought into this House for debate in the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador, which allows for differing opinions on a variety of issues, if any member purports to have them, or he is allowed to do so.

The Meech Lake Accord, Mr. Speaker, is a document that affects the whole country and affects this Province and will affect it a great deal in the future. One of the problems, and one of the big debates going on right now across the country, is what are the ramifications of some of the things that have been allowed to go into, or not go into, the Meech Lake Accord.

There have been a hue and cry by a number of groups across Canada, and in different parts of the country, to reopen and to discuss certain parts of the Meech Lake Accord. This has been looked upon as being against the Meech Lake Accord or if you reopen it, it will become unravelled.

I have a different point of view. I think if they all got into one room for eighteen or nineteen hours and decided on a document, then they could certainly go back and have a second look to see if there are some things that might be able to be helped and to be introduced.

Before I get into the Meech Lake Accord, and I am going to talk about Canada and the vision that we have, somewhat, but let us consider Newfoundland, its importance and its role in Confederation. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) was up talking about fisheries jurisdiction and the Liberal Opposition's policy on fisheries jurisdiction, what it is and what it is not. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat at a loss, to tell the truth, at what he was saying.

He was giving our position on the fisheries jurisdiction saying that we are against the fisheries jurisdiction. He says that we are

against further jurisdiction for the Province of Newfoundland.

MR. MORGAN:

Your leader is.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I heard him, I listened attentively, I never said a word, I must say, I just sat there and listened and I was trying to get from the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier where we said, and where we as a party are against giving us further say in the management of our fisheries resource. I have looked, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN:

It is madness, that is what he said.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

There is madness, but it is not with the policy that we have, it is with what they have.

I have looked and I have searched, I have read through everything that the Premier has said on fisheries jurisdiction; I have looked through everything that the Minister of Fisheries has said about fisheries jurisdiction, and in all my reading I have come across some things that seem to fly in the face of what these two hon. gentlemen are saying about our position on the fisheries jurisdictional question.

I am looking forward, Mr. Speaker, to seeing the members of the other side get up, after I present a couple of these documents, and then come back with the argument that, 'Yes, the Liberal Opposition is against fisheries jurisdiction when it comes to negotiations and when it comes to management of the resource,' which is so important to this Province. Nobody

questions that.

We have many people on our side, on these benches over here, who have fishing districts, who have districts that are dependent solely on the inshore and offshore fishery. These individuals, Mr. Speaker, have a great stake in what happens in the future to the fishery.

When I hear the arguments being put forward and the condemnation being put forward of the Liberal party's position concerning the Meech Lake Accord and concerning fisheries jurisdiction, it appears to me, Mr. Speaker, to be a big bluff. That is the only word that I can use. It is nothing but a big bluff.

If you read what is going on about it and you read what has been said in this hon. House of Assembly, and what is being said in the hon. House of Commons in Ottawa, one comes to a differing opinion. I have to note for the hon. the Speaker, June 17, 1987, seven or eight months ago, this House debated a resolution that was put forward by the hon. member for Twillingate and the member for Twillingate happens to be on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, he happens to be part of the Liberal Opposition. This hon. member, who has a great respect and has been involved in the fishery and trying to help it across this province for many, many years, put forward a Private Member's resolution on the fishery. Now, if we are so scared of our position, I would like to know why he would do such an insane thing as to open it up for debate when it is our only opportunity, Mr. Speaker, once every few weeks, to debate any issue in the province.

So I say to myself, what would we do that for, Mr. Speaker? I looked at the result of what happened over those two days of debate. Words are words, Mr. Speaker, and you can only go by what you see. What surprises me, Mr. Speaker, is the motion was put forward by Mr. Walter Carter, the Liberal fisheries critic, the member for Twillingate, -

MR. DECKER:

A good member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

A good member, yes, he is. The motion was amended by the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) and a subamendment was moved by the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), who happens to be the Opposition House Leader on this side of the House. The amazing part of all of this, Mr. Speaker, which runs and flies into face of their whole argument and the only argument-

MR. MORGAN:

The Leader has changed all that. There is a new policy now. He said it is madness to get jurisdictional control. He has changed your whole policy now. (Inaudible.)

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I ask for protection from the harassment of the -

MR. MORGAN:

It is a sham, he says.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I read this and I say to myself, now -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

The hon. member will have his opportunity, he can do so, no problem, okay. Now, the words were spoken and the resolution was amended twice, Mr. Speaker, and was adopted by this hon. House unanimously. All parties in this House agreed with the resolution which means that -

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Wells was not here.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Wells was the Leader.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, Mr. Wells was the Leader, by the way, and concurred totally. The member for Bonavista South voted for it. Every member opposite voted for a resolution that the Liberal Opposition brought forward on the fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I am going to read it out so that anybody is having a problem hearing will understand what we are saying. I am going to jibe it all together, and see, Mr. Speaker, if their argument makes any sense. The motion was amended:

"WHEREAS the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador entered into an agreement with the Government of Canada for the restructuring of the offshore fishery;

"AND WHEREAS the inshore fishery

is undergoing difficult times because of the depleted fish stocks, overfishing and the lack of an appropriate provision for provincial involvement in management of the fisheries," that is from a party who is scared of their position.

"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 this is the kicker, Mr. Speaker, "and an appropriate provision for provincial involvement in management of the fisheries."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss to try to figure out what they are trying to say on the other side about where we have changed our position, or what our position was.

These members in the House of Assembly have voted for the Liberal Party's position.

MR. TULK:
What date was that?

