



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 20

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
Order, please!

Oral Questions

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question was intended for the Minister of Fisheries but, in his absence, I will ask the Premier. With the much talked about fish aid package over the last few weeks, I am wondering if the Premier could inform the House what the Provincial Government's involvement will be in the aid package that is going to come forward, hopefully within the next few days, to address the very serious problems created around the Province because of the serious crisis in the fishery?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, exactly what the role of the Province will be is not finally determined yet. Last August, we put forward a proposal to the Federal Government proposing a role for the Province so that both Governments could jointly be involved in it. Again, in January, we put forward proposals, and during January and February there was substantial detailed work done on a joint proposal. By the end of February, the Federal Government, the Federal Ministers, Mr. Crosbie in

particular, and by this time Mr. Valcourt had replaced Mr. Siddon as Minister of Fisheries, there ceased to be any detailed discussion with the Federal Committee and the Province. So the Province went ahead on its own and continued to work out the details, even though substantial work had been done by the end of February on developing a proposal and putting in place a memorandum of understanding between the Federal and Provincial Governments.

However, since the end of February the Federal Government has, for whatever reason - I am hesitant to attribute motives - have been reluctant to participate with the Provincial Government. Now, whatever their motivation, I do not know. That coincided with the appointment of Mr. Valcourt as the Minister of Fisheries, pretty well.

A few weeks ago, the Government submitted to the Federal Government a further detailed proposal as to what should be done and put forward its proposal in detail. When I spoke with Mr. Valcourt last, about two weeks or so ago, he indicated that he still wanted to deal specifically with the Province's proposal, and they were considering it. I have not heard from him directly since that time. I do know that the Minister of Fisheries has been in touch with Mr. Valcourt as late as yesterday; I know that officials in his Department have been in touch with federal officials this morning; the Minister and I have scheduled a meeting for later this afternoon for a full briefing on it. Beyond that, I do not know.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A supplementary to the Premier. I wonder if the Premier could inform the House if the Provincial Government will be involved financially in the package, or is the Provincial Government merely seeking to be involved in the implementation of the package and administration?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

That has not yet been agreed to. If it is going to be agreed to, we have offered to be involved financially in the package. That will be announced if, as, and when a percentage is agreed upon.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When the Premier announced the financing for the extended notice period to Fisheries Products International and the offer to National Sea, he said that was done because neither the Federal Government nor the Provincial Government had adequate plans or proposals in place to deal with the crises that were affecting, at that time, Grand Bank, Gaultois and Trepassey. Since, of course, there has been significant fallout because of receivership of a number of companies, and so on.

My final supplementary: Is the Premier satisfied that fishermen, fish plant workers, and, indeed, those communities which are going to be very negatively affected throughout the Province, is he satisfied that the concerns of those people will be adequately

addressed in the package?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

No, Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied that the Federal Government will adequately discharge its responsibilities. What I have seen from their performance up till now does not give me that level of confidence. As late as January or February I had a higher level of confidence, but, as of the last few weeks, I have grave doubts about the motivation, the determination, and the sense of responsibility of the Federal Government to fully discharge their obligations in the matter.

MR. WOODFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is also to the Minister of Fisheries but, in his absence, I will direct my question to the Premier. As we all know, the caplin fishery in this Province has been a very important fishery in the Province each and every year, and more specifically in the last two or three years. In view of the fact that an ever-increasing number of fishermen in the Province have been notified as of late that their caplin fixed gear licence for 1990 has been refused, could the Premier tell the House if the Fisheries Department or his Government have been informed, or has there been any representation from fishermen in the Province

concerning the refusal.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I will take the question under advisement and provide the answer to the House as soon as I am able.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) part time.

MR. WOODFORD:

No. Some Members opposite are saying they are part time. Would the Premier also, in talking to the Minister of Fisheries or Federal officials, make a commitment that if this is true - I know it is true. I have certain refusals here on my desk today from fishermen in my district. So it is definitely true, although the Premier may not know about it as yet. Would he make a commitment to the House that he will make representation on their behalf to the Federal Minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I will take the whole matter under advisement and I will advise the House as to exactly what the position is as soon as I have had an opportunity to discuss it in detail.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, either they want an answer or they want to babble. They can have one or the other, but not both at the same time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER WELLS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will take the matter under advisement. Now that the Minister is here, it may well be that the hon. Member would prefer to ask the question again to the Minister, or otherwise he can wait, if he does not want to use up Question Period, and the Minister can look at Hansard and provide the answer.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:

Well, seeing the Minister is here now I will not go into the short preamble about it. The direct question, firstly, did the Minister of Fisheries have any representation from fishermen in the Province with regard to the refusal of their fixed gear caplin licence this year, for 1990? There were an awful lot of them from my District and other areas of the Province over the last few days with regard to the refusal for 1990. Did the Minister have any representation from fishermen?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I should explain my absence in the House. I just came back from addressing the Seafood Conference, at the Radisson Hotel, therefore I was not here to - I was not outside, hiding behind the curtains.

MR. SIMMS:

A standing ovation.

MR. W. CARTER:

A standing ovation. No, Mr. Speaker, we have not had any representation, not that I am aware of.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I cannot believe that.

MR. W. CARTER:

Well, you can believe it. We have not had any representation made -

MR. SIMMS:

We have had at least (inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

I will check it out. I will check with my officials, but I am not aware, personally, of having had any such representations. But I will check it out.

MR. WOODFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:

Well, it is a fact. As I have said, I have three on my desk and I am sure Members opposite will certainly get representation from their fishermen over the next few days. In any case, would the Minister not make a commitment to the House that he will, when he does get representation from fishermen, and my request today as the Member for the Humber Valley District of the Province, request of the Federal Minister, on their behalf, that their licence be reinstated?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly will have to take a look at it and find out the basis for the licence being cancelled or withheld. I see no reason, of course, why I could not support their request that it be reinstated. But I repeat what I said a moment ago, that there may be letters in my office which I have not seen with respect to the cancellation of licences. In the meantime, I will have the matter investigated and maybe report back to the hon. Member before the House adjourns this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

In making that representation to Ottawa and to the Federal Minister, I would ask the Minister if he would consider in his consultations with him, which I would say he is going to have over the next few days, asking him to at least let them fish for this year with their caplin fixed gear licence and then give them the next twelve months to go through the review process, which is normally what they do in a case like this. Would he take that into consideration?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have requested a meeting with the Minister. In fact, he is supposed to be calling me this afternoon to confirm a time for a meeting at the earliest possible date. If and when that

meeting comes to pass, I shall certainly raise the matter you have raised and do all I can to make sure that if there are any fishermen out there who have been treated badly or unfairly, I will make sure that the Minister is made aware of that.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a supplementary to the Minister of Fisheries, as well. In view of the fact that because of proposed changes in the criteria for the issuing of fixed gear caplin licences in the Province this year, 800 full-time fishermen will be denied caplin licences.

MR. SIMMS:
Full time.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Full-time fishermen. Now, Mr. Speaker, not part-time, full-time fishermen. Can the Minister tell the House whether or not there has been any prior consultation between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland on this major significant policy change in licencing for fishermen in Newfoundland and Labrador?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I can only say that there has been no consultation

that I am aware of. Now, I know there are meetings going on all the time between the various officials of Federal Fisheries and the industry and people in my Department, but I have not been officially notified by my Federal counterpart that that many licences will be cancelled out this year. I am not aware of it. But certainly I will have it investigated and report back to the House as soon as I can find out what is going on.

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance about his now infamous payroll tax. The Minister has said that the tax will raise \$15 million net this fiscal year, with the tax coming into force August 1st and, therefore, applying for eight months of the budget year. Would the Minister explain how much of the \$15 million net this year will come from private sector employers?

MR. SIMMS:
Good question!

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

DR. KITCHEN:
I cannot give you the exact figure. The total amount that will be coming will be \$15 million. Some will be coming from municipalities - I am sorry, none from the municipalities - some from the Federal Government, some from various other agencies, and the remainder from private businesses. The total amount will

be, as close as we can figure it out, \$15 million, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that the Minister cannot tell us how he calculated the \$15 million.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is right.

MS VERGE:

I would like the Minister to take my question about how much from the private sector as notice. My second question is how much of the Minister's \$15 million projection will come from Federal Government employers?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to forecast precisely how much is going to come from an individual firm, because, you see, you have to wait until the end of the year to know how much was paid out in payrolls. There is always a certain amount.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WINDSOR:

How did you do your budgeting?

DR. KITCHEN:

Our best estimate is \$15 million total, Mr. Speaker, and I am not prepared to go into any detail as to how much a particular employer would pay.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Finance tell the House where he got that \$15 million figure? Did he pull it out of the air? How did he arrive at it?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Good question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, we have our ways of forecasting revenues, based on payrolls, and I am not about to indicate precisely how we did it. What we have done is base our forecast on estimated payrolls -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) you do not know. Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

DR. KITCHEN:

We based our estimates on estimated payrolls in the Province, and that is how we forecast it. They are as accurate as we can make them. Now, you can also ask, how much are you going to collect in rabbit licences? How much are you going to collect in income taxes? They are all estimates. Everybody estimates. How much is going to be coming from the GST? Everything is an estimate, and no Minister of Finance would ever let people know in advance precisely how much a particular company is going to pay. That is a very silly question. It is important, I believe, Mr. Speaker, for Members opposite to get their questions lined up properly rather than to

repeatedly ask silly questions.

MR. RIDEOUT:

How about you? You have not found out after a month and a half.

MR. WINDSOR:

We have not gotten one answer.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The Ouija Board Minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the Minister of Finance agree that the payroll tax will be levied on three general groups of employers, number one, private sector employers, number two, the Federal Government and, number three, Provincial Government Departments and Provincial Government funded agencies? And, if so, will he explain how much of his \$15 million net projection for this budget year is coming from each of those three categories?

MR. SIMMS:

Estimated.

MS VERGE:

The estimate of how much of the \$15 million net from the payroll tax will come from, number one, private sector employers, number two, from Federal Government employers and, number three, from the Provincial Government and provincial agencies.

MR. SIMMS:

How much do you estimate? You should be able to answer that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

No, he cannot tell us.

MR. WARREN:

Boy, oh, boy!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, this is shocking! Will the Minister undertake to table the breakdown of his \$15 million estimate?

MR. SIMMS:

Ask the Premier. He knows.

MS VERGE:

Will the Premier give these details to the House within the next day?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

I am not too sure of whom she is asking the question. She mentioned the Premier, the Minister of Finance and various people. I am not too sure. Do you want me to answer the question? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I will now direct my question to the Premier.

I would like the Premier to explain to the House of Assembly how his Minister of Finance and his Government are estimating \$15 million net revenue from the 1.5

per cent payroll tax that is coming into force on August 1st this year? How much of the \$15 million estimate is coming from private sector employers, how much from the Federal Government, and how much from the Province and the Province's agencies?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Off the top of my head, I do not remember the details. What I do remember is that there was a breakdown of where we estimated the sources would come from and, if hon. Members opposite keep it up - they are trying their best to undermine the tax constitution, they are trying to hurt the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

We are looking for answers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER WELLS:

They want an answer and I will give them the answer. They are trying their best to undermine the ability -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Then answer the questions.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

PREMIER WELLS:

They are trying their best, Mr. Speaker, to undermine the ability of the Government and the Legislature to collect the maximum portion of this tax as we estimated primarily from the Federal Government and its

agencies, from national business organizations carrying on business in Newfoundland. We want to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What is it?

