



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 13

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush*

Thursday

[Preliminary Transcript]

29 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 hon. Roger Simmons, Member of Parliament for Burin - St. Georges. Also, we would like to welcome on behalf of hon. Members twenty-eight grade XII students accompanied by two teachers and the Canadian issues class of Musgravetown High School, Musgravetown. Also we would like to welcome to the galleries today seventeen girl guides accompanied by their three leaders from St. John's.

#### Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, the problem of the huge number of refugees deplaning from eastern European and Cuban airlines at Gander has now reached crisis proportions. As of midnight last night there were 2,201 refugees being maintained by the Provincial Government in hotels in the Province.

The Province would have no difficulty accommodating two or three hundred refugees at any one time, as we have done over recent years, nor do we mind paying our fair share of the cost. However, the number of refugees in the Province has grown from 368 in mid-January of this year to 2,201 at the moment. And if you bear in mind the population of this Province and our capability, 2,201 is roughly the equivalent of having over 100,000 in Canada in

those two months. Now you can imagine the reaction there would be in the nation if all of a sudden we had 100,000 refugees descend on the nation. That is the level of the impact on this Province. Virtually all of the motel rooms in the Province are filled to capacity. The matter reached a crisis stage last evening when certain hotels in Gander requested some of the refugees be moved in order to enable those hotels to meet longstanding commitments. An emergency meeting was held with the Minister of Social Services to deal with these requests and discuss Government's response to this crisis.

From Newfoundland's point of view the problem has two dimensions. First, we have literally run out of suitable physical space to accommodate the refugees. At the moment 82 per cent of all available hotel, motel, and tourist lodge facilities on the Island of Newfoundland is occupied by refugees. Hotels have to meet their other longstanding commitments and are requiring us to move the refugees for brief periods of time to allow them to honour their other committed reservations. As well, only Gander and St. John's have the immigration and interpreting services necessary to properly attend to the needs of the refugees.

The second dimension of the problem is the cost. It has for some time exceeded the capability of this Province and has gone far beyond what can be reasonably expected of the poorest Province in this nation in dealing with what is a national problem or a national obligation. It is now costing the taxpayers of this

Province, their share, the total gross cost is \$2.50 million, the share that has to be born by the taxpayers is in excess of \$1.25 million per month to provide accommodation only to the refugees that are here, and the numbers are growing every week.

Now, in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we also have to provide for medical services and education services as needed so this is a major problem and a major cost.

Ignoring for the moment the financial burden on the taxpayers of this Province we must within the next few days find an alternative that will enable Canada to treat the refugees in a humanitarian way. Newfoundland's physical capacity to do so is exhausted. Last night we had sixty refugees sleeping on mattresses in a large room in the Battery Hotel. That is the stage which we have reached so it is a matter of crisis proportions.

I have this morning both spoken to the Prime Minister and written to him to apprise him of the gravity of the situation and to seek his immediate intervention. He has assured me that he will personally look into the matter.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is not really adequate for me to say he has assured me that he will personally look into the matter, he gave me a greater level of comfort than that. In the discussion that I had with him I felt complete confidence that at the conclusion of the conversation he would attend to the matter very quickly and would provide the help that we will need. As a matter of fact I have reason to believe, since my conversation with him, that action is already underway

and I want to express my gratitude to the Prime Minister for his immediate response.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not think anybody gets any particular satisfaction out of the very difficult problem that the refugees have, that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has in this particular matter and that the people of Canada have.

Mr. Speaker, we can only at this point in time because of the gravity of the situation concur with the statement made here today by the Premier. I think that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians as a society have shown a great deal of sympathy and compassion for refugees that have been coming into our Province in such great numbers, particularly over the last number of weeks and months. There is no doubt about it that we have exceeded our fiscal capacity and our physical capacity to be able to address the continuing growing problem.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, we support the initiative by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to seek, on an emergency and urgent basis, additional help from the Government of Canada. We obviously have exceeded, as I have said, our capacity physically and financially to be able to continue to address this problem and the nation must get involved and help us out. Where are we going to put them, aside from the financial fiscal cost as the Premier said.

So we do have to have help and we certainly support the Government and the Premier in that initiative.

The only other thing I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that I find it kind of strange that the Minister of Social Services, who has been carrying the brunt of this particular problem day after day, was not able to make this Ministerial Statement to the House today and it had to be delivered by the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to inform this hon. House of the Government's decision to proceed with the construction of a road to the community of Petit Forte.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you.

Hon. Members will recall that several months ago I announced my Department's intention to evaluate the merits of the construction of a road to the community of Petit Forte, before proceeding any further with this project. That evaluation is now complete and the Government has decided to continue with the construction of the road from Brookside to Petit Forte.

The road to Petit Forte will be approximately 23 kilometers in length and the total construction

costs are estimated to be \$5.9 million. Completion of the road is scheduled for the Fall of 1991.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, how pressure has worked. How pressure has worked!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, nothing has changed, not a thing has changed as it relates to the impact the Federal Government will have on this road. It is unfortunate that the Minister and his colleagues sat by and punished the people of Petit Forte for so long for voting Conservative in the last election. The people of Petit Forte have taken up petitions; I have a thousand name petition here I was denied the right to present on their behalf the other day. There is a boatload of people from Petit Forte due to meet with the Premier tomorrow afternoon. All things are coming together, but I say Thank God the work of the previous Government and the work of the Federal Government has finally succeeded.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not thank all my colleagues for the support they have given me on this project. I would not be --

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Yes. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the people of Petit Forte, the people of the Burin peninsula and the people of Placentia District for the support they



offered, but I really want to thank the hon. John Crosbie, who told the Premier and the Minister, 'Until you honour the agreement on the Petit Forte Road, do not come near me to talk about any other roads: the Burgeo Road, the Curling Waterfront or anything else - until that is deal with. John Crosbie deserves a lot of credit for this road.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to elaborate on Government's approval of \$250,000 for the purpose of improving the information/interpretation facilities presently in place at the two major gateways to the Island and to plan for additional facilities at gateway locations as travel volumes continue to grow.

Hon. Members will recall that in last year's Budget, \$100,000 was provided to provide for a new display for the lower level of the Provincial Interpretation/Information Centre at Port aux Basques. In this year's Budget, Government has approved an additional \$150,000 for further improvements to the centre at Port aux Basques. The planned improvements relate to the information services available to visitors and will include an expanded area for private sector tourism related businesses to display their brochures, a much improved visitor information area, and because of the location of the centre, a designated section of the display area will highlight southwest Newfoundland. As a major interpretation/information centre, we must continue to ensure this facility is maintained and

operated in the most appropriate manner.

Mr. Speaker, with the introduction of the new Marine Atlantic ferry, "The Joseph And Clara Smallwood", on the Argentia service and in support of the projected increase in the visitor traffic via the Argentia gateway, I am also pleased to announce that Government has approved \$100,000 to complete the preliminary design and begin the site selection for the new Provincial Interpretation/Information Centre to be located in the Argentia area. This preliminary work will be completed during the fiscal year 1990/91 so that we may include the actual construction costs in the Estimates for the next fiscal year, 1991/92.

The present facility at Dunville has served us well, but as the traffic increases there is a requirement to expand to meet the needs of the increasing number of visitors. This new centre, when completed, will contribute significantly not only to the numbers of visitors who visit the areas, but will assist in convincing visitors to stay longer and increase their expenditures in the southwest avalon region.

Further, Mr. Speaker, we must not underestimate the importance of Labrador. With the opening of the road from Baie Comeau to Labrador West, the Labrador West area is rapidly becoming the third important gateway to this Province. As progress is made on the Trans Labrador Highway, we will continue to monitor the visitor traffic into Labrador West for the purpose of completing our planning efforts in support of the construction of a visitor centre in the Labrador West area. We

expect to begin the site and design work during the 1991/92 fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, this Government recognizes the importance of locating appropriate visitor interpretation/information centres at the major gateways to the Province. We will continue in our efforts to improve and expand on these and other similar facilities right throughout the entire Province. Thank you.

MR. GREENING:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. GREENING:  
First of all, I want to thank the Minister of Development (Mr. Furey) for delivering a copy of this statement to me before the House opened today. Let me also say to the Minister on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House that we are pleased with the Minister's announcement today and welcome these initiatives taken by the Minister.

I would like to say to the Minister that he is in charge of a Department which presides over one of the greatest untapped resources this Province has, and that is the tourism sector. Any progress the Minister can make in having people made more aware of the tourism potential of this beautiful Province of ours, certainly is supported by all Members of this hon. House.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see information/interpretation centres at both Port aux Basques and

Argentia. It is very appropriate that these two sites be chosen to receive funding, Mr. Speaker. These are the two major gateways to our Province and, as such, provide the first impressions of our Province to visitors from around the world.

It is good also, Mr. Speaker, to see services made available to the Port aux Basques Centre for the private business sector to display their brochures. If there is one complaint I most frequently hear from visitors to our Province, it certainly has been the lack of information available to visitors upon entering our Province. Quite possibly this will change over time, and this is a good step forward. One hundred thousand dollars for Argentia for preliminary studies and design and site selection for a new visitor centre in that area is welcome news also, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. GULLAGE:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:  
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today that Government has approved new policy guidelines with respect to the financing of regional recreational facilities in Newfoundland and Labrador.

The new policy guidelines are the result of a complete review of the complete review of the Regional Recreation Facilities Program. This review was undertaken with a view toward effecting improvements in the provision of recreational

facilities throughout the Province.

The rationale for this program basically was to encourage municipalities to join together to build and operate major facilities ensuring greater financial viability from an increased tax base.

In the past fifteen years, the Provincial Government spent approximately \$30 million on a variety of community recreation facilities. The majority are minor in nature and include facilities such as ballfields, outdoor courts and recreation halls. Major facilities such as arenas and indoor pools were also funded under this program.

Our review indicated that many of these facilities were poorly designed and constructed and that they did not respond to specific needs of the communities and additionally, they have proven to be very costly to operate and to maintain. On average, it has been discovered that municipal councils are subsidizing arenas and pool operations to the extent of between \$40,000 and \$60,000 each per year.

