



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 2

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Monday

[Preliminary Transcript]

12 March 1990

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
Order, please!

On behalf of hon. Members I would like to welcome to the Speaker's gallery today the Consul General of Israel, Chalmon Schirman. Mr. Schirman is based in Montreal and the jurisdiction of his office includes Quebec and the four Atlantic Provinces.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Also accompanying Mr. Schirman today in the Speaker's gallery are the President of The Hebrew Congregation of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Sydney Epstein, and also the Vice-President and Treasurer of the Hebrew Congregation Dr. Michael Paul.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might take a moment of the time of the House to extend congratulations to a personal friend of mine who has attained a rather significant accomplishment. I refer to Reverend Edward Marsh who is at the present time Rector of Holy Trinity Church in Grand Falls. On March 3 Reverend Marsh was elected Bishop of the Anglican Central Newfoundland Diocese. Reverend Marsh will now be responsible for the parishes located in the area from Grand

Bank to Buchans. He will be replacing Bishop Mark Genge who will be retiring, I understand, the end of July.

Reverend Marsh is a Grand Falls native. He has spent thirty years serving various parishes throughout the Province and indeed in Labrador as well. I would like to ask Your Honour if you would send a letter of congratulations and best wishes to Reverend Marsh and his wife and three children.

I will tell the House I had a brief conversation with the Bishop Elect just a couple of days ago and congratulated him. He pointed out to me one sad disappointment in that the Diocese Office is located in Gander and he will probably have to move to Gander. So I thought perhaps he might be able to use his influence to move the Diocese Office from Gander to Grand Falls, but I do not think that is likely to happen.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if such a letter of commendation is sent.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you Mr. Speaker. On this side of the House we would like to associate ourselves with the remarks made by the Member from Grand Falls. Bishop Mark Genge has filled that office for many years and filled it very well. In Gander we never use his last name - everybody calls him Bishop Mark, and he has done a tremendous job. I would also like to suggest that perhaps we can add to that a letter for Bishop Mark wishing him well in his future endeavors and hoping that he will have a very

enjoyable retirement, if in fact that is what he is going to do. I am sure that Bishop Elect Marsh will find that the work is very, very challenging and I wish him the best of luck in his career. I welcome him to Gander.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, at the same time if you would allow me a minute, Sir, I would like to ask you to send deepest sympathy to the family of Mrs. Alice Perrault in Happy Valley, Goose Bay. I should say that Mrs. Perrault was one of the three families that started the Town of Happy Valley in the 1940's along with Mr. Goudie's family and the Saunders. And on March 3rd, Mrs. Perrault at the age of 94, passed away. She was responsible for the Girl Guide movement in the Town of Happy Valley at the time also, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask the House to send condolences to her two sons, Walter and Ronald.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We on this side of the House would certainly want to be associated with the sentiments raised by the Member from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and reiterate everything that the Member has said about a great lady who has passed on. Her contributions are immeasurable in our Town of Happy Valley, Goose Bay, and indeed all throughout Labrador. We happily associate ourselves under those sad circumstances.

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the Hibernia Negotiations have been the subject of considerable interest among members of the general public and the news media. Accordingly, I believe it would be appropriate to inform Honourable Members of the status of these negotiations at the present time.

Honourable Members may recall that in September past a meeting was held which was attended by the heads of the four Hibernia Companies along with the Federal and Provincial Ministers involved.

At that meeting which I attended along with the Honourable Dr. Gibbons, a new schedule was agreed to for the balance of the Hibernia negotiations. That schedule contemplated the conclusion of the negotiations in time for formal signing ceremonies of the legally binding agreements by June of 1990. I undertook publicly at the time to ensure that the people of Newfoundland were kept up-to-date as to the progress of negotiations and the extent to which we were meeting the various components of that schedule.

In December past I informed the House that considerable progress had been made in all areas of the negotiations, although the specific work plan agreed to in September by Ministers and Chief Executive Officers had fallen behind somewhat in certain areas. However at that stage it was the view of all parties to the negotiations that sufficient time

remained to still conclude the process by mid-1990.

Since December the Hibernia Negotiations have remained an important area of activity for Government and our negotiators. Meetings are ongoing continually among the various groups responsible for the negotiations in such areas as tax, royalty, finance issues, industrial benefits and legal issues. Since December, considerable progress has been made in all of these areas. Because some areas of the negotiations had fallen behind the September schedule, a revised detailed negotiating schedule has been developed and agreed to by the parties. This revised negotiating schedule still contemplates the satisfactory conclusion of the legal agreements before the end of June of this year. If we are able to meet that schedule it is important to resolve the remaining substantial issues within the next several weeks. If we fail to do that we will be unable to meet the mid-year deadline.

From the Province's perspective, the key element in the negotiations at this point in time is the subject of industrial benefits. The Statement of Principles signed in July 1988 required the Oil Companies to assemble and outfit the main support frame in the Come By Chance area of Newfoundland. This element of work represented a key industrial benefit for Newfoundland, both in terms of the amount of work it represented and the high quality of that work. Because of a design change, the details of which have already been made public, no main support frame will be utilized in the project configuration that is now

envisaged by the Companies. The negotiation of a benefits package to replace the main support frame work is the major focus of our efforts at the current time.

The Province remains committed to the satisfactory and timely conclusion of the Hibernia Fiscal Negotiations, provided that Newfoundland's benefits objectives, and the other commitments contained in the Statement of Principles are fully met by all parties. While it may not be appropriate to publicly discuss actual details of our negotiating positions, it is my intention to keep the House and general public aware of the general status of negotiations from time to time.

The Hibernia negotiations are complex and continue to represent a major challenge to all the participants. However, we are continuing to make significant progress.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, let me thank the Premier for providing us with a copy of his statement shortly before the House opened.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Premier on behalf of my colleagues that we wish the Government every success on behalf of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians in negotiating an industrial package that will be to the utmost benefit of the people of this Province. We all share

that common goal and we wish the Government every success in doing that - an industrial benefits package that is totally consistent with the provisions of the statement of principles that was signed a year and a half or so ago.

Mr. Speaker, having said that I believe that perhaps the most important line in this Ministerial Statement delivered by the Premier is on page two and I quote: "If we fail to do that we will be unable to meet the mid-year deadline." I am very much afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier and the Government are setting the foundation in this particular statement, as well as other statements that have been made over the last several days, perhaps trying to get the public to be lulled into expecting that the deal may not be completed by the middle of June.

I have indicated in this House - and people laughed on Thursday, Mr. Speaker - that there were indications from the business community in this Province that gives one the feeling that perhaps the Government is not as confident today as they were several weeks ago about being able to come to a conclusion on this particular issue by the middle of June.

Mr. Speaker, if Newfoundland and Labrador ever needed the Hibernia Project we need it now. This Province is facing economic catastrophe, economic disaster, and politics aside we hope that the Government can deliver for the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, a number of serious and life-threatening fires in the older section of St. John's this winter were fought by members of the St. John's Fire Department under the most adverse conditions imaginable - conditions that made it extremely uncomfortable and unpleasant even to be outside for more than a few moments at a time. Trying to contain a fire is difficult at any time and much, much worse when faced with horrendous conditions, including bitterly cold temperatures and in the midst of blinding snowstorms.

I know in one particular instance this winter when, after containing a fire, the firemen returned to their respective stations with blistered hands and suffered from fatigue, frostbite, smoke inhalation and hypothermia. A few were even worse, including one man who was hospitalized after sustaining varying degrees of burns. With little or no regard for their own safety and at the height of the fires, these men entered the smoke-filled dwellings and successfully managed to rescue victims who were trapped inside by flames and smoke. In another case, it was necessary for a fireman to go back inside and assist in the rescue of his partner when, after entering the building, he became overcome by smoke and because of the darkness was unable to locate an exit. As Minister with responsibilities for fire protection, I would like these firefighters to know, that we are very cognizant of their valiant efforts and that we appreciate the valuable service which they continue to provide on

our behalf. I know that similar comments apply to fire fighters all throughout the Province, including the 6,000 volunteer firemen, who make themselves available 24 hours a day for the safety and protection of life and property. I believe I speak for all Members of the House of Assembly, in extending to firefighters our sincere appreciation for these acts of bravery and for this most commendable work on the part of all citizens of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker we on this side of the House would like to certainly associate ourselves with the comments of the Minister regarding the firefighters in this Province. We all recognize the tremendous contribution they have made to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, both the paid firefighters, and indeed, the volunteer firefighters throughout our Province. There is no doubt that their contribution to our society has made Newfoundland a very safe and good place to live. As the Minister was speaking, one realized that presently we have a firefighter who is now in hospital, who received severe burns during a recent fire. I know, Mr. Speaker, that our caucus have already sent the fireman in question our good wishes and, probably, it is appropriate at this time, to ask the House, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all Members, if they would send to Mr. Jarvis, the best wishes from the Members of the House of

Assembly.

MR. DICKS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. DICKS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Monday, March 12th, 1990, I was advised that as a result of a decision by the Provincial Court of Newfoundland at St. John's, no assistance would be offered by court staff to applicants requesting peace bonds. This resulted from a court decision that staff should not prepare the documents on behalf of an applicant. Section 810 of the Criminal Code of Canada provides that where a person fears that another person will cause personal injury to that person, their spouse or child, or will damage property, he or she may lay an Information before a Justice of the Peace. The Justice who receives that Information can cause the parties to appear before him or her, or before a summary conviction court, which has jurisdiction in the same territorial division.

At that hearing the Justice or Provincial Court Judge may order that the defendant enter into a recognizance, with or without sureties, to keep the peace and be of good behaviour for a period not exceeding twelve months and comply with such other reasonable conditions considered desirable by the Court for securing good conduct of the defendant. Breach of the peace bond can lead to a term of imprisonment up to one year.

After review of the decision taken within the Provincial Court I have

issued instructions that the Clerks of all Provincial Courts assist applicants to complete the necessary documentation to apply for a peace bond. Copies of standard forms for application will be placed in all courts on an urgent basis. The peace bond mechanism is, in my view, a viable and necessary element in Government's ongoing effort to reduce the level of family violence.

The Provincial Court of Newfoundland at St. John's will, as of Tuesday, March 13, 1990, assist applicants in preparing the necessary documentations to apply for bonds.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On behalf of the Opposition I would say that the swift action on the part of the Justice Minister (Mr. Dicks) to respond to this worrying interruption in the administration of the Criminal Law is welcomed. I would think more than this is in order. It is incumbent upon the Minister and his staff to monitor developments at the St. John's Provincial Court and the other Provincial Courts around the Province to make sure that administration of the peace bond provisions of the Criminal Code is resumed and is carried out efficiently.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Criminal Code peace bond provision is not nearly enough to combat the widespread problems of wife battering and child abuse that plague our nation and our Province today. The Justice Minister has before him a recommendation that is more than a year old, a recommendation that was on his desk when he assumed the portfolio last May, that the Department initiated a Victim Court Worker Program, all the preparatory work was done. I call upon the Minister and his colleagues in the Government to act immediately to bring in the Court Worker Program. Right now our publicly funded Criminal Justice System provides advocates and legal representatives for accused people. We have extensive publicly funded programs for offenders but, yet, we are doing nothing in a formal, regular way to provide assistance for victims.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I would call upon the Minister and his colleagues to give adequate operating funding to the three transition houses for battered women and children, and to fund the establishment of new transition houses in Labrador West and Gander, where need has been documented.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, before I finish it has been brought to my attention that once again, at the start of this new Session, the Member for Placentia (Mr. Hogan) is making sexist noises as I speak on a very serious and tragic subject.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shameful!

MS VERGE:

I would ask Your Honour's

protection, to rule out of order future sexist noises by the member for Placentia and his colleagues in the far corner of this Assembly.

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) meowing, and stuff like that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order the Chair did not hear any remarks, but the Chair will look into it. I think that has been raised before. I certainly want to dismiss with that and point out to all hon. members that that is not permitted. The Chair did not hear any noises whatsoever, but the matter will be looked into.

Oral Questions

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the Throne Speech delivered in the House on Thursday the Government indicated, quite clearly, its firm intention to bring in a resolution to rescind this Legislature's approval for the Meech Lake Accord.

Mr. Speaker, as well, the Premier has given, I think it is fair to say, the impression that such action by this House would be normal parliamentary procedure, that there was nothing precedent-setting about this particular intention on behalf of

the Government. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier to articulate for the House, clearly and precisely, examples of similar situations taken by other jurisdictions in Canada. In other words, has any other jurisdiction in Canada ever given its approval to a constitutional amendment, or a constitutional process, and then rescinded that approval at a later date?

MR. SIMMS:

Good question!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

To this kind of specific the answer is no, to another one the answer is yes. It was done by the Province of Quebec in the case of the Victoria Formula in the discussions when approval was given to it and subsequently withdrawn by the Government of Quebec. Since 1982, when the amendment was put in place that created an amending procedure exercisable within Canada - that was implemented in 1982 - this is the first general amendment subsequent to that procedure. That procedure that was put in place contains a section, Section number 46, Subsection (2), that specifically provides that in the event that a Legislature passes a motion or a resolution to approve of an amendment, the legislature that does so can withdraw that at any time prior to the implementation of the amendment.

Now, as this is the first occasion on which that amending procedure has been exercised, there is no prior occasion when this actual action under Section 42 has ever been exercised, because it only came into effect in 1982, and this

is the first general amendment since that time. But prior to 1982 there was agreement signed in Victoria to an amending formula which the Province of Quebec subsequently withdrew from.

MR. SIMMS:

Did they pass it in their legislature?