MR. K. AYLWARD:
It was June 17, 1987 was the date.

MR. TULK:
When did Mr. Wells become leader of the Liberal Party?

MR. K. AYLWARD:
I believe it was just before that.

MR. TULK:
June 6.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, that is right. Thank you very much, my hon. member for Fogo.

So we have a big distortion going on, Mr. Speaker, and I look forward to the other side when they get up. I will send copies of this around and ask that it be made available. They voted for this in this House of Assembly. So I assume that they adopted our position, Mr. Speaker. I assume that they have adopted our position, Mr. Speaker. I can only assume that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I think the document speaks for itself. As a matter of fact, the member for Bonavista South amended the motion and agreed with it. So, we have no problem with that, Mr. Speaker. This flies in the face of what they say, so I look forward to hearing what they are going to say when they get up. I would hope that they address it.

The only thing they can say is, 'We have changed our minds now. We changed our minds, now I do not know what we changed our minds to.' I am not too sure. What I am sure of is they are going to clarify it for us. I have no doubt about that in my mind. I am looking forward, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MORGAN:
(Inaudible) the member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to hearing what they are going to say about the position that they voted for.

Mr. Speaker, we can all carry on this argument. I could say over there that they did not vote for it and that they did not agree with our Liberal position. I mean, if I wanted to, Mr. Speaker, I could say that the Premier was not here on that day and did not agree with the House's position on the management of the fishery. I could play the same game, but I am not going to.

I am going to go by what was adopted in this House of Assembly as a position of the House of Assembly of all parties. If they do not want to go by that, Mr. Speaker, it is just too bad. I am sorry. We are going to carry it forward.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I mean, we can all play the game of deception, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:

You cannot ignore the truth.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

- that is exactly right, and you cannot ignore the truth. It is there and it has been passed through this House of Assembly.

Another thing, in my readings about jurisdiction and how important it is to the Province in relation to the Meech Lake Accord, the Premier had a press release out March 16th and, in presenting the Meech Lake Accord, he is saying "the pack is an opportunity for the Province to exert greater

control over its fishery."

The Premier did not change his position. He agrees with us, so I do not see what the problem is, Mr. Speaker. I was kind of perplexed the same day when he got up and started accusing us of not having a similar position, trying to get management of the resource for the people of the Province. I was kind of perplexed and I got some more information, Mr. Speaker, as to what this interpretation means. What does this really mean? This thing that we have, this amendment that we have, the Meech Lake Accord, when it talks about putting fisheries on the table to discuss. What does that mean in the future for Newfoundland? In looking at that, I have talked to a variety of resource people who know what is going on and who were involved with these negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, the federal Minister of Fisheries, Tom Siddon, was asked a question in the House of Commons in Ottawa just a few days ago about what the amendment in the Meech Lake Accord meant when it comes to fisheries jurisdiction and its negotiation of that for the Provinces and Canada.

MR. FUREY:

I guess the boys (inaudible).

MR. K. AYLWARD:

It is, absolutely, yes.

Mr. Speaker, I am again hoping to try and find something here that is going to make their case somewhat plausible, but thus far, I have found nothing.

So I read this sent down from Ottawa to us. The Minister was asked a question, "Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the

Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

"Premier Peckford stated yesterday in the Newfoundland House of Assembly that a clause in the Meech Lake Accord will lead to greater provincial jurisdiction specifically Newfoundland and Labrador jurisdiction, over the fishery.

"The Federal Minister of Fisheries knows that Canada's fish stocks are currently managed by the Government of Canada.

"Does the Minister share the Premier's interpretation of the Meech Lake agenda clause on the fishery, specifically, is he ready to say to the House today that Ottawa is prepared to cede part of its constitutional jurisdiction in the fishery to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador or, for that matter, to any other provincial government."

Mr. Speaker, that is a straight forward question that would clarify some of the confusion that seems to be persisting in this Province right now.

The answer is from the hon. Tom Siddon, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans:

"Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises a very important question indeed. The spirit of the Meech Lake Accord is that the respective provincial and federal Governments should be willing to sit down from time to time and talk about matters of mutual interest and concern.

"In that spirit a clause was inserted in the Accord to the effect that on a regular basis First Ministers would review the roles and responsibilities of the

federal and provincial governments regarding the management and allocation of our fish stocks. It is clearly understood by all provincial governments" - all provincial governments, he said, Mr. Speaker - "that the Constitution of Canada recognizes the responsibility of the federal government under the Fisheries Act for the management of the fishery."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I do not know what that says.

"I see nothing wrong with sitting down from time to time, as I do regularly," as I have done in the past, "with my provincial colleagues to talk about the extent to which they offer advice and input on the management process."

He goes on to further say, Mr. Speaker:

"We have met over a dozen times in the past year and a half and that kind of dialogue should continue. However, it is not my intention to suggest any ceding of ultimate responsibility by the federal government for the fishery in this context."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What? What!

MR. FUREY:

Read it again.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

"However, it is not my intention to suggest any ceding of ultimate responsibility by the federal government for the fishery in this context."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the hon. Tom Siddon, Minister of federal Fisheries, the same person that they are going to negotiate with that they say they have got in the Meech Lake Accord, they have got it now.

We are going to believe the hon. Premier, no problem. That is why everybody in the Province should believe exactly what he says.

But, do you know something? The other parties that he has to negotiate with are not believing him, as a matter of fact. They are not even believing him. They do not know what he is talking about up in Ottawa. He is the federal counterpart.