MR. WINDSOR:

We all know the employers, give us the breakdown.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The question has been asked and there is no need for Members to keep repeating the question. The Premier knows what the question is, and hon. Members should wait to see if the answer is coming.

The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, they have been trying now for weeks to undermine the legitimacy and the constitutionality of it only to the detriment of the people of this Province. It is time they put the interest of the people of this Province ahead of their own narrow political interest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, this tax has been estimated to generate the maximum portion of the tax revenue, totalling \$15 million, to come from Federal Governmental sources and major national businesses and institutions carrying on business

in the Province, so as to do the least possible harm to the small business people in this Province who are exempted if they have a payroll less than \$300,000. And, Mr. Speaker, our ability to do that and to achieve that end for the better interest of the people of this Province is being made infinitely more difficult by the constant prejudicial comments of the Members opposite for their own narrow political interest.

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HEARN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is also to the Minister of Finance. Can the Minister tell us how many of the school boards in the Province will have to pay the payroll tax?

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

DR. KITCHEN:
None, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would like to point out to hon. Members to my right when the question is asked, I see no reason to repeat the question. Hon. Members have plenty of time in Question Period and can stand and ask another question. It does not do anything to expedite the process.

The hon. the Member for St. Mary's

- The Capes.

MR. HEARN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister just said, in answer to my question, that no school boards in the Province will have to pay the payroll tax. The Minister of Education told us last night that practically all the boards will have to pay the payroll tax, and the Minister of Finance has to develop a mechanism in order to replace that lost funding. Will the Minister tell us how he plans to replace the lost funding that will be collected from school boards?

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

DR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, in answering the question I would like to correct something the hon. Member said. Last night, I deferred to the Minister of Finance in answering that question and I said if taxes were assessed, the Minister of Finance would guarantee that there would be no negative impact on the budget of school boards and other post-secondary institutions in the Province.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the Minister. He said last night quite clearly, left no stone unturned in fact, in making sure that everyone understood that most boards had a payroll over \$300,000 and would be susceptible to the tax, but he said the money would not come out of his budget, the money to replace it would have to go through his budget from the

Minister of Finance. He would not answer how it would be done, he said it would be left up to the Minister of Finance. That is why I asked the Minister of Finance what mechanism he is going to use to make sure that school boards are not out of pocket in relation to the payroll tax.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, we are going to accumulate the amounts. This year we are going to accumulate the amounts that various Government emanations and Government Departments have accumulated for the payroll tax, and then, toward the end of the year, we are going to bring in a Special Warrant and pay that amount off. So really it means that school boards do not pay, but they are technically subject to the tax.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance as well, and it relates to councils in this Province. Let me say that the Minister of Finance, in answer to the first question, said that municipalities will not be taxed this year. There will be no funding, he said earlier, coming from municipalities this year. In his statement he says that it will be implemented January 1, 1991. That will be part of this financial year, this fiscal year, Mr. Speaker, so can he tell us where he got this \$15 million?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

I would like to clarify the year involved. The Member is referring to the fiscal year. When I said the tax will impact on municipalities after January 1991, that is when the municipalities year starts. Their budgets have already been calculated for this year and approved for this calendar year, so the tax cannot come into effect for them until the next calendar year, in which case they should make provision to pay the payroll tax.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, first he said it was not part of this fiscal year, now it is part of this fiscal year and if he wants them to make plans to have it in place for the taxation system in 1991, for their budgets, is the Minister suggesting that is an avenue for the councils, therefore, to raise taxes or cut services?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, that is a matter for the councils to deliberate. They may raise taxes, cut services or look for Government assistance, whichever way, whatever they do to compile a budget. It is the same as any other tax they have to pay, and they will have to pay it.

Now, for most councils it will mean that they will not be subject to the tax because of the \$300,000 deduction from payrolls. Some municipalities will be paying

taxes; they will be out money, and they will have to raise that money in their usual way of raising any other tax money.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have confirmation from the Minister of Finance that he is expecting the councils in this Province to raise taxes as a result of this payroll tax he has just introduced in the Legislature. Let me ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, in the cases -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Okay, we will use Placentia as an area, the Member's District where they are trying to force amalgamation throughout this Province, and you get a lot of councils coming together where it will be obvious, Mr. Speaker, in the area of Placentia -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:

Where it will be obvious that there will be tax increases as a result of the municipalities coming together, Mr. Speaker. The towns will become larger, the operations costs will become greater, and the number of employees will increase. In other cases, Mr. Speaker, towns which are now being forced to amalgamate with larger towns, such as Spanish Room in Marystown - well, Marystown has to pay it - how does the Minister expect this program he has introduced to work with forced amalgamation by his

colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs? Do you think he will encourage it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, it certainly would not encourage amalgamation. But, at the same time, the tax would be such a small factor in making people's minds up in a particular series of municipalities. If several come together and they go over the \$300,000, perhaps by \$10,000, then the tax on \$10,000 will be \$300. So, if that is what it takes to discourage amalgamation, then it was not very firmly in place in the first place. It depends on the community. I would suggest that the effect of the tax on this issue would be minimal, miniscule, and not to be contemplated.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister is also quoted as saying that the impact on small business in this Province will be minimal. How does the Minister explain this letter, which is addressed to him, dated April 19, from a small business in this Province? I will not quote exactly from the letter, Mr. Speaker, but he basically says, 'My total payroll is \$1,267,000,' which qualifies him as a small business in this Province, by employees or any other stretch of the imagination. 'Expenses were \$1.2 million, for a pre tax profit of \$54,000. On that profit this business pays federal and provincial income tax combined of

\$12,000; total tax payable today of \$12,000.' Based on his payroll, which is 75 per cent of his total expenses, because he is in the service industry, he estimates that he will have to pay \$9,077. That is a 16.6 per cent reduction in corporate profits, Mr. Speaker, almost doubling the amount of taxes he will be paying. How does the Minister explain that impact on a small business in this Province?

MR. R. AYLWARD:

That is shocking, boy, shocking!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the letter, and I do not know if the person who wrote the letter did all the calculations. One calculation that should have been performed would be to look at the impact on the income tax. Because this tax, this health and post-secondary education tax, would be a deductible item, so that the actual amount may or may not be \$9,000, depending upon how the person did his calculation. It could be as much as \$5,000 depending on the category, or \$6,000 or \$7,000, whatever it would come to in that particular case. So it is probably not as much as the Member suggests.

On the other hand, let me tell you this: One of the main purposes of the health and post-secondary education tax is to compensate for federal withdrawal from this field. Businesses are forever coming to Government, and properly so, saying let us get a good post-secondary education system,

let us put money into the post-secondary education system. Now, we are saying it is appropriate for businesses to be carrying their fair share of the post-secondary education dollar.

Similarly with health. If we improve the health of the people in the Province, that improves the health of the workers and cuts down on the sick leave and so. I am not going to push that too far.

MR. SIMMS:

No, you had better not.

DR. KITCHEN:

But it is something that should be taken into account. If people want a well-educated work force and a healthy work force, then it has to be paid for. No one likes to pay taxes. Taxation is a violent act perpetrated by Government on its constituents. Let us face it. That is what it is. It is a rough thing to do, but sometimes it has to be done because the alternative is not to provide the services. No one likes to increase taxes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question Period has expired.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased today to table my Department's current research report for 1989 which was released to the public recently at the prospector's convention in Toronto. This 347 page report

presents the results of some 36 geoscientific projects carried out by the Department's survey branch.

Mr. Speaker, the mandate of that branch is to gather, describe and interpret data related to the geological history and mineral resources of the Province in order to understand the origins and occurrences of the Province's mineral deposits. This data base is essential to an effective and healthy mining industry.

This year's current research volume further expands our understanding of the Province's earth history containing reports of scientific studies of rock formations from Hebron in Labrador to Manual in Newfoundland. Examples of this research include the investigation of graphite mineralization in Western Labrador and studies on the gold and base metal occurrences of the Baie Verte Peninsula.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we will be conducting further tests including geochemical and microscopic works on samples and producing detailed maps and reports from these surveys.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to table the report.

Notices of Motion

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act, 1977." (Bill No. 32).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. DICKS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act Respecting Enduring Powers of Attorney."

I further give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Small Claims Act."

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I still have eighteen, nineteen, or twenty petitions left to present, but today I will just present two I think, because I think at three o'clock, we go to Orders of the Day. Now, Mr. Speaker, looking through the petitions which I have here, I have one on Sunday hunting. In fact, I understand that besides the petitions I have on Sunday hunting, there are some 22,000, and I repeat, Mr. Speaker, 22,000 signatures on a request to the Minister for Sunday hunting in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Now, Mr. Speaker, I was amazed during the past weekend to hear through the media that the hon. Minister responsible for wildlife advised the Wildlife Federation in Gander, that he would be making recommendations to his Cabinet with some sort of a Sunday hunt. Now, Mr. Speaker, I find that most unusual coming from a Cabinet Minister knowing that there are or supposed to be some

kind of Cabinet solidarity. There is supposed to be some kind of secrecy in the Cabinet that the Minister would go publicly and announce that he was recommending to Cabinet a Sunday hunt in some sort of a way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if, and I say to the Premier and the rest of his colleagues, if Cabinet does not agree with the Minister's recommendation of a Sunday hunt, then I would think the Minister has no alternative but to resign as a Minister of the Cabinet, because he has advised the general public that he is recommending there will be some sort of a Sunday hunt. I would also say to the Minister, that I understand, and I need to be corrected, but I understand that the Minister has in his possession a number of petitions signed by the people in Newfoundland and Labrador requesting a Sunday hunt. Now, Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Does he have any from his sister?

MR. WARREN:

In fact, I do not know if the Member had anything from his District, but I know there is something like 900 names, 900 names from the people in Labrador requesting a Sunday hunt.

MR. EFFORD:

Who told you that?

MR. WARREN:

Who told me that? Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. Gentleman, the hon. Minister of Social Services, that I have attended meetings on Sunday hunting for the last five or six months, in fact, at one meeting we had over 200 people in attendance. Yes we are

in support of a Sunday hunt, and let me say, my hon. colleague from Naskaupi does have petitions signed in support of the Sunday hunt. I know that the Minister is going to get up and make a few comments on Sunday hunt, because he has news, and I would like him to tell the House of Assembly- there are two things. All of those possible applicants or the successful applicants which usually, by the end of May are notified if they are successful in the big game license. Now surely goodness when they receive their successful application from the Department there should be something attached to that application advising the individual if he can or cannot hunt on Sunday. That is number one.

And the second thing, Mr. Speaker, which is more important, according to the number of calls which I am getting from all over Newfoundland and Labrador and from Port de Grave, is that if it is for the big game, what about the small game? Now, Mr. Speaker, you cannot distinguish between the small game hunters and the big game hunters.

Mr. Speaker, I would think that if the Minister is making recommendations to his Cabinet surely goodness he would make sure that he would also include the small game hunters as well as the big game hunters in any decision, whether it is for Sunday hunting or whether it is against Sunday hunting. That is entirely up to the Minister and the Cabinet to make a decision. But I think this concern has been ongoing for the last number of years. The Cabinet sooner or later has to make a decision whether there will be Sunday hunting or whether there

will not be Sunday hunting. But at least let the 22,000 people who have said they want it, or let all the other people who said they do not want it, to receive notice -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

MR. WARREN:
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

In concluding, I would like to advise the Minister that they should make a decision as soon as possible on this very contentious issue whether there will be Sunday hunting or no Sunday hunting.