The original guidelines under the Regional Recreational Facilities Program stipulated that Government would pay for the construction of these facilities from capital account over a two or three year period.

Under the new guidelines, Government, together with the municipalities involved, would finance the cost of construction amortized over a twenty year period under the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation.

The cost-sharing ratio would be

80/20 with the Province paying 80 per cent of the share. The new policy will make it easier for municipalities to deal with the financial burden. However, municipalities will have to convince the Province that they have the ability to finance their portion.

Another element of the new proposal is the establishment of a minimum and a maximum, as the funding limits with respect to the involvement of the Province. Under the new policy, funding for major recreational facilities would be restricted to two projects annually.

Mr. Speaker, the new policy guidelines state:

That a minimum of \$100,000 and a maximum of \$1,500,000 are established as the funding limits for the financial involvement of the Province under the program, with any amount over \$1,500,000 to be the complete responsibility of the relevant municipalities to be provided from their own resources;

2) That a maximum of two major projects per year to be approved, with a total allowable capital expenditure of \$3,000,000. What this means is that in the current year the Government would commit to two major recreational facilities, at a cost of \$3 million;

3) That in identifying projects to be approved in any year, the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs shall provide an opportunity for all interested municipalities in the Province to be considered, with the Minister to provide a full report to Cabinet on the recommended projects;

4) That for each application received under the program, the total cost of the project is to be allocated among the individual municipalities involved in the application on the basis of the populations of the respective municipalities as established by Statistics Canada in the most recent census; and that a detailed review of the financial position of each municipality be carried out by the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, to establish that each municipality will be able to service its share of the debt involved and the projected operating cost of the completed facility;

5) That for each application approved under the program, financing for the project to be arranged as follows:

(A) The municipalities associated with the application to be authorized to borrow from a chartered bank or other financial institution, Government guaranteed loans for amounts not exceeding their respective shares of the total cost of the construction of the facility, including design and related costs, together with the amount required to capitalize the related accrued interest on the loans up to the date of substantial completion of the project and for an additional period of six months beyond that date, if required; with legislation to be introduced in due course to sanction the guaranteed loans and following completion of the project, the loans to be repaid to the chartered banks or other financial institutions and refinanced by the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation through the issue of debentures to the respective municipalities for a period not

exceeding twenty years;

(B) Repayment of the debentured debt in 5 (A) to the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation to be made as follows:

(I) For the 80 per cent Provincial share, payments of principal and interest be made by the Province to the Corporation, on behalf of the municipalities, over the term of the debenture, from annual budgetary provisions in the relevant account centres of the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. Any interest accruing on the Provincial share of the debentures beyond the six month capitalization period to be paid by the Department from annual budgetary provisions in the relevant current account centre;

(II) For the 20 per cent Municipal share, payments of principal and interest be made by the municipalities to the Corporation over the term of the debenture from their own current resources. Any interest accruing on the Municipal share of the debentures beyond the six month capitalization period to be paid by the respective municipalities from their own resources.

This Policy is to have effect from April 1, 1990.

Mr. Speaker, there will not be a Recreation Capital Grants Program, as such, for 1990/91 as no new funds were identified in the budget. One of the reasons for this is that we felt that it was time to assess this Program to determine if, in fact, there is a better way of delivering financial assistance to the municipalities to assist with new construction and refurbishment of existing recreation facilities.

Officials of my Department will review similar programs throughout the Country and it is my hope that a new program or programs will be in place by the spring of next year.

In the meantime, we have identified approximately \$350,000 for new Recreation Capital Projects to be committed immediately and I will be announcing these projects within the next few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, also budgeted is \$100,000 for the Arena Pool Retrofit Program, \$25,000 for the arena structural safety assessment. Mr. Speaker, when you consider that there is \$1.7 million in the budget for previous commitments together with the amounts indicated today, I think it can be said that Government is making a significant contribution with reference to the construction and financing of recreation facilities in the Province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WINSOR:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WINSOR:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First I would like to thank the Minister for providing me an advance copy. What I do not know is what took the Minister so long to prepare it. One year it has been in the making and I do not see very much here that is going to solve the recreational needs of this Province. I want to take exception to some of the remarks the Minister made. The Minister

said the majority are minor in nature and includes facilities such as ball fields. I think he should go out into the communities of Newfoundland and see if they think a ball field is of a minor nature. See what they think of it.

The Minister says the facilities were poorly designed and constructed. I think he should ask the people of Bay Roberts and the people in the Southern shore area if the facilities that were in place were poorly designed and constructed.

Mr. Speaker, under the guidelines, the 80/20, what the Minister has done is to shift the burden of this directly to the tax payers of the communities by having to finance twenty per cent over a twenty year period. This is going to involve a substantial cost to municipalities because of the high interest. The previous program would have had the construction completed in a three year period with money all up front and that would have been the end of it. Now it is going to be financed over twenty years and if you can imagine small municipalities having to finance \$200,000 perhaps \$300,000 to reach the length of the \$1.5 million, twenty years, you can imagine the interest that would accrue to the communities. What is devious in this statement, though, is that the Minister says a maximum of two major projects a year with a total allowable capital expenditure of \$3 million. But in his guide lines he says that it is possible that a facility that would cost \$100,000 could be constructed, which means that in a given year we could have facilities costing \$200,000 and not the \$3 million as the Minister indicates. Now I do not know what kind of political trickery this

Government is engaging in. This might be somewhat similar to the budget. This sounds like a Dr. Kitchen statement. The other thing the statement fails to include is how do communities get considered for this? The Minister makes a point in each one of his statements of saying municipalities. He does not include unincorporated areas which in many communities make up a large part of the regional recreational complex program. How are they to be considered when they do not have books for the officials at Municipal Affairs to audit? He makes no mention of feasibility studies. Are they to be carried out?

What happens to the communities who have already carried them out at a cost of \$25,000 for a community? Are these applications to be reconsidered or do they have to go through this same expense again? In the last page of his statement the Minister says there will not be a Recreation Capital Grants Program for 1990-91. The Grinch who stole Christmas, he announces on one hand and takes it back on the other. The Minister suddenly announces \$350,000 for new capital recreation projects and I wonder if that is not money which was left from last year's Budget and is now going to be allocated this year? In reality there is not five cents in this Budget for new small capital works projects in this Province.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we saw, for the first time, Government's new Interim Consumer Advocate spout the Government line as he commented on Newfoundland Hydro's application for a rate increase that is now before the Public Utilities Board.

It is obvious, from the start, that this new Interim Consumer Advocate, Mr. Speaker, is no Andy Wells when it comes to protecting the consumers of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy.

Does the Minister concur with Mr. Casey's convoluted logic that Government's decision to phase out the PDD subsidy of \$30 million over a three year period, and that will have to be clawed back from the consumer, that Government's decision to put a loan guarantee on the debt of Hydro, which will be another \$9 million that the consumer must pick up, in other words, Government's budgetary decision to force Hydro to come up with another \$39 million which must be passed on the ratepayers, does the Minister concur with Mr. Casey that this has nothing to do with the 4.5 per cent rate increase that Hydro is now looking for over the next three years? In

other words, 13.5 per cent over the next three years, and that has nothing to do with Government's budgetary decision.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, I did not hear Mr. Casey, so I am not going to comment on anything he might have said, until I do hear exactly what he said.

MR. RIDEOUT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister should check out what Mr. Casey had to say last night. In essence, what he had to say was that the Government's decision to abandon the PDD subsidies and put on the loan impost on Newfoundland Hydro had nothing to do with the increases.

Let me ask the Minister this, Mr. Speaker: Can the Minister tell the House as the Minister of Mines and Energy whether or not he sees the role of the Consumer Advocate at PUB as one of defending rate increases, as one of defending Government policy on Hydro budgetary decisions, as one of attacking the Federal Government on tax policy, or should it be defending the consumer of Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, the Consumer Advocate is the Consumer Advocate. He is

not there to protect or defend Hydro. Hydro is in there to defend itself.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the same Minister.

In view of the fact that this Consumer Advocate, who took this pathetic sort of Government lapdog approach yesterday before the PUB in its first public hearing, would the Minister consider giving some funding to an independent outside consumers group to represent their interests before the PUB, in view of the fact that this pathetic civil servant bureaucrat cannot represent the interests of the consumers of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

I have no comment on that, Mr. Speaker. I think it would be more appropriately put to somebody else.

MR. A. SNOW:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Menihek.

MR. A. SNOW:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs (Mr. Gullage), the Minister responsible for Recreation, Sport and Fitness. The Minister announced yesterday in a small little wire that he shifted out over the wires, another onslaught against the people of Labrador that was contained in the Budget of two

week's ago, the Budget that was not going to hurt the people of this Province.

He announced last week that the Labrador Air Passenger Subsidy Program was discontinued; yesterday they announced that the youth have been hit in Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame!

MR. A. SNOW:

A \$100,000 reduction in the Labrador Travel Program.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The people's Budget.

MR. A. SNOW:

A decrease of subsidy for sports and cultural groups of 75 to 50 per cent for youth and 50 to 25 per cent for adults. Can the Minister tell this hon. House and the people of Labrador why this program was originally put in place, and why now it is being cut?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

A good question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, my Department was fortunate in that having to make savings in my Department, this is one of the areas that was identified. I feel very fortunate that we only had to cut, as we did, 75 per cent to 50 per cent, and from 50 per cent to 25 per cent.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Fortunate?

MR. GULLAGE:

The program has not been

eliminated. The reduction in terms of dollars is \$100,000. It is a reduction, it is a cut in the Budget, but it is a cut that was identified in my Department and it is in place.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Menihek.

MR. A. SNOW:

Mr. Speaker, the people of Western Labrador, indeed all of Labrador, do not feel that it was a fortunate cut.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. A. SNOW:

The gutting of a program is what they call it. My supplementary question is again to the Minister. We saw in the Budget of two weeks ago an additional \$3 million tax grab coming out of Western Labrador. Recognizing that this Government also predicted a \$10 million surplus in their Budget, can he tell me why he has to cut it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Answer the question. Answer the question.