AN HON. MEMBER:

I believe (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

They did not pass it in their legislature.

MR. RIDEOUT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Misleading again.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I just want to point out to hon. Members again that the Chair has difficulty in recognizing two Members. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition is asking a question, and for other Members to ask questions is just taking his time.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier knows that the Victoria formula was never submitted to the House of Commons or any legislature in Canada and, therefore, he has confirmed that this is precedent-setting in nature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Merrill Lynch has publicly indicated that an

independent Quebec would be a viable economic unit, and in view of the fact that should Quebec separate certainly Canada as we know it today would be fractured, could the Premier tell the House whether or not he or the Government has commissioned any studies to look at the negative economic impact on Newfoundland and Labrador should Quebec, in fact, separate from Canada?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

I do not know. I dare say we might get \$500 million a year out of the electricity, because we could redirect that for use in Newfoundland. That might be a good place to start.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

You gave it away, sure.

PREMIER WELLS:

You asked the question. Do not get upset at the answers.

MR. TOBIN:

Why did you give it away?

PREMIER WELLS:

You asked the question. You got the answers and you do not like them. Do not get upset at them.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to allow the political and economic future of this Province to be dictated by an over-the-telephone opinion given by Merrill Lynch in New York. We are going to decide the position we take in establishing the basis for the future of this Province and its participation as a full participating Province of Canada,

and its opportunity to have a sound economy and build a fair and equitable economy all across this country on the basis of what is right in constitutional terms, not on the basis of some off-the-top-of-his-head opinion given by a commentator from Merrill Lynch in New York.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, it is strange that a telephone conversation regarding countervail possibilities for assistance to F.P.I. and NatSea was good enough for the Premier, but it was not good coming from Merrill Lynch.

Mr. Speaker, could the Premier tell the House what constitutional safeguards, if any, this Government has to ensure that the Parliament of Canada will not introduce a resolution to rescind that legislature's approval for the Atlantic Accord. Does the Premier have any constitutional safeguards in that respect?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

There are no constitutional safeguards in place for the Atlantic Accord because the former Government was unable to get it put in place. It was just a show. The former Government put the Atlantic Accord in place and did absolutely nothing about giving it any constitutional protection.

Now, Mr. Speaker, whether or not there is ever any constitutional entrenchment of the Atlantic Accord will be determined on the

basis of what the Federal Parliament and the other provinces agree or do not agree to do. Obviously the former Government could not achieve it - they would not agree to it, so far as I know - or presumably they would not have been so negligent as not to do it. But, in any event, they failed to do it.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask the Premier a question on the Meech Lake Accord, as well. Obviously the Premier has very, very strong views on the Meech Lake Accord. I would like to know if the Premier believes that Newfoundland and Labrador alone has the legal power to block the Meech Lake Accord.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Technical legal power, yes. Political or moral right to do so, no.

I have indicated clearly in answer to the question asked by others in the Mainland media, what would the Newfoundland Government do if every other legislature in this country approved of the Meech Lake Accord? I have given a steady, consistent answer from the beginning. In that situation I would say to the Prime Minister, Prime Minister, I do not believe. I am confident that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador do not want this Accord. And I do not

believe the majority of the people of Canada want it. But, Prime Minister, you hold a national referendum and if the majority of the people of Canada want the Meech Lake Accord, then, Prime Minister, in that circumstance, if you get a positive approval from the majority of the people of Canada, I would go to the Legislature and ask for their approval of the Meech Lake Accord, even though I disagree with it. If they refused, I would resign as Premier and recommend to the Prime Minister that they proceed with the approval of the Meech Lake Accord without Newfoundland's approval.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have another question for the Premier.

Public opinion polls show that the vast majority of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians do not understand the Meech Lake Accord, let alone the Premier's alternative to the Meech Lake Accord. The Premier's self-proclaimed legal expertise has been found wanting on Bill 53, which virtually everyone in the Province does understand, and, therefore, possibly with education and awareness people in the Province will discover that on the Meech Lake Accord, the same as on Bill 53, the Premier is fallible, the emperor has no clothes. Therefore, will the Premier initiate a committee of this Legislature to hold public hearings, in centers all around

the Province, dealing with constitutional reform so that there can be meaningful discussion involving all the people of our Province about what the Meech Lake Accord really means, and what the implications of our Province blocking it have for the future of our Province and our Country?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

The first thing I have to do is correct a misstatement. I have never proclaimed constitutional expertise. As a matter of fact, to the extent that I have done anything, I have denied it. And I have done it on quite a number of occasions. That comment about me keeps coming from all directions, from a variety of directions, and I have tried to disabuse it. I have some fair amount of experience in constitutional work, but I do not claim any expertise. So the hon. Member is incorrect in making that assertion.

Now, to get to the point, the hon. Member is right that the vast majority, not only of Newfoundlanders, but of Canadians, acknowledge they do not fully understand what is in the Meech Lake Accord. They have the very clear sense that it would result in a situation where one Province is there and all the rest of us are there, and that is unacceptable. They have the clear indication that it will result in one group of citizens being there and the others being down there, and that is unacceptable. But they do not understand the complications of it, that is quite correct.

What the hon. Member did not say is, why. Why? They do not

understand it because the Prime Minister and the ten Premiers of the day, including the former Premier here, hatched the deal in secret, in the back rooms, and have never given it an opportunity to be exposed to the light of the day.

Mr. Speaker, as I have gone across this country and across this Province trying to get people to talk about the impact of the provisions of the Meech Lake Accord, to debate the issues, all I get from the Prime Minister and proponents and supporters of the Accord is, 'If you love Canada, you will support the Meech Lake. If you do not support Meech Lake, you are rejecting Quebec. If you do not support Meech Lake, you are unpatriotic. If you do not support Meech Lake, you are humiliating Quebec. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is why the Canadian people and the Newfoundland people do not understand the details and the complexities and the issues arising out of the Meech Lake Accord, because the Prime Minister and the Premiers who have supported it in the past have been deliberately refusing to debate the issues; they have been invited on many occasion to do so. I am prepared to do so throughout this Province and indeed throughout this country, if need be, debate the real issues of the Meech Lake Accord, as and when required.

Now there is a variety of ways by which that may be achieved.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) time.

PREMIER WELLS:
There were fourteen questions involved in the question.

AN HON. MEMBER:

There was one question.

MS VERGE:
Will there be a committee of House of Assembly to hold public hearings, that is the question?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Why did you not?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER WELLS:
Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many ways to ascertain the wishes of the people of Newfoundland, and I can assure hon. Members that this Government will be totally satisfied as to the wishes of the people of this Province before any action is taken.

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

MS VERGE:
What hypocrisy! And what gall! Why did not the Premier mention the Meech Lake Accord in the election campaign last year?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. Member is on a supplementary question and no comment is permitted. The Member is supposed to get into the question.

The hon. Member.

MS VERGE:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Why did not the Premier mention the Meech Lake Accord in the election campaign last year? Why in a year of being Premier has this Premier not struck a Committee of this Assembly of the

elected representatives of the people to hold public hearings on the Constitution? There have been Committees on Bills, there is a Committee dealing with Bill 53. Why has the Premier not set up a Committee to deal with the Meech Lake Accord and have meaningful dialogue? Not just the Premier going around preaching, but a two-way conversation about the Meech Lake Accord.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Let me correct another misstatement. The implication in the question, why did not the Premier discuss this during the election campaign has within it the implication that it was not. It has been raised numerous times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER WELLS:

I did at least ten interviews with National and Provincial media and discussed it and raised it and spelled out expressly, and I will produce the papers in which it was reported and file them in the House, and can will be seen in the news programs, and I will provide the dates So there is no trouble to get it. And it will show very clearly that it was raised numerous times. The difference is, Mr. Speaker, the chickens in the opposite party were not prepared to debate the issue. They were not prepared to face it. That is the difference.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:

The one thing about our Premier was he could tell the truth.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter). In light of the Provincial Government's financial assistance package for an extended notice period to employees of Fisheries Products International particularly, and the company had given a commitment to employees in some communities for a minimum of sixteen weeks employment and twenty weeks employment for employees in other communities, could the Minister inform the House what amount or what portion of the \$11.5 million financial assistance package to FPI will be advanced this year?

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member is quite right. The Provincial Government did, in fact, undertake to help defray the cost of extending the working period for this year and for next year. This current year the Province will be providing an amount up to, I believe, 20 per cent of the payroll, with the company absorbing the 80 per cent, then the following year it will be reversed, the Province will absorb 80 per cent of the cost of the payroll and the company will provide the balance. Mr. Speaker, whatever it takes to fulfill the obligation and the undertaking

given by the Province, that is the amount of money we will be providing this year.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for his answer.

Can the Minister inform the House what the employment levels at the three Fishery Products International Plants are, particularly Grand Bank, Gaultois, and Trepassey? Have they remained constant? Is the Minister or his Department monitoring what is happening in those communities?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the employment levels will remain reasonably constant. I know there are discussions going on now between the Committee, Trepassey, and Fishery Products International as to exactly what the numbers will be there, but it is our understanding that the numbers will remain constant with what they were in previous years.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to the Minister that there have been layoff notices given to employees in three of those plants already, some of them a number of weeks ago. Within the last week or ten days, there have been additional layoff notices given to employees at Fortune, which, of course, was not even covered under this particular arrangement, as I understand it. So, I am just

wondering really, Mr. Speaker, in a final supplementary to the Minister, what conditions have the Provincial Government attached to the \$11.5 million assistance package to Fishery Products International? Is it just a blank cheque arrangement, where the company will get \$11.5 million, or was it funding, as I and everyone around the Province thought, to benefit the employees in the affected communities, or is it really funding to benefit the bottom line of Fishery Products International? In concluding, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister undertake to table in this House the conditions attached to the financial assistance package for the extended notice period to Fishery Products International?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I should point out that the assistance package offered by the Government, the total cost of which in the final analysis will be, I suppose, close to \$15 million, is being made available simply and purely for the benefit of the workers. It is our understanding that, in fact, the arrangement we have with FPI will result in a cost to that company. FPI tell us that it will more than likely cost them probably close to \$3 million in order to comply with the request of the Province that the extended working period be made available. Certainly, again in answer to his question, that money is being made available simply for the benefit of the workers and not for the benefit of the company itself.

MR. MATTHEWS:

So there are no conditions attached to it.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, (inaudible) and I apologize. I missed that question. Certainly I will be happy to take that part of his question in consideration and give some thought to maybe tabling a copy of the joint undertaking between the companies and the Province.

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 Fisheries. The line pursued by my colleague is certainly one that we would like to pursue and will at another time, but I would like to turn attention to the inshore fishery, because the policy of this Government, apparently, is to let a number of inshore fish plants go by the wayside. Some of them have already gone, and the Deputy Minister of Fisheries has been quoted recently as saying as many as 100 inshore plants might close. I ask the Minister, in light of the consequences which we already see happening around us, will the Government change its policy?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the quote the hon. Member is attributing to the Deputy Minister of Fisheries is inaccurate. He has already, I think, clarified that, and I am sure he will clarify it again, at some future date. Certainly it is

not Government's policy, just for the sake of downsizing the inshore processing sector, to allow plants to close.

In cases, Mr. Speaker, where a plant is in serious financial trouble and when there does not appear to be any hope that that plant can survive, when it has problems with respect to the resource, management and its cash flow, then the Government must take a very serious look at that plant before it renews or offers a new loan guarantee. I presume the hon. Gentleman is referring to the situation with Universal MultiFoods, the company which is now in receivership, and that was exactly the principle followed when they were asking for Government assistance. It was on that basis that Government could not see fit to accede to their request.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In relation to the Universal Operation, it is one we will have a fair amount to say about in the next few days. I would like to ask the Minister, however, due to the fact that the Universal Operation involving five plants, two in St. Mary's - The Capes, two in Ferryland area and one down in Belloram, is now in receivership and the future is extremely uncertain, what is the Minister doing presently to make sure that the fishermen in these areas will have markets this coming year and that the workers will have work?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I should point out that the plants in question are in receivership, not because of any actions on the part of this Government. The action that resulted in the companies being put into receivership was initiated and found necessary by the Canadian Saltfish Corporation. Certainly we will do all we can to ensure that there will be no glut in that area. We have reason to believe, by the way, that when the trap fishery commences, there will be an outlet for fish caught by fishermen in that area, who would otherwise have sold to the plants which are now in receivership.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Along with the individuals, the fishermen, not having a market and the plant workers not having work at present, everything is in such a state of flux that it may be sometime before markets and jobs are ascertained. In the meanwhile, of course, you have people in picking up the bits and pieces, which is going to jeopardize the whole operation. We also have a number of creditors who were hit hard, including the Provincial Government, for \$2.6 million. I ask the Minister, in light of the people involved, the effect to Government itself and to the creditors, to the fishermen and plant workers who, under Universal had a tremendous amount of work, a company that had good markets and has aggressively gone after product - resource was not the problem - in light of all that, what plan does the Government have, seeing that they are not going to help to try to

find markets, as they have already said, it is in the hands of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, and the people are saying they are glad it is, what is the Government going to do to try to assist the creditors who were jeopardized by this Government not assisting the company concerned?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the Government already made a very generous gesture, I think, to the creditors of that company. When the creditors came to us advising us that the owners of the plant would be willing to undertake an arrangement to pay off their debts to those companies if the Government would do certain things, namely, to relieve the company of the \$2.6 million dollar debt owing by way of a loan guarantee, the Province did, in fact, pay off that amount, although it was put back on the books as a loan to the company. But, certainly, we kept our end of the bargain. The owners of that plant did not. I believe they made one payment to the creditors and then they reneged on any further payments, and that is where it stands. The Province did, in fact, offer to help. In fact, we made a very tangible offer of help, and it is not our fault that the creditors were left holding the bag. Had the owners kept their end of the bargain, as they promised, then the creditors would have been paid off.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, as everybody is aware, no doubt, a very tense and serious situation has arisen in Grand Falls, at Abitibi's mill, where, in fact, the entire operation has been shut down and there are many in that area, and I guess around the Province, including myself, who have very serious concerns about both the present and the future of that particular mill. What is happening out there today is happening on the heels of the shutdown of No. 6 machine, which the Government, incidentally, said last December it was going to investigate the reasons for; it has happened on the heels of the loss of dozens of jobs, and so on.