MR. DAWE:

Would you tell me why (inaudible)?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

If the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs wants to get up, he will have his opportunity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

You are gone next time. Do not you worry, Mike Vickers and company are going to take care of you. You are not even going to get a chance to run out there.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I asked for protection. I am getting harassed, and I do not know if I am going to be able to take it, Mr. Speaker. I just do not know.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have order, please?

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. DAWE:

Mike will (inaudible.)

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, do not worry, the member for St. George's is going to get his too. That is not a problem. We will worry about that later.

MR. DAWE:

Would you like to come down and run against me?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Do not worry! Mr. Speaker, I tell you they want me to run all over the place. It is a hard real problem, I have to tell you.

MR. DAWE:

That is why I asked you to come down.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, sure, no problem.

Anyway, I see I am getting under the dander of some people on the other side, Mr. Speaker, and I do not know why. I am having a real problem understanding this. I do not know why.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, if I never get elected again, let me tell you that I will have had my say, as I do as an elected member, in this hon. House, making my points of view on the Meech Lake Accord, and the fallacy that this government projects about the fisheries jurisdiction in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

So you can threaten and you can go

in and you can do it all, Mr. Speaker, but the words are words, and the facts are the facts.

I am looking forward to seeing, when the hon. members get up, that they take these two documents that I have put forward and they look at them and read them, and then come back to the same argument, which is the only argument they have, Mr. Speaker.

On the Meech Lake Accord, the only thing I heard when they both got up, the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries, is that fisheries jurisdiction is the big problem, and they are trying to castigate the Opposition from being against it.

Mr. Speaker, these two documents that I read from, I think, clarifies the position for any human being in this Province who is reasonable and who is going to look at the situation.

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I do not take kindly too. I am a salt of the earth Newfoundlander too and the same with my colleagues on this side. I do not accuse the members opposite of not being Newfoundlanders or not fighting for Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to do that. The only thing I will argue with is maybe their way or maybe their policies that they are carrying out.

While they can accuse us of being anti-Newfoundland, I am not going to do that, Mr. Speaker, because I believe, you see, in my heart of hearts that they are working to try to improve it. The thing is we are doing the same and I would wish that they would give us the same recognition. Maybe one of these days they will, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to put forward our position as often as we can to try and clarify any of the types of statements that are made if we think, Mr. Speaker, that they are to the contrary of those that should be put out to the public.

I think in this regard the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) should concentrate a little bit more on what their position is and what they are going to do with the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa who has now said, I do not know what they are talking about down in Newfoundland.

I would wish that the new Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Dawe) will certainly now take it upon himself to get in contact with his federal counterpart to try to figure out what does the Meech Lake Accord mean for us here in Newfoundland.

MR. TULK:

It is time for them to get around to it.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

It is time for them to get around to it, yes.

I am looking forward to seeing clarification of what it means because we have the two parties now, Ottawa and Newfoundland, and the same stripe of a government, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK:

We are in agreement down here, as of June 17.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, we are in agreement down here, we are all wanting the same thing. Now he says Ottawa wants the same thing. He says that Newfoundland wants the same thing, but the Liberals do not.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, by leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

AN HON. MEMBER:

No leave.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

No leave!

MR. FUREY:

A good speech.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Bring in your leader and let him take the heat.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Is there a half hour or twenty

minute debate in this?

MR. SPEAKER:

Twenty minutes.

MR. FUREY:

No, no half an hour.

MR. TULK:

Half an hour, Your Honour, I understand that Your Honour thinks the gentlemen had twenty minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

I apologize to the hon. member for Stephenville. He still has ten minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Was the hon. member recognized?

MR. MORGAN:

Yes, I was, Hansard will show it.

MR. SIMMS:

Well okay, I just wanted to make sure that he is the next member to be recognized.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for letting me continue.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we dealt with that issue fairly extensively now and I look forward to the hon. members opposite looking over those two wonderful documents and trying to figure out

what exactly they mean in the context of the Meech Lake Accord.

Mr. Speaker, in looking at the Meech Lake Accord, it seems to me that we have an agreement that while they have all tried to make Quebec feel a part of Canada, I think they have gone to a fair extent, Mr. Speaker, and they put these words now in a document that is going to be handled by the courts which might, well, I think, somethings can be improved. I am a bit weary of some of the language that has been put into it, Mr. Speaker.

In looking over the distinct society clause, for example, if you get out any dictionary, Mr. Speaker, distinct means that it is separate or individual, distinguished from others.

Society in the dictionary means a part of a community bound together by common interests and standards. Now, if you put both phrases together, Quebec, I think, has a lot more than they probably could have hoped for in this accord.

Canada and its bilingual nature as a country, I think, are somewhat in jeopardy, Mr. Speaker. There are a number of people in the country concerned as to what the implications are and how they are going to be dealt with in the courts. I think the hon. Premier and the premiers of other provinces and the Prime Minister should look a little more closely at the document to see if certain things can be improved. I would hope that the hon. Premier would take that under consideration, and the Prime Minister.

I know that the premier of New Brunswick is now looking at the

document very closely. He is going to take his time and look to see if there are some improvements that can be made.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude I received a brief from a university student from Stephenville who is at the journalism school in Ottawa, a very prestigious school. He did a brief on the Meech Lake Accord, and he had a couple of statements that I would just like to read into the record because they speak well and are very important.

In one of the statements he says, "It scares me to think what might have happened if this document had been in place in 1949 when Newfoundland and Labrador decided they wanted to join Canada.

"The fact that an extreme minority of Canadians living in P.E.I. can deny their fellow Canadians the full rights that they enjoy is and should be morally offensive."