MR. GULLAGE:

Why?

MR. A. SNOW:

Why, indeed! If this Government has a \$10 million surplus predicted in its Budget, why indeed do you have to cut this program?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, in the Budget process, of course, cuts were



identified in various Departments in order to come up with a Budget that was acceptable. The fact that Government decided to be in a surplus decision on current account is a decision of the Government, and that is a separate item entirely from identifying Budget cuts in whatever Department.

MR. FLIGHT:

A good answer!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Menihek.

MR. A. SNOW:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is again to the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. I do not believe that he really understands the importance of this particular program to the people of all Labrador. While I specifically speak for the interests of the people of Western Labrador, other people in this Chamber may, indeed, speak for some of the other people of Labrador. But my phone has rung off the wall since yesterday evening. I was on the phone until 1:00 o'clock this morning.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. gentleman is in to his third supplementary and, as hon. Members know, they should proceed to get to their supplementary as quickly as possible.

The hon. the Member for Menihek.

MR. A. SNOW:

Does the Minister realize that just this morning the High School Athletic Federation, in Labrador, announced the curtailment of a program that is going to cut 200 students from a program this month? Does he realize that?

Does he realize some of the effects this will have on this whole Province, not just Labrador? Does he realize why it was put in place? It was to influence more travel within this Province, from the Island to Labrador and from Labrador to the Island, and, indeed, this may force them to travel to the Province of Quebec because of economic means? Is that what he is trying to do?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, I will be speaking, of course, to the three federations that are involved and impacted by this program. As for the high school program he refers to, for this particular month it will not be affected; this does not take effect until April 1. I am familiar with what you are saying, but that will not be impacted. I said all existing programs in effect and all commitments made will be honoured, and that is a fact. We do understand this could have some impact, but keep in mind the program is still in place. It is a reduction from 75 to 50 per cent, and 50 to 25 per cent, but the program is still in place.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. Now that the Minister of Finance confirmed for my colleague, a few days ago, that the 20 per cent air subsidy

program will not be reinstated, and now that the Minister and Provincial and Municipal Affairs has confirmed for my colleague that there will be \$100,000 cut from the sport and cultural travel program, could the Minister tell this hon. House when he will be making the third announcement, of another major cut to the people of Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, it has not gotten through to hon. Members opposite that this Province, this year, is forecasting going in the hole \$250 million more than it went in the hole before. Those hon. Members over there and their predecessors drove us \$5.2 billion in the hole and we have to cut, we cannot spend. We have been spending like drunken sailors over the past few years and we must come to grips with that deficit problem.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the Premier. Yesterday I had the opportunity to visit Labrador and I met with the town council of Happy Valley - Goose Bay, in fact, at the same time the Minister was making his statement about the cut to sports and culture. Yesterday in Happy Valley - Goose Bay everybody showed a real concern about this Government selling off Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter I wish the Page to deliver to the Premier. I ask the Premier if he would seriously consider the contents of this letter and remove

Mr. Jim Kelland from his Cabinet, to save Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

I do not know if there is a question, Mr. Speaker. If there is a question, I will answer it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, the people in Labrador have said loud and clear in the last few days that Labrador's representative in the Cabinet of Newfoundland and Labrador is not speaking up in the interest of his people. Would the Premier kindly take the necessary steps, on behalf of the people in Labrador, to remove the hon. Member from his Cabinet and possibly put the Member for Eagle River (Mr. Dumaresque) in the Cabinet, in his place?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, it has been my experience with the hon. Member in the House that nothing he has ever said has had an iota of credibility or substance to it, so I give what he said no more credibility and substance than what he said in the past, I just consider it to be a silly, foolish remark.

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. First of all I have to set the record straight, Mr. Speaker, in saying that I did go to the Minister and ask for funding for my district. I also met the Minister on two occasions and on the last occasion he told me what he thought the mil rate would be, as suggested by his Department. I want to make that clear. But, Mr. Speaker, it was only this morning, when I attended a meeting in Flat Rock, that reality came home to roost. I want to ask the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) joke, boys.

MR. PARSONS:

You can joke about it all you like. It is no joke with the thousand people whom I represent in Flat Rock. You can laugh all you like! But I want to ask the Minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

There is too much interference, on both sides of the House, for the hon. Gentleman to ask his question. The hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. PARSONS:

Will the Minister tell this hon. House whether he intends to send the same letter to all the Councils of Newfoundland, the same

content, as the one he sent to Flat Rock?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

I am not familiar with the letter to which you are referring. But if you are referring to the fact that Flat Rock Council was asked to make adjustments in their Budget, that is quite true. Several other Councils were asked to do the same thing.

If I might explain to the House, there were certain communities in the Province which were identified as critical - critical - by my officials in the regional offices. I asked the approval of Government, that if these communities were willing to make adjustments in their finances to qualify them for Capital works, that I would approve it, and they have been asked to make those adjustments in their Budgets. If they were willing to make those adjustments, they would be qualified for Capital works. If I had not asked Government for approval for these critical projects, they would not have been approved at all, or even considered.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, then, will the Minister acknowledge the fact that what he did in telling the people of Flat Rock, that they had to set their mil rate at 13 mils -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What? What? 13 mils?

MR. PARSONS:

13 mils! Would he accept the fact that this is corrupt and indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is blackmail in its truest form? What he is saying, in essence, is if you do not charge this mil rate, as suggested by my Department, then you will not receive any funding. Will the Minister tell the hon. House?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Member that assessments in the rural communities, on average, are 50 per cent, even 40 per cent, of the urban areas. So when you think of a mil rate of 13 mils, it really equates to a mil rate of 6.5 mils, if you are talking about an urban area, because the assessments are, generally speaking, half of the urban areas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order please!

The Chair has said on several occasions that Members should not ask questions from their Chair. They have a right to ask questions, and when they are recognized they can ask the Minister all the questions they like, as the Member for St. John's East Extern, is now doing. I will allow the Minister to clue up in a few seconds.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, what the communities have been asked to do is to bring

the ratio of their revenue, and the revenue includes all revenue, in line with the average for the Province - revenue against assessments. In fairness, all communities involved on the critical list were asked to do that. All of them were asked to do that. Those who were willing to adjust their finances to the average of the Province, or better, would be qualified for the capital works identified. Now, that was entirely fair. The amount would vary from community to community because of the differences in assessments. I cannot speak specifically to the community of Flat Rock, but I can tell you that everybody on the list identified as critical was treated fairly and equally.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, again to the same Minister. There are about two or three kilometers of black pipe in the ground down there, and the community has to pay an assessment on that pipe, 20 per cent of its revenue. What the council wants to know, and I am only repeating what they said to me this morning, is will they go down and take up that damn pipe, because it is not serving one single house? Will he have his people go down and take the damn thing up! It is not serving one house, so why do they have to pay for it? Even with the \$450,000 you allotted them this year, it would not go any distance. There still would not be one house serviced. Will the Minister agree to call some kind of tender so they can go down and remove the pipe from the ground, which the people are paying for

for nothing?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe what I am hearing. Throughout this Province we have communities which have phases started, the first phase complete, the dry-lines waiting to be finished. Are you suggesting that throughout the Province we take up lines, projects which have been started? There are many, many communities waiting to complete the phases necessary over time.

MR. PARSONS:

They cannot pay it. They cannot pay it.

MR. GULLAGE:

Because we are doing on a priority basis the communities identified with the most critical, pressing need. We have many, many situations where there are dry lines waiting to have the project completed, which can only take place over time.

MR. RIDEOUT:

A whim of the highest order. If there was ever a whim Minister, you are it.

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 to the Minister of Fisheries. A few days ago, he indicated he had a request to issue another processing licence

in the town of Trepassey. Has the Minister made a decision on that? If so, what is the decision?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have made a decision on it, and the decision was not to issue the licence.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, when the Minister spoke a few days ago he referred to a licence on the Southern Shore which he said had been issued due to the fact that the Appeal Board had overturned the Department's original decision. I understand the Appeal Board had also overturned the decision on the Trepassey licence. If this is so, what are the reasons you turned down the request?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister followed to the letter the final recommendation of the Appeal Board.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I ask the Minister, then, in light of the fact that the licence which is in Trepassey and is operating the FPI Plant, if in the future that plant does close, as some people hope it will, and we hope and know it will not, if it does go down and if there is a

tremendous downturn in the area, will he consider reviewing his decision?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, that is hypothetical and I do not deal with hypothetical questions.

MR. HYNES:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Trinity North.

MR. HYNES:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance.

I wonder if the Minister could advise this House as to how many permanent employees within his own Department, nobody else's, have received layoff notices since he read his Budget in this House?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, a number of positions in the Department of Finance have been eliminated as a result of the budgetary process; ten positions involving eight people, because two are currently vacant.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Trinity North.

MR. HYNES:

Mr. Speaker, given that these gasoline and tobacco tax inspectors collected some \$135 million to \$150 million worth of revenue for the Treasury of this Province, can the Minister tell this House how he intends to

ensure that the same amount of revenue will be collected?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, we looked very carefully at this before bringing in this rationalization in our tax collecting procedures, and we are convinced that there will be no diminution of revenue as a result of this move.

MR. WINDSOR:

That is not what your officials say.

MR. HYNES:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Trinity North.

MR. HYNES:

Mr. Speaker, given that under the Collective Agreement these employees, I understand, have bumping privileges, and within the Clarendville office, for example, there are two gasoline and tobacco tax inspectors eliminated but there might be a lower position available for them to go into, could the Minister indicate to this House whether they will red circle those gasoline and tobacco tax inspectors so that they will not lose any salary by taking a lower position?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, we are looking very carefully at what happens to the particular individuals, and we will do whatever is possible.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, some time ago, the Provincial and Federal Governments negotiated an agreement to the tune of \$21 million, which was cost-shared 50/50, a subsidy to the Marystown shipyard to construct trawlers. It is my understanding that this agreement will be expiring tomorrow with approximately \$9 million left in it. I would like to ask the Minister of Development if there are any plans as to what will happen to that money after tomorrow?