I want to ask the Minister of Forestry, if I might, can the Minister now give the workers of the area and the people of the Province a satisfactory answer, as several months have passed since he headed a Cabinet Task Force to investigate the reasons for the closure given by the Company? Can he tell us what the reasons are? Is the Minister and the Government fully satisfied with the reasons given? Is the matter now considered to be closed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. Member for his question.

I first want to assure him about the role the Government played with regard to the Redundancy Agreement which saw the shutting down of number 6, an acceptable package that was negotiated and agreed to by the union and our role in it.

On December 8, the Deputy Ministers of the three Ministers making up the Ministerial Committee the Premier appointed met with the Union, Company, and Mayors in Grand Falls. On December 19, the same Committee of Deputy Ministers met with Abitibi-Price in Toronto. On January 9, 1990 the three Ministers met with the Union in Grand Falls and the subject at every one of these meetings was the shutting down and the agreement that would flow from the shutting down of number 6. On January 9 the Ministers met with the Union in Grand Falls, the National Leadership as well as the Local Leadership. On January 12 the Ministers met with Members of the Board of Directors or Abitibi-Price, in Toronto. Later in January the Premier, with the Ministers, met with the National Leadership of the CPU as well as the Local Leadership.

I take some pride, Mr. Speaker, in telling the House that the role played by the Ministers, including myself, towards the eventual settlement that was agreed to by the Company and the Union, and the role played by this Government, was appreciated, both by the Union and by the Company. They saw us in a position where we facilitated an agreement that the Union and the Company felt was the best possible solution to a very aggravating problem, the shutting down of number 6.

Now, relative to his question, Mr. Speaker, about the present situation, the present situation is simple. The mill is shut down. There is a wildcat strike, which, in effect, is an illegal strike. The company has closed the mill down. One of the Locals have erected a picket line. The

other locals of the Union have refused to cross the picket line and, Mr. Speaker, anything that happens with regard to that situation is within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. Since my own constituency is very much involved, I have had discussions with the Minister and my understanding is that the Minister has her Department mobilized to play whatever role is appropriate in the given situation in Grand Falls.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

I wish I had asked the Minister for a report of the activities of the Committee, Mr. Speaker. That is what he answered.

I asked him if he is satisfied with the answers given to him by the company for the shutdown of number 6. Having gotten nowhere there, and since there is only a minute or so remaining, I had a question for the Premier which I will have to defer. But I do want to ask a supplementary question, if you wish to call it that, to the Minister of Labour, dealing with the same situation.

I would like to ask the Minister of Labour, because it is matter of extreme urgency, I can assure her - I have been in communication over the last two days with just about every union leader out there in Grand Falls. When I say a serious and intense situation is occurring, I mean that sincerely. In fact, I am very concerned that it might even turn nasty.

I would like to ask the Minister this: Would she be prepared to

get personally involved, pick up the telephone and call the two groups involved and offer to act as some kind of an intermediary to get the two sides talking? I believe, quite frankly, that if the Minister were to take that kind of initiative, there would be significant response in order to allow the two sides to carry on discussions under a much better atmosphere than exists right now. I think personal intervention by the Minister, a telephone call to both sides, might be the very thing to do it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will remind the hon. gentleman from Grand Falls that this is an illegal strike and my hands are tied at the moment, until the workers return to their work site. At that particular time, then, the appropriate people in my Department are prepared to help them come to grips with the particular problem that has led to this wildcat strike.

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

0 0 0

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House before we get to presenting

reports. To add to an answer to a question that was asked by the hon. the Member for Humber East (Ms Verge) and I did not have the material immediately available. I am now able to provide one newspaper, dated April 19, which reports that 'Nevertheless one of the first things Wells vows to do should the Liberals be elected is fight the Federal Government over the Meech Lake Accord.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

I am not finished yet.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER WELLS:

Wells said, 'He wants the Accord changed or he will have it rescinded by the Newfoundland Legislature.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

To a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

I wonder what newspaper it is, by the way?

MS VERGE:

The Western Star.

MR. SIMMS:

The Western Star. And it was dated April 19?-

MS VERGE:

How about the Liberal campaign -

MR. SIMMS:

- which was the day before the general election, I point out.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. It is a point of clarification.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Notices of Motion

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce A bill, "An Act To Amend The Assessment Act, 1986," (Bill No. 22).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Urban and Rural Planning Act," (Bill No. 9).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Municipalities Act," (Bill No. 23).

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Provide For The Regulation Of Motor Vehicles Used In the Transportation Of Persons and Goods For Compensation."

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Fish Inspection Act," (Bill No. 18).

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am really anxious to get recognized on this one. I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Revise and Consolidate The Law Respecting Crown Lands, Public Lands and Other Lands Of the Province." And for the information of the Member for Humber East (Ms Verge), Bill No. 25.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Freedom Of Information Act," (Bill No. 6).

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce A bill entitled, "An Act Respecting The Department of Education."

"An Act To Amend The Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Welfare Institutions Act."

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Day Care and Homemaker Service Act, 1975."

MR. TOBIN:

About time.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting The Department Of Social Services."

MR. TOBIN:

It took you long enough (inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:

It took me a year to clean up your mess.

DR. KITCHEN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

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

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

I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that this House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the guaranteeing of certain loans under "The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957".

I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the advancing or guaranteeing of certain loans made under "The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957".

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask

leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act Respecting A Pension Plan For Certain Employees In The Province".

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Livestock Health Act".

I further give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Revise The Law Respecting The Management, Harvesting And Protection Of The Forests Of This Province".

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DICKS:
Mr. Speaker.

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 To Repeal Certain Obsolete And Spent Statutes".

I further give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Revise The Law Respecting The Provincial Court".

Finally, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Revise The Law Respecting Securities".

Orders of the Day

MR. SIMMS:

Order 1.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 1, Address in Reply.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader and Member for Grand Falls.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, very much.

It is a pleasure to be able to rise in the House today and speak to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, as read last week by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

Before I get into the meat of my comments today, let me say I shall try to keep my remarks as brief as possible so as not to bore, particularly those in the gallery, particularly the press, and also, to give the Members of the House the benefit of some of the experience I have had here in the Legislature with respect to Throne Speeches in the past.

At the beginning, I want to congratulate most sincerely, the Member for LaPoile (Mr. Ramsay). A traditional thing that people do when they speak in the debate on the Speech from the Throne is they congratulate the mover and seconder of the motions to draft the Reply. I do not believe there was ever a Reply drafted, by the way. I do not think your Committee that has been established will have to worry too much about an overabundance of workload placed on them.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Share it with the Governor, if they are lucky.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, you might get a chance to meet the Governor for a few moments, if you are lucky.

Nevertheless, the comments made by the Member for LaPoile were very well put together and he articulated very well his concerns and his position on a number of issues, as did his near seat mate, the Member for Placentia (Mr. Hogan), who seconded the motion.

I commend both of those Members for the fine job they did on Opening Day in moving the motion to draft the Reply to the Throne Speech. They did a commendable job.

Having said all that, you have to remember that these two individuals, of course, are not rookies any longer. They are now into the Second Session of the Legislature, so they should have the bugs ironed out by now and should have no difficulty in standing and speaking in debate.

We would expect on this side to hear more from Members in the back bench, the private Members, if you wish, on the Government side in speaking to debate and not let the Premier in this Session insist that you not stand and speak in debate. Not let the Government House Leader whip you into staying in your seats and just sitting there and voting for everything that they bring in. Get up and speak your opinions, get up and speak your minds. I am particularly interested in hearing from the Member for Pleasantville. The Member from Pleasantville has a reputation of being outspoken and not necessarily towing the party line. And we recall very well late last Session-

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
No, he has. He is a man of principle.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Sure he is.

MR. SIMMS:
When we brought in the legislation with respect to the Economic Recovery Commission, everybody will recall, it was the Member for Pleasantville who sat on that side of the House and refused at first to vote. Refused at first to vote on the legislation brought in by the Government to establish the Economic Recovery Commission. Until-

AN HON. MEMBER:
He was whipped into line.

MR. SIMMS:
Yes, and about five minutes after that he was quickly whipped into line. The pressure was put on him, the arm was bent and he grudgingly stood up and finally voted for that Bill. But we all know what his views are. We all know the reason why he did not vote on it in the first place because he, like many people in this Province today, believed that the establishment of that Economic Recovery Commission is really nothing short of a farce. And we will have more to say about that as we get on.

Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, since I have the opportunity may I say that I really, really enjoyed the panel debate - the panel that the CBC Television has put in place and will have in place I understand now on a weekly basis, every Friday evening. Representing the N.D.P. Party was the leader of the

Party who does not have a seat in the House, but somehow sits here from time to time. He is gone today. He performed reasonably well, I think. Our own Member for St. John's East I thought performed magnificently. I am not being biased when I say that. I thought she performed very, very well. But the individual who stole the show without question, Mr. Speaker, the individual person who stole the show that night was none other than the old thumper himself, the Member for Bonavista South. But now mind you he is relatively new at it, not used to all the press coverage and television coverage, so I have a couple of words of advice for him - whether he takes it or not is up to himself. I would suggest that he try to hold himself back from thumping and pounding so much on the desk particularly as it is close to the microphone. They might want to curtail that kind of activity. I would also urge him to perhaps take sips of water in between, so he does not get too excited. He came across as being a bit excited and his voice got a bit high pitched, and you know, it was like he had so many things to say but he had only ten seconds to say it. So he might want to control himself somewhat. Other than that he said absolutely nothing with respect to defence of the Government policies, which is unfortunate. However, knowing the Member for Bonavista South, he will probably improve as time goes on. I really hope the CBC calls him back again next Friday and all the Fridays thereafter. I cannot think of a better representative for the Government than the Member for Bonavista South who is, of course, a lawyer.

Now on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I have to confess there

are a few others over there who I would not mind seeing representing the Liberal Government on that panel as well. I would love to see the Minister of Finance, for example. I would like to see him be the Government's representative on that panel every Friday evening. The Minister of Finance, I think, would add a lot to it. The Member for St. George's - I am not sure if the Member for St. George's has even spoken in the House - perhaps he did, but as I said earlier, I hope he will change that in this Session and stand out to speak his opinions. Do not let the Premier keep you suppressed. Do not let the Premier and the Government House Leader keep you in your seats merely for voting purposes. Get up and speak your mind and maybe one day you too will receive the call the Member for Bonavista South (Mr. Gover) got and be asked to appear on that panel. I hope that day comes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with those few preliminary remarks let me make some comments with respect to the Throne Speech. In particular I want to make some comments with respect to the Prorogation Speech, first of all. That is a Speech that often goes by with no comment, or with little comment. A very good reason for that was, I think, it took three minutes to read the Prorogation Speech on the day before the Throne Speech. I just happened to keep a note of what I thought was said. I went up for an interview with the press gallery right after prorogation that day, and somebody facetiously, I am sure, made the comment that that was probably the most significant accomplishment of the new Government in its first year in office and it took all of three minutes to tell everybody

about it, but I am sure they were being facetious when they said it. I remember in the Prorogation Speech they said they brought in fifty pieces of legislation in their first session and there was nobody in the press gallery whom I asked that could remember any of them. There was one exception, the Economic Recovery Commission, they remembered that one. But nobody could remember any of the other forty-nine pieces of legislation and again that was for a very good reason, because there was not much of significance, I guess, brought in in their first year in office, which is rather strange. Most of the initiatives were housekeeping simply. They did have the nerve to tout the Economic Recovery Commission in their Prorogation Speech, which surprised me an awful lot. I saw the Member for Pleasantville (Mr. Noel) snickering as it was being read. He might deny that but I am sure I saw him snickering over there when they made a big deal about the Economic Recovery Commission in the Prorogation Speech, because it is probably, and may probably be, the biggest schmozzle and the biggest farce we have seen by this Government in one year's efforts. They did say, I am not sure who it was referenced to, but they did say they had undertaken efforts to revitalize the Public Service. That is a quote, I believe, from the Prorogation Speech. Efforts have been undertaken to revitalize the Public Service.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They fired everyone.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, I thought about that. They certainly have taken efforts to revitalize the Public Service. They purged the Public Service

upon taking office. They fired a number of people. They did hire some people. They hired a new Assistant Deputy Minister for the Department of Social Services, I recollect.

MR. TOBIN:
Say that again.

MR. SIMMS:
If my colleague was listening instead of talking he would hear what I said. I have said some pretty important things about the Member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). I said in the Prorogation Speech they made reference to the fact that they revitalized the Public Service. That is what they said in their Prorogation Speech, and I suggest that they revitalized it by purging the Public Service and by firing all kinds of civil servants. A big thing they did to revitalize the morale of the public servants in this Province was they hired a new Assistant Deputy Minister of Social Services, Beaton Tulk. Then they have the gall to say they revitalized the Public Service. What they have in fact done, Mr. Speaker, is they have demoralized the Public Service and not revitalized it.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech itself, I have to say, was extremely disappointing. It was lacking special, or specific initiatives. In fact there were very few initiatives at all but none that were specific which is a very big disappointment.