Mr. Speaker, as for this amending clause that they have brought in for unanimity, I think this young gentleman speaks from the heart when he talks what about the ramifications are for new provinces coming in and also for the idea that you are going to get everybody to agree on the same thing. I mean that is quite a ways away from what we did have which many people thought was a good compromise, Mr. Speaker.

One of the last comments that the gentleman - Mr. Michael White his name is - went on to say, is "I would like to point out to the members of this committee that it is the youth of this country that will have to live with the Meech Lake Accord." He said, "I see this document as a binding of our hands in the future for

constitutional dealings." He asks the members of the committee to consider his comments and take them very seriously.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. House today to take mine very seriously, especially when it comes to this issue of fisheries jurisdiction and the type of pretensions that have been put forward by the provincial government.

I would hope that they would look closely at what the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Siddon) has said about what he thinks about Newfoundland talking about management of the fishery. I think we are going to have to talk again to the hon. minister up there in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, because, for some reason, he does not have the same perception as what we have down here. So, I ask, Mr. Speaker, that these concerns be addressed and I thank you for the pleasure and the privilege of speaking on the Meech Lake Accord.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, first of all may I say that the Meech Lake Accord is more important than, as referred to by Opposition members a few days ago, a place to jig salmon. It is more important than that. It is a document that is important to all of Canada and a document very important to this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I watched the last speaker attempt to defend his leader's position on the Meech Lake Accord. I will listen very attentively, as well, to the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry) to hear what he has to say on the same issue. He disagrees with his leader and rightly so.

Now, hon. members in the backbenches or in the frontbenches of the Opposition, cannot get away from the following: A few days ago in this House, irrespective of what happened last June in debate in this House on resolutions, the following quote was made, and I quote from Hansard, the Fourth Session, No. 5: "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."

Now, Mr. Speaker, who made that statement? Was it someone in the House of Commons in Ottawa? Was it someone in the NDP Party? Was it someone on this side? Was it a member of the backbenches of the Opposition? No, Mr. Speaker, it was not. It was made by the man who is now enunciating and promulgating Liberal Party policy, the new leader. So irrespective of what the backbenches are going to think, and I know that my friend and colleague from Twillingate can in no way accept the fact that - for example, let me read the next quote, Mr. Speaker: "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 further jurisdiction. It is a charade, Mr. Speaker. It is

a sham."

Now, who said that? It was not the member for Twillingate. It was not the hon. member for Fogo. It was the new Leader of the Liberal Party who is putting forward new party policy. So, irrespective of my friend from Stephenville, who just sat down, and I think he is in a very hot spot, as is the member for Twillingate, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, the member for Bonavista North and the member for Fogo - the member for Port de Grave, he can go out and try to jig salmon. I do not refer to him as an hon. gentleman anymore in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that these members have to go back to their respective constituencies and they have to explain to their people the new position. Because when the former leader spoke in this House on May 1, 1987, on the Meech Lake Accord, he spoke on behalf of all his party and he spoke in support of it. There was not one dissenting voice then saying, 'Oh, no, we disagree with the Meech Lake Accord.' At that time, they all supported it.

MR. BAIRD:

And supported the licencing.

MR. MORGAN:

Yes. I know he had lots to say at the same time, but, Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to hearing him say it again, as a former Liberal leader disagreeing with his party's present leader.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that Opposition members are now in a very embarrassing situation. My friend from Twillingate stood on many a platform across this Province, as Minister of Fisheries

MR. DINN:

And a good one.

MR. MORGAN:

A good one. I agree with that.

- and he said, 'We do not have any control over our destiny.' Oh, how often he said that! 'We have no control over our destiny. We have no say over the most important industry we have.' I can hear him saying it now. 'We do not know how many fish they are going to catch. We do not know what fishing gear they can use. We do not know what size boats they can use. We have no control over who gets licenses or how many licenses are issued. We have no control over all these matters.' And he was so right.

How can he, today, stand and support his leader who says, 'It is a sham for us to have more control over our destiny. It is a sham.'? Surely, members of the Opposition over there are not that weak-kneed, that suddenly they are going to cow down to a courtroom lawyer coming in with no ideas on the fishery. And it shows me one thing, that the Leader of the Opposition is ignoring the views of my friend from Twillingate and the member for Fogo, two very knowledgeable men on fisheries matters. And that is a very serious situation, when a man aspiring to become Premier of the Province can stand up and say it is a sham for us to have jurisdiction.

Let me close my debate by quoting the former Liberal Leader who, no longer than a few months ago, in May, 1987, said, "I think this agreement might do it for Canada. I heartily endorse it and so does

my party."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Now, what is wrong, boys? What is wrong?

MR. MORGAN:

I shall return!

I will adjourn the debate today by saying your new leader, on Fisheries policy alone, will destroy your party in rural Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The debate is adjourned by the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

Debate on the Adjournment
[Late Show]

I now call on the hon. the member for Menihok, who is not satisfied with the answer he got from the Minister of Social Services about the question of the Young Offenders' Review Board.

The hon. the member for Menihok.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The original question that I asked last Friday of the Minister of Social Services was, what was he going to do with the Young Offenders' Review Board now that a provincial court judge in Grand Falls has ruled that the

legislation enabling this Young Offenders' Review Board to operate is clearly unconstitutional?