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

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you.

I am not sure that I heard the prayer of the petition, or whether the hon. Member read it or not. But I guess, as he did not get the opportunity in Question Period probably to broach the same subject he may have taken that part on the Order Paper to express a view perhaps.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member wishes me to make some comments on his petition he could do me the courtesy of being quiet while I do so.

The question of Sunday hunting has been indeed ongoing for quite a long time, Mr. Speaker. In fact it was back in the days when the hon. Member who raises the issue was a Member of Cabinet and no doubt back as far as when he was a Liberal Opposition Member and after his Tory awakening when he

walked across prior to entering the Tory Cabinet. So it has been an ongoing issue, Mr. Speaker, often brought to my attention.

I believe the petition he talks about, the major petition, in which he indicates there is possibly 22,000 names. I would be more inclined to think it may be even closer to 40,000. Certainly in excess of 30,000 and that is a significant segment of our population. What I have said publicly, Mr. Speaker, since I have been the Minister responsible for such matters is that I welcome input from any side of any question. Sunday hunting happens to be one of them. I think it is in the public domain. It is general public knowledge that when an issue is raised with Government, Government would investigate and look at the particular issue. The issue of Sunday hunting has obviously been raised in the judicial system as well as to the politicians. And we have considered that.

I think it is also in the public domain, Mr. Speaker, that eventually Cabinet will have to make a decision based on the three most obvious options which are: to leave the ban in place, lift the ban entirely, or some modified form of a ban, or lifting of a ban. Really, this is the context in which I have discussed it in Gander and many other places. What Cabinet will do eventually with respect to a time frame I am sure the Member has already clearly indicated and I am not about to say when it will go to Cabinet, or what my particular departmental recommendation will be and I have no intention of doing so. And the Member is fully aware of that. But there is a great concern about Sunday

hunting, the hon. Member represents one of the largest hunting constituencies in the Province, traditional hunters, long-time hunters. I do not know if he has said what his position was with respect to Sunday hunting. I do not think he has ever said. He prefers to sit on the fence and sitting on one fence he tries to knock other people off what he perceives to be other fences.

But what we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is in a proper and good management manner taking care of the affairs of the wildlife resource of this Province, while at the same time doing the greatest good to the most possible people, so when Cabinet eventually gets to a decision the decision will be made known publicly and I am sure that most people will be satisfied with that decision.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, I only have a few comments. I have misgivings about Sunday hunting. I have to be truthful but I think we are missing the point, that a month from now licenses are to be issued. The Minister can say what he likes about people opposite when they were in power, but the point remains that there are thousands of Newfoundlanders known to the Minister by the names of the people who have signed petitions -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

Make a decision. The Minister has said, and I have heard him on radio programs, saying that the decision is going to be made by Cabinet, but if there is a sufficient number out there, and he believes there is a sufficient number against it, a sufficient number pro to it, why does he not make a decision and let the people know out there, let the thousands of people that are waiting to see, people who have two weeks holidays and are including their two Sundays in the two weeks, people like myself who do not care one way or the other. I have sufficient time to go out there and hunt. I can take three weeks if I want to if the House is not open. I do not care if it is Sunday or Monday, it is immaterial to me, but there are people out there who have a vested interest. All we are saying is because of the closeness of the season, because of the issuing of the licenses within the next month, will the Minister make a decision? Will he make a decision? Will he tell the House, yes, tomorrow I will make a decision? That is all. It is not what we did when we were in Government. That has no bearing on it. You are the Minister and there are people out there waiting for your decision. Make the decision.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for LaPoile.

MR. RAMSAY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present to the House today and in the amount of time remaining I should be able to get it in. I received it a few days ago and it concerns the Minister of the Environment and Lands as well. I

will read the prayer of the petition. To the hon. House of Assembly of Newfoundland in Legislative Session Convened March 8, 1990 the petition of the undersigned students of the District of LaPoile, St. James Regional High in Port aux Basques, that the Provincial Government place an immediate ban on the use of non-returnable bottles within the Province. Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your hon. House may be pleased to support the petition and take the necessary action. As in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, I have not counted the number of signatures, but there are quite a few students in the high school in Port aux Basques. I attended a seminar discussion session with the students at the high school there and several other students from various schools in the area, about the environment in general a few weeks back.

In this past week as most of us are quite aware, with this being earth day on Sunday past, and also with a general increase in concern over the environment in the country and also throughout the globe, I feel that initiatives like this, and we see that the students of our Province are definitely taking the environment issue very seriously, and we as a Government, the Government of the Province, and we as Government Members in support of the same Government feel strongly, quite a few of us, that this is a time to act and not necessarily a time to continue the efforts to study, not really speaking for the Minister. He will have to put forth the Government's position on this particular petition, but it is a

matter which, I think, people throughout the Province have taken lightly for too long. Often initiatives that are taken by the Federal Government on the order of pollution controls on cars, on the order of a variety of -

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is the prayer of the petition?

MR. RAMSAY:

I just read the prayer. It is on non-returnable bottles to become returnable. As most of us know the only returnable bottles in the Province currently are beer bottles and the students see this of course as contributing to the litter factor throughout the Province thereby decreasing I suppose the beauty of the Province as far as the tourism industry goes. Increasing the possibility of danger with broken glass. I know that some students in my District undertake to, during regular clean up weeks that are held by the various councils, to go out and collect a good percentage of the garbage that is littered throughout the area and a good proportion is disposal bottles. Even a small amount put on these deposit amount, even on non-returnables may effect a better collection for the recycling process, if they are not to be used for other means of being rebottled or whatever.

And as I was saying prior to being interrupted by Members opposite to clarify the prayer of the petition. I think that we have to look to the future and just what we are going to do with our environment. It has become a global matter. It is no longer just a matter of concern to a few green individuals, people who align themselves with the various Green parties and Greenpeace and

at times radical elements.

I think it is creeping more and more into the regular household and the ideas of even using a drinking box, I know lunchtime today I had a small drinking box and someone mentioned to me, you know, that that drinking box is not environmentally friendly. And you have children of all ages coming up to you and saying, you know, you should not use those disposal diapers on your children. You know these disposal diapers are possibly the largest contributor to filling up landfills without a chance to being recycled.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that variety of comments on the environment I will ask the Minister to respond to the petition and hopefully in the near future we can see a return in the Province to deposits for return of bottles to help clean up our environment and also help us contribute in a small way to the overall affect on the global environment by using less electricity in the production of the glass -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. RAMSAY:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I and the people on this side of the House certainly go along with and appreciate what the hon. the Member for Port aux Basques says in the prayer of the petition. We believe that the environment issues are so clear, and there are so many people being affected by the environment on an every day basis, and when we look on the sides of our roads and ditches, the roads that we pass every day we can see numerous bottles, debris in every respect.

But if we could eliminate a certain portion of them and I certainly agree with the Member's contention that plastics, if they cannot be brought back should be eliminated. If plastics are to remain as part of the consumers need, then there would have to be some provision or forced provision, if necessary, that those plastics be recycled or at least be brought back so to give a little bit of an incentive to people to pick them up.

You very seldom, I know in the areas that I have been, where you will find beer bottles because the beer bottles are perhaps five or six cents each, and kids or whatever, ten cents each, kids go along and pick them up and make a few dollars. And it is good in both ways, it is good to the child and it is also good for the environment. And never will I, as a Member from this side of the House, have any reluctance whatsoever in praising a person who comes across with a petition or any other form to express or to try to implement a process whereby we will have a better environment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

It is sick out there, sick to most individuals, but we have some individuals who could not care less. I again want to emphasize, and emphasize very strongly, Mr. Speaker, to this House, that I, for one, am very, very worried of what is going to happen to the future generation if we do not take the ball and put it in our own court and kick it, if necessary, to clean up the environment. I certainly, and all my colleagues on this side, certainly support the prayer of that petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The sort of petition presented by my colleague and supported by the hon. Member across the way is the type of petition I really love to see come in here, because we have made a concerted effort to make young people, particularly, aware of the concerns and the environment. And I would like to think the former Administration did much the same thing, in having school programs and education programs and so on. But we have really gone a step further than the former Administration was able to do, probably by the time constraint of April 20th, last year. But we have taken some positive steps. I am sort of ashamed to say, on behalf of the former Administration, that we were the last jurisdiction in Canada to take steps to put in place a round table, a discussion forum that would help Government develop a conservation strategy towards sustainable development, Mr. Speaker, and we are working on

that.

It was considered by the former Administration. I am not being derogative when I say this, but the time constraint of an election, which saw them ousted, probably did not allow them to take any further steps. But this Administration did continue and are in the process of arranging a round table on that particular forum. It pleases me no end that the hon. Members, the presenter and the supporter, would voice the concerns and the words of the young people in our Province, where we had to start our education with respect to the environment.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that attitude of myself as the responsible Minister, and this Government, is a recognition that we cannot continue to pollute the face of our planet and expect to live here fifty years from now as we do now even, and I think our objective should be to clean up that which we have already - and I mean this globally - polluted and prevent further pollution of what we still have remaining. So, I can support the concept. It is not a simple thing to say have returnable bottles and deposits and so on. You know there are recycling efforts which started before my time - the former Administration again - and we are making some efforts along those lines and looking for, on a continual basis, ways and means to respond to the three Rs of principle, when you are talking about cleaning up the environment, which is to reduce, recycle and re-use as much as we can of what we now currently put into our environment.

I support the concept. I

appreciate the Member bringing it forward, I appreciate the support from the hon. Member across the way, and I can give assurance, Mr. Speaker, that our Government is committed to doing something about the terrible environmental mess that we have created globally, and provincially, as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I advise the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains that there is one minute left and we must then proceed to Orders of the Day.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will keep my petitions for other days.

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:

Orders of the Day. It being Wednesday, it is Private Member's Day. We go to the Private Member's Resolution given notice of yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition, related to the seal hunt.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

We took the opportunity yesterday as an Opposition to give notice of this particular resolution dealing with the seal hunt because we think it is important and timely that this issue be debated now. Therefore, we took the opportunity of Private Member's Day, and since it was our turn to propose a resolution for debate to the House, to propose this particular

resolution.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition would allow me one brief interruption. There is a person in the gallery who may not be there very much longer, and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would not mind. I want to welcome to the gallery the Mayor of Millertown, Mr. Richard Fitzpatrick, and extend to him a welcome on behalf of all hon. Members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Leader of the Opposition is always delighted to give way to welcome municipal leaders to this Chamber, especially from Millertown, that great hunting area of Millertown and Buchans.