There are opportunities in a Throne Speech, I think, for a Government to outline its plans for the next twelve months or so - the following Session. In the past, if you read previous Throne

Speeches, you will see they have often been criticized for not being very specific. But there have often been in Throne Speeches in the past, specific plans the Government had. But in this particular document this year, Mr. Speaker, in this particular Throne Speech, really there was nothing specific.

It was interesting to see, I think it was in an editorial in The Evening Telegram, stating you would think the Government might have taken the occasion to say it was going to clean up Bill 53, for example. To get out from under all of this controversy it has created for itself. It would have been a great opportunity if they had wanted to. Stick it in the Throne Speech. Say you are going to change it, going to improve it. You are going to do what the people want. You are going to bend to the people's wishes. Why did the Minister of Fisheries not tell us what the Government is going to do to respond to the serious situation that we face in this Province today? The economic crisis - particularly the fishery crisis - which is evident all over this Province today. Why did the Minister of Fisheries not tell us in the Throne Speech what the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador is going to do, rather than just blame everything on the Federal Government and attack the Federal Government. The Provincial Government has a considerable amount of responsibility in this regard as well. But in the Throne Speech, all we saw was a bit of history on what has happened, how it has developed, but no solution, no specific suggestions or no indications in the Throne Speech as to what this Provincial Government intends to do to

respond to it. Nothing whatsoever, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on two or three topics if I may, and only briefly, because obviously you only have twenty or thirty minutes to speak. You would never be able to say it all at one time. But I am sure I will have other opportunities.

I would like to talk briefly about the situation with respect to the fishery, because I have had occasion to serve as a member for the last month or so, on a special Caucus Fishery Committee that we have established, under the very able and capable chairmanship and leadership of the Member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews). That Committee, Mr. Speaker, has gone around this Province over the last month or so - and the Minister of Fisheries himself would know what a wonderful experience that is in many ways - because I believe when they were in Opposition they did something similar. But I can tell you for my money it was probably one of the best initiatives that we did as a caucus. I only wish the Government caucus would do something similar, because believe me the people would like to hear the Government caucus.

I say to the Minister, a Government caucus, I am not talking about just the Minister going out and meeting some people. I am talking about taking some of your colleagues, going around to every community in the Province that is going to be affected or as many as you can fit in, give these people an opportunity to express their concerns publicly and within earshot of individual Members of the Government, particularly backbenchers. Because I will tell

you, it is a valuable experience Mr. Speaker. It is a superb experience. We have, this Committee, in a few short weeks, travelled to Grand Bank, we have travelled to Gaultois, we have travelled to Belleoram, we have travelled to Riverhead, St. Mary's, Trepassey, Fermeuse area where we met people from Ferryland as well who attended that meeting. We have met here in St. John's with the Union representatives just in the last couple of days, from National Sea, Ms Hyde and some of her colleagues. In all of those meetings, Mr. Speaker, the seven or eight whatever it was, what impressed me the most was that the people at those meetings were individuals who were extremely concerned about their future. They had suggestions to make, offered alternatives probably, and suggestions and solutions. They have ideas. They may not be workable. They may not be right. But the fact of the matter is those people at least got the impression when we went around, that we had an interest in hearing from them and giving them a chance to tell us how they are going to be affected. How their lives are going to be affected. How their communities are going to be affected. And the reality is, Mr. Speaker, that for many communities in this Province if things continue as they are, if the prediction of the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, as contained in an article in The Sunday Express a few weeks ago is accurate, when he said, '100 out of 200-odd plants in the Province are likely to close'. If that happens in this Province, Mr. Speaker, then clearly an entire way of life will disappear. An entire way of life will disappear in many parts of this Province.

And that was evident to me as a Member of our caucus Fisheries Committee in every single community that we visited, and I am sure my colleagues, the Member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) and the Member for Fogo (Mr. S. Winsor) will agree with me. It was so evident in every community we went to that they are very, very concerned about the future of their communities. The future of their fish plant operations is primarily on their mind, but they know that if the fish plants close down, if something is not done to try and keep things alive, keep things going, then they know that life as they knew it in those communities will disappear.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government it appears, seems to be prepared to let that happen - maybe I am wrong. But I have not seen any indication of a response. I have not seen or heard anything in the Throne Speech certainly about it. All they seem to do is blame everything on the Federal Government, yet show no initiatives themselves as a Provincial Government as to how they are going to respond. You have a responsibility as well, the Provincial Government has a big responsibility. You cannot let communities close down. You cannot let people leave. You cannot let communities die. It cannot be done.

And if we had enough people on that side, on the Government side, who had the gumption and had the political will and had the courage to say 'No we will not let those communities die.' And 'yes, we will offer these communities something at least to look forward to in the interim.' Because I think the Minister has even said and scientists and everybody else

is saying, that this is going to be an interim situation. That in a few years time, four or five or six years, whatever it is, the stocks will rebuild. But what happens if the stocks rebuild and the communities have died, and the plants have closed and the plants have been sold for something else, or the plants have fallen down and all of the skilled workers have left the communities. What happens to those communities then?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

They are gone.

MR. SIMMS:

I tell you what happens, there will be no communities as we know today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. CARTER:

I wonder would the hon. Member allow a question?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would love to normally, but I only have about seven minutes left.

MR. W. CARTER:

It will only take five seconds.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

I want to touch on some other topics. The Minister can speak next in the debate if he wishes, I have no problem with that.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I want to make that point. And the Fisheries Committee on this side will not stand by, nor will this caucus, this Opposition caucus stand by and let the Government proceed to allow these things to occur - that seem to be occurring without a fight. I can assure the Minister of Fisheries that and I

can assure Members opposite of that.

Now there are Members on that side as well who feel, I am willing to bet they feel exactly the same way I do, as I just expressed. I am sure they do. They have to have a lot of concern about their communities. But whether they are prepared to let the Government proceed, whether they are prepared to put all their eggs in the one basket which will come down from Ottawa and think that will be the answer, remains to be seen. We will see what they are made of, I guess, when the time comes, including the Member for St. John's South (Mr. Murphy).

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also want to touch briefly on the Post-Secondary Education White Paper that the Minister of Education put out a few weeks ago or a few days ago or whenever it was, and I only want to make this comment on it. In that white paper there are proposals or plans to down-size the community college structure and system as we know it. There are plans to move college headquarters which exist now, and have only been in existence for a couple of years, from the Burin Peninsula, as I recollect, the community college headquarters which now exists in Carbonear, I believe, and they want to move it all into one central location again, Clarenville. I think that is what is outlined in the white paper. I know the Member for Carbonear incidentally, and I did not hear the Minister say this, maybe one day he will tell us, but I heard the Member for Carbonear say nothing like that would occur - headquarters moving from Carbonear for the community college - until there were public hearings held.

He is quoted as having said that. Now I suspect the Minister of Education (Dr. Warren) quickly telephoned him and said, 'I did not say anything about public hearings. I said we are waiting for public input. People can write us and phone us.' Public input. But the Member for Carbonear, as I am sure the Minister knows by now, has said specifically that public hearings will be held on that issue down in Carbonear before any decision is taken. So, the Minister might want to have a quick chat with the Member for Carbonear. But I make the point again, the point I am making just quickly, they want to move something from one community, move it all into a central location. So, it is -

AN HON. MEMBER:

They want to amalgamate.

MR. SIMMS:

-I am getting to that. So it is happening in the fishery, down-size the fishery, close communities, let them die, let people move into larger centers. You see it now in post-secondary education. Close the headquarters in Carbonear, close the headquarters in Burin, move it all into Clarenville, centralize it all in Clarenville. And of course, we have our friend Eric the Amalgamator, who has been at it now for a year, brow-beating communities, brow-beating people, trying to force them to, again, centralize. So you can see the philosophy of this Government. In only one short year it is coming out loud and clear. You have centralization of post secondary institutions, you have down-sizing and closing communities and centralizing those people into larger areas, and you have the amalgamation process itself, which

is meant to down-size, make smaller or eliminate the smaller communities and centralize into larger areas. So in those three areas alone the Government's philosophy comes out loud and clear. It is amalgamate, it is centralize, it is, as we all know, resettlement. That is precisely what it is, Mr. Speaker, and that is precisely the philosophy of this Government. And that is consistent, by the way, with the Premier's own position on the Meech Lake Accord. That is the Premier's position. He is consistent in that regard. He believes in centralizing all of the power in upper Canada in Ottawa. The Premier has said that, he has said that. And he does not agree with the Provinces getting any of the power, and this document proves it as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, make no wonder that we in this Province, on this side of the House in particular, and those that have concerns about this new Government and what it has done in it's first year are concerned when we see this kind of philosophy coming out every day, day after day, day after day. It is centralization, if it is bigger it is better, is their philosophy, bigger is better. But as we all know, of course, that is not quite accurate.

I have not got much time, but I want to get into a whole bunch of things. One thing that I do want to get on the record is a comment with respect to the Economic Recovery Commission. By the way, I say to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Efford) while he is over there waving to get up and speak on that, may I commend to him the reading of a book written by his colleague if he has not already read about it.

MR. EFFORD:
I have read it.

MR. SIMMS:
He has read it. 'The Welfare Officer Will See You Now,' an excellent book. As a matter of fact I just had mine autographed earlier this afternoon.

AN HON. MEMBER:
That is a good book.

MR. SIMMS:
It is, yes.

The Economic Recovery Commission, Mr. Speaker, let me just have a couple of words to say on the Economic Recovery Commission. The infamous Economic Recovery Commission. The Economic Recovery Commission that my friend, the Member for Pleasantville (Mr. Noel), wherever he has gone, loves the Economic Recovery Commission. He loves it. He is the only one with backbone over there, Mr. Speaker, on that side. He had the courage to sit for a while at least, long enough for us to see what his position was. He clearly sees this, as many people in the Province do, it is a farce, and it will become a bigger farce, it is in place now, a year. The poor old chairman, the poor old chairman, Dr. House, the Deputy Premier, the acting Premier, I think he is making more than the Premier's salary, I am not sure. I do not believe the Premier's salary is 105 thousand dollars. He is certainly making more than the poor miserable wage that is given to the Cabinet Ministers over there, and I think, if I am correct, he may even be making more than the top public servant in this Province. The Clerk of the Cabinet. The Clerk of the Cabinet, with all of his onerous responsibilities with which we are

familiar, is getting less than the Chairman of the Economic Recovery Commission. Now can you imagine that! The poor old fellow is only getting 105 thousand dollars a year. I tell you the truth, I do not know how the man is going to make ends meet. I do not know how he can manage it, I do not know. Plus expenses. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to get some questions off in this session of the House, about the Economic Recovery Commission. You see the debate in the public with the President of the University slapping The Evening Telegram on the wrist for saying that the University is paying Dr. House \$ 75,000.00. That is not true, he does not do anything for us - and in the next breath, he says of course, well, really, we are paying it, but the Government gives it back to us. That is the way it is paid, so the bottom line is, Dr. House is getting 105 thousand dollars. Now when the matter was raised in the legislature last spring, May - June, when the Premier was asked 'what are the salaries?' He said the 4 or 5 other Commissioners were going to get \$75,000.00 and Dr. House, because he had additional responsibilities would get a little bit more, and as soon as we have all the arrangements made with Dr. House, he would make it public. He would let us know - this Premier who says he is very open. Mr. Speaker, until Doug House appeared on an open line radio show last week, and blurted it out, nobody knew what he was making in the way of a salary. The Member for Pleasantville should pay attention to this - I want to repeat it once more for him - the Chairman of the Economic Recovery Commission is making twice the salary of the Member for Pleasantville, and the Member for Pleasantville, in my view, is much

more competent. I would like to know how much of this 3 million dollars that was set aside for the establishment of that commission has been spent.

MR. BAKER:
900 thousand.

MR. SIMMS:
That is all that has been spent? Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Government House Leader he had better go back and get some more information! He had better go back and get some more information, because I would say they have spent that on furniture alone. Furniture, computers, salaries, they are employing - I do not know how many people - secretaries galore, they have got furniture for their offices.

AN HON. MEMBER:
How many jobs have they created as a result?

AN HON. MEMBER:
The same number as Sprung.

MR. SIMMS:
Not true - it cannot be true. I do not believe it. Anyway I will be asking questions like that. But what I would like to see is an itemized statement, that is what I want to see. I would like to see an itemized statement of all their expenditures. And you know I saw Dr. House's report, which was put out not so long ago. I do not know if Members had a look at it. It was one of those photo copies run off on a computer, and they gave a bunch of stats of what they have been doing so far since he has been there. I guess if you take the time to look through it, which most would not, but I happened to do it because I have an interest in the Economic Recovery Commission. I saw where

they had, for example, some tricky little statements. They are talking about the Stock Saving Plan and how, since from 1989 to this year, since the Economic Recovery Commission took over the Stock Savings Plans, the sale has gone up by 52 per cent, something like that. Yes that is true. That is absolutely true, it went from 18 million up to 22 million. It went up by 52 per cent since Dr. House and the Economic Recovery Commission took it over. But what they did not say, Mr. Speaker - and this is also true - from 1987 to 1988, the year that it was Administered by the Department of Development or Finance itself, without going out to a 3 million dollar Economic Recovery Commission, do you know what the sales were in the Stocks savings Plan? Do you know by what it was increased?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No, No.