MR. WINDSOR:

And will he resign?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member is correct. There is an Ocean Industry Subsidiary Development Agreement. One small component of that was the trawler support program. It was a \$21 million component, cost-shared 50/50. I think the Province expended up to \$6 million; there was \$4.5 million left. The agreement does run out in a couple of days. The Premier and I met with Mr. Crosbie and Mr. McKay last week to discuss the priorities of the Province with respect to future ERDAs.

I can tell the hon. Member that we have put forward our position with respect to the Ocean Industries

Subsidiary Agreement, and if, in fact, we are successful in signing a new agreement, that \$4.5 million will be re-profiled under that agreement for the General Ocean Industries Marine Support.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Let me ask the Minister if he would consider asking the Federal Government to re-allocate the money, which was negotiated for and used for a subsidy to the Marystown shipyard, to a special fund, put it on hold and wait for necessary work for the Marystown shipyard employees, Mr. Speaker? As the Minister knows, approximately 200 of those employees have now left the Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member knows that we tried very diligently to re-profile that \$4.5 million to capture the work for the 60-metre shrimp trawler that FPI required for its fleet. In fact, we put \$4.5 million on the table. We sought agreement with Ottawa to put their \$4.5 million on the table; we asked Fishery Products to come forward and hold off putting that into Norway.

So, we did everything we could possibly do, Mr. Speaker, to access that money within the limited time frame we had. I cannot force FPI to build wet-fish trawlers they do not currently need in this downturned economy with respect to the fishery. But I can tell the hon. Member this,

if he wants to be honest about it, since this Government has come to power, we have put \$13.8 million into a new ice-strengthened vessel for Marystown, since this Government has come to power it has put up a performance bond for \$10 million for the Provo Wallis for Marystown shipyard, and this Government just recently announced \$25 million for an icebreaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The Minister is now beginning to wander and drift. He has answered the question satisfactorily.

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Development has his facts a little bit confused. The Federal Government agreed to put up their \$4.5 million; the Provincial Government would not put up theirs unless the union made concessions to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. These are the facts of what happened, Mr. Speaker, not what the Minister of Development is saying happened. Let me ask the Minister if he would forget the policies set out by this Government in terms of punishing the employees of the Marystown shipyard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) Tobin.

MR. TOBIN:  
Yes, he announced the ferry which will be started in 1991.

Will he not, Mr. Speaker, allocate the \$9 million to where it

belongs, to the employees of the Marystown shipyard? Will he do the honourable thing, come clean with the people of the Province, and allocate the funding to the project it was negotiated for, place it where it should be?

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

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, the Government has been in power for eleven short months, I think, and we have punished Marystown shipyard to the tune of some \$50 million in eleven months. Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell you -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) money?

MR. FUREY:  
Well, with the Speaker's indulgence, \$13 million for the ice-strengthened ferry; \$10 million for the performance bond this Government put up for the Provo Wallis, to protect that.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) the borrowed money?

MR. FUREY:  
This Government had to guarantee that money. And \$25 million for an icebreaker, Mr. Speaker. I was very proud to announce in Marystown, with the Marystown union there, that we were seeking the immediate release of \$1.5 million for the offshore fabrication yard.

Mr. Speaker, I should say that with the release of that \$1.5 million for preliminary engineering and design work and land clearing, that will trigger another \$34 million cost-shared by this Province, for the offshore



fabrication yard at Cow Head.

So, Mr. Speaker, I, and the people I spoke with when I was in Marystown, can only conclude that if that is punishment, give us lots more of that punishment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, a very quick question. The LSPU Hall have now received a letter confirming that the Secretary of State's Cultural Initiatives Department will be able to honour their commitment for a grant contingent on cost-shared funding from the Province. They have written the Minister. I would now like to ask the Minister if he is now prepared to bring to Cabinet the request for, I think, something in excess of \$45,000 to meet the Provincial commitment for this matching funding?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of that letter and, indeed, as I said I believe last year, when a question was asked concerning this matter, that subject to the Federal Government agreeing to pay a portion of the cost, that I would bring the matter to Government for

consideration, and I will do just that.

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

When will you be doing this? And when can the LSPU Hall expect an answer?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

The request is being considered by my officials right now, Mr. Speaker. As soon as we have dealt with it in the Department and I have a recommendation ready for Government, I will bring it forward to Government.

MR. WARREN:

Yes, and you took it away from Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question Period has expired.

#### Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 45 paragraph 2 of the Financial Administration Act I wish to table a list of temporary loans raised pursuant to section 44 and 45 of the Act. What I am tabling, Mr. Speaker, are the temporary borrowings or Treasury Bill offerings that we have made over

the past year and also the overdrafts that we have incurred from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, in addition I wish to table the following list under section 51 paragraph 3 of the Financial Administration Act, a list of guaranteed loans paid out by the Province since the last sitting of the House. And without going into great detail I would like to read the list of them: Star Forest Products, \$65,000 plus interest; S. T. Jones and Sons Ltd., \$550,000 plus interest; Newfoundland Enviroponics, \$10,136,000; Clarkeson and Gordon, the receivers, \$1.237 million; Universal Group of Companies, \$6.7 million; Notre Dame Bay Fisheries, \$2.9 million -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I remind the hon. the Minister that he was given leave. We have passed that and he should try to proceed as quickly as possible.

DR. KITCHEN:  
Just one or two more, Mr. Speaker. I wish to make one more reading, Baie Verte Mines, \$20 million.

Answers to Questions  
for which Notice has been Given

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

MR. EFFORD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday in my absence there was a question asked by the Member for Grand Falls to the Premier concerning the Government's decision in cancelling or deleting an \$84,000

grant to the Youth Diversion Program at Grand Falls. I guess at the same time that that question was asked in the hon. House of Assembly I was at Gander meeting with the Committee from Grand Falls.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:  
No, four people were there.

Mr. Speaker, nevertheless, it was the decision made by Government in the recent Budget. One of the reasons for making that particular decision, which I discussed with the Committee yesterday, was that there are twelve other alternative measures programs around the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. There is one similar to the one in Grand Falls here in St. John's. I will give you some figures, Mr. Speaker. The one in Grand Falls last year put through on its formal program 52 youth for the whole year. In St. John's they put through, on the same similar program, 604. For the people in St. John's we gave a total last year of \$2,750; for the people in Grand Falls for 52 youth we gave \$78,000. Also, Mr. Speaker, that same group, an informal program, that same group, accessed almost \$200,000 from different Federal programs, Youth Strategy and so on, extra program. So we have seen this is a particular area, where one group of people on a volunteer basis in St. John's and eleven other groups across the Province are doing it. For example, in my own District of Bay Roberts we have an alternative measure program we funded last year for a total of \$500. We have one in Corner Brook, which put through more boys and girls than did Grand Falls, and we gave them

\$1,250 for the whole year. There was an inequality in what we were giving one group as compared to all the other groups who are operating very successfully on a volunteer basis. And those volunteers were questioning why we were giving one group such a large amount of money, and not giving it to those people who were operating a very successful volunteer program. Government made a very wise decision, Mr. Speaker, as I informed the people yesterday, and the reasons why we did it is accepted throughout the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

### Petitions

MR. PARSONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Speaker, the petition that I am going to present to this hon. House is a petition which I tried to bring to the floor of the House on Tuesday, but because you ruled, Sir, that no more petitions could be presented because the hon. the House Leader called Orders of the Day, I did not get the chance. Now, Mr. Speaker, there were some important issues at that particular time. But the important issue at that time, Mr. Speaker, was to many people of no more importance than many other issues that this Province has to

deal with.

Mr. Speaker, for the record I will read the prayer of the petition. A petition to the hon. House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador in Legislative Session convened: The petition of the undersigned residents of St. John's East Extern; 'that we are concerned that the provincial Government has made a decision to eliminate moose licences issued to groups. Wherefore your petitioners urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to review this decision with a view to reinstating party licences of moose hunters in addition to individual licences. As in duty bound your petitioners we will ever pray.'

Mr. Speaker, like I have said before in this hon. House, there are 40,000 of us hunters who try for a licence every year. And, Mr. Speaker, we sought for and Government complied with our suggestions that the moose licences would go primarily on a party system. Now why the expedience, why do I need to introduce this petition at this particular time? Mr. Speaker, soon the licences will be drawn for, and we feel as people on this petition and I as one member of the petition feel very strongly that the Government should change its mind about licencing.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Too bad the Minister is not here.

MR. PARSONS:  
Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is too bad the Minister is not here but perhaps he is out in the Common Room with the speaker turned on, but at any rate -

MR. WARREN:

He is gone to submit his resignation.

MR. PARSONS:

My colleague says he is gone to submit his resignation. Perhaps that is true, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of confusion as to what way the draw went, and what way the Government is suggesting that the draw be done in 1990. Mr. Speaker, there are five categories, and up until this year because of pressure from groups, up until this year, Mr. Speaker, there was Pool 1, party licence; Pool 1, single licence; Pool 2, party licence; Pool 2, individual licence; Pool 3, party licence; Pool 3, individual licence; Pool 4, party licence; Pool 4, individual licence.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

No, it was always like that. They always had their licence. And there was a Pool 5. Now, what happened this year -that is what the people pressed for. There were several reasons why they wanted to do this, Mr. Speaker. Number one, you gave twice as many people the opportunity to hunt. All Newfoundlanders are prone to hunting, or most of them. When you applied last year the first priority was Pool 1, party licence, and then you went to Pool 1, single licence, but after that, Mr. Speaker, individual licence, after that you went from party licence Pool 1 to party licence Pool 2, then all those that applied were taken into consideration. Then you went to party licence Pool 3, party licence Pool 4. Mr. Speaker, individual licences were not

considered until all those party licences had been taken into consideration. It went right down on the party licence and what happened, because of pressure, I wrote a letter, Mr. Speaker, and I know several of my friends wrote letters, telling the Government that the party system was the right way to go.