As I was saying in my few opening remarks, we think it is important that this particular resolution be debated now, and that is why we took the opportunity to have the resolution come before the House today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can say as well, categorically and clearly, that the idea for this resolution was contained in questions and debate researched by us when the present Minister of Fisheries was the official spokesman for the Opposition on fisheries matters back three years ago. The Minister of Fisheries took the

same position then as we are taking in this resolution today, that barring any assistance forthcoming from the Government of Canada, there should be an assistance package for the sealing industry from the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

So, we will be tremendously surprised, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister, speaking on behalf of the Government, does not give his wholehearted endorsement to the gist of this particular resolution. We would be very, very surprised if that does not happen, because that would be a total about-face, a total change from positions articulated in this House, certainly three years ago, and, I am sure, on other occasions, as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to say this, that those of us on this side of the House deplore categorically and without any reservation the fact that the Government of Canada have not come to the aid of the sealing industry. It is not something new, Mr. Speaker, that this present P.C. Government in Ottawa have failed to do. Governments in Ottawa over the years, since the sealing industry got in trouble eight or ten or twelve years ago, have consistently refused to come to the aid of the sealing industry in Newfoundland and Labrador. And this present Government in Ottawa is to be condemned as roundly as their predecessors were to be condemned on this very matter. That is why we have no hesitation in the 'Whereases', in the recitals in the resolution, in deploring and condemning the lack of action by the present Federal Government in coming forward with an assistance package to allow people to prosecute the seal

fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. SIMMS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
They do not deserve any praise, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:
Right on!

MR. RIDEOUT:
They do not deserve any excuses being made for them, and they will get no excuses from people on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Now, Mr. Speaker, having said that, it has been the position of successive Provincial Governments in Newfoundland and Labrador over the last several years, to support as best we could a fledgling revitalization of the seal fishery. It is nothing new, Mr. Speaker, for the Provincial Government to issue loan guarantees for the Northeast Coast Sealers Co-op. That is nothing new at all. We were doing that for the last three or four or five years. From the very first season the Co-operative got off the ground, Mr. Speaker, we were issuing loan guarantees so that the Co-op could have an operating line and be able to purchase skins, pay their payroll, pay for their purchases, and carry out their everyday activities.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, to guaranteeing an operating line for the Co-operative, we had within the estimates of the Department of Fisheries, for the number of years we guaranteed loans for the Co-op,

an amount of money, an interest subsidy, for the Co-operative to be able to meet their interest payments on the loan guarantees. So, not only did we guarantee a working capital line for the Co-operative, we also provided a grant so they could pay their interest on a monthly or quarterly basis, whatever it was, to, I believe, the Bank of Nova Scotia. So that form of assistance is nothing new.

I welcome and appreciate the \$1.7 million loan guarantee the Provincial Government has provided again this year for the Co-operative for their operating line. I do not know whether or not the Province is continuing to provide a grant so that the Co-operative can pay the interest on that loan and previous loans. I do not know that. There was nothing in the announcement that came from the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Development regarding that, so we will have to hear from the Minister whether or not that is the case. It used to be the case. We used to provide a subsidy, through the Department of Fisheries, for the Co-operative to pay the interest on their loan.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it is nothing new for the Province to provide assistance to enable the Canadian Sealers Association to market meat or to market the blubber for fat purposes, to market the organs for which there is a good market potential in the Orient, as Members know. There is nothing new in that. As I say in my resolution, Provincial Governments deserve the credit because these are programs that successive Provincial Governments have developed, implemented and carried on over the last four,

five or six years in an effort to help revitalize the sealing industry in Newfoundland and Labrador.

What is missing, Mr. Speaker, and what is missing more so this year than ever before, is an assistance package for the harvester, an assistance package that will make it economically worthwhile for the landsman seal hunter to be able to go to the ice, be able to go to the sea, go to the bays around Newfoundland and Labrador and hunt seals.

The amount that the marketplace will allow to be paid, Mr. Speaker, does not make it viable for the individual sealers, when you take into account the cost of ammunition, when you take into account the cost of gasoline, when you take into account the cost of transporting the seal skins from St. Anthony to Fleur de Lys, or from Twillingate to Fleur de Lys, or from Goose Cove to Dildo, where the private sector operation is. When you take into account all these costs, Mr. Speaker, the sealers would lose money.

Now, obviously it is not worth their while to prosecute that part of the fishery if they are going to lose money, so, therefore, for the first time in the revitalization effort, this year they legitimately approached the Government of Canada and asked the Government of Canada to subsidize - not subsidize, Mr. Speaker, that is not the right word, they asked the Government of Canada to provide price support through the Prices Support Board, and that Board has been in place for decades to do just that, to provide price support to various species of fish in times when it is not viable for fishermen to

commercially exploit those species. So the price support program of the Government of Canada was ideally suited to provide a price support, I believe it was \$850,000 or \$900,000, to sealers principally along the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador, so that they could prosecute the seal fishery this year.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is vitally important that there be a seal harvest this year for a number of reasons. First of all, of course, there is a market for maybe 75,000 or 80,000 seal skins, a market in the leather industry, where those skins, having been deblubbed, will be sent off and tanned by Blue Tannery, or whatever they are, in Ontario, and then sold in square yards or square meters to the leather market. That is a vital part, Mr. Speaker, of the revitalization process. And if the Northeast Coast Sealers Co-operative, who have entered into a contract with the tanning company in Ontario cannot keep that commitment this year, Mr. Speaker, then we all know what will happen next year. If they cannot provide the 50,000 skins to the tannery this year, then, obviously, that tannery is going to look for substitutes next year; they will look to some other part of the leather industry for substitutes and that very important component of the revitalization of the seal fishery will be lost, I do not know about forever, Mr. Speaker, but it certainly will be lost for quite a long time to the sealing industry of Newfoundland and Labrador.

The second important reason, Mr. Speaker, for the Government of Canada to have supported this initiative was the overall state

of the fish stocks around the Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador in its own right. Everybody knows, as Morrissey Johnson said so aptly several months ago, that seals do not eat turnip, they obviously feed on other species of fish. Now, we are not suggesting that the largest part of their diet is cod, we are not suggesting that the largest part of their diet is turbot or species that have great commercial value for the fishermen of Newfoundland and Labrador, but we are suggesting, Mr. Speaker, and what has been proven beyond a doubt scientifically and biologically, that a significant part of their diet is caplin, and caplin, of course, is the food fish for the groundfishery, the cod fishery all along this coast. Dr. Harris points out emphatically in his report that we have to do something to control the enlarging seal population off the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador. I mean, even if you did not have an ounce of scientific ingenuity within you it would make common sense, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot let that herd grow out of bounds and allow the system to get out of balance without it having a negative impact on the fish stocks off the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that should be said is this, that at some point, some day, whether it is this year or next year or the year after or five years from now, at some point, some day, some time, there will have to be a cull of the seal herd. You just cannot let them grow at the rate of 250,000 or 300,000 a year. The best guess now is that there are around 3.5 million or 4 million seals out there. They did their scientific count finally this

year, so we will have the numbers, hopefully, before 1990 is over. But, whatever it is, what we do know, Mr. Speaker, is that there are far more seals been recruited to the herd than are being taken out of it, and that has been the case every year since the end of the commercial hunt. There is nobody who can deny that. There are far more seals being recruited to the herd - far, far more - than are being taken out of it, so, therefore, at some point, either this year or five years from now, if there is not a revitalized seal fishery, Mr. Speaker, there will have to be a cull. I say to this House, Mr. Speaker, and I say to the Government of Canada, and I say to anybody who will listen, a useless cull is useless; it will have to be done because you will have to do it to protect the other fish stocks in the ocean. That is why you will have to do it.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a better alternative. There is an economic alternative, and the economic alternative is to ensure that there is a revitalized seal fishery. And it can be done. The Canadian Sealers Association, the Northeast Coast Sealers Co-operative, and, to some extent, the Norwegian operation, in Dildo, have proven that there is slowly beginning to come back a market, particularly for adult seals.

I do not think we will in our life time, unfortunately, ever see the white coat hunt again, and I say 'unfortunately' as a Newfoundlander and Labradorian. But there is a market for adult seals. The problem this year, Mr. Speaker, is we need the support of Government to make sure we are there next year, and to make sure we are there the year after, and to make sure we are there the year

after that. Because as the revitalization process continues, Mr. Speaker, I am confident the marketplace will strengthen and this support that is required from Government will only be short-term support, it will not be support that will be required every year on an ongoing basis.

I come back, in the few minutes I have left to me, Mr. Speaker, to this: We have legitimately, all of us I think - legitimately all of us - roundly condemned the Government of Canada for failing in their responsibility to provide this price support to the seal fishery. But they, having made the decision they did, wrong as it was, Mr. Speaker - and let me say something else on that point. It is not as many people would think, from what I have been told, that great pressure from the protest groups or the European community led the Government of Canada to make that decision. The Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker, had made the decision for the Price Support Board to provide this support to the sealing industry. The principals in the Canadian Sealers Association and the Northeast Coast Sealers Co-operative, and others, were told that it had been approved. They were told by representatives of the Government of Canada, both elected and non-elected, that it had been approved.

The people, Mr. Speaker, who got to the Government of Canada and got to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and changed his mind on this price support was not the European community representatives, it was not representatives of the protest groups, it was our own large fishing companies right here in Atlantic Canada. That is where it

came from. I know just as I am standing here today that it was Fishery Products International and National Sea who got to the Federal Minister of Fisheries and convinced him not to provide this price support to the sealing industry, because they were afraid of the anti-sealing movement affecting their marketplace.

That is a legitimate concern from their point of view, but now many times, Mr. Speaker, do we in Newfoundland and Labrador have to continue to be blackmailed by those people? I had a film over in my office - I do not recall ever taking it. It is probably still over there - showing the campaign they were going to put on if there was a large vessel offshore hunt; a VCR video, television clip, showing the kind of campaign they were going to put on in the marketplace in the United States if the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland supported a large vessel offshore hunt. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that a landsman based small vessel hunt would lead to that kind of thing, and I am convinced that it was wrong for the larger companies to lobby the Government of Canada. And I make no excuse for them. The Government of Canada should never have listened to them. They should have told them, We are going to support this anyway. Someday we will have to do it. We either do it in an economically viable way now, or someday there will have to be a useless cull and a useless slaughter that will provide no economic return to anybody.

But having come to the sad reality of where we are today, Mr. Speaker, I think the plea must go out to this Government to provide

more support than they have, as welcome as the support is they have provided so far. But there is one component missing, and that component, Mr. Speaker, is an incentive to make it feasible and to make it viable for fishermen to get aboard their longliners and go out and harvest the seals. It is not viable for them to do it today; they will lose their shirts at doing it today. And if they lose their shirts at it today, probably the last possibility for the next several years of creating a revitalized seal fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador will go down the drain.

So I come back, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Fisheries who made this very same suggestion years ago, three years ago as a matter of fact, that when the Government of Canada does not come to the assistance of, in this particular case the seal fishery, it is incumbent upon the Government of Newfoundland so to do. On behalf of the sealers we ask the Newfoundland Government to consider this resolution today, and we ask the Government to join with us in supporting it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition quotes from a resolution I introduced in the House some years ago, a debate, a motion, asking for the Government of Newfoundland to come up with a subsidy to offset or to compensate for the subsidy that was not forthcoming from the Federal Government. I do not have a copy

of that debate here, but I suspect hon. Members opposite, who were then sitting on this side, refused to accept my motion, and I am sure for all the right reasons, refused to come forward with the subsidy that was referred to in the motion.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member's motion contains a lot of merit until it gets down to the last paragraph, 'BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House calls upon the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to immediately institute such a program so that the landsmen hunters can continue with this year's seal hunt and so that the Northeast Coast Sealers Co-op can meet its market commitments.' What he is asking there, of course, is for the Province of Newfoundland to make good on a million dollar subsidy as was requested by the Sealers Co-op of Ottawa, and as they subsequently refused.