Mr. Speaker, the problem is a very significant one, because the legislation that was ruled unconstitutional is federal legislation on the setting up of the Young Offenders' Review Board, and it specifically refers to the ten-day delay between the time the board renders a judgement and the time that the young offender can be set free. That ten days was ruled by the court to be unlawful detention. I think it is an important point to remember, because what it means is there is nothing we can do in terms of changing our own legislation to make the Young Offenders' Review Board and the procedures it has been following constitutional. Mr. Speaker, the reason I was addressing the question is because that decision was rendered on March 7 and the 30-day appeal period would expire on April 6, which is only, as we know, about ten days or so away.

Mr. Speaker, what I would wish to do now is to urge the minister to see the error of his ways and dissolve the Young Offenders' Review Board, get it off the backs of the young people of our Province who are unfortunately incarcerated and go back to the system that worked quite adequately when provincial court judges heard these appeals.

The reason, Mr. Speaker, I suggest this, is because we have a Chairman of the Young Offenders' Review Board making \$65,000 a year, a political appointment, by the way or, at least, the second of the political appointments to that position. We also have the expenses of the board and so on,

for a board that cannot constitutionally hear a case any more. It has not heard a case since March 7 and, quite frankly, until that decision is overturned, which it will not be, in my opinion, it will never be able to hear a case. And the time that it will take to appeal this particular decision may be three months, six months, a year, going to the appeals court here in the Province, and in that time period, this individual and his entire administration will sit down with nothing to do.

So, that is why I am saying to the Minister of Social Services, disband the board, lay off the individuals concerned, or reassign them to some other useful purpose in the government bureaucracy, and let us get back to the system that worked before.

Mr. Speaker, even if we were to go to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland or the Appeals Division of it, and if we were to get a decision there, and it were appealed beyond that to the Supreme Court of Canada, we would be in a position where we might wait years before this board will ever have the authority to hear a thing again.

Mr. Speaker, the board was set up initially to give a sinecure to a former member of the government over there.

MR. LONG:

Shame! Shame!

MR. FENWICK:

It was clearly not needed. There was no need for it since, in all other provinces of Canada, the Young Offenders' Review Board has not been established. We are the only Province to put it in place.

Mr. Speaker, last August we showed the terrible case of an individual, a young fellow, who went before the board, was ordered to be released and yet spent another month in custody because the Review Board was between Chairmen. Between the jigs and the reels of the whole thing, this individual was made to serve another thirty days incarcerated as a result of this bureaucratic contraption that has been put in place by the governments concerned.

I would be very much interested in hearing the Minister of Social Services stand in his place, admit that his predecessor erred in putting this board in place, admit that the government is now seeing that a much more appropriate system is to go back to the judges, and to admit that we can save about \$100,000 or \$150,000 a year by disbanding this board and going back to the previous system.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, we have just heard the same political rhetoric from the member for Menihek that we have heard from him so often. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the member has used this board to try and attack the credibility of individuals involved. He referred to a very competent and very capable individual, Mr. Dickson, who is Chairman of it, as a political hack a little while ago, while it is my understanding that everybody in the Baie Verte area thought that he was an NDP supporter.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Right on! As a matter of fact, they came to me and said, 'What are you doing appointing Socialists,' and that kind of stuff. He does not even know who has been supporting him.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, what his politics are or what his politics are not is not important. He is a man who is capable, a man who is competent to hold the position he was appointed to. He does not have to subject himself to the member for Menihek, and I take exception to it. He is a man who is a born and bred Newfoundlander, who has worked hard for this Province, and now he is excelling in the position he holds. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, as it relates to these types of issues, that he has to take a back seat to the member for Menihek.

Mr. Speaker, today in his statement he acted as judge, and then he went all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada and he said, 'In my opinion, they are going to throw it out anyway.' Now, Mr. Speaker, we have another legally trained er in this House.

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, in this House in the past few days as it relates to Social Services? The member for Port de Grave got up today waving a piece of paper which related to problems at the Youth Correction Centre in Pleasantville. But when you looked at it, the complaint was made by somebody who had completed four years at Memorial University, and had a student loan, while there are people down there who he feels are not as qualified as he is. Now, that was the urgency. That is what the alarmist got on with today, Mr. Speaker, and what

he has been getting on with here for too long; trying to alarm people to get headlines in the paper, when there is no substance whatsoever on which to base his complaints. He has never, Mr. Speaker, demonstrated anything conclusive, including some of the stuff he got on with last year.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Menihek talks about the Young Offenders' Review Board. That was set up by this government because we believed it had a role to play and we wanted to take advantage of what was put in place to provide every avenue available to the young offenders of this Province. We believe that we have a right to assist these people. It is unfortunate that the leader of the NDP Party believes that this right should not be extended to young offenders in this Province.

We are very much aware of the ruling that was passed down by the judge. We are very much aware of that, and we are dealing with it, together with the Department of Justice. As it relates, Mr. Speaker, to what action will be forthcoming, I can assure the hon. member that when the decision is made we will inform the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

I now call on the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, who is not satisfied with the answer he received from the Minister of Transportation concerning the Newfoundland Safety Council.

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In answer to the first part of my question today, the minister said

that as far as he was concerned there would be a full programme in operation for motorcycle safety training this year in this Province. Now the fact of the matter is, there are about ten centres in the Province where training is carried out. This year, if the Newfoundland Safety Council will offer the course, they will only offer it in one or two places, so I do not think this could be classed as a full programme. Maybe it has something to do with the Overpass mentality of members over there; if it is anything for outside St. John's, they are not too interested in providing it.

The rest of the Newfoundlander is going to suffer because of the lack of courses in safety. The fact of the matter is, this is of very serious concern to a lot of people in this Province in view of the fact that a sixteen year old, who can physically operate a motorcycle, can go and be given his licence and then be on the road without the proper safety training. We all know of the accidents that can be caused while operating a motor cycle, not only to the operators, of course, but to the innocent public.