MR. SIMMS:
It increased by nearly 100 per cent from 1988 - 1989, from 8 million dollars up to 15 million, nearly 100 per cent. So one could argue, one could argue to Dr. House and the Commission. Do not try to take credit for that kind of nonsense, because the fact of the matter is if you are going to then it should be pointed out that sales have been dropped by half since you took over administering the Stock Savings Plan, which is a fact in terms of percentage.

AN. HON. MEMBER:
They have used sleight of hand.

MR. SIMMS:
Indeed they have. The Government House Leader (Mr. Baker) shakes his head. How stunned can you be? Did you hear what I said?

There was 100 per cent one year and fifty-two -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Turn up your hearing aid, boy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:
That is not nice.

MR. SIMMS:
I apologize to my colleague for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), too, because he did not hear what I said either. But, Mr. Speaker, I make that comment about the Economic Recovery Commission in a serious vein because I believe that the Government has made a drastic mistake, usurping the powers of Ministers on that side. I have more faith - and I never thought I would ever see the day I would say it - I have more faith in the Minister of Development developing a plan for economic recovery for this Province than I do in this Economic Recovery Commission. Now I never thought I would ever see the day I would say it but I say it now and I say it honestly. If the power was left with the Minister of Development, and the Minister of Development was given the tools to do what he should do, what he should be doing as Minister of Development, instead of taking away his powers and giving them to an non-elected bunch of commissioners who run the Economic Reform Commission, that Minister of Development, I bet you, could put forth a fantastic plan for economic renewal and revival in this Province. I bet you. But what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the Leader, the Premier of the Province has spoken. He said there will be an Economic Reform Commission, and

low and behold there is an Economic Reform Commission, and by God, do not dare try to talk me out of that, because that was my plan. That was the Premier's plan. He announced it. He announced it in the election campaign and he has announced it every day since practically, so who sitting around the Cabinet table had the gall or the nerve? I say if the Member for Pleasantville was sitting around the Cabinet table he would have spoke up. He might not have been in the Cabinet but he would be no further behind than he is today, because he is not in the Cabinet now. The Member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), I would have thought, would have said, 'but Premier, why do you not leave the powers to us as Ministers. Let us do our job first of all. Let my friend and colleague the Minister of Development, who is new in the office, but a very articulate young man, a very competent young man, why do you not let my friend, old Chuck there, see what he can bring in for us in the next year?' Why did the Member for Port de Grave not say that to the Premier?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I mean what I am saying and I mean it sincerely. I want to throw this out to the Minister of Development, by the way, and the Member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, I would like for him to perhaps tell me. I am sure he knows because just about everything I ask him he knows the answers to. He even gives me answers when I am not even asking - he is very good at that. I want

him to tell me about the Economic Recovery Commission's new plan to incorporate this new Crown Corporation. What is it called? We see ads in the paper advertising for space for this new Crown corporation - New Corp.? They are advertising for space and they have not even set it up yet. That is a dandy, too. But what I want to know, Mr. Speaker, what I would like the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to tell me is: in Gander for example where the central office is going to be located as I see in the ad, I want to know this, the space required for the office in Gander I am told, is enough to accommodate twenty-odd offices. That is what I am told by people in the business - architects, contractors, and those people. Twenty-odd offices. I wonder if the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture tell me if -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Wes Simms is in on that.

MR. SIMMS:

My brother has nothing to do with it. He knows nothing about that stuff. He is not interested in that stuff. He is interested however, in the Bulgarians, I can tell you. The Minister of Forestry can tell me this: Is it the plan of the Government, or at least of the Economic Recovery Commission, in this wholesale change, this centralization plan, to move the Rural Development offices, to move the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation offices, from Grand Falls, from the Exploits area, the Grand Falls/Windsor area, out into Gander? That is the question I would like answered when somebody on that side speaks. I would really like to know that. And, if the Minister says no, they are not

moving Rural Development, they are not moving the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation office out of the Grand Falls area, that is great, I am very pleased to hear it.

Can he tell me, then, what offices will be located in that -

AN HON. MEMBER:
In the new city?

MR. SIMMS:
Yes, in the new city.

Can the Minister, when he gets a chance to speak in the debate, tell me, then, what offices will be located in New Corps proposed office plan for Gander?

AN HON. MEMBER:
That will all be announced.

MR. SIMMS:
I know it will all be announced in due course, but he can tell us now in advance. We will not say anything about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask a question about that.

By the way, how much time do I have?

AN HON. MEMBER:
One hour.

MR. SIMMS:
I have an hour? Really? How come? That is very surprising. I thought I only had thirty minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Oh go ahead if you want to.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, I can certainly do it. I have all kinds of material here. I am just wondering, what Standing Order is that, about the hour?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Tell us about the letter you wrote (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
I will bring that up now, yes. But, before I get to that -

MR. TOBIN:
Tell us about the phone call you got from (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
No, let me tell you about -

MR. TOBIN:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
The Minister will have to admit, I did not mention that one anywhere. Everybody else did, but I did not.

But here is one that is rather interesting. Look! A photograph of the distinguished Minister of Social Services in The Grand Falls Advertiser. The Minister was out and spoke to the Kiwanis not long ago. Somebody sent me a copy of this, and I must say, I was taken aback when I read the - I did not mind seeing the Minister there talking to somebody from the Grand Falls area; that did not bother me, or the fact he was out speaking to the Kiwanis, although I am a bit surprised he did not let me know about it. Usually Ministers let me know in advance when they are coming out, so I can prepare some kind of a welcoming group.

But I read the little clip underneath it - and there are Members over there who will

probably get a kick out of this, too: 'Social Services Minister, John Efford, addressed the Grand Falls Kiwanis Club on Tuesday on the cause and effect of negativism in Newfoundland.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Just listen, now! I had to read the next line: 'The Minister suggested that sensationalism by the media often reinforces thinking that is counter-productive.' And I thought to myself, of all people! Certainly, he is an expert in the area, there is no question about that. However, he was out there saying, 'Oh, this is bad. We should not be doing this. None of this high profile sensationalism, that is wrong, that is unfair.' And he built his entire career on sensationalism in front of the media. I thought that was rather funny when I read it, I must say. I would like the Minister to send me a copy of his speech. I would appreciate getting a copy of his speech. I am sure there must be some good stuff in it. And it would be good for Oppositions. We might be able to take your advice, not to sensationalize things.

The Minister of Forestry asked me if I would also touch on a recent communication I had with the Minister of Municipal Affairs, old Eric the Amalgamator, and I will. I will raise it here today, because I think it is nothing short of - I do not have my Beauchesne with me - political blackmail is probably not a nice word to use; I do not mean it in a real nasty sense, but you will know what I am about to say. I will try not to say anything nasty or wrong, I do not mean to do

that. But, the Minister of Municipal Affairs wrote to the Exploits Valley Regional Services Committee dealing with a water treatment plant for the Exploits Valley region, which includes my District of Grand Falls, the District of Exploits and the District of Windsor - Buchans. It serves all three of those communities, headed up by the Mayor from Bishop's Falls, at the moment, from the District of Exploits, one Mr. George Saunders, well known, I think, to Members opposite in particular, certainly well known to me.

Several months ago that Committee came in and held a meeting with the Cabinet Committee, Chaired by the Minister of Education, Social Policy Committee of Cabinet I believe it is, made a tremendous presentation, talked about the need, but more importantly talked about the need to continue the project, because the project started a couple of years ago with a considerable amount of money spent on engineering, \$700,000 or \$800,000 I forget what it was now. Then there was a further commitment given by the previous Administration for which a snag developed. Nevertheless, the project was put on halt by the new Government. So when the Municipal Capital Grant Program was announced here a few weeks ago, there was no mention of funding for the water treatment plant. They called me and I said well, unfortunately I am not in the Government, so I do not know what is going on specifically and they do not often tell me. But I did say that I know some people who might know, so I checked around, and low and behold the answer that I got back was, "Well, we might save that for the budget. We might not put it in our Municipal

Capital Grants thing, it has been pretty controversial there is a great big need for it, it has already been started and all the rest of it, so maybe that might be a little tidbit to include in our budget.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

I doubt that either will come about.

Here is what the answer is, they finally got an answer from the Minister. I do not know how they got the answer. George must have telephone him and said, Eric send me out something so that I will have something for the meeting.

Nevertheless, the Minister sent out a letter, and in that letter the Minister said in essence, I will paraphrase it, I will not quote from it, that the Government has decided that the question of ongoing funding for the water treatment plant in the Exploits Valley will not be addressed until the amalgamation issue has been resolved between Grand Falls and Windsor. Now that is in essence what the Minister said in the letter. I have a copy of the letter, which the Minister in his infinite wisdom sent to me after I had a telephone conversation with him. His bureaucrats were not quite sure if they should or not. Nevertheless, that is what was said in the letter. My concern is this, I said it publicly, that is a form of - I do not want to use the word but you know what I am talking about - because the people of that area deserve clean water. It has nothing to do with amalgamation, absolutely nothing at all, the project got under way as an example of regional

cooperation long before amalgamation was even talked about. The project started three years ago. So for the Minister now to somehow tie that in with the amalgamation to me is a threat. It is a threat. It is a hidden threat. It is like the threat of the regional taxation agency that the Government talks about setting up, if you do not amalgamate, we are going to set up a regional taxation agency, take the money from the Town of Grand Falls and give it to Windsor. How silly?

AN HON. MEMBER:

What?

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, yes. That is what he is talking about.

Now this is another threat. The Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs says, it is sort of hidden, he did not come right out and blurt it out, but he clearly meant if you do not amalgamate boys and girls, you will not get any money for your water treatment plant. If you amalgamate there is a good chance you might get it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Devious is the word.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, okay.

I really think that is an unfair decision for the Government to take that kind of a decision. I do not see why one has anything to do with the other. People deserve clean water, people deserve to have their request for funding for that water treatment plant addressed now, it has nothing to do with amalgamation, absolutely nothing whatsoever. And that by

the way is also the feedback that I am getting from the Committee Members out there from the District of Exploits, the District of Windsor - Buchans, as well as the District of Grand Falls. It was an unfair decision of the Government to put off the question of funding for the water treatment plant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a few more minutes if I wish to take them, but I want to say this, that my friend and colleague, the Member for Torngat Mountains, (Mr. G. Warren) has a delegation of young students from Labrador in the galleries, and he wants to have a chance to speak while they are here in the galleries. So I am prepared to forfeit my remaining ten or fifteen minutes. I know somebody on that side will probably speak first. Maybe they will not, maybe they will give the Member a chance to speak for his fifteen or twenty minutes. It is up to yourself, whatever you wish to do.

But that is the reason. I do not want you to get the impression that I cannot go for another fifteen minutes, because I certainly can. I will take my seat now and see what happens.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (L. Snow):
Before recognizing the hon. the Member I would like to take this opportunity to welcome to the gallery a group of students, a Recreational, Cultural Exchange Group. We have ten students from Mount Pearl and ten from Nain, and they are accompanied by their Recreational Director, Mr. Randy Edmunds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

First, I would like to thank the hon. the Member for St. George's (Mr. Short) for giving me the opportunity to say a few words. I really appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, let me first express my appreciation to the Mover and the Secunder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, given by His Honour the Lieutenant-governor. Also, Mr. Speaker, although you just did it, I want, Sir, to say welcome to a number of students from the historical District of Torngat Mountains, led by a very good friend of mine, Mr. Randy Edmunds, who, during the last election, I would say, had been very instrumental in having me returned to this House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I say to hon. the gentleman that Mr. Edmunds is not ashamed at all, because Mr. Edmunds had a choice of picking one of three good members who could have represented the people of Torngat Mountains in this House, and I think he made a wise decision.

Mr. Speaker, nearly forty years ago, in fact it will be forty years at midnight March 31, the hon. Joseph R. Smallwood completed a task that was started in 1867, when Sir John A. Macdonald became

the first Prime Minister of Canada and Canada became a Dominion.

On July 1, 1867 it was the Province of Nova Scotia, the Province of New Brunswick, the Province of Ontario and Quebec. On July 15, 1870 Manitoba joined, on July 20, 1871 British Columbia followed; on July 1, 1873 Prince Edward Island; and on June 18, 1898 the Yukon became a Territory; on September 1, 1905 Alberta, Saskatchewan and the Northwest Territories joined. And finally, in 1949, Newfoundland and Labrador became the tenth Province of Canada. And those great intelligent men had a vision of Canada. They had a vision at that time, Mr. Speaker, which saw Canada a country from sea onto sea onto sea, from the Pacific to the Atlantic to the Arctic. Mr. Speaker, it was because of the wisdom of those individuals at that time, up until 1949, that we saw a country that stretched from coast to coast.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that the House of Assembly opened in the month of March, and I want to join with the many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, wherever they may live in this great country of ours, and say thank you to Joseph R. Smallwood, the Father of Confederation, who brought Newfoundland into Confederation. I want to say thank you to that individual.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, from page 11 of the Throne Speech, which was delivered by His Honour on Thursday, I quote: "...Accordingly, you will be asked to pass, in the manner

authorized by Section 46 of The Constitution Act (1982), a resolution to rescind the approval of the Meech Lake Accord given by the Fortieth General Assembly."

Mr. Speaker, the above quote has shocked this Nation. Those are the words of the new kid on the block. Canada consists of many cultures, consists of many religions and each province and each territory has an agenda. Up until April 20th, 1989, it was a united Canada.

Mr. Speaker, when the election was declared on the famous April 20th of last year, 47 per cent of the voters of this Province were shouting with joy. Naturally, Mr. Speaker, 53 per cent were unhappy.