Again, they had several reasons and I mentioned one already, Mr. Speaker, that the party system could have an involvement of twice as many hunters as what individual licences would involve. The other reason, Mr. Speaker, is because over the years there have been several accidents out in the woods. I know of a couple of instances where moose hunters have been injured. When you give an individual licence that person must be an individual who does not want to go with a party so the danger is greater. If anything happened to that hunter in the woods he could be there alone, so to protect that person we all pressured him. Now, when I called down to the Department I asked the gentleman in -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I believe the hon. gentleman's time is up. I left the Chair for a moment. It was difficult for me to see the clock. The hon. gentleman has been extended a minute by leave.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

I said they have granted him a minute. The House has granted him a minute.

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, what I say to Government and the Minister - I hope he is listening - is there were several ways to increase the number of licences. Mr. Speaker, I think that you and every other Member of this House will agree with me that there is carnage out there on our highways. There is not a day passes that there is someone, especially at a certain time of the year, that there is someone not injured with a moose, hitting a moose, or a moose coming out in their way and there is an unavoidable accident. We have had several deaths and if the Minister had issued licences, special licences even, Mr. Speaker, close to the Trans-Canada, say back perhaps a quarter of a mile from the Trans-Canada, it might, and I think everyone would appreciate the fact that it perhaps would relieve some of the problem. Mr. Speaker, those problems are grave and unjustified because there is an answer to it. I believe there is an answer to it, Mr. Speaker, and I reiterate again that I hope the Minister takes this into consideration and I hope we revert back to the party licences.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that when I called the gentleman down at the office he said he was under pressure from the individual licence applicants. I say to you, the only reason why those individuals wrote in was because none of the rest of us who always apply for party licences had any reason to write. So they were out there alone. The only letters received by the Department were from individuals who applied for licences. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the Member for St. John's East Extern.

I guess being the Minister for a short period to time with responsibility for wildlife, it is one of the particular divisions that are very, very close to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the Government of the day would change a program that was working. It happened after last May 5. In fact, the former Administration was going to improve on the party licence system so more people in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador could avail of the moose hunting season.

Mr. Speaker, another crafty move on the part of the Minister of Finance was, and I do not think the media have picked up on this one, giving out more single licences so that the Province was getting extra funds, the Province was collecting extra money. So, Mr. Speaker, here is another increase in funds, revenues for this Government, by about the Government changing a program that was effectively working for the people in this Province who were looking for a moose licence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this year we will have people in Pool No. 2, party licences. Prior to this year, their chances of getting a licence were 60 per cent to 70 per cent. By being in Pool No. 2, their chances of getting a licence this year have diminished to 35 per cent or 40 per cent, because

those single licences will come first.

Mr. Speaker, this again just shows the disregard this Government has for people who enjoy the recreational facilities in this Province, such as moose hunting, an event which thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders look forward to in the Fall of every year. All of a sudden, the Minister, through his craftiness and his Budget, decided that less people will bet into the wilderness to enjoy a long weekend, or the three or four days they have always look forward to year after year.

Mr. Speaker, I support this petition and I would hope that when the next meeting of Cabinet takes place, the hon. House Leader will -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:  
It is never too late. It is all done by computer now, so change it back to the way moose licences were issued for the last three or four years. By doing that you will satisfy a greater number of people, people who have enjoyed the outdoors of Newfoundland for hundreds and hundreds of years. I say to the Minister, it is never too late. Do not be too high and mighty to change a program when it is not working effectively. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TOBIN:  
Another petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. Government House Leader.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Is he speaking to the petition?

MR. SPEAKER:  
I assume. The Speaker has no idea what he is speaking to.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
(Inaudible) did not happen the other day.

MR. BAKER:  
I would like to comment on the petition so ably presented by the Member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Well!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Would the hon. the Government House Leader take his seat?

The Chair wants to make it quite clear that the Chair is recognizing individuals. The Chair wants to clear this up for once and for all. The Chair is entitled to recognize a Member on this side of the House. On petitions the rules state: two speakers from the Opposition side. So, obviously, when a petition is presented and it is recognized that there is nobody standing and the Government House Leader stands, the Chair must recognize him. I want to get this straightened out once and for all.

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to comment very briefly on the petition moved and seconded by Members opposite. We understand what the petition says. We understand the feeling of the people who presented the petition. There was a change made in the order of pick. I believe at the same time we increased the number of moose licences available in the Province and made a number of other changes. I would just like to assure the hon. Members that the petition can be passed along to the Minister, and I am sure the Minister will take that petition under advisement and consider the request. I believe that the reasons for making the change, were not the reasons as mentioned by the Member for Torngat. I think that the Minister had very good reasons for the change that did occur in the order of the licences, however, in spite of that, I assure hon. Members that the Minister will take the petition and have a look at it and hopefully respond at some later date.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of 97 residents from the community of Spanish Room, that would be in the District of Burin - Placentia West. One hundred per cent of the voters who were eligible to sign the petition, have signed it. The petition is against Government's proposal to amalgamate them with the town of Marystown. Mr. Speaker, the people of Spanish Room, circulated a petition throughout the community, on one

side they had those in favour, on the other, those who opposed the Government's amalgamation and nobody signed in support of the Government's forced amalgamation agenda.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, it most certainly is a petition to the House. Unlike the ones that the hon. Gentleman used to submit when he was in opposition, and there are no secretaries names on it either. This is the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker. To The hon. House of Assembly of Newfoundland in Legislative Session Convened. Would that suggest the House of Assembly? The petitioners of the undersigned, residents of Spanish Room, are concerned that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has proposed to amalgamate the municipality of Spanish Room with Marystown and acted to bring about these amalgamations without the consent of the people affected by this decision, wherefore, your petitioners urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to immediately halt the plans and action to amalgamate the municipality of Spanish Room and as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is not a petition to the hon. House, I do not know what is! The community of Spanish Room, Mr. Speaker, is a little distance from Marystown, but it is where the Cow Head facility is proposed. The Cow Head facility which is owned and operated by the Marystown shipyard, which is a subsidiary or a Crown Corporation of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. It is a facility

that the previous Administration and the Federal Government agreed to spend \$36 million to expand. It is a facility in Cow Head in the community and this Government in conjunction with the Federal Government; last September 21st, the Minister of Energy wrote the Federal Minister who decided and said, 'after meeting with my Cabinet colleagues, I concur that we should not proceed to start construction of the Cow Head facility at this time;' that is where Spanish Room is located, Mr. Speaker, in case hon. Members do not realize it.

The people there want the right to their own identity, they do not want to be forced to amalgamate with Marystown. They have expressed that quite clearly, quite candidly when they had the opportunity to public hearings. They had that opportunity a short while ago despite the fact that one of the appointees to the commissioners was the Assistant Deputy Minister who the people have a great deal of respect for. But they have a great understanding for the fact that he works for the Provincial Government and may be influenced by this Government that have always acted without conciliation and certainly in a dictatorial fashion. People who know what is going on have every right to be suspicious of a commissioner for the Department of Municipal Affairs sitting, dealing, participating, and recommending as it relates to amalgamation.

Mr. Speaker, this party is not opposed to the concept of amalgamation. We have never been opposed to the concept of amalgamation, provided amalgamation is what the majority of the people who live in the

community want. Having represented rural Newfoundland, having known the District that was forced to resettle a number of years ago, having seen how the people of Petit Forte refused to resettle and how they fought the Government on resettlement and won, today having seen how the people of Petit Forte refused to accept the decisions of this Government not to provide them with a road. How they fought, Mr. Speaker, lobbied, fought, and won again today, that is what makes up the trust and heart of the people of Placentia Bay. That is what makes up the trust and heart of the people in Spanish Room, too, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Both sides of the Bay.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, both sides of the bay. There is no doubt about that. The Member knows full well, Mr. Speaker, where he stood on the Petit Forte road. I have never heard him speaking in the House of Assembly regarding it but I honestly believe deep down in my heart that the Member for Placentia supported the people of Petit Forte having a road. There is no doubt. Deep down I believe that even though he was silent in this House. As a matter of fact I know he did. I asked him to support it and he said, yes. And I asked the Member for Bellevue (Mr. Barrett) to support it and he said, no. That is the difference between two Government Members. The Member for Bellevue said, no, to the people of Petit Forte and the Member for Placentia (Mr. Hogan) said, yes.

This petition is extremely important to the people of Spanish Room. The people there have to



make their living, they work and operate out of Marystown. They hope that this Government will stop resettling people to the Mainland. There are 200 gone from the area since this Government came in some of whom are from Spanish Room. They have been forced to resettle by an uncaring, unsharing and unconcerned Government for the economic conditions of this area. The way they have treated the Marystown Shipyard has been sad, Mr. Speaker. They have constructed one ferry and tried to hoodwink the people last week by announcing another one that will not start until February 1991.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, if I could borrow that petition from my colleague for just a moment? I listened to everything he said with great interest but I just want to make reference to the names. I think the Member mentioned the number of ninety-five who had supported this petition. The petition, I can say to those people in Spanish Room, has been very ably presented by their Member, the Member for Burin - Placentia West (Tobin), when they expressed their views on the amalgamation issue.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words with respect to, not only their position, which is I believe somewhere in the area of 100 per cent opposed. Is that what the Member says?

MR. TOBIN:

That is 100 per cent.