Now, the minister said that the Safety Council's programme is an excellent one. There is a bit of fallacy in that, too. In actual fact, motorcycle manufacturers are genuinely not happy with the way the Safety Council Programme is being run. One of them told me, when I talked to him, that they had lost confidence in the Newfoundland Safety Council's ability to administer this programme. He said they were using instructors who are not properly trained and that the programme, in general, was very

slipshod in the way that it was being run. I would like the minister to take seriously the concerns that were expressed by the manufacturers and the dealers, because, again, it is an example of where there is smoke, there might be fire.

Now, another thing I want to mention is the fact that manufacturers are concerned about adequate training for operators of ATVs, and the dealers. As to adequate training for ATVs, we all know that there is legislation coming in now about the operation of these three wheel vehicles. In the United States and in Canada, those are possibly used as personal vehicles, but an ATV is a utility vehicle and is used in many parts of rural Newfoundland.

Since there is quite a record of accidents with those vehicles, there should be a training programme for operators of them, but the Newfoundland Safety Council is not ready to provide this sort of safety programme right now.

I understand, too, from the motorcycle dealers and manufacturers, that there is another organization in Newfoundland. The minister is aware of them, because they have written and requested that they be given the authority to conduct this training programme. That organization is the Newfoundland Motorcycle Federation, I believe, which is ready and capable of carrying out this training programme. It has members in all the large centres, and it has the approval of the motorcycle dealers and manufacturers.

I would ask the Minister, if a problem is discovered with the

Newfoundland Safety Council during his investigation, if there might be a way that he will be able to provide training this year by using the Federation.

MR. DAWE:
(Inaudible).

MR. GILBERT:
It is not a laughing matter. This is a life-threatening situation that we are involved in here, I tell the former Minister of Transportation. Lives of people are being put in danger because of the fact that there is no training provided, and I would strongly suggest that some action be taken by the Minister before there is a tragic loss of life because of improper training, or no training at all, of operators of motorcycles.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the hon. member in Question Period, my Department is very, very concerned with safety in this Province and that is why we provide a grant to the Newfoundland Safety Council to operate the motorcycle training course. We have been very, very supportive of that particular course over the years, Mr. Speaker. It has been going on, I believe, over the last eight or ten years. As I have said, we have supported the Council because we felt that they have provided an adequate service, a very good service. As I indicated to the hon. member in Question Period today, I have met with the Newfoundland Safety Council on

three different occasions over the last couple of months, and also with the Motorcycle Federation.

Now, I do not believe it is any secret - I think it is public knowledge, as a matter of fact - that there has been some difference of opinion between the Motorcycle Federation and the Newfoundland Safety Council with respect to the operation of the course itself, and that is why I have been meeting with both groups to try and iron out the problems.

The hon. member mentioned a few moments ago that he is convinced that there will not be a programme this year, or there will not be a full programme operating all across Newfoundland. Well, Mr. Speaker, only time will tell that. Having met with the Council only yesterday, I have been given every indication that the course will continue this year, and that they are getting ready for it and trying to get an adequate number of bikes to be used in the course.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, it is a very good course. We have had a number of people right here in the House of Assembly, as a matter of fact, take that course. I believe the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth and his son took that course a couple of years ago. The Minister of Forestry has taken the course, as well, as did the former Minister of Transportation and some of his family, and all the reports that I get are to the effect that the Newfoundland Safety Council have provided a very, very good service, and we have every reason to be totally supportive of the programme.

Also, Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the hon. gentleman talked a

little bit about ATVs in the Province and that there is really no initiatives being taken to provide courses there. Well, it is my understanding that a training programme is offered by the Motorcycle Federation on ATVs. As a matter of fact, we are very concerned at the Department level with the safety aspect of that programme, and that is why we have provided \$85,000 for promotion of safety on ATVs, and we have three instructors employed to go around the Province, go out to the various schools in the Province to tell the young people about the proper use of ATVs.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize that I would hope that the Newfoundland Safety Council will be providing that course once again this year. As I indicated a moment ago, up until yesterday I have not been given any indication that they will not be providing the course. They are in the process of trying to get as many bikes as they can right across Newfoundland so that the course is offered not only in the large centers like St. John's and Corner Brook and Grand Falls, but all across the Province.

Once, again, I would like to indicate my support for the Newfoundland Safety Council and to express the hope and the wish that this course will continue. Because it is a very, very good one, and one which we should all support. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

I now call on the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, who was not satisfied with the answer he got from the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs concerning the railway.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to ask the hon. minister if he would provide opinions that deal with the following documents: These are documents exchanged between the delegation representing Newfoundland at the negotiation of the Terms of Union and the federal delegation. Some of them are minutes of joint meetings, and some of them are confidential, or even top secret documents of the Canadian government position at the time. But they deal with, and I will only refer to the excerpts from the railway and I will provide my hon. friend with copies of them if he wishes, they deal with reaction to the proposed Term of Union that the federal government would take over responsibility for and relieve Newfoundland of the public cost involved in the operation of the Newfoundland Railway and the related steamship and marine services.

In dealing with those, here are some comments, just so that the hon. minister will know what I am talking about:

One is a submission of answers to the Newfoundland delegation and the last few lines of it talks about the establishment of a subcommittee to examine and report upon problems involved in the integration of the Newfoundland government railway system with existing transportation facilities in Canada. That is one reference to it.