Mr. Speaker, to my hon. colleague from Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), the joy of the 47 per cent of the people at that time was because they had a new Government elected, a new Government lead by Premier Wells. That was the joy the 47 per cent were shouting for. Now, Mr. Speaker, today, almost one year later, the people of our Province have felt the poisoned tip of the Premier's sword. The country our forefathers built has now been severed by the sword of King Clyde, Mr. Speaker. That is what has happened.

Forty years ago, I say to my hon. colleague from Exploits (Mr. Grimes), Mr. Smallwood became a father of Confederation, and, Mr. Speaker, today he is referred to as the only living father of Confederation. But, Mr. Speaker, today our Premier is known throughout Canada as Clyde the Destroyer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me go to the second part of my speech. During

the Premier's speech on Thursday he mentioned, in his closing remarks, that he wanted the Newfoundland people to hold their heads high and go home with their pay cheques and not beg from Ottawa, Ontario or Quebec. Those were the closing remarks in his speech on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, I first went to work in Labrador in 1965, approximately 25 years ago. As many Newfoundlanders have done, I went to work in Labrador because of the richness Labrador had to offer. There are Members 'in this Legislature from the past Government and the present Government who have heard of disenchantment and discontent from the people throughout Labrador, of the unfair treatment they received from Newfoundland during those years. Mr. Speaker, it has been said over and over again by many people in Labrador, including my hon. colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Dumaresque). Mr. Speaker, up there today that same feeling exists.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was because of that feeling that Mike Martin, Tom Burgess, and others started the New Labrador Party in the 1970s. It was the New Labrador Party which sat in this House for some time in the 1970's, and it was because of disenchantment and concern about the way the Island portion of the Province and the Government of the day was treating the people of Labrador.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) Province.

MR. WARREN:
Yes, the Government which is the Province, and as the Island portion was treating the people of

Labrador. My colleague, who was born on the Labrador coast, can probably vouch for it much better than I can.

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday past the hon. the Member for Eagle River introduced a very important resolution in this Legislature. To quote the resolution: "Be it resolved that this House endorse the principle of adjacency as adopted by this Government and that those closest to the resource must get the greatest benefit." I agree, Mr. Speaker. But it was only four or five months earlier that this hon. gentleman and the Member for Naskaupi were attending a meeting the Combined Councils of Labrador when the Minister of Fisheries' Department announced that one of this Government's ships was fishing within fifty miles of Labrador, and taking the fish from Labrador and bringing it back to the Island to be processed. That was only five months ago, Mr. Speaker. It was one of the middle distance boats that was fishing within fifty miles of Labrador, off Main, by the way, where there is a Government fish plant and people were waiting to get some stamps to get their UIC; and the Minister took their fish and brought it back to the Island. I agree with my hon. colleague who has brought in a resolution to show that we have to give Labrador what belongs to them.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Your time is up.

MR. WARREN:
My time is not up yet.

Since 1949 the people of Labrador have been told by governments to put up or shut up. That was the message going to the people in

Labrador. They said we will take your iron ore, we will take your codfish, we will sell your hydro power, we will build dams and bridges and we will encourage NATO to be established. And for all this what will they get in return? The people in Labrador will get the highest costing food in the Province, they will get the highest costing transportation in the Province and they will get the worst health care in the Province. Also, Mr. Speaker, their hunting and fishing privileges have been taken away. And I can go on and on. It is akin to taking bread and giving back crumbs.

I stand here today, a person from the Island portion of the Province, having been born and raised here, and I am ashamed, after having been in this House going on eleven years, that the Premier of this Province has one ambition, which is to destroy Canada. That is what this Premier is up to. He is trying to destroy Canada. I want to give the Premier notice today, and the hon. Member for Placentia (Mr. Hogan), and everyone of his colleagues over there, that the seed the Premier sowed Thursday for a divided Canada will cause me as one member for Labrador, I am confident, and my hon. colleague for Naskaupi, my hon. colleague for Eagle River and my colleague for Menihek (Mr. Snow), to take whatever steps possible to -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:
Exactly what you are saying, my friend. Those are the exact words. I will take whatever steps necessary, I will endeavour to do my utmost, if the Premier is going

to split up Canada, to make sure that Labrador will go its own way too. Labrador will go its own way and I will lead that battle, because I do not want a Premier of this Province destroying Canada. Because now, at the present time, it is Labrador which is keeping this Island going, with its riches, its fish and its iron ore. I will lead the battle to make sure that Labrador gets out of Newfoundland and goes on its own and be either a Province or a Territory. I will lead that battle, Mr. Speaker, because I am thinking of those young children up in the gallery, when tomorrow the Premier of this Province might destroy the country they belong to, the country Canada. I am sorry I have to see the Premier lead us to a divided Canada.

MR. TOBIN:
Join the States.

MR. WARREN:
No. Labrador will not join the States.

MR. TOBIN:
That is what the Premier wants.

MR. WARREN:
The Premier may want to join the States, but Labrador will not join the States. In 1867 we became the country Canada, and by 1997, in another seven years, with that wedge dividing Canada, separating Canada, separating Newfoundland, separating Quebec, with that in line -

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

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Opposition House Leader, on a point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. Member is making a fine speech, but I am sure he is having a great deal of difficulty because there is an awful lot of muttering and talking from Members on the other side. Could I suggest to the Speaker that perhaps he might ask Members who want to carry on a conversation to move outside the House so the Member can get on with what is a fine speech. It is very unfair.

MR. SPEAKER:

I agree with the Opposition House Leader. I think there is a lot of noise on both sides of the House. I recognize the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I know one thing, by the comments I am hearing from that side of the House, they know the Premier of this Province has sown the seed, and you are part of it my friend - you are part of it. You talk to the people of Labrador who have been saying for years and years that they have been ripped off. I say to the hon. Gentleman, I will do what I can as an elected Member for one of the Districts in Labrador, and if this country breaks, which the Premier wants, I will be one of the advocates leading Labrador away from the Island portion of this Province.

I say to my hon. colleagues, in closing, the Premier said we have to look at our children and our grandchildren and their children. I say to all my colleagues, let us face it. The Premier has sown the seed and may, by his ambition, see a country divided, a country that some great gentlemen and ladies built, together, over the past 100 years. I say to the gentleman living on Roaches Line

today - unfortunately, because of his health he cannot respond -

MR. HOGAN:

What about (inaudible)?

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, the ignoramus from Placentia, as usual, is up to his same tricks. I would say that the hon. gentleman who is living on Roaches Line - because of his poor health he is unable to communicate - that gentleman is going through a really rough period knowing that there is another Liberal Premier in this Province - that gentleman helped to build a country from sea to sea, Mr. Speaker, and it would be most interesting if that gentleman could express his opinion today on what this Premier is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Premier will realize that we are united from sea onto sea. I guess, Mr. Speaker, the National Anthem, 'Oh, Canada, we stand on guard for thee,' and all these things we say, unite us from Coast to Coast.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Stars and Stripes.

MR. WARREN:

Yes. As my hon. colleague just said, we may be singing the Stars and Stripes before too long, because that, maybe, is what the Premier wants. He said it might be better to join the United States. I say, Mr. Speaker, if this Country is divided, it would be better for Labrador to go on its own.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude by saying that I will continue to fight for a united Canada. But once the division takes place, as it will in a very few short years, you may as well say good bye to

Labrador, because I will be the one to lead them away from the Island portion of this Province.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for St. George's.

MR. SHORT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I must say I got a valuable lesson in politics in the House today. I let the gentleman for Torngat Mountains get up to say hello to the people in the gallery, and he was his usual self. I hope he does not expect this to happen again; at least I would expect him to be much more civil next time than he was this time.

Before I get into the couple of points I want to make I would like to say to the Member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) that it was not because of his goading that I am standing up today and speaking to the Throne Speech. I was asked on Friday if I would respond, and I immediately said yes.

First of all, I would like to congratulate the Members for LaPoile and Placentia for the excellent job they did on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, our Government has embarked upon some very bold initiatives in the last ten months, which I believe will lead to the economic recovery of this Province. The Opposition criticizes us for not doing anything. How many Governments during the recent past, and we will even say seventeen years,

have been able to (a) lay out a blueprint for post-secondary education in this Province; (b) announce and have working a task force on agriculture in this Province; (c) set up a committee structure in this Province to let the public review proposed legislative changes before they are passed in this House; (d) immediately upon taking office asked an independent body to make recommendations on a benefits package for MHAs instead of creating certain paid positions for backbenchers in government ranks while the Opposition suffered; (e) tackled head on the issue of amalgamation; (f) not only completely restructured the Department of Development, but also said to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, we want your ideas, we are willing to listen to your ideas, and we are willing to assist in whatever manner is necessary?

Mr. Speaker, I ask how any Opposition can criticize those initiatives, especially since all of the activity has been carried out in the last ten months?

Where, I ask, could you go in the records of the last seventeen years and find such bold thinking and such a course plotted for the future of this Province?

Mr. Speaker, lest the Opposition has the idea those are the only initiatives, let me assure you that I have not even mentioned the areas of hydro electricity, Hibernia and the fishery. I am sure they probably would not want me to mention Meech Lake.

Mr. Speaker, if I could, for just a moment, I would like to speak in just a little more detail on a couple of those areas that I have

mentioned and how those will affect the District of St. George's in particular. The Throne Speech indicates that a report of the Task Force on Agrifoods will be available later this year. Personally, I am looking forward with great interest to this report. The District of St. George's has some of the best farmland anywhere on the Island, but because of a lack of importance attached to the agricultural industry in the recent past, most of the available land remains idle. I look forward to the recommendations of the Task Force because, as the Throne Speech states, the agricultural sector has been wrongly ignored and is largely underdeveloped at the present time. My District could grow and prosper economically as people take a new interest in farming. I believe, if we are to diversify our economy, we have to get serious about agriculture in this Province. And I believe and I feel confident that this Government is committed to doing so.

In the coming months and years you will see this Government implement programs that will allow first-time and existing farmers to become more productive. In recent years, we have merely paid lip service to the financial needs of farmers, especially those starting up. But this has to, and will, change.

Mr. Speaker, I believe farming is now big business. I believe the Member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford) has echoed these sentiments a number of times. It is no longer just two and three acre things, it is big business. If we are going to promote the agricultural industry in this

Province, we have to treat it in that manner and we have to give it the financial assistance it needs.

I believe, for example, that there are areas in the agricultural industry that are virtually untapped. For example, for the raising of sheep, an area on the West Coast certainly has a great deal of potential. Pasture lands is another area that has been neglected, and there needs to be new monies put into them.

Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks I mentioned the restructuring of the Department of Development, and I believe there were a few comments by the Member for Grand Falls. I listened when the Member for Grand Falls was talking about the Economy Recovery Commission, a little while ago, when he was speaking. Having worked very closely with the Rural Development movement for the last eight years, I have taken more than a passing interest in the changes occurring recently in that Department; I guess one could say that I have had a sneak preview of what is to come, and frankly I like what I am seeing and hearing.

One can only get excited when one hears statements from the Throne Speech like the following, which I want to quote: "Emphasis will be placed on the expansion and development of small to medium sized enterprises through this new Crown Corporation, whose services will be delivered through a system of regional offices located across the Province, with accompanying decision-making being decentralized to the regions." Just imagine! No more running off to St. John's every time you have a project proposal to bring in. There will be regional offices.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine having a regional office that will not only listen to your proposal, but will also have expertise to deal with your planning and financial needs? Sir, the more I think about it, the better it sounds.

I will just use an example that I am pursuing, a concept like lobster processing on the West Coast. There is no reason why, with the aid of the Economic Recovery Commission and the regional office, such an idea cannot be pursued and plans put in place, that moneys can be allotted in the regional office and, if it is determined that it is a viable operation, then it can proceed.

Mr. Speaker, several years ago Dr. House recognized the important roles played by the Development Associations in respect to economic ventures. It makes me wonder sometimes - I have to say this - why you hear such negative comments about Dr. House now, when, only a few short years ago, he was the gentleman picked by the other Government to head up the -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes, but not for \$105,000 a year plus expenses.

MR. SHORT:

We are not talking about money, we are talking about the light in which the man was viewed when he was hired to do a job.

MR. MATTHEWS:

But he was not elected to run the Province.

MR. TOBIN:

He was not elected to run the Province, either.

MR. SHORT:

Not now, either.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I remind hon. Members this is not the Question Period.

The hon. the Member for St. George's.

MR. SHORT:

Thank you.

Given the opportunity now by a Government willing to listen to the ideas of its people, I see Development Associations taking the lead in the economic recovery of this Province.

I believe you are going to see a much more diversified economy as people explore new ways of making a living. Over eight years, I must say, I have seen and heard a large number of new ideas put forward by Development Associations, and I believe those are the types of ideas the Department of Development will now begin to use to get this economy started.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have to speak briefly about another area, the tourism industry.

The Throne Speech highlighted tourism as an economic bright spot in the Province, and I have to echo those same sentiments.

We have talked about the importance of tourism development for years, but that is about all we have done with it. I think it is time for a real change in thinking, and a time to really get serious about helping this industry grow.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who has ever

visited the West Coast, in particular St. George's district, will have to admit that there are no spots more scenic. Yet, what have we managed so far in tourism? Tourists get off the ferry in Port aux Basques and the first stop is Corner Brook. It is time to say to visitors to this Province, 'We have a beautiful Province and we want you to see it and enjoy it.'

Personally, I have long advocated a coastal road that will go from the Codroy Valley all the way to Stephenville. Get people off the highway. Show them the communities. In advocating that idea, I will continue to do so until it becomes a reality.