Mr. Speaker, that issue is still very much alive. In fact, I talked to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans last night at nine o'clock, from my home, and that was one of the first things I mentioned to him, the need for the seal subsidy. In fact, I reminded him that the President of the Canadian Sealers Association would be visiting his office today, and I pleaded with the Minister to be very sympathetic to the request being made by Mr. Mark Smal. I told him that without the subsidy, it would be very doubtful whether or not the seal harvest as it was envisaged a month or so ago would be able to proceed. The Minister did not say no to my request, and I must confess he did not say yes, either. But he did not appear to be altogether adverse to the idea.

It would hardly make sense, Mr.

Speaker, for the House to approve this motion today, calling upon the Government of Newfoundland to come forward with a \$1 million subsidy, while the matter is still very much alive and under consideration in Ottawa. What will be the reaction of the Minister in Ottawa if it comes to light that the Newfoundland Government does not want his \$1 million subsidy, that they have decided to go it alone? The answer, of course, is quite obvious. He will just clap his hands, I am sure, and be very happy that he saved another \$1 million for his federal coffers. So, Mr. Speaker, the last Be It Resolved in this motion just does not make sense, and certainly is one we could not support for the reasons I have just given.

Mr. Speaker, the Province of Newfoundland, this year, has treated the sealing industry and the people involved in it very generously. Earlier in the year, we approved a \$1.7 million loan guarantee through the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation to enable the Sealers' Co-op to purchase the pelts that would be sent to Canada Blue Tannery, in Central Canada, for processing, tanning, on a joint venture basis - \$1.7 million. Now, they wanted, I believe, a minimum of 50,000 seals in order to make that kind of a venture profitable. I am still hoping that maybe they will get that number or a number close to that, but certainly had the Federal Government come through with the subsidy as requested, I think it is safe to say that this year Newfoundlanders would have seen a harvest probably close to, or maybe in excess of, 100,000 seals, and what would have had a very worthwhile effect, not only on the

economy of the Province, and Lord knows we need that kind of an input into the economy, but it would have also had the effect of thinning out the seals to that extent. Therefore, in my conversation last night with Mr. Valcourt, I reminded him of these two things: I said, Mr. Valcourt, you complain that Newfoundlanders have to rely on unemployment insurance benefits. I was referring to his speech in Halifax a few days ago. I said, your comments were not very complimentary, but you had an opportunity this week to do something that would have alleviated the situation in a number of Newfoundland communities. In fact, I said, there would have been about 1,000 fishermen who would have benefitted from this year's seal fishery had you seen fit to provide the price support under the price support program which is there for these occasions.

I told the Minister, as well, that given one of the recommendations of the Harris Panel Report, having to do with seals, I reminded him that it would have the double-barreled effect of reducing the seal herds by 100,000. Maybe that is not going to have too much of an impact in terms of reducing the numbers out there, but certainly it is a start. We are told that at the present time there are about 4 million seals within our waters. We are told, as well, that these seals eat many, many thousands of tons of fish, and, in fact, about 500,000 tons of caplin. In fact, I am told the seals now eat more fish than is harvested by the major fishing nations of the world. That is rather strange, too, when we talk about what is happening in the fishery and what it will cost to

rehabilitate the fishery in this Province to give those engaged in it a chance to live in dignity, that we would allow the seal herd to explode to the point where they are now eating more fish than what is being caught by the fishing nations of the world.

Not only that, of course, they are having a devastating impact on other species, for example, caplin. They are major predators of caplin. Caplin, of course, is all part of the food chain that keeps the cod healthy. They are major predators of shrimp, for example, and other types of fish, all of which is very important in the overall scheme of things.

So I am very disappointed that the Federal Minister has not seen fit to make good - and as the Opposition Leader said, it was clearly understood at the beginning; I think Mr. Crosbie's office, for example, gave an undertaking to the sealers that this money would be forthcoming. In fact, they visited my office a few days later to discuss another small subsidy for seal meat, and they were absolutely elated over the prospect of having a good seal harvest this year. In fact, they were talking a harvest in excess of 100,000 seals.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Did you say you heard (inaudible) was still alive?

MR. W. CARTER:

It is still alive, I understand. Frankly, I do not hold out too much hope for it, but the matter is still alive.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They did announce publicly they were not going to do it.

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, and they also announced that they were going to do it.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, the announcement was made by whom, Ross Reid, was it?

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Crosbie's office, I am told.

MR. SIMMS:

But the only announcement from the Minister, Mr. Valcourt, was that they would not do it, is that correct?

MR. W. CARTER:

That is right. Mr. Valcourt came to my office two weeks ago and that was the first subject we discussed. Again, I impressed upon him the need for it and he expressed some concerns. He said he just came back from Brussels and saw some things over there that worried him.

MR. SIMMS:

So are you saying now, then, as a result of your conversation last night with the Minister that he is reconsidering the matter again.

MR. W. CARTER:

No, I am saying that in my conversation last night, I think the door is still a little bit open. There is a little opening there that he might still see the error of his ways and provide that subsidy.

MR. SIMMS:

When do you expect to hear that?

MR. W. CARTER:

I do not know. I can only tell the House that today, the President of the Canadian Sealers' Association is visiting Ottawa, and knowing that gentleman as a very dedicated gentleman in terms

of efforts to rehabilitate the seal fishery, I think he will make a strong case. I would not discount the possibility that after Mr. Valcourt gets through with Mr. Mark Small and company today, he might regret that he ever made the previous decision not to give the subsidy.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the Province certainly have nothing to be ashamed of in terms of what we have done to help rehabilitate the seal fishery this year, bearing in mind that we have recognized now for a long time that if the seal fishery is to become rehabilitated, we are going to have to pay more attention to finding ways and means of utilizing the whole body, the whole carcass, and not just the skin.

With that in mind, we have undertaken some very intensive research to find out exactly what can be done with seal meat, how it can be made more palatable to the Europeans and Asians and Americans. We have provided funds to enable processing companies in the Province to acquire 40,000 or 50,000 pounds of seal meat, on which they will be experimenting and trying to get in to the marketplace. I am told that they are having a reasonably high level of success in that regard.

We are also providing \$210,000 in subsidies to the Sealers' Association to enable them to buy 600,000 pounds of seal meat, all of which will go into animal food, targeted mainly to the fox farming industry. We are told that the fox farmers look upon seal meat as probably the highest protein and probably the most valuable food you can feed to fox and other such animals. And we are very happy

now to be able to provide that kind of money in order to secure the quantity of meat that is necessary to make a worthwhile project there.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A good project.

MR. W. CARTER:

It is an excellent project.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, it is an excellent project. And we are not discounting, Mr. Speaker, the possibility of acquiring markets for meat for human consumption. It seems strange where we have a number of third world countries where people are starving to death for the want of protein and nutrition that we are over here sitting on a resource that if properly developed and prosecuted could go a long ways toward feeding the hungry in the third world - and that is something else we are going to have a look at, and in fact are looking at.

The Canada Blue Tannery, the company by the way that the deal has been made with to purchase the 50,000 pelts that is being financed by virtue of the \$1.7 million loan guarantee from the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, that will be converted into leather. It appears that there is a good market now for leather in the world and it will certainly attract a lot less attention in terms of the protest movement than furs.

Canada Blue Tannery is probably one of the most progressive companies of its kind in Canada,

and our negotiations and discussions with that company have left us to believe that if this experiment this year succeeds, as we think it will, that company would be interested in maybe establishing a branch or at least moving its entire operation to Newfoundland for the purpose of conducting a tannery and mainly for seal pelts. Now if that were to happen, of course, that would have the effect of providing some badly needed jobs, and it would go a long ways toward helping to rehabilitate and make it more viable.

From what I am told they do everything from fish skins to fox pelts to almost every kind of a skin or a pelt. In fact I have seen some of their - when they were down here last they brought down some of their fish skins. I forget the fish, it might have been a char I believe, and they showed me that it was processed and cured, a very attractive leather, and they believe there is a very substantial potential in this Province as well for that kind of a product.

But certainly Canada Blue Tanning would be a welcome addition to the commercial life of Newfoundland. And we will do everything we can to attract that company to come here.

Mr. Speaker, while I am speaking and before I sit down I want to take this opportunity to pay a great deal of tribute to the Economic Recovery Team, to Mr. Doug House and Mr. Wayne Humphries, both of whom serve on that team, especially Mr. Humphries. He got the idea, he took this on as a project and identified areas where development could take place, had numerous

meetings with the Sealers Co-op and the Canadian Sealers Association, numerous meetings with Canada Blue Tanning, officials in my Department and Development. Mr. Humphries worked like a Trojan for quite a long time putting together this package, and I can tell the House that without the efforts of Wayne Humphries and Dr. Doug House and the Economic Recovery Team, generally, that the Canada Blue Tannery deal would never have been consummated and I can tell you now that if and when this development materializes, as we think it will, then full credit, along with the credit to the sealers and Small Brothers, and Ches Coish and others, they are the people who will have to get the credit.

My Department, Mr. Speaker, worked on it as well. And early in the game I seconded Mr. Roy Benson from my Department who is involved in this on a full time basis to work with the Economic Recovery Team and with the Sealers Co-op to provide them with the necessary information and data that they would require in order to put their package together. So they worked as a team. But the team was headed by Wayne Humphries, and I give him a lot of credit for what has transpired to date. And if the seal fishery comes back, as we believe it will, then the credit, certainly a large part of that credit will have to go to Mr. Humphries and his team.

So, Mr. Speaker, those of us who have some knowledge of rural Newfoundland and had occasion maybe to be raised in rural Newfoundland, we do not need to be reminded of the importance of the seal fishery to our Province. In fact there was a time when the seal fishery provided a major part

of the income that fishermen needed in order to survive at that time of the year. And in fact it was, in many cases, used as working capital to get them back fishing in the spring. And I believe that the Government of Canada has got a very real responsibility to do whatever has to be done to make sure that the seal fishery is given a chance to revive itself and to once again become a very important and a very viable industry.

I condemn Ottawa for its treatment of the seal fishery, the callous and uncaring way in which they have treated the application that went to them from the sealers co-op for the subsidy. They have a right to do that. Indeed they have a responsibility to provide that money. They have legislation that will enable them to do it under their price support legislation. There is no reason in the world why they could not have come forward with this money.

In closing I want to make some reference to the charge made by the Leader of the Opposition to the effect that maybe pressure that was brought to bear by the large fish companies and maybe the Fisheries Council of Canada might have had the effect of dampening their spirits or changing their minds because I know at one point in time I believe the decision was made to provide the subsidy, but within hours there was a cooling off. And I have a sneaking suspicion that maybe it was on the basis of representations made to the sealers or to the Minister that maybe he found it necessary to have a change of heart. But anyway, it certainly will have a severe hardship on the fishermen, most of whom cannot go to the ice fields and successfully prosecute

the seal fishery. That is too bad for all the reasons that I have given.