On another document, that is a memorandum from the Assistant Secretary of the Cabinet to the Secretary of State for External

Affairs in July, 1947, the federal people are talking about, 'In the event of Union, I think it would be almost inevitable that in the course of time the railway would become part of the government owned system, since we now provide a governmental transcontinental system -'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have order while I am speaking so that the hon. minister can hear what I am saying.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

- 'covering all provinces and could scarcely make an exception in the case of one.' Clearly they were talking about the transportation system. In another document they talked about the capital expenditures necessary to put it and keep it. So, they recognized what their constitutional obligation was. What they said specifically was, that the capital expenditure in connection with the property to put it and keep it in proper condition, would probably involve \$17 million. Then they went on to talk about the capital expenditure involved in making it wide gauge.

In another document dealing with the Terms of Union and what they meant and how they should be interpreted, here is what was said. These, Mr. Speaker, are extracts from a memorandum by members of the federal Interdepartmental Committee on Newfoundland. It was a Top Secret document in July, 1947 when they were negotiating the Terms of

Union, and they said this: This is important. I ask hon. members just to hear it so they will know what we are dealing with.

The federal people saw the obligation to take over the Newfoundland railway at that time in these terms: "It is suggested that assumption of the railway and steamship services would be justified on the ground that it was merely the extension of the coast-to-coast transportation system to take care of the needs of the new Province."

Now, when the Terms of Union talked about taking over and relieving Newfoundland of the financial costs incurred in the operation of the Newfoundland railway and the related steamship and marine services, they acknowledged at the time that what they were doing was doing nothing more than assuming 'assumption of the railway and steamship services would be justified on the grounds that it was merely the extension of the coast-to-coast transportation system.'

That obligation remains, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. minister that he should ask his legal experts to take a look at it in that context and provide an opinion in that context.

The final reference, Mr. Speaker, is to Minutes of meetings between delegates from the National Convention of Newfoundland and representatives of the Government of Canada. At that meeting they established a joint subcommittee, and they set out its purposes. Here is how they described its purposes:

"To bring together information on the Newfoundland railway and

steamship services with a view to enabling the Canadian representatives to examine the problems that would be involved in the event of union in the integration of the Newfoundland Government railway and steamship services with the Canadian transportation system."

So when they were agreeing on the Terms of Union, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the hon. member that he ask for legal advice and provide tabled copies of the legal advice that he says the government is relying upon to demonstrate their position so that we can look at it in the context of these documents and these understandings by the people at the time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker, God help us all if the member opposite ever gets the opportunity to negotiate.

What he has done here in the past five minutes, Mr. Speaker, is to read out a bunch of preliminary documents, proposals and objectives in 1947. What we are dealing with and what a legal opinion will be based in - and albeit it, Mr. Speaker, we would on this side, and everybody else in Newfoundland, have liked some of those things that were discussed and some of the objectives of the people from Newfoundland to be included in the

Terms of Union. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen who negotiated the Terms of Union at the time were not able to put that assurance and that guarantee into the Terms of Union.

What we have to deal with is what we have here, as a part of the Canadian Constitution, which is the Terms of Union between Newfoundland and Canada. Never mind what somebody thought in 1938, in 1947 or 1948. What is relevant, Mr. Speaker, from a legal perspective - I sort of feel humble that I would offer the Leader of the Opposition legal advice - but from a legal perspective, this is the document that will be dealt with in a court of law.

Whatever the members negotiating the Terms of Union wanted to put in place is completely irrelevant. They are not part of the Terms of Union. It is very unfortunate that they are not part of the Terms of Union. They should be. We have all agreed they should be, but they are not part of the Terms of Union, Mr. Speaker, and that is the document we have to deal with.

I want to go back, Mr. Speaker, to what I said earlier today when the question was forced asked. In the 60s, when that hon. gentleman was in the Cabinet of the government of this Province, if that legal opinion of his was so valid and so relevant, why did they give away the rights of the Argentia branch line and the rights to a passenger service? There are a whole list of things that come under the same clause, Mr. Speaker, that are long gone under exactly the same clause as the railway is contained, have long gone, and most of them long gone before 1972. Gone, Mr.

Speaker, when that learned gentleman opposite, Leader of the Opposition, says now that there is in fact legal opinion saying that you have assurances of a continuation of the Newfoundland railway under the Terms of Union.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

The Pickersgill letter will confirm that.

MR. DAWE:

He has it there. You gave it away, he said. That is in reference to the Argentia. The Cabinet table of Newfoundland started the irreversible erosion of the Newfoundland railway to the point it is today.

We on this side, Mr. Speaker, certainly since I have been a member of this administration, have fought day in and day out to try to stop that erosion; to try to turn the tides of something that was started long before this administration came into place.

The Leader of the Opposition is trying again, Mr. Speaker, to have it both ways. He is coming in here seventeen years later and trying to suggest to this administration that they do something or that they have certain rights that he, as a member of the provincial Cabinet some seventeen years ago, would not do.

Surely, goodness, if there was good solid legal advice at that point in time that the railway had to be maintained in a certain way, that had to contribute to the Newfoundland economy and transportation system at a certain level, then certainly, Mr.

Speaker, surely, the hon. gentlemen opposite and the government at the time would have insisted that that particular understanding of the Terms of Union, or the legal position of the Terms of Union, would have held sway and we would not be in the situation of talking about resolutions or anything else to do with the railway at the present time.