My district, as well, has the most and the best salmon rivers anywhere on the Island, yet over the years we have allowed this valuable tourist attraction to be destroyed. Mr. Speaker, we do have the potential but we have to get serious about promoting it. Mr. Speaker, I could continue but let me end by simply saying that I agree with the statement by the Premier on Thursday when the Throne Speech was read. He said, last year we outlined our plans for the economic recovery of this Province. Those plans have not changed so this Throne Speech merely reaffirms our commitment to those ideas and briefly mentions what we have accomplished thus far and where we are going from here. I support the initiatives of the Premier and the Government thus far and I have to agree with the Premier when he says that this Throne Speech is one of quality and not quantity.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in having this opportunity to respond to the Reply to the Throne Speech. I also take this opportunity to congratulate the member for St. Georges (Mr. Short) on a fine speech.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A Maiden Speech.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I do not think so. I think he spoke before.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

He spoke before.

MR. MATTHEWS:

He did a good job regardless of whether he spoke before or not.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Yes, he did a good job.

MR. MATTHEWS:

As a matter of fact I suppose you could compare the length of his speech to the length of the Throne Speech. I guess that sort of tells us everything about this particular Throne Speech, where a Member on the Government side could not stand up any longer than he did and defend and talk about the Throne Speech, so I fully understand now why the Member for Exploits (Mr. Grimes) is looking so depressed and tormented over there today. It is the first time I have seen him like that, but I guess as the session goes on and the further the Government gets into the mandate the more and more we will expect to see looks of anguish on the faces of those opposite, because they will

realize that their days are growing short. It is kind of sad, really that that would happen because we saw the frustration just a few nights ago on the face of the Member for Bonavista South (Mr. Gover) when he was on the panel of Here and Now. I sent him a note today suggesting that he should now make a cheque payable to CBC for the damage he did to the interview desk. Debbie Cooper was in the gallery to get the cheque.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to mention a few things referred to in the Throne Speech, particularly the Economic Recovery Commission. It seems that has taken up quite a bit of time in debate in this Legislature and I would just like to say once again that I really hope that the Economic Recovery Commission works for Newfoundland and Labrador. I hope the money that is being spent on the Economic Recovery Commission will indeed pay dividends for the thousands of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that are out there looking and grasping at something for their future. If the Economic Recovery Commission is the answer for those thousands of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians then I will be very, very pleased. I would not say I would be the most pleased person in Newfoundland and Labrador because certainly the man who orchestrated and set in gear the Economic Recovery Commission, quite naturally, would be the most pleased of all. I really hope it works because there does not seem to be too much else around that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians can hang their hat on these days. In saying that I have to say I am very, very concerned with what we have seen emanating from the Economic Recovery Commission over

the last number of months. We have seen a report or two given but as I have read the results of the reports I have not been overly encouraged that the expectations, I guess, that have been thrown into the laps of the Economic Recovery Commission will indeed materialize, but I hope it does. I would like as well, Mr. Speaker, to talk for a minute about the educational system of the Province, and particularly the Minister of Education's white paper on post secondary education that he put forward a week and a half, two weeks ago, which I read with great interest, of course, having some knowledge of the workings particularly of the post secondary side of education in the Province. And there were some things in it that I liked, some things in it that I liked a lot. There was things in it that we talked about when I was the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, and I am sure that the officials that are still there working with the Minister had significant input into the white paper. But there are a few troubling things as well, and allow me, if you would, Mr. Chairman, to talk particularly to the Minister about the Eastern Community College, of course, which takes in my area of the Province. And we have seen the boundaries of the Eastern Community College redefined, restructured to take in a couple of other campuses.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Carbonear as well.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I have got no problems with the restructuring or the re-alignment of the Community College boundary or any others, but it is really bothersome to see the proposal in

the white paper to move the headquarters of Eastern Community College from Salt Pond to Clarenville. . Not that I have anything whatsoever against Clarenville, their future, their prosperity, their educational opportunities; it has nothing to do with that. But what bothers me about it is that the headquarters for Eastern Community College is already established. There has just recently been an agreement entered into, a five year lease for office space in a brand new building for Eastern Community College. The President, the support staff of Eastern Community College are already established and located in the Salt Pond, Marystown, Burin area, some 20, 25 people. And to have those people relocate and the office relocated, particularly, is going to cost money that is unnecessary. It is unnecessary to move that headquarters. If there was some educational value or some educational benefit to moving the headquarters of Eastern Community College I would have no argument with it whatsoever. No argument with it if it was going to mean that the educational output, the education received by the people being serviced by that Community College region was going to be better, then I would support the move because when we get down to brass tax about important issues in this Province, and particularly education, I want to see the best level of education, whether secondary or post-secondary, offered in this Province. And if moving the headquarters of Eastern Community College from Salt Pond to Clarenville will accomplish that in that particular Community College structure, then I would support it even though politically it might be personally damaging, because I would be able to defend

doing something for better education. But in this case it is not going to mean better education. There is no educational value whatsoever attached to the move, and it is going to cost the Community college, the board of directors, the Boards of Governors and consequently the Department of Education, money to make that move, which is totally unnecessary. So that is my feeling. I see the Minister shaking his head and saying no that is not true. But if you are going to relocate the staff, find new headquarters, it is going to cost you money.

Now I understand as well that Carbonear is to be affected. I do not the extent of the Carbonear affect or what has happened. I have not heard anything from the Member, and I do not follow the press as closely in that particular area of the Province as I do my own. But I do not know what his feelings are on the fall-out in the Carbonear area because they, in essence, have a headquarters there as well. So whether that is going to be totally eliminated, those jobs and that position as President, whatever is going to be re-aligned, I do not know. But my point is in saying what I said, Mr. Speaker, is that there is no educational value attached to what the Minister is proposing in his white paper as it pertains to relocating headquarters.

No benefit. Because if you are talking about meetings for the Boards of Governors, if you are talking about meetings for the principals of the campuses, either way you look at it with five campuses wherever the meetings are held there are going to have to be

people from four campuses travelling to get to the meeting. If it is in Salt Pond four travels, if it is in Clarendville four travels, if it is in Bonavista four travels, if it is in Carbonear four travels, and so on. So I cannot see the logic of what the Minister is proposing to do. So I just wanted to say that to him. I will have other opportunities to make my views known to the Minister, but I just wanted to make that particular point today.

MR. TOBIN:

He said he is going to answer it.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER:

He said he is going to answer it.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Oh, he will. I am sure he will. He always answers. But that is the question. What will his answer be? But I am sure he has some reasons for proposing what he is proposing to do in the White Paper.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

I have him nominated for President of the University.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is good. I was going to mention that as well.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Yes, I nominated him.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I hope we will soon get an answer from him because before too long, if what I read in here is correct, he might be the new President of the University.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

I nominated him.

MR. TOBIN:

He will not because the Minister of Finance (Dr. Kitchen) is getting an alarm clock and he is going to wake up.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

I nominated him and Herb Kitchen so they will be fighting with each other.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I suppose if you were a betting person you would bet that it would be one of the two that will be the new President of MUN.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) over in Africa.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

Hoping what happens?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

Is he? Maybe that is why he is frustrated that the Member for Exploits (Mr. Grimes) has heard that neither one of the two gentlemen are on the short list for the new President of MUN. So therefore he knows he is going to be staying in that seat for a longer period of time. Maybe that is what is wrong with him.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Another chance blown.

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, there is some more rhetoric in the Speech from the Throne about the health care

system in the Province and we heard a lot of that in the election of last April.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Yes, tell them in St. Lawrence and Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

More hospital beds were going to be opened. We are going to have a more efficient, effective, better health care system in Newfoundland and Labrador. And unfortunately 47 per cent of Newfoundlanders believed that. And I guess the 47 per cent who did vote for the new Government for their proposals for health care and everything else that they proposed and promised in the election are having second thoughts today about why they did because just a few months after coming to power they indeed closed hospital beds in this Province.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Forty-seven per cent (inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

Put regional health care systems in jeopardy. As a matter of fact in a couple of regions of the Province I know that health care has deteriorated to a level never before experienced in those regions and those communities.

MR. TOBIN:

An uncaring Minister.

MR. MATTHEWS:

And that is from a Government, Mr. Speaker, who promised that things would be much better.

MR. TOBIN:

A hypocritical Minister.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Now having said that you have to realize the financial capability, fiscal restraint, and everything

else that goes with running a Province or a country and being a Government.

MR. MURPHY:

And your colleagues in Ottawa.

MR. MATTHEWS:

And your colleagues in Ottawa and all that stuff. But let me say to the Member for St. John's South (Mr. Murphy), that the coffers were not overflowing in Newfoundland and Labrador when his colleagues were in Ottawa either. And you just have to reflect on what your own Premier and your Leader has been saying over the last number of months when he looks at the last forty years at what has happened to Newfoundland and Labrador and regional disparity, and everything else that he has talked about. So just do not make flippant comments just for the sake of making them.

MR. MURPHY:

Pierre was a lot better to you than Brian is to us I can guarantee you that.

MR. MATTHEWS:

What I was saying there, Mr. Speaker, before I was rudely interrupted by the Member for St. John's South, who seems to make a habit of doing this, is having to realize the limitations that you have to make decisions with or on, that you should be very much aware of that as you go about the Province campaigning to get in a position of decision-making. You go out around the Province and you promise the world and wake up thirty days after you make the promises and find out what you promised, in fact, you cannot perform, you cannot implement, and you raised expectations throughout the Province, false expectations, such as we saw with the promise by

the Liberal Party at the time, by the Premier to abolish School Tax Authorities in Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. TOBIN:
(Inaudible) jail.

MR. MATTHEWS:
They are still reviewing the School Tax System in Newfoundland and Labrador. In their second Throne Speech there is reference made again to school tax. They are still not sure what to do with it.

MR. TOBIN:
The Minister of Education.

MR. MATTHEWS:
And the message is there again as it was there with health care, do not go about the Province promising something if you are not sure you can do it. If you are not sure how much it is going to cost, if you are not sure where you are going to find the funds to replace the funding for education that comes into the School Tax Authorities you must know where you are going to get the money to replace the School Tax Authority, and consequently the School Boards before you go about the Province promising to abolish it or promising to improve the health care system and so on.

MR. TOBIN:
Now he is putting them in jail.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Yes, and the latest incident on School Tax issue in the Province is that a gentleman has been thrown into jail because he is just over the limit now in earnings. For the last three years he has not made enough to be required to pay school tax, and this year he has just a few

hundred dollars over the limit and now he is being thrown in jail for - I do not know how long it is -

MR. TOBIN:
Fourteen days.

MR. MATTHEWS:
- fourteen days, because he thinks he should not have not to pay school tax. Another thing which is very, very important for the Minister of Education to consider is, it is my understanding that the rate of collection amongst School Tax Authorities in the Province has decreased.

DR. WARREN:
A little bit.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Is what?

DR. WARREN:
A little bit but it is coming back.

MR. MATTHEWS:
A little bit. But it has decreased. It is coming back now because people have suddenly realized that what the Premier promised, in fact, is not what is the case.

A lot of people in the Province did not pay their school taxes because they did not think there would be any more school taxes coming after last April's election, and they refused to pay the tax.

MR. TOBIN:
And now he is putting them in jail.

MR. MATTHEWS:
They refused to pay the tax and, consequently, there was less money going into the coffers of the School Tax Authorities because of the promise the Premier made, and he could not keep his promise.

Now the Minister even agrees with that. He agrees with that. The Minister is the only man over there who is half sensible. That is the truth of it. Half sensible. He is the most educated, the most sensible over there.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He has been preaching at the university about school tax.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes.

I would say, for the Minister's sake -

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is more (inaudible)

MR. MATTHEWS:

Oh, certainly. I agree with that, as well. For the Minister's sake, for his own pride and for his sanity, I hope he gets the job as President of MUN, because he will not be able to take another two years, or whatever is left of the mandate of that Government, over there being so sensible and being so educated.

MR. TOBIN:

He does not enjoy putting people in jail.

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, he does not.

The other thing I think is true about the Minister is that he is starting to wear thin and get tired already of putting those very reasonable proposals forward to Cabinet and not really getting his way. Of course, I am not being selfish about it. If I were selfish about it politically, I would hope they would just stop listening to the Minister altogether and then there would

not be one item of sanity coming from the new Government.

I want, Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, to talk about the most important issue in Newfoundland and Labrador, not only today, but every day, and has been for centuries, and that is the state of the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery. There has never been a crisis experienced before in this Province of the proportion that we are facing in the fishery in this Province today.

It is very, very frightening for me, Mr. Speaker, as I have said one hundred times before but I think it is worth repeating, that we have two Governments, the Provincial Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and the Federal Government of Canada, who, I do not believe, do not know how to go about dealing with the issue, I believe they refuse to go about dealing with the crisis in our fishery. I think they flatly refuse. The Federal Government particularly, I feel, has been bamboozled by the same bureaucrats that have been there for the last ten to twenty years, the very same bureaucrats who in the early 1980s said, the Newfoundland fishery had to be restructured because there was an over-processing capacity in the Province. At the very same time they were saying that, they were saying the crisis in the fishery was not because of the lack of fish. At the same time they were saying plants should close in this Province, they were recommending a total allowable catch in excess of 400,000 metric tons. But that was their way, in the early 1980s, of trying to get the Newfoundland fishery restructured.

What we see now, Mr. Speaker, are

those same bureaucrats giving advice to different Federal Ministers, of different political stripes, by the way, who are still convinced that we poor souls in Newfoundland and Labrador, getting as meager a living as we are from the fishery should not even get that.