MR. SIMMS:

That is the point I wanted to make. There are 100 per cent opposed to amalgamation with the town of Marystown. Since this Government came into office a year or so ago, just about a year ago now, one of the first things they undertook without a mandate from the people was this whole amalgamation question, to deal with this whole amalgamation question, and they have bungled it right from day one. The Province, in terms of municipalities, has been in chaos with respect to dealing with this issue of amalgamation. The process has been criticized hither and yon, from all parts of this Province. The process that was implemented by the Minister at the beginning was totally confusing. The Minister was on one day making a statement about amalgamation, the Premier was on the next day saying something else, and on, and on, and on, it went. It became a joke. The people of Spanish Room are representative of a lot of communities in this Province who were put on the Minister's hit list for amalgamation against their wish. The Government House Leader can shake his head but these are facts. In principle we have always said the principle of amalgamation is not one that we oppose. In fact we supported it when we were Government in a number of areas but in the areas where we supported it, it was done with the approval of the people, the people in the communities affected. That is the difference in this particular process, even though the Premier himself has said, as I understand, unless he was misquoted, said himself that no community will be forced to amalgamate beyond their wishes,

except that he throws in this little caveat now, and they say, well the Government will not order amalgamation against their wishes, we will bring it to the House of Assembly. What kind of fools do they think we are? I mean the Members in the House of Assembly have a majority and they have a minority, the majority is made up of the Government Members, and if the Government Members and the Cabinet says, we are going to impose amalgamation on this community, but we will not do it by the Cabinet, we will try to fool the people a little bit and say we are going to bring it to the House of Assembly, everybody in this world knows it will be done because of the Liberal Government's majority. So they need not try to fool anybody by taking that route. If they do not have the courage themselves to make the decision as a Government, then do not try and pawn it off by saying, oh, the House of Assembly somehow is going to be the body that will make these decisions.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Spanish Room have spoken. They have spoken clearly.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:  
Yes, and they have made their views known at the public hearing called by the Minister, which he was not going to call at the beginning and would not have called except for the fuss that was created and the fuss that was kicked up by a number of people. But their Member, they can be very proud of their Member, the people from Spanish Room. This is the same Member, Mr. Speaker, that has led a month's to month's fight, the Member for Burin - Placentia

West (Mr. Tobin) is the same Member that has led a fight for the last several months, day after day, in this House of Assembly calling on the Government to complete that road to Petit Forte and finally today we saw the results of his efforts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:  
And, Mr. Speaker, in this same way the people of Spanish Room can be proud of the representation of their Member today because I feel quite certain that because of his representations, the same results will come about. They will get their wish. They will not be amalgamated with the Town of Marystown, and it will because of that Member over there, if they do not want it he will not go along with it, Mr. Speaker. He did a great job today, and I support him in his petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

I have a petition also that I wish to present today. It is from the fishing community of Pinsents Arm in the District of Eagle River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:  
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I advised the hon. Member for Eagle River (Mr.

Dumaresque) that I did have a petition from his District. I talked to him earlier, and Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member recognizes that I do have a petition and he also knows what the petition is about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Repeat that again.

MR. WARREN:  
Pinsents Arm is in the District of Eagle River, Mr. Speaker. The prayer of the petition is as follows: We the undersigned the residents of Labrador are concerned with health care that is presently available through the Grenfell Regional Health Services. Concerns have been expressed that patients are not receiving the proper health care. Wherefore your petition we humbly pray that your Honourable House may be pleased to take immediate steps to support a public inquiry into health care in Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the last number of years and in particular for the last eleven months I have been after the Minister of Health to put aside the politics once and for all, and recognize that the people of Labrador need better health care than they are presently receiving from the Grenfell Regional Health Services Board. Now, Mr. Speaker, some time ago I asked a question of the Minister in this House concerning patients transferred from the Coast of Labrador to the Happy Valley/Goose Bay area. Mr. Speaker, at the time the Minister spoke in this House, and it is on record, the Minister said publicly that he was not satisfied with the health care that was being

delivered in Labrador. The Minister has said that publicly in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if as a Minister of the Crown he does not believe that health care is being delivered in the most humane manner possible to the people in Labrador, then the Minister should do as this petition requests, and that is have a public inquiry into health care.

MR. REID:  
That was health care like down there this time last year?

MR. WARREN:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. gentleman that health care anywhere in this Province is not as good as it should be. Every year we are advancing further and further toward the twenty-first century. I say to the hon. the Member for Carbonear (Mr. Reid), last year there were people within the Government of the day who showed a little more concern for health care in Labrador than the present Minister of Environment and Lands does. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Environment and Lands has been requested for the last year to meet with the Happy Valley Town Council, in his own district, and he has not said yes yet. One of the biggest issues is health care and the new hospital for Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

The new hospital for Happy Valley - Goose Bay will also help the residents of Eagle River and Torngat Mountains. That is why the hospital is needed for Goose Bay, it is for central Labrador. I am surprised the Minister of Environment and Lands is not speaking up for the people of Labrador, Mr. Speaker. He is not

speaking up for the people of Labrador!

Mr. Speaker, on two occasions in the last week we have seen two major cuts, plus no money for the new hospital. I understand the Government House Leader has asked the Member for Eagle River not to say anything for or against this petition. I hope the Member for Eagle River will get to his feet, because I think he can do a much better job than the Minister of Health is doing.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker, as hon. Member's know, this Government has a tremendous commitment to health care throughout the Province, especially as it relates to Labrador. However, in speaking to this particular petition I have to advise hon. Members that although the prayer of the petition is a sensible one and I am sure the people who signed it were genuine, I cannot say the same about the hon. Member who is presenting the petition.

I have here a copy of a letter.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, he cannot question (inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER:  
He is speaking to the petition.

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

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

Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:  
As is often the wont of this particular Minister, I do not know why he does, if he does it deliberately or if he knows he does it, but he is so irritating. He got up and he said he does not question the genuineness of the people who signed the petition, he does not question the genuineness of the prayer of the petition, but he cannot say the same about the Member who presented the petition. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, that is out of order and unparliamentary. You cannot question a Member's motives.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The Chair did not hear the remarks by the Minister of Health, but the Chair takes the points made by the Opposition House Leader. I am sure if the Minister of Health has said anything untoward, that he will do the appropriate thing.

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a letter, Mr. Speaker, from Pinsent Arm on Labrador, signed by Peggy Twyne, who obviously did not understand the shenanigans that her Member was up to. She said, 'Dear Mr. Decker: Please -'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:  
They know what is coming, Mr. Speaker. They know what is coming.

- 'please find enclosed a copy of a petition sent to me for circulation by Mr. Garfield Warren.

It has been circulated and signed by the residents of Pinsent Arm.

Other copies,' she says, 'are being sent to Premier Wells and Danny Dummaresque.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a concocted petition if ever I have seen one.

Now, let me tell hon. Members some of the things we are doing for Labrador. If the hon. Members would go to the last Budget and look at page 219 of the Estimates, 44, Subsection 03, there they will see Community Clinics. That is a little over \$2 million. That, Mr. Speaker, is for health clinics at Hopedale and Davis Inlet in the hon. Member's District. That is what we are doing.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Where?

MR. DECKER:  
In Hopedale and Davis Inlet, in the Member's District.

The hon. Member talks about the condition of the health care system in Newfoundland and Labrador today. I agree with him. His Administration was in power for seventeen years and we saw seventeen years of neglect in the health care system in this Province. There was a freeze, Mr. Speaker, where not a nail was driven, not a window was fixed, and not a roof was touched. There was an absolute freeze, Mr. Speaker.

In this year's Budget, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health is spending \$834 million to try to correct some of the damage which that Administration, when they were in power, inflicted upon the health care system of this Province. We cannot do it overnight. We have only been in power ten short months. In these few months we have taken health care and we have raised it from

the depths to which they allowed it to sink, and we have put it up now so that it holds a predominant position in the Budget of this Province. That is why I am proud to say that Mrs. Twyne, who, not understanding the game fully, not understanding the manipulation that her Member is putting upon her, instead of sending the petition back to the hon. Member as he had wanted her to do, she sent the letter back to me.

MS VERGE:  
Do not underestimate that woman.

MR. DECKER:  
Well, if you do not want me to underestimate her, maybe she does understand the game, and she wanted to show me the silliness and the shenanigans that her Member is up to. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:  
Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

MS DUFF:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am rising to support the petition of my hon. colleague, the Member for Torngat Mountains. I am very sorry, in listening to the Minister, whom I expected to really address the issues in the petition rather than disintergrate into an attack on the Member, because this Minister, in fact, I think is very genuinely concerned

about health care in Labrador and he has reason to be, he lives in a District that is very close to the coast of Labrador, and when he was a Member himself he was very frequently raising issues.

He has attacked the genuineness of this petition, and I would like to just make a point on that. If an hon. Member, and in my months of contact with this hon. Member, he is constantly receiving complaints and solicitations from his constituents who have problems and who come to him and ask him what are the means that I can use to have my concerns addressed in the House of Assembly? Now I would say many of us are in the same position, that people come to us and say, how can I get my voice heard in the House of Assembly? I think it is quite within an hon. Member's responsibilities to advise his constituents that a petition is one of the ways in which this concern can be addressed.

Now I have read the Member's -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) another man's District.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MS DUFF:

I think we are getting away from the point. The point at issue here is that we have an area of this Province, the coast of Labrador, which, by reason of its geography, by reason of the fact that it has a very large native population, by reason of the fact that it has great poverty and social problems that are associated with native populations in a coastal community, has health issues that are substantially different from health issues

elsewhere in the Province. This area has been concerned for sometime about how well a St. Anthony-based Grenfell Association is addressing those needs, and one of the things that needs to be addressed is whether or not there is need for a separate board on the Coast of Labrador.

Now, in answer to your allegation that nothing was done previously, I can tell hon. Members, and I would like to have it on the record, that in the past six years alone, very largely due to the untiring efforts of the hon. Member for the area, there have been six separate health clinics opened on the Coast of Labrador: in Makkovik, in Postville, in Rigolet, in Forteau and in two other areas. So I would not call that doing nothing.

This hon. Member was moving very strongly toward getting something done about the hospital in Goose Bay. In fact, there was money in the Budget last year, a Budget which has been admitted had been largely prepared by the previous Administration, to do planning for an upgraded hospital in Goose Bay, very necessary since there was a phaseout by the Grenfell Association of the Northwest River Cottage Hospital. What happened to that? This hospital is totally inadequate, and this Government has now taken all funds out of the Budget for a new hospital in Goose Bay, which is very hard to understand from a Minister who purports to understand the seriousness of the health issues in this part of our Province.