So, Mr. Speaker, I join with the hon. the Leader of the Opposition in asking Ottawa to reconsider and to make that money available. But I remind him that it will serve no purpose at this time to expect the Province to give an undertaking. It would serve no purpose at this time to expect the Province to give an undertaking that if Ottawa does not come through with the subsidy that we come up with it, because if they think that we are going to do it then you can be sure of one thing, that they will not do it. Now that is what makes the hon. Member's motion rather strange. That he would ask Ottawa to reconsider the issue and then end off by resolving that if Ottawa will not do it that the Province should step in there and fill the breach.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was a little bit amazed, Mr. Speaker, with the final comments from the Minister of Fisheries. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, basically what he is saying is that if the Federal Government does not help then the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador will not be helping and I think that is a sad, sad day for the people involved in the seal fishery in our Province. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1987 - it is interesting for Members opposite to remember that date, Mr. Speaker, in particular I will read

the names of Members opposite who were in the House at that time. I will read them by their names as per Hansard: Mr. Flight, Mr. Lush, Mr. Carter, Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Efford, Mr. Baker, Mr. Furey, Mr. Kelland. Those are Members who were in the House on February 6th, 1987. That Resolution: Therefore be it resolved that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador initiate a seal harvesting program, in February 26th, 1987, and that will protect our cod fisheries from the path of destruction. Now all those Members opposite supported that the Government would initiate a seal harvesting program and the Premier agrees, and I agree.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me get into the contents of my few other remarks for the next ten or twelve minutes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We on this side of the House, certainly in the official opposition are quite willing and indeed anxious to support the motion that has been put forward today by the Leader of the Opposition. I think that with the support we are giving this motion and the fact that the House is going to be debating this motion for the next hour and fifteen minutes carries with it some responsibility, in that it is not enough for me or the Premier or anyone else for that matter to stand here and make great flowery speeches about the importance of the seal fishery to the social and economic life of our Province. We have to make sure that this motion does not go the way - Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat this - we have to make sure that this motion does not go the way of most Private Members motions, that is, to be debated for the day and then forgotten. So Mr. Speaker, I urge the Minister of Fisheries,

I urge my colleagues opposite to make sure that that does not happen to this very important motion that was presented today. I honestly believe that the Newfoundland people are a little sick and tired of talk and speechifying when it comes to the seal fishery. That is not to take away from the importance of the seal fishery or the importance of the elected Members sitting in this House or to the revitalization of the sealing industry.

I feel that the time is long gone now, for talk and long speeches on this very important matter. The time is now at hand for some action, Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat that again. The time is now at hand for some action to bring the industry back at least, somewhat to what it was before the industry was effectively killed by the protestors. I said a moment ago, that I believe that most Newfoundlanders, most outport Newfoundlanders, especially people who are dependent upon the seal fishery have come to the conclusion that the time is now past for talk and we must take some action. Mr. Speaker, the seal hunt should never have been allowed to suffer the fate that it has suffered.

I still say, and Mr. Speaker, I have to agree today that has been one of the main reasons why our seal fishery is not working today as it was twenty years ago. Mr. Speaker, I say this in quotation marks, "I still say that the Government of Canada, the Government of the Province, and maybe our neighboring Atlantic Provinces should have taken a decision then to do what has to be done to ensure that the seal fishery would continue and those

do-gooders, whose motives I question, would never have been allowed to get away with what they got away with in this instance."

Mr. Speaker, the seal fishery is important to the District that I represent. In my District fishermen depend heavily on the seal fishery to supplement their income. I am told that the average small boat fishermen who keep close to the shore, those fishermen do not go very far off shore, it was not at all unusual for that fishermen to make \$2000 or \$3000 to supplement their income in the fishery. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleagues opposite, and I want to say this again and again, Mr. Speaker, that maybe there is too much politics, very famous words, Mr. Speaker, too much politics in the whole issue. Maybe that is one of the problems we are having, that there is too much politics.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to practice what I preach and not spend too long debating this motion, except to say that I would again ask the Member, to browbeat if he has to, to use whatever influence he has to on his colleagues, and it is considerable, I understand. I want to read the last paragraph, Mr. Speaker, because it is very important. Again I want to say that we support this resolution and we look to the Government to literally put their money where their mouth is and do what has to be done to take the necessary action to make sure that the seal fishery is reinstated, revitalized and that once again it will become an important social and economic factor in rural Newfoundland. All that was said by the Minister of Fisheries on February 26, 1987.

All those last words I said, Mr. Speaker, were identical, word for word, as said by the Minister of Fisheries when he sat over on this side. Hansard will give you copies, Mr. Speaker. I have it here and I just read word for word what the former Member who sat over here in the Opposition in 1987 said word for word.

I want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, those last words because it is very, very important. He said, I want to tell the Government to put their money where their mouth is and that is what the hon. Leader of the Opposition is saying today. He is saying to the Minister of Fisheries and to the Premier that now the shoe is on the other foot and put your money where your mouth is and do what the Minister of Fisheries said two years ago, it is no good to talk about it, the people out there are sick and tired of listening to politicians talking about it, let us put our money where our mouth is. The Premier was shaking his head earlier when I was reading some of those comments, he was almost disbelieving what I was saying, but once I told him it was said by his own Minister, the words of his own Minister when he sat on this side of the House, and now the Minister is in Cabinet and again it is fine and dandy for the present Minister of Fisheries when he was a backbencher on this side to say what he is going to do but in fact, Mr. Speaker, he cannot do it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to table some very important information. I called a while ago on the Provincial Government to at least harvest 6,000 seals in my District. Mr. Speaker, the Government themselves who own the fish plants and own the Government

retail stores there, who have managers who have been trained in the evaluation of seal skins, as they have been doing for years, could purchase the 6,000 seal skins as they could be used for the handicraft industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have statistics here that were given to me by the Federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, the hon. Bernard Valcourt, on the decline of the arctic char and salmon in my District. Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to note from 1986 to 1989 the harvest of salmon has gone from 126,396 pounds down to 87,021 pounds, a reduction of nearly 40,000 pounds. Char has gone from 126,506 pounds down to 86,519 pounds. Now Mr. Speaker, this decline does not at all have to do with the overfishing in the various Bays by the native people because if there are ever conservationists in the Province, people who would protect the fishery, it is the native people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the resolution as given by my hon. Leader of the Opposition, however, Mr. Speaker, all of this has occurred because of protestors. Our seal fishery was doomed because of the protestors.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to read a comment. The comment is from Patricia Grant, and my hon. colleague the Minister of Social Services will remember I read those comments two or three years ago in this House, but I am going to repeat them today. Here is what Patricia Grant, one of the animal rights welfare groups, one of those people who were out there to protect the animal welfare, said. I will quote what she said, 'We will not stop campaigning

until we have washed the blood from your hands. We are not asking for money. We are asking for mercy for the seals whose only crime is being born with a fur coat.' Mr. Speaker, that was a comment made by Patricia Grant of the World Animal Welfare Group.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to say and I will repeat what I said three years ago.

MR. PARSONS:

Is that the one who was here?

MR. WARREN:

I do not know my hon. colleague, but these are the comments she made three years ago. In fact, I quoted them on March 18, 1987 and I quote them again today. I will quote the same comments that I made on March 18, 1987. Mr. Speaker, to quote my comments again, I would say to my hon. colleagues here in the Legislature and to all of the people in Newfoundland and Labrador, I would like to say to Patricia Grant and to anybody else, that I will not stop campaigning for justice for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

I am asking for mercy, Mr. Speaker, for the people in my District and in everyone else's District, the only crime that those people in Newfoundland and Labrador have is that they were born into the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and have to earn a living by the sweat of their brow. That is the crime, Mr. Speaker, that the Newfoundland and Labrador people have to be guilty of.

Mr. Speaker, those people, Mark Small and his sealer's association, the native peoples in Labrador and the people throughout the Bays and Coves in Newfoundland and Labrador are crying for our help, they are crying for the help of the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, and they are crying for the help of all politicians in this Legislature. They are crying for the help of the politicians in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, and all they are doing is saying for God sake help us save our seal fisheries, help us to make a decent living, and that is the least this Government can do.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I can speak with some deal of feeling and emotion toward this issue. As all hon. Members will know I belong to and live on the Great Northern Peninsula, the part of this Province which was involved with the seal hunt more so than any other part of the Province, Mr. Speaker. For 500 years citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador every spring went out to the ice flows and they engaged in a very humane slaughter, they killed some seals, they took the fur, they took the skin, they took the meat, it was a part of their income, it was a part of their food, it was a part of their clothing. This was done for about 500 years in the history of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, back in the early 1970s I had just moved back to the Great Northern Peninsula after spending some ten years living in other parts of Canada and I can remember that faithful spring when the onslaught was made on the Newfoundland seal hunt. I can remember some of the downright schemery which went on. I can remember the way that the media was manipulated. I can remember the lies when people stood up and said with a straight face, bare faced, downright untruths, Mr. Speaker, I saw this take place in the early 1970s.

Let me give hon. Members one example of the biggest lie, the biggest deceit I suppose that was perpetrated upon a nation, upon the world and that example, Mr. Speaker, is when the famous international actress Brigitte Bardot came over to see firsthand the seal hunt. I am sure some hon. Members have seen the photograph where this fine actress is standing with a seal pup in her arms, and the caption to this picture is saying 'I managed to rescue one seal pup'. A very pretty white seal pup, a very attractive good looking lady put this propoganda to the world, 'I managed to save one pup.'

Mr. Speaker, let me tell hon. Members what actually took place. That famous world actress never, ever went to the ice. She never, ever was on a sealing ship. She went into Forteau over on the Labrador Coast. She went to one of the local houses over there and she was given a stuffed white coat, a white coat which was stuffed, the Grenfell Association did it for years. It was a souvenir, they used to stuffed those white coats. She took this stuffed white coat in her arms.

She was photographed and this was the picture. 'I managed to save one little white coat.' It did not stop there.

She went down to the local supermarket or she had someone go down and she brought several bottles of ketchup and she went around the harbour and they smashed this red ketchup all over the ice, and the photographers came in with their coloured films and they took pictures of Brigitte Bardot on the ice flows off Newfoundland and Labrador, saving one little baby seal. Now that is the kind of mentality, Mr. Speaker, that we are dealing with - people who do not mind lying, do not mind deceit, they killed and they destroyed an industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I love animals as much as anyone else on this planet today, as all of us. Newfoundlanders are known for the way we treat our animals. But I believe that in nature there has to be a balance otherwise the whole system will fail. It is natural for the bigger fish to swallow up the smaller fish. That is the way nature perpetuates itself. With the fish in the ocean today there are basically two main predators, one predator is man, the other predator is the seal. Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the predators must either be taken out of the chain or else both predators have got to cut back on their harvesting.

There is something revolting about man killing animals simply for the sake of killing. Man is going to kill his dogs or kill seals or kill any other animals, or even kill other men. There is something revolting about that. Kill for food, kill for clothing, or I suppose to kill to preserve

the balance of nature, there can be some place for that.

Now when the previous Speaker was up he talked about when this group of people - and I sat with them proudly - when we sat on the other side we talked about a seal harvesting industry, Mr. Speaker. We talked about a seal harvesting industry. We talked about putting our money where our mouths were. We talked about encouraging a seal harvest which would be internationally accepted, which would help address the balance in nature. We talked about a seal harvest.

Just a few days ago the hon. Minister of Fisheries was proud to get up and on behalf of this Administration announce that we are not content to sit and talk. We are not content to complain. But we are indeed committed to the same principals, the same beliefs that we held when we sat and stood on the other side of this House. We said that we were prepared to bring in, put in place the means whereby a seal harvesting industry could be started. We would take the first step. We have made available a subsidy so that now the meat - the seal meat - can be put to some use. Now I just forget the amounts. How much did we put in place? It was a considerable amount of money that we have put in place so that we can subsidize the harvesting of seal meat, Mr. Speaker. So it was in excess of \$200,000 in this year alone, and that goes to show that we are not prepared to sit back and allow our previous commitments, our previous promises to go to waste. We are prepared to do something about it, Mr. Speaker.