The hon. gentleman cannot have it both ways and he is not going to get it both ways because, as the Minister of Fisheries indicated today, every single individual in this Province is going to know what the Leader of the Opposition stands for as it relates to the railway, what he stood for seventeen years ago, and what he tries to make out he stands for today; including his stand on the fisheries, his stand on Churchill Falls, and his stand on every single fundamental issue,

He is trying, Mr. Speaker, to take us back seventeen years, to bygone days, to nostalgia. I am sure he sits around and twiddles his thumbs and thinks about his good old days. Well, the good old days, thank God, are gone and this administration are not going to let you or the wax museum that you have over there, the mummified mannequins that you have on the other side - you should have seen them. They almost looked alive when you are out in the Chamber out there. Just look across the line there. Is that not something?

Mr. Speaker, we are not going to let him get away with it and I would guess that perhaps there are members on the other side that are not going to let him get away with it either.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Before we adjourn, I just want to mention to hon. members that the Opposition House Leader and I have agreed that since the matter of Interim Supply is such an important matter and since the Opposition indicated the other day they wish they had a bit more time - I think the finance critic mentioned that - we have agreed to alter our agenda for tomorrow only. Rather than continue on with Meech Lake tomorrow, we will be dealing with Interim Supply, if that is acceptable. I thought I should tell members of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about Monday?

MR. SIMMS:

Monday we will be on Interim Supply as well.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The arrangement is, of course, as the Government House Leader said. We agreed that we would debate Interim Supply and that we would alter the agenda somewhat. As I said to him then and I say to him

now, the Opposition stands ready to co-operate, if we get the same kind of Answers to Questions that we got from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). On that basis we will debate Interim Supply tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! It is moved and seconded that the House do now adjourn all those in favour "Aye", those against "Nay", carried.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 25, at 10:00 a.m.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

March 24, 1988

*Valerie Day Hon.
Minister of Fisheries
24 Mar. 6 1988*

ANSWER TO QUESTION # 115 as asked on Order Paper of March 15,
1988:

- (a) Vehicle was purchased for the Department through the Government Purchasing Agency and thirteen companies were asked to submit bids for a full size car.
- (b) The vehicle was purchased February 11, 1985 from Hickman Motors Ltd. for \$13,897.00 which was the only bid received for a full size car.

CONTENTS

Thursday, 24 March, 1988.

Statements by Ministers

<u>Science and Technology Advisory Council formed:</u>	
Premier Peckford.....	0436
Mr. Wells.....	0437
Mr. Fenwick.....	0438

<u>Seal Fishery policy:</u>	
Mr. Rideout.....	0439
Mr. W. Carter.....	0441
Mr. Fenwick.....	0442

Oral Questions

<u>Motorcycle Safety Training:</u>	
Government funding. Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Doyle.....	0443
Problems with the program. Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Doyle.....	0444
Manufacturers withdrew support from Safety Council. Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Doyle.....	0444

<u>Newfoundland Hardwoods:</u>	
Union wanted plant privatized. Mr. Kelland, Mr. Barrett.....	0444
Future of workers laid off. Mr. Kelland, Mr. Barrett.....	0445
Inventory of plant. Mr. Kelland, Mr. Barrett.....	0445

<u>Boys' Home:</u>	
Expressions of dissatisfaction. Mr. Efford, Mr. Tobin.....	0446
Letter concerning past hiring practices. Mr. Efford, Mr. Tobin.....	0447
Investigation of conditions urged. Mr. Efford, Mr. Tobin.....	0447

<u>Intergovernmental Affairs:</u>	
Legal opinions on enforceability of Term 31. Mr. Wells, Mr. Dawe.....	0448
Legal opinion holding Term 31 protected railway. Mr. Wells, Mr. Dawe.....	0449
Legal opinions claiming constitutional obligation of Canada offered. Mr. Wells, Mr. Dawe.....	0450

Nuclear Powered Submarines:

Government position on their being based
in St. John's. Mr. Long, Premier Peckford.....0451
Their purchase would entail reduced spending
in other areas. Mr. Long, Premier Peckford.....0452
Environmental hazards. Mr. Long,
Premier Peckford.....0453

Consumer Affairs:

Bill C-22 and increased drug prices.
Mr. Fury, Mr. Young.....0454
Representations for a program to lessen
drug price increases for those on fixed
incomes. Mr. Fury, Mr. Young.....0455

**Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees**

Consent to Kruger borrowing \$30 million:
Mr. Windsor.....0455

C.A. Pippy Park Annual Reports, 1985-86, 1986-87 and
Tender Act Exceptions, 1977, January-February, 1988.
Dr. Twomey.....0456

**Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given**

Mr. Rideout.....0456

Petitions

Canada Post:
Mr. Tulk.....0457
Mr. Baker.....0458
Mr. Simms.....0459

University courses returned to Labrador:
Mr. Fenwick.....0460
Mr. K. Aylward.....0461
Mr. Matthews.....0462

Road Conditions:
Mr. Callan.....0463
(Ruled Out of Order).....0464

Standing Order 23, the fishery:
Mr. Tulk, Mr. Simms, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Wells.....0464

Recess, Ruled Out of Order, Mr. Speaker.....0468

Orders of the Day

First Reading of Bill No. 9.....0468

Motion 2, The Meech Lake Accord:

Mr. Rideout.....0468
Mr. K. Aylward.....0472
Mr. Morgan, adjourns debate.....0482

Debate on the Adjournment

[Late Show]

Young Offenders:

Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Tobin.....0484

Motorcycle Safety Training:

Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Doyle.....0486

Term 31, The Terms of Union:

Mr. Wells, Mr. Dawe.....0489

Adjournment Motion.....0493