I am totally amazed that the hon. Member for Eagle River has been so quiet about the health issues dealing with northern Newfoundland and the Coast of Labrador, and the

hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands, who is based in Goose Bay and more than any one else must know how the people in Goose Bay feel about that. Because when I was in Goose Bay, less than a year ago, with the Federation of Municipalities, that was one of the big issues that was raised, and there was great joy in Goose Bay because there was planning funds in the Budget. I imagine there is great sorrow in Goose Bay right now because of the signal that has been given by the Minister, that those funds have been totally eliminated from the Budget.

But I think it is important that we not lose sight of what is at issue here, and what is being asked for, and that is simply a concern with the health care and a petition to have a public inquiry into the health care in Labrador. The need is there we all know. It has been on Here and Now, it has been in letters that have been tabled, it is here. With or without this petition I think we do know that there are serious concerns about the adequacy and the best method of delivering health care to the Coast of Labrador and Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

I would think that a petition to have a public inquiry so that we can lay down once, and for all and hear from the people once and for all, what is needed and take some action to correct these problems would be an eminently sensible and humane action for this Government to take.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Falls.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I have the privilege of presenting a petition today on behalf of residents of Grand Falls, Windsor, and Bishop's Falls. When I was in my constituency last week, as a matter of fact, some people approached me about the issue of moose accidents on the highway and the need for an increase in moose licences. I suggested to them that if they wished, they could get a petition together and I would be quite happy to present it on their behalf.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Quite legitimate.

MR. SIMMS:

Because of the short time they had, I was going back the next day - I was only out there for a day - they managed to get fifty names on this following petition. I would like to read the prayer of the petition for the benefit of Members of the House, particularly Members opposite, and particularly the Minister of Environment who is responsible for wildlife.

'A petition to the House of Assembly: To the hon. House of Assembly of Newfoundland in legislative Session convened - perfectly in order, perfectly proper - 'The petition of the undersigned residents of Grand Falls, Windsor and Bishop Falls, that, 1, the number of accidents on our highways involving moose is unacceptably high; and 2. the number of moose licences issued to persons in this Province has not increased in proportion to the increase in the moose population;

wherefore your petitioners urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to take immediate steps to increase the number of moose licences available to the people of this Province and as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.'

Mr. Speaker, they did not have enough room on the front page of the petition. They even added -

MR. MURPHY:  
Who signed it?

MR. SIMMS:  
Now the hon. the Member for St. John's South, unfortunately, has a habit of speaking when he should not speak. And opening his mouth one time, is sometimes once too often.

This particular matter of accidents on our highways involving moose which have caused deaths on our highways is not something to make a joke of. I can assure him this petition is not meant to be presented in a humorous fashion. I am sure he did not mean to make light of it, but I am cautioning him he should not, because it is a serious matter.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister would even agree with me. In the past number of years, as a matter of fact, but in particular over the last year or so, I have had people approach me about the number of moose accidents on the highway, particularly those accidents which caused death. The Minister is probably more familiar than any of us - he should be, I guess - with the statistics, and maybe if he says a few words to the petition he might enlighten us a little bit as to what those statistics are.

I am not sure if the number of highway deaths attributed to moose accidents has been increasing or not. I have the feeling that it has been, but I am not quite certain. As a matter of fact, I also remember it has been an ongoing problem and an ongoing concern and people have expressed their concerns from time to time about this particular matter.

I have correspondence in my office from constituents, and I have had phone calls from constituents and people from outside my constituency, expressing a lot of concern. A lot of time it is people who have been affected by it, perhaps somebody in their family or a relative, or whatever, has been injured in an accident or, heaven forbid, even died as a result of an accident on the highway. I remember one time in recent year, I, myself, put questions to the wildlife people about whether anything could have been done to prevent this from occurring. And the wildlife people, I know, at one time talked about doing some studies to determine whether or not a certain kind of chemical, or something of that nature, sprayed along the highways could be helpful in preventing the moose from moving onto the roads. Unfortunately, the funding was not provided, and was probably done during our time in office, I do not know. I am not attributing blame or anything, but that was one of the things the Wildlife Division itself was looking into or considering.

Then you had a suggestion by another Member of the House, I believe last session, about this particular issue, suggesting that maybe some kind of make-work projects could be undertaken to cut the brush back further from



the highway's edge, so that that might help prevent the moose from coming onto the highway. I believe the Member for La Poile at one time even suggested a larger, much more grandiose make-work scheme, to build a fence, I think, on both sides of the highway, from Port aux Basques to St. John's. I think that one might be a long time coming!

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the point is made and made very well by the people who have signed this petition, that there is an alarming number of accidents on our highways attributed to moose, and a large number of deaths, and we hope something might be done about it.

One of the proposals the petitioners make, of course, is that if there was a further increase in moose licences, that might help. Now, I know there has been an increase in licencing over the last few years, an increase in licences in various parts of the Province. I guess what the petitioners are saying is there should be even more.

With the change the Minister introduced in the big game licence draw this year, where it appears that more priority now will be given to individuals as opposed to party groups, as it was in the past, maybe, in fact, it could be easier to provide more licences for big game hunters.

So, it may be something the Minister could address when the petition is referred to him and to his Department for a response, but, in the meantime, he has an opportunity in this short time frame, during petitions, to perhaps comment on it, and I would like to hear from him exactly what

the situation is.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! Order please!

The hon. Member's time has expired.

MR. SIMMS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KELLAND:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I apologize to the hon. Member for not quite hearing all the prayer of the petition; there was some background noise and I did not get it all. However, I know the general content and the concern about what is really a very valuable resource, the moose population in our Province. Nevertheless, overriding all of that is every hon. Member's concern about the safety of life and property.

We received some statistics, to mention that first of all, Mr. Speaker, from my hon. colleague, the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. I think they are significant, and I might just mention some of them. They are available in more detail for anyone who wishes to have them.

Up to and including October, 1989, accidents generally numbered well in excess of 10,000. In those accidents, there were 2,500-odd -

MR. SIMMS:  
Would you mind saying that again? In what period?

MR. KELLAND:

For 1989, up to and including October - all accidents I am speaking about now, just to give you the background - substantially over 10,000. In those accidents, there were 2,500-plus-a-few injuries, and the number of fatalities from all accidental causes was sixty-three. In the moose accidents in the same time frame, 1989, up to and including October, there were 395 moose/vehicle accidents, a very, very significant number, there were 100 injuries and, saddest and worst of all, I am sure everybody will agree, there were three fatalities in that time.

It appears to be fairly constant. We have some reference, at times, back to 1987 and 1988, as well. It would seem there is no real decrease. It either maintains a certain level of consistency or it seems to increase, so three fatalities this year; there was one, I believe, the year before, and so on.

It is a matter of concern because, certainly, one fatality is one too many, and we have to take steps any way we can to try to alleviate that situation and, at the same time, control the moose population, forgetting the accident part but keeping in mind good management practices.

I do not have the exact figures to give the hon. Member today, but there is quite a substantial increase in the allocation of moose this year, as there was last year, I believe something in the area of 2,500 extra licences. I do not have the exact figure, but there is a substantial allocation in the resident hunting and a fair increase in the non-resident hunting through outfitters.

I can give the exact figure at a later time, if the Member so wishes, but that is only one aspect of controlling vehicle and moose accidents. Obviously, just increasing the quota itself will not do it. And we have been examining ways, as the hon. Member suggests, of finding some other means of controlling or reducing the incidents of vehicle and moose accidents.

We do not have any final answers, but we are going as far away as Scandinavia for information, where they do have a substantial problem along the same lines, numbering many, many times more than we have, not so much in Labrador, but mainly on the Island of Newfoundland.

We are going to use that type of information plus other suggestions to try to come up with a comprehensive package, whether it is cutting back the brush, as I believe one of the Members suggested, on certain roads which appear to be congested, by considering the effect that road salt apparently has in attracting wildlife and big game out to the road areas. There has been some thought about that. How do you solve that? Would you put salt licks a distance from the road, for example, which would attract the big game animals, the moose, into the off road areas? At the same time, that may create another problem from a management point of view and, perhaps, even from a safety point of view as far as hunters are concerned.

So all these things are being considered. We have no final answer because there is no simple answer, Mr. Speaker. But it is a continuing project, one of which, as the Member suggests, is a

substantial increase in the moose allocation for the coming season.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the Member for Kilbride, I would like to identify the questions for the Late Show this evening. I apologize to the hon. the Opposition House Leader if I have disarranged the order of these when I was reading them. The first one I have is, I am dissatisfied with an answer given to me by the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs concerning the suggested mil rate for the town of Flat Rock, from the hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons). The second one is from the Member for Menihek (Mr. Snow) stating his dissatisfaction with an answer given to him by the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs concerning cut-backs in recreation and travel funds for youth in Labrador. The third one comes from the Member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) expressing his dissatisfaction with an answer given to him by the Minister of Finance with respect to Budget cuts.

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am sorry I missed you there. I did not know if you were finished or not.

I would like to have a few brief words on this petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Just for the point of clarification of the Chair. I was out and I do not know where we

are. Was this a new petition?

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is the second speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Thank you.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

As the Opposition House Leader said I wish to comment on a petition which he had so ably presented to this House a few minutes ago, a petition from some seventy-six residents of the Central Newfoundland area, people which cover three electoral Districts, Grand Falls, Windsor, and Bishop Falls. The prayer of their petition, as was stated in this Assembly has to do with the amount, the number of moose, which are increasing in this Province. I have no doubt that all of us would believe that. We seem to have a very good habitat for the moose population in this Province. We do have a lot of moose and they are increasing very fast in this Province. A lot of them seem to, I guess, with the improvement in our roads and with more roads being built in this Province, I guess we are going to see speed limits increase throughout our Province and because of this I would say we are going to see an increase in traffic accidents because of the moose population and because of improved highways.