Now, they have no suggestions as to what we should do to replace that. I have not heard one suggestion coming from the federal bureaucracy, or the Federal Government to date, as to how we should deal with this very serious issue, particularly as we are struggling to overcome what most people recognize as a resource problem and a resource crisis. I say most, because not everyone is convinced that the resource situation is as serious as most people are saying it is. When I say most, I am talking about people in authority, from the Federal Government to the Provincial Government, to top federal bureaucrats to top provincial bureaucrats, to even Dr. Harris himself.

And, of course, we have not seen the Harris report yet, in the Province. The Government, with all due respect, has not even seen the Harris report yet, the Minister as late as today told me, which really appalls and alarms me. Because the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador should have been in receipt of that report a day or two after the Federal Minister; extend the courtesy to the Federal Minister, give him a day or two to peruse the report, but, then, he should have sent a copy of that report to the duly elected Government of the Province. Who else they wanted to give it to in the Province is up to themselves, but the Government

of Newfoundland and Labrador should have had the report, and I want to go on record in this House as saying that.

Carrying the argument a bit further, Mr. Speaker, to talk about the Province, I never thought in my wildest dreams that I would see a Provincial Government, a Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, who would be so willing - so willing - to see the social fabric, the employment fabric, every other fabric that you want to talk about, destroyed, particularly of rural Newfoundland and Labrador, but that is what we have. Since the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries came to office they have consistently said that the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador must be rationalized and downsized; there must be fishermen come out of the fishing boats, there must be fish plants closed, fish plant workers displaced. But, again, up to today no one has said where those fishermen, those fish plant workers, those trawlermen will turn for a living. The only person who has made any type of comment about where they might turn for a living, since this crisis has been upon us for the last ten to twelve months, has been the Minister of Employment and Labour who said, 'Well, I guess they will have to turn to welfare,' but no one else. To give her credit she made a suggestion, and that is more than I have heard from anyone else. But it was not the proper suggestion that she made. I guess she found herself in the same position the Economic Recovery Commission finds itself in today, and the same position the Economic Recovery Commission found itself in a couple of months ago, and the Provincial Government consequently

found itself in with the panick decision they made, the panick decision to provide Fishery Products International with \$11.5 million for an extended notice period.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, on the same day they said no.

MR. MATTHEWS:

The very same day, at 12:40 p.m., that the Premier stood in the lobby of Confederation Building and said, 'I would if I could, but I cannot,' at 8:00 p.m. that night he had Mr. Young over in his office and said, 'Vic, old boy, I have \$11.5 million for you.'

MR. TOBIN:

Why? Why did he change?

MR. MATTHEWS:

You see, because that was an admission on the Government's part, an admission on the part of the Economic Recovery Commission that there were no plans in place to deal with this crisis.

So, we have two levels of Government, plus the Economic Recovery Commission, which still do not have any plans in place to deal with the crisis in the fishery. Thousands of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are being laid off. Notices are going out today to workers at F.P.I., and have gone out over the last two or three weeks, people who thought that when the Premier announced the \$11.5 million, and Mr. Young had his press conference to announce the \$11.5 million, they at least had 20 weeks employment this year and 20 weeks employment next year. But what some of them found in their pay envelopes the last few weeks is that the numbers are decreasing, the employment levels are

decreasing, even with the \$11.5 million the Provincial Government is putting forward for an extended notice period.

Now, that is why I asked the question of the Minister of Fisheries today, what conditions has the Provincial Government attached to the \$11.5 million to Fishery Products International? To me, it is a very fair question. The people employed in the three plants affected want to know will the work force be reduced by 50 per cent and the Government still give the company \$11.5 million? That is the question that has to be asked.

MR. SIMMS:

Maybe the Member for St. John's South (Mr. Murphy) put the pressure on it - did he? - and told the Premier, 'You had better do it, buddy, or else I am gone.'

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is another situation, of course, the St. John's NatSea situation, a very troublesome situation that we find ourselves in. I say we, because we want to see solutions to that problem, as well. We want to see the employment levels on the South Side kept as they are.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, and our caucus believes and our special fisheries committee believes, that there can be a way found to keep the employment levels stable at the South Side plant, not only until 1991 or until August 5th or May 5th or whatever date it is, but forever.

AN HON. MEMBER:

And how is it to be done?

MR. MATTHEWS:

How is it to be done?

MR. SIMMS:

He cannot tell you now.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, we probably could tell him. It would probably be unfair to tell him, because we have had discussions ongoing with people affected by it.

MR. MURPHY:

A seventeen year stigma.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Listen, in seventeen years the St. John's, Southside plant was not closed. It just so happens that about 10 months after you were elected it is closing. Now, that is the brutal reality of it, and here you are sitting in the very caucus of the Provincial Government that only gave an offer to National Sea after - after - it made an offer to Fishery Products International. That tells me how effective you were. And the very days I stood in this House and told you your plant was due for closure, you denied it day after day. The Premier bamboozled you, and the Minister of Fisheries said, Do not listen to them, Tom. They do not know what they are talking about. But who knew what they were talking about? Who told this Legislature and told the public of this Province what plants were going to close in Newfoundland and Labrador?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

You did. You did.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is right.

I told you. All I am saying to you is this, that if the Provincial Government had given National Sea the \$3 million dollar offer before they announced the plant was closing, you might have

had until 1991 at your present levels, as well. But you were too late coming with the \$3 million offer, and the company was embarrassed because they had already announced the closure and your Government had concurred with it. That is what happened.

Now, having said all that, I hope for the people of the Southside that there is a way found. I believe there can be a solution found for NatSea, particularly when they are talking about shrimp, because at least there is an offer for a shrimp operation. A lot of communities in this Province today have no offer for anything. I think on top of the shrimp operation, which will provide X number of jobs, there can be other things done there to process fish that may be going somewhere else. Fishermen are even looking for a market to sell their fish today, by the way, inshore fishermen.

MR. SIMMS:

The bottom line is there are options.

MR. MATTHEWS:

There are options.

If that was processed on the Southside with a few other million pounds that might be landed in St. John's and trucked somewhere else, then they all could be happy. Could they not? Does the Member agree with that? Do you agree with that? How come you have not talked to the Premier about it?

MR. SIMMS:

The Premier will not talk to him.

MR. TOBIN:

Why did the Government take so long in making an offer to NatSea in St. John's? That is the

question.

MR. SIMMS:

The Premier wanted St. John's closed. That is the bottom line.

MR. MATTHEWS:

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that has been really, really bothersome in this whole fisheries issue is the lack of leadership that has been displayed by the Premier and his Cabinet Ministers in dealing with the fisheries issue. They have not gotten into the middle of the issue whatsoever. They have avoided the issue. They have been content to blame Ottawa totally for the mess. We are not saying on this side that Ottawa does not deserve a fair share of the blame, I have said it before and I will say it again, they do.

MR. SIMMS:

They certainly do.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You people are the duly elected Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, and it is time you rolled up your sleeves and got into the middle of this fisheries racket and tried to come up with a solution for the communities around this Province.

MR. SIMMS:

Right on.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You have not done it. You have been derelict in your duties. You are still not doing it.

MR. SIMMS:

Did you read the editorial today?

MR. MATTHEWS:

You have not done it with the announced closures of the two major fish companies in this Province. You are refusing to do

it on a daily basis with the small and medium size companies in this Province, fish companies who are coming looking for assistance by way of loan guarantees. Fish companies are falling daily and the numbers are going to increase daily as we gear up for the new fishing season. Now that is the brutal reality of it, and I say that to those Members opposite for a reason, those particularly that we refer to as private Members or backbenchers. You did not believe us last year when we told you about the major companies, but you had better believe us today about the small and medium size companies and inshore plants all over this Province that people are depending on this year to get a bit of employment to get them through next winter.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mention New Ferolle.

MR. MATTHEWS:

What happened to New Ferolle up in the Minister of Under Development's District, the half Minister of Development. He only has half a Department now. Dr. House got the rest. There are locks on New Ferolle up there. They could not get hold of the Member I am told. The could not get him. The plant is gone. They looked to the Province for assistance and there is none available. There are 250 or 300 more people gone. I am only telling you what I have been told.

MR. FUREY:

Who told you?

MR. MATTHEWS:

I cannot give away my sources.

MR. FUREY:

You are talking to yourself again are you?

MR. MATTHEWS:

You thought I was talking to myself last year when, as the Minister of Development, you did not know which fish plants in the Province were going to close either, but you did not care.

MR. TOBIN:

And as Chairman of resource policy you did not know.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is the problem. Valleyfield, Twillingate, Fogo Island Co-op, all around the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Then I hear they are giving out more processing licenses.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, there is another processing license in the mix we hear. We are having a shutdown, as the Deputy Minister of Fisheries said, of 100 plants in the Province probably this year. We are giving out additional processing licenses.

DR. KITCHEN:

Proper thing.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Proper thing the Minister of Finance says but what would you expect of him, coming from that big fishing District he represents? Grabbed \$100 million from the taxpayers of the Province last year and we look forward to them grabbing another \$100 million this year, I suppose. More licenses. What you are doing is you are aggravating the problem because you do not know how to deal with it. The Government does not know how to deal with the present crisis and it is time you rolled up your sleeves and got in the middle of it. We are not talking about partisan politics here. We are talking about the

future of Newfoundland and Labrador and that is more important than me and more important than you. It is more important than me being in Government or you being in Government - it is more important. And all I am pleading to the Government is to please, even though it is rather late in the game to get involved, try to find a solution for those fifty to one hundred communities that will be negatively affected this year by way of plants that will not reopen.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Jerseyside is not open.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Jerseyside is another one. Jerseyside is gone the way of Long Harbour and the way that Argentia will go under Hibernia, I would say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MATTHEWS:

So, Mr. Speaker, these are my remarks on the Gracious Speech from the Throne, as I think it is referred to, Mr. Speaker. And I suppose you have to stick with parliamentary requirements, parliamentary language and you ordinarily have to congratulate the Mover and the Seconder, who did a good job, a marvelous job, Even the Member for Placentia (Mr. Hogan) did a good job.

MR. HOGAN:

(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

But you did, you did a good job. The Member for St. George's had a good speech today. But when I see the Member for Gander (Mr. Baker) in the Premier's seat I really

think that if he had won the Leadership perhaps we would not be in this mess today. He would not be going all over Canada telling the rest of Canada what is good for them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:
Down in the States.

AN HON. MEMBER:
He voted for Meech Lake.

MR. MATTHEWS:
He voted for Meech Lake, that is true, did he not?

MR. TOBIN:
He voted for Meech Lake.

MR. MATTHEWS:
He voted for Meech Lake.

So with these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I conclude.

MR. MURPHY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for St. John's South.

MR. MURPHY:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I am told that the hon. the Member for Grand Bank adjourned the debate.

MR. MURPHY:
No, he could have not.

MR. SPEAKER:
Okay. The Member for St. John's South.

MR. MURPHY:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
Does the hon. Member want to adjourn the debate?

MR. MURPHY:
With the privilege of the Chair I would adjourn the debate until tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before we get around to -

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

Was the Member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) asking for the -

MR. TOBIN:
No.

MR. SPEAKER:
No.

MR. TOBIN:
I was just going to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker, like the rest.

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

MR. BAKER:
It is already adjourned.

Before we adjourn the sitting today, I wonder if the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Simms) can inform us about what is going to happen on Wednesday, Private Member's Day?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the agreement we set last Session, I guess, the intention is to carry on with the Private Members' Resolutions, back and forth, one each, and on the Monday, or at least no later than the Monday prior to the Wednesday, each House Leader would indicate which resolution they intend to call. So I would like to indicate to the House that we will be calling resolution No. 1, I guess. I am not sure. I do not have a copy of it here, but it is the one laid down by the Leader of the Opposition. It was a resolution dealing with the economy, if Members will recall, and it will be No. 1, because it was the first one presented. That is the one we will be calling, for the benefit of the Government House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think the agreement we had last Session was slightly different from what the Opposition House Leader is now saying. Our agreement was that we would not go one on one, but out of every five the Opposition would have three and Government would have two. There was an attempt to give the Opposition more Private Member's

Days than the Government. I agree with him that we will continue with that practice, and quite often the Opposition could have two Wednesdays in a row if they wanted to, this kind of arrangement.

MR. SPEAKER:

Do hon. Members want to stop the clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes. We did have an ad hoc kind of arrangement last time. I just thought it might be better to formalize it so that we all understood clearly what the situation was, and if you were going to say you wanted two in a row or whatever the case might be, that might be a bit too loose. I do not know. But, of course, if the Government does not call a Private Member's resolution on a particular Wednesday or a couple of days before, well, then, I guess we would have no choice but to call one.

I thought we would go one on one, back and forth, particularly because I am getting the feeling that Private Members on your side do not have too much involvement. We want to provide the opportunity for Private Members on that side to put forth their resolutions. Members opposite agree. And agreements have been broken before. I remind the hon. House Leader about the Legislative Review Committee and how that got twisted the last time around. Let us say one on one; we will go this week and you will go next week and

alternatively. Let us stick to that and Private Members, in particular, will get a chance to put forth resolutions. I think that is fair.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We will go as far as Wednesday and say that the resolution we will debate Wednesday will be the resolution which was put forward by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I hesitate to involve myself in the foolish antics of playing politics with the way the House is going to progress. I hesitate to sink to that level, Mr. Speaker, so maybe we better discuss the details of the issue at some later date.

I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow at 2:00 p.m., and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 13, 1990, at 2:00 p.m.