Now this motion which is before us

today is a motion which by and large I accept the tenor of. It has to be dressed up a little bit. There has to be a few minor changes - well that is understood. We cannot expect the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to do everything perfect. His record has not been all that great in the past. There is no reason why he should have done this to be a perfect motion. So it has to be dressed up. But generally speaking I accept the principal of what this motion is saying. But the thing that disturbs me about this particular motion, and it is broader than the seal hunt, it has far reaching implications that are even broader than the seal hunt. The thing that disturbs me about this motion is the way that local Tory's, the Members of the House of Assembly who sit on the other side try to divorce themselves from their cousins in Ottawa. Try to divorce themselves from their brothers and sisters in Ottawa. They try to divorce themselves from their own blood brothers in Ottawa. Now that is what they are trying to do with this motion, Mr. Speaker, and I am getting sick and tired of seeing people - Mr. Speaker, I am a Liberal, and I am proud to be a Liberal - and as long as I am a Liberal I am going to stand up and back up the things that my Party stands for. Now that is what it means to be a Liberal. And I would have more respect -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

-I would have more respect for Members on the other side of the House if they were prepared to say, 'I am a Tory and I am going to stand by Tory principals.' That, Mr. Speaker, is what

politics is all about. And I would have greater respect today for hon. Members if they were up supporting their buddies, their blood brothers in Ottawa, or else say point blank that they are going to divorce themselves from the Tory Party and you are going to be sitting as NDP's or whatever you will. Obviously, we do not want them over here, but let them sit as Independents, let them do their thing.

Now, there are several examples of this. The most obvious one, I suppose, is what has happened to the women's centres. The hon. Member for St. John's East, the hon. Member for Humber East - the other day I heard the hon. the Member for Humber East get up and lambaste Ottawa because they have taken away funding from the women's centres. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is like shooting yourself in the foot! Who is Brian Mulroney? Who is John Crosbie? John Crosbie is the Member for St. John's East. Brian Mulroney is the Member for Humber East. So when the women's centres are closed by the Government in Ottawa, the women's centres are closed by the PC Tory party of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker. That is what is happening and there is no way they can divorce themselves as long as they are Tories. It is as simple as that.

The Goods and Services Tax: The Goods and Services tax is probably going to be one of the worst things that could have happened to this Province in the last twenty-five years.

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

Cannot take it. Cannot take it!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

It is not that we cannot take it, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to make a brief point of order. I have heard the hon. Minister of Health in full flight before and he gives some great political speeches. Unfortunately, what we are debating here today is a very serious issue and a very serious matter. Members only have fifteen minutes or so to debate it. The hon. Minister probably only has five minutes left and he is talking about the GST, he is talking about women's centres, resolutions which we have debated in the past, by the way. The women's centres issue was passed with the total support of all Members in this Legislature just a few weeks ago, and the GST one, I suspect, we will be debating next week. I would like to ask the Minister if he would treat this matter seriously and talk about the sealing issue. That is the important matter. He is obviously being irrelevant to the debate, and that is my reason for the point of order, Mr. Speaker, relevancy!

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am working up to who is responsible, and I am using illustrations. One illustration is what Members opposite have done with the women's centres. The other illustration is the Goods and Services Tax and what Members opposite have done. Not Brian Mulroney, not John Crosbie, but Members who sit over there. They are the ones who are keeping their friends, their blood brothers, their cousins, their kissing cousins in Ottawa. The health and education transfers, which were so brutally taken away from us this year by their Tory brothers and sisters and cousins in Ottawa, it was the Tory Government -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am leading up to it to explain that when Members opposite are trying to somehow shift the blame and responsibility for the fishery to this Legislature, they are indeed talking and trying to back up their friends in Ottawa who are causing this. I would suggest to hon. Members that the proper way for them to deal with this issue is the way we would deal with it if we had a Liberal Government in Ottawa; it would be a phone call between friends, a phone call between brothers and sisters, a phone call among cousins. That is the way this should happen.

So, if this Private Member's Resolution was really serious, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition

would have been standing up in this House and announcing on behalf of the Tory Government which he supports, the Tory Government which he is trying his best to keep in power, the Tory Government which he helped put in power and campaigned for in the last election - Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, with this motion, is going about it all wrong. I agree with the principle of the motion, but I do not agree with the silliness they get on with when they talk as if they were a party which existed unto itself; they have no relatives in Ottawa, no relatives anywhere else. I am not going to sit idly by and allow them to go on with this nonsense. Because like it or lump it, and I want the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to know, I want the fishermen to know, I want them to know up on the Northern Peninsula and down on the Burin Peninsula, throughout this land, I want them to know that this is Tory policy, this is the essence of Tory policy.

Mr. Speaker, if somehow a revitalized seal hunt could do something for the big businesses in this country, how fast would you see their cousins in Ottawa running with it and having the big businesses run those advertisements, as they did during the last election? So there is no way Members opposite can slide, slither or sliver out from under the responsibility they have, because they are responsible for defeating the seal hunt. They can try to make all the political points they want, but Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are not going to swallow that nonsense anymore. It is hon. Members over there who are helping keep the seal fishery dead and let us not lose sight of that fact.

As I said when I began this debate, I agree with the principle. There is a little bit of dressing up we have to do, so I am going to move, seconded by my colleague from the Great Northern Peninsula, the hon. the Minister of Development, that the motion be amended by deleting all words including and following: 'AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED'. Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I am doing this is there are really two motions there. I suppose another way would have been to split the motion, but I am choosing to go with an amendment. I refer Members to Beauchesne, page 184, Paragraph 598, which says: 'No cases can be found of any private Member receiving the authority of the Crown to propose a bill or motion involving either the expenditure of public money or an increase in taxation.' I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition would not want to see that happen, so I am doing him a favour and amending this motion. Also, Mr. Speaker, on page 364 of Beauchesne

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are out of order.

MR. SIMMS:

What was the first one?

MR. DECKER:

Page 184, Paragraph 598. The other one is page 364, recommendation 79 (1), Standing Orders of the House of Commons: 'This House shall not adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to the House by a message from the Governor General in the session' - in our case, it would be the Lieutenant-Governor -

'in which such vote, resolution, address or bill is proposed.'

Mr. Speaker, apart from that little bit of dressing up, which was very, very appropriate, and I am not the least bit surprised at the hon. the Leader of the Opposition because, looking at his batting average, he has not been batting all that well right from the time he decided to call the last election. I am helping him so that we can vote over here, to have the motion amended and put some sanity and put some reason in it. But I do not want to leave this debate without reiterating, without making it perfectly clear to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Sit down!

MR. DECKER:

Time flies so fast when you are having fun.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader on a point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would say that the amendment proposed by the hon. Member is absolutely and totally out of order. The references he gave to you are so silly and ridiculous it is not even funny. The second reference he gave you is an appendix to Beauchesne. It has nothing to do with Beauchesne at all.

Let me just give Your Honour two or three parliamentary references from Beauchesne's Fifth Edition. They are in the Sixth Edition as well. I am not sure of the page there, but I will read from the Fifth Edition. It has not changed, and it is dealing with amendments. 'A motion may be amended by leaving out certain words' - certain words, not the entire resolve. That is Paragraph 428, page 153, in the Fifth Edition.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps the most telling reference for Your Honour, which, Your Honour, will probably be the only one you will need, is that 'an amendment which proposes a direct negative' - which this obviously does, because it takes away from the intent of the resolution entirely - 'though it may be covered up by verbiage is out of order.' But here is the most telling one. Mr. Speaker, that was Paragraph 436. Paragraph 436 (2) is the telling one and it is in the Fifth Edition, Page 155: 'An amendment which would produce the same result as if the original motion were simply negated is out of order.' Obviously, Mr. Speaker, this particular part of the resolution if voted against would be negated, therefore, this particular amendment, which would try to do the same thing, would be totally out of order. And I would submit that the amendment is far, far from in order, and Your Honour might want to take a minute to check it out. But I think you would be setting a dangerous precedent to allow such an amendment to be pursued.

MR. BAKER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader on a point of order.

MR. BAKER:

Obviously the amendment is in order. It has been our practice many, many times, in the five years I have been in this House, to have amendments which delete sections of motions.

MR. SIMMS:

Not if you could (inaudible).

MR. BAKER:

It is quite obvious the amendment is in order. By deleting certain words as outlined by my friend the hon. Member for the Strait of Belle Isle, it does not negate the original motion at all, Mr. Speaker. It is very obvious that by condemning the dastardly act by the Federal Government, we are not negating that by not having in that 'AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED.' We are still doing that, and that is the main resolution. It is obviously the main resolution because of the way the Opposition Leader presented his motion, because his resolution is the one we want to remain in there. And then 'BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,' that is the afterthought. So the main resolution we want to be there.

And the next point, Mr. Speaker, is obviously that these are two entirely separate issues, one not related to the other. And it is very, very possible for Members to have strong feelings about one on one side and equally strong feelings about the other part on the other side, so it is a motion that is impossible, Mr. Speaker, to vote on. So we are only tidying up the motion for Members opposite, and we are making sure that when a vote is taken in this House, that it is very obvious

what we are in fact voting on.

I would also like to refer to what the Opposition House Leader said about the reasons given by the hon. Member for the Strait of Belle Isle. He indicated that, in fact, a private Member, through constitutional custom, cannot make a motion or resolution in the House, and it is unacceptable, which deals with the expenditure of public money, that the only way this can be done in the democratic parliamentary system is through order of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, by order from the Lieutenant-Governor. This is how these matters are handled in a democratic society. The Member simply pointed this out, two distinct references. Our Standing Orders are silent on the matter. There are two distinct references from Beauchesne which indicate that this type of motion, whether it comes before the House or not, is certainly not acceptable to be voted on in the House of Commons for that very reason.

So we are simply, Mr. Speaker, increasing the acceptability of the motion by deleting a part that is in fact, as the hon. Member pointed out, quite unacceptable. I would quote for Your Honour Beauchesne, paragraph 567, which indicates: 'The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability...' and that is precisely what we are doing, we are increasing the acceptability to the House.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that the amendment is in order, and I await Your Honour's decision.

MR. SIMMS:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader, to the point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

One final submission to Your Honour. Obviously the Government is trying to play some little game or some little trick here. The Government can simply vote against the resolution, Mr. Speaker, and it would produce the same results. That is why 436 (2) is in there. If that can be done by simply voting against the resolution, then an amendment that does the same thing is out of order. That is what that says and that is what it is there for. So that is clear-cut and dry.

Now, this particular Government, of course, has shown on occasion where it may often disagree with Your Honour's ruling anyway and simply, if they do not like what Your Honour's ruling may be, challenge the ruling and they will have their own way. What they are doing here, unfortunately, is wasting the time of the House with more silliness and chicanery. That is all they are doing. They are not dealing with that last speaker from the Government's side who hardly talked about the sealing issue, a matter of extreme importance to the people of this Province. There is only ten or fifteen minutes left for the next speaker now, because the motion must conclude by 3:40 p.m., with the closing arguments by the mover. I just think this is a shameful act on behalf of the Government. There are lots of references there which indicate that this is not relevant, not in order.

We can simply come up and propose a subamendment which would offer an alternative to the amendment

they proposed, which was to delete, but, I mean, who wants to get into all of that? If they do not want to support the resolution, then be men and women enough to vote against it. That is all you have to do.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, the Government's position is very clear. We want to support the resolution. We want to deplore the decision of the Government of Canada not to offer price support for the seal hunt this year. We think their position is deplorable and we want this House to say so with a unanimous voice. By tacking on the second part of the resolution, the Opposition makes it impossible because we cannot accept that proposition from them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

PREMIER WELLS:

The President of the Council made the point very clearly. The purpose of this amendment is to make the basic motion acceptable so the Whole House can endorse it and support it, as we would. We will do that, when you remove that part. And I do not mind if they agree to vote on that separately. I have no quarrel with that. An amendment has the same effect. I do not mind if they want to propose that resolution separately. We will debate it. We will vote on it separately, because it is entirely a separate question.

We, Mr. Speaker, endorse totally deploring the decision of the Government of Canada not to offer price support in the seal hunt this year, and we want to vote in favor of so deploring the action of the Government of Canada. But we cannot support the additional part they tacked on, which they do with all their resolutions, to try and put the Government in a position where it has to vote against the whole resolution.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to vote against something that we support. What we are going to do is delete the part that is unacceptable and then we are going to vote for the part that we support. Now that is the thrust of the amendment. So, there are no gains or anything. The purpose of it is, in accordance with Beaulieu, paragraph 567, 'the object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability.' Now, what we are doing is modifying it in such a way as to increase the acceptability. That is precisely what we intend to do, and it is, of course, Mr. Speaker totally in order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will tell the Premier, Mr. Speaker, what he is going to do, and that is he is going to follow the ruling of Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker will decide whether or not the proposed amendment is in order or it is not. We have argued that it is not. The Government have argued that it is. It is not for the Premier to get up and tell

this House, 'I will tell you what we are going to do, Mr. Speaker.' That is not what is going to happen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

If the Government had any honour at all, it would vote on this resolution, it would support it. But if it does not want to, let it vote against it and next Private Member's Day, Mr. Speaker, bring in whatever kind of resolution they want to. That is what the Government would do and should do, but the Premier is trying to take this House on his back, as he has been doing ever since this Session opened.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just very briefly, I think the point that is being missed here, Mr. Speaker, is the purpose of taking a vote in the House of Assembly. The reason for motions and the reason for making a decision by motion in a democratic parliament, obviously, is to put a clear proposition to the people elected, representing the people of the Province, and allow them to vote on that clear issue so that everybody knows what they are voting on. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is obviously the purpose of this Assembly. This purpose is thwarted when a resolution or a motion is put that includes two things which are separate from each other, and where it would be possible for individuals to feel

very strongly in favor of the one matter and very strongly against the other matter.

MR. TOBIN:

This is terrible, Mr. Speaker. This is terrible!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who do you think you are, God?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BAKER:

I am pointing out what this Assembly is for, the normal accepted purpose of a democratic Assembly. That is exactly what it is. It is not for playing games, it is for making decisions, and I am sure some Members opposite know exactly what I am talking about.

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, which I believe is in order, makes it easy for Members to vote on a clear proposition, a clear proposal, and that is all we are doing. I believe resolutions should not be put before the floor of this House which have double meanings and double-barrels to them. I believe that whenever that happens, as happens in Ottawa whenever there is a double-barreled effect of one resolution, it is automatically separated into two so that a clear decision can be made on the intent of the resolution. In this case, it may have been acceptable to split it. There are two separate things; we could have had two separate votes. But since that was not possible, the only other alternative is to make it acceptable to vote on; it cannot be voted on in the form it is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The Chair will hear one submission.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

I have offered two or three parliamentary references for Your Honour already, and I will offer him a couple more. All Members opposite have done is argue we should not do this or we should not do that, but they have not given Your Honour much help in terms of providing parliamentary references. Again, let me refer Your Honour to the 6th Edition of Beauchesne, Page 176. Paragraph 579 is the first one I will read for you, it is very short, then I will read the one which I think will tell the tale. Paragraph 579 (2), and this is where I would argue that this is a new question. What they are proposing is an entirely new question from what we proposed in the main resolution. 'An amendment may not raise a new question which can only be considered as a distinct motion after proper notice has been given.' What they are proposing in their amendment is a new question. But, if they do not like that one, then maybe this one will hit home, Mr. Speaker, and I will conclude with this: Paragraph 578, Subsection (3) 'An amendment approving part of a motion and disapproving the remainder is out of order.'

Mr. Speaker, nothing more needs to be said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The Chair has heard enough arguments on this matter. I will

recess for a few minutes to get some advice from the Table Officers on this amendment.

Recess

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

In ruling on the amendment put forth by the hon. the Minister of Health, the Chair has considered the arguments put forward by both sides of the House. The argument that the amendment would negate the motion, certainly it does not do that. Section 567 of Beauchesne says, 'The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability...' That certainly is the case here. And it is certainly under Section 578, 'An amendment approving part of a motion and disapproving the remainder is out of order.' It does in no way approve part of the motion and disapprove the remaining part. I rule the amendment is in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. PARSONS:

I move the following sub-amendment, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Member for Grand Falls: Be It Resolved that this House calls upon the Government of Newfoundland to immediately provide whatever necessary financial assistance is requested by the Sealers Association in order to allow them to continue its efforts to revitalize the seal hunt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

A good amendment. Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

What do I do, sit down now?

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is out of order.

MR. MATTHEWS:

It does not matter if you say it is out of order. It is up to the Speaker to rule on that.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

It is in order. Carry on!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

May I have a copy of that sub-amendment?

MR. PARSONS:

I hope you can read my handwriting.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair will again recess briefly to check on the validity of this.

Recess

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The Chair has ruled that the sub-amendment is out of order because it negates the amendment and under Beauchesne, 578 (2) 'An amendment which would produce the same results as if the original motion were simply negated is out of order.'

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, unlike the Government when we do not necessarily like Your Honour's ruling we are not going to challenge it.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to compliment my colleague from St. John's East Extern who tried so hard to get involved in this debate but because of the political or the parliamentary trickery of the Government, the Government House Leader, and the Premier and so on, his time obviously was taken away from him, Mr. Speaker.

In addition to that, of course, I have five, six, seven minutes or whatever is left on the clock to wind up debate on this particular resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this. What we have seen here today on an issue so important to Newfoundland and Labrador is unbelievable. The Government has done nothing here today except try to take itself off the hook so that it can partake in casting a vote for a resolution, that in the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, means nothing. That is exactly what the effect of the amendment has been. It will mean nothing for the seal hunt in Newfoundland and Labrador that the Government, the trained hoods and harps on the other side, can get up and vote for a resolution that has been watered down and has no meaning, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

So, Mr. Speaker, let the word go out to every sealer in Newfoundland and Labrador today wherever they are, along the northeast coast of Newfoundland

and Labrador, that this Provincial Government, as they have been doing consistently, Mr. Speaker, on every issue related to the fishery in any aspect in Newfoundland and Labrador has no backbone. They do not intend to support it, Mr. Speaker. All they intend to do is take every chance they get to try and lay the blame on somebody else. That is exactly what they have done here, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I would if I could, but I cannot. The great speech of the Premier as the crowd from Grand Bank backed him into the elevators. He was not long changing his mind when he got up to the eighth floor, eight hours later.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this as well. This Government are the people who support this Government, when they were over here in Opposition in the days when the Trudeaucrats and Trudeauites were trying to screw Newfoundland into the ground, Mr. Speaker, not one of them had the political fortitude to stand up and take on their own political cousins. Not one of them, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Not the Minister of Health, not the Minister of Development, not the Minister of Fisheries, not any of them who were over here at that time. All they would do, Mr. Speaker, was stand and ring their hands and say, 'How are we going to get out of this political mess

today.' The difference between us, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House and the people on that side of the House is that when the interest of Newfoundland and Labrador dictates it and demands it, no political party will stand in our way, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
The same vision, Mr. Speaker, the same tenacity, the same vision permeates everything that this Government is doing today in terms of constitutional procedures and constitutional amendments. If the old man, if the old mentor, if the old godfather, if god himself, Trudeau, says it is right, then it is good enough for me, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, we did not say it. The Minister of Health today when he began the first procedure to scuttle this motion said everything that I just said, Mr. Speaker. He said it in spades. They were not prepared, they are not prepared, they will never be prepared to put Newfoundland and Labrador first at the expense of their political cousins in their own party in Ottawa. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the difference between them and us and that difference will remain forever and a day, I would say to the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, a couple of things gave me a bit of joy in my political career. Twice as a

matter of fact I was able to show the hon. the Minister of Health what it is like to get the boot, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

And one of those days when a man, Mr. Speaker, representing a rural Newfoundland constituency -

MR. DECKER:

You were one were you not?

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is right. Not ashamed to admit it, nor is the Minister of Health I assume. As a matter of fact -

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The Minister of Fisheries.

- Mr. Speaker, in the 1982 campaign when I buried the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

- and including his own side of the bay, Mr. Speaker, he was going around campaigning on my side of the bay saying elect me and I will be with Brian Peckford almost as quick as the hon. gentleman for Fortune - Hermitage, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is what he was going around telling them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate part about this today is that all the Government is interested in is trying to give the perception that they are saving their political hide. There is no principle involved, Mr. Speaker. There is no great feeling for building an industry in Newfoundland and Labrador that has been here for centuries. There is no feeling of bringing back to rural Newfoundland and Labrador an opportunity to make a living from the seal fishery. That is not their concern, Mr. Speaker. Their concern is to try to somehow or other disassociate themselves from the guts of this resolution and thereby try to save their political hide, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

So every fisherman out there, Mr. Speaker, who is dependent on the seal fishery to earn part of their living will know that we deplore and we condemn and we can curse on the attitude of the Government in Ottawa, but this crowd is as equally as guilty, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

The Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, shakes his head. The last time the Minister of Finance shook his head was when there was a resolution passed by the PC Party to fling him out of the party, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

I know about politicians leaving parties, voluntarily getting out, but I do not know of anybody, Mr. Speaker, who was involuntarily flung out except the Minister of Finance.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Booted out!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Booted out!

Now, Mr. Speaker, and thank God you can have him after the job that he has done on the Budget, Mr. Speaker, the Premier can have him and welcome to him. After the job that he has done on dividing one part of Canada against the other, Mr. Speaker. The Premier can have him and welcome to him. But the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that this Government does not have the courage of its own convictions to support this resolution and all they want to do is save their own political neck, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the House ready for the question?

All those in favour of the amendment 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

'Nay'.

MR. SPEAKER:

In my opinion the 'aye's' have it.

All those in favour of the resolution as amended, 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against, 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

'Nay'.

MR. SPEAKER:

In my opinion the 'aye's' have it.

At 5:00 this House stands adjourned until tomorrow Thursday at 2:00 p.m.

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Just before we conclude, Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader asked me to announce that Municipal and Provincial Affairs Committee meeting is cancelled tonight and will be done Monday night in the House of Assembly. And that is by agreement of both sides if the hon. Opposition House Leader wants to verify that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I spoke to the Government House Leader and it would require leave or agreement, and of course, we are prepared to agree because our Committee Members would like it that way. But I presume then that tonight there are no meetings at all.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right.

MR. SIMMS:

And I gather there are two meetings tomorrow night, Justice

and Environment. Those are the last two.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday at 2:00 p.m.