AN HON. MEMBER:

There is also an increase in vehicles.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

We have an increase in vehicles and an increase in traffic mileage on our highway because people are becoming more affluent, whether we all believe that or not, at certain times there are more

vacationers on our roads. I see more recreation vehicles throughout the summer on our highways. We are going to have more commercial traffic on our highways because of improvements made to the highways and improvements made to the transportation system in this Province, mostly because of the former Government. It is interesting to note some of the signatures on this petition. I do note that one signature is A. Snow. I am not sure if that is our Deputy Speaker but he does not live in that area. It could be a relative of the Deputy Speaker for this House. There are names, Terrance Aylward, who could or could not be a relative of either one of us in the House. I am not sure it is a relative of mine. I do want to comment on some of the reasoning for -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) one of a kind.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

I do not know if there is a relative so it might be a conflict.

I remember when we were doing some investigation on the moose accidents in the Province and if there could be an increase in licences. The wildlife biologists, those in charge of the moose count, I suppose in the Province, always felt that they never had enough money to do the proper studies. They were always doing some studies but they never figured they had enough to do an indept study as they felt was necessary to get a good count of moose in the Province, so they always set the quotas for moose licences at the low end of the scale so that if they were going to err on how many mooses licenses could be put out in this Province

they were going to err on the side of conservation to make sure they would not damage the moose population or moose stocks in the Province.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, there was a sizable amount of money requested by the wildlife biologists to do proper studies. I am not sure if they got that money yet. I have not looked at the Budget of the wildlife Division of the Department, but there was a great need for extra monies to complete the studies of moose population, so that we could know if they were at dangerously high levels, particularly in areas near our highway.

One other thing I would like to say to the Minister is that there was an experiment done just west of the Foxtrap Access one time, a studied experiment where brush was cut along the Trans-Canada Highway, and for a couple of years I think some of the University professors were involved in it. It was a make work project but it has a direct influence on this petition. There were studies done and I have never heard a result of it.

Now in the area that was studied and cleared there is a two-lane highway so it is irrelevant of what happens in that area now. But we did have a couple of years where some people at Memorial University did do some studies.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I want to inform the hon. gentleman that his time is up.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

MR. BAKER:  
Motion 12, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Motion 12 - Meech Lake.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Is the hon. the Leader of the Opposition up on a point of order?

MR. RIDEOUT:  
No, no I just just going to proceed. Your Honour has to make a ruling, I guess. I am sorry.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Yes. I am now prepared to rule on the amendment proposed by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to the resolution of the hon. the Premier on March 27. Standing Order 36 states 'That a motion may be amended (a) by leaving out certain words; (b) by leaving out certain words in order to insert other words; (c) by inserting or adding words.' The hon. the Leader of the Opposition moved that the resolution be referred to a Select Committee of the House of Assembly to be called the Select Committee on the Constitution With the Power to Examine the Following: (a) the resolution to revoke the Meech Lake Accord; (b) the constitutionality of the referendum proposal contained in the Accord and; (c) the constitutional proposal of the Government. And that the Select Committee be empowered to hold hearings within and outside the Province and to take evidence from

witnesses residing both in the Province and outside the Province.

After extensive consultation and research and study and consultation with experts in the Province and outside of the Province it is my opinion that the amendment proposed by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition fails to comply with any of these requirements. As it is presented as a distinct motion without reference to the original motion. It does not conform with our Standing Orders nor with precedents. I therefore rule the amendment inadmissible.

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

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Yes, I will be very, very brief I do not want to take any time from the Member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward). Mr. Speaker, when we were at the point on Tuesday night when I moved the amendment I think I had about five or six minutes or so remaining in my speaking time. That time, of course, was used with both sides of the House making the argument as to whether or not the amendment was in order. Now I fully recognize and concur that comes out of my speaking time and that legitimately and legally my speaking time is over. I am not making any wrangle about that. Of course the same thing applies to the Premier, and I think for the last ten minutes of his remarks on Tuesday, because we had raised points of order, we had taken about ten minutes or so of the Premier's time and we agreed for the Premier to have it.

I wonder would the House give me the courtesy of five or six minutes just to do the same thing?

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it the decision of the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is concurred.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

And obviously, Mr. Speaker, that will have nothing to do with the thirty minutes for the hon. Member for Stephenville. It will not be taken out of his time. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank Members on both sides of the House for extending the same courtesy to me that was extended by us to the Premier, and I see nothing wrong with that.

Mr. Speaker, in about five minutes or so that I have left I just want to take the opportunity to make one particular point. I guess it was the point we were trying to make in the amendment that I moved on Tuesday night. I believe that it is vitally important to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that there be the widest possible understanding and the greatest possible understanding of the implications for Newfoundland and Labrador if this constitutional impasse that the country finds itself in at the present time is not broken. And I believe that it is incumbent on the Government - it is incumbent on us all but it is particularly incumbent on the Government - to

establish a process whereby the people can, themselves, become involved in what is happening here.

To take the unprecedented step of rescinding a constitutional approval given by another Legislature without referring that along with the accompanying alternatives proposed by the Government to the people, I believe is wrong, Mr. Speaker. It can equally be argued that we were wrong two years ago, but two wrongs do not make a right. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, the unprecedented nature of this particular move to rescind an approval given by another Legislature should be referred to the people for appropriate consultation. I cannot accept that it has been good enough, the Government's position that maybe at some time we will refer our own proposed constitution amendments. Maybe they will, maybe they will not. But that is only half the problem, Mr. Speaker, or half the matter. The other half is the rescinding resolution that we are now debating.

And, Mr. Speaker, time is running out. The clock is moving very, very quickly. We are now almost up to the end of March and if you are going to have an appropriate round of public hearings I suppose you would certainly want a month or so to do it. I cannot see how you could do it much faster than that. And, you know, the Easter break is coming and you would have to get a committee struck and get up and running and scheduled and all that kind of thing. So, you know, those things do not take a lot of time, Mr. Speaker, but they do take some time. So, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the Government had not concurred in doing that.

Mr. Speaker, finally before my time runs out. I have listened very carefully to Your Honour's ruling on amendments about adding to and taking away from resolutions according to our Standing Orders. And I would like to move, before my time finally elapses, seconded by the Member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) that the resolution be amended by inserting before the words, "to certify to his excellency, the Governor General, authorization of the said amendment by this House," the following words. "And following written notice by the Speaker to the Members of the House of assembly." I have copies here for the Speaker and for the Government if we have a page, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

After the Cabinet makes its decision, before he notifies the Governor General, he notifies the Members of the House first.

MR. RIDEOUT:

And the Speaker must formerly authorize the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I assume you will want a minute or so to look at it when it arrives and to determine whether or not it is in order. I think it is, and I would ask Your Honour to advise me accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. gentleman would permit, I would just like to recess for a couple of minutes.

### Recess

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before ruling on the amendment I

would like to point out to hon. Members the inadequacy of many of our Orders and it will only take a few moments. I can assure hon. Members in the particular area we are in, there are some large inadequacies in the rules and proceedings of our House. I would direct the Members who are on the appropriate committee to certainly take a look at this particular area.

Having said that, I rule the amendment in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Maybe now we will hear from the hon. the Minister of Health about drafting amendments that are in order or are not in order. The snarky little comment that the Minister made when the first amendment -

AN HON. MEMBER:

He was only joking.

MR. RIDEOUT:

You have to test the waters, Mr. Speaker, to see what conforms with the various rules and the precedents of this House. Some do and some do not. Sometimes amendments get accepted or rejected for the flimsiest of reasons but there is always a precedent to back it up, Mr. Speaker. You test enough and eventually, hopefully, you will find something that does conform with the rules and this amendment as ruled by the Speaker obviously does.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the amendment would authorize or make certain that the Speaker of this Legislature would formally give written notice to every Member of this House of Assembly before Your Honour gives the appropriate notice to the Governor General of Canada.

I think it would be totally discourteous. Obviously Members would know from the news media what the results of a referendum had been. We do not live in isolated cages, we would know that. But we are also, Mr. Speaker, elected Members of this House and for the Speaker of this House not to have to take the courtesy to write to every Member of this Legislature, to formally inform every Member of this Legislature the official result, Mr. Speaker, of the referendum, before informing somebody else in written form outside the Province, I believe would be totally inappropriate. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that is why we have proposed this amendment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said Tuesday night and I want to say again, that I believe we are heading for a time of great constitutional crisis in this country. I am not at all convinced that in the three or four months between now and the 23rd of June, there is a sufficiently compromising attitude flowing within the leaders of this country, to try to break that impasse.

I see some hope, Mr. Speaker, coming out of New Brunswick. I cannot say I like it all, but I do like the attitude of Premier McKenna, when he openly and candidly says, 'This is what we propose. We do not propose it as something written in stone. We

are prepared to listen to other people who might want to add to this proposal we have made.' At least the attitude is compromising. At least the signal of conciliation is being sent by the Premier of New Brunswick, right across the country. At least the signal of being prepared to co-operate is being sent by the Premier of New Brunswick to all Canadians.

I am not at all, Mr. Speaker, encouraged that the same attitude exists in Manitoba. It seems to me that the political leadership of Manitoba, the Premier of Manitoba, the Leader of the Official Opposition, the Leader of the New Democratic Party in Manitoba, have an attitude very similar to the attitude of the Premier of this Province: 'If we do not get exactly what we demand, if we do not have our demands met absolutely - I am talking about Manitoba, now, I say to the Premier, if he will listen for a second - 'if we do not have the Manitoba demands met absolutely, then we are not prepared to compromise.' Every alternative, Mr. Speaker, every new initiative that has been put forward by Premier McKenna or anybody else, so far has run into a stone wall of discontent, a stone wall of dissatisfaction, a stone wall of not wanting to be heard or listened to from the total political leadership of Manitoba. And, Mr. Speaker, that is so similar to the position adopted by the Premier of this Province, that it is frightening.

So far, every initiative, the McKenna initiative, did not even warrant a week or two of consideration by the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador. It did not warrant a week or two of deep



thought and study and analysis by him and his mainland constitutional advisor. It was dismissed very quickly, Mr. Speaker, as not being adequate. And perhaps it is not, but could it have been built-on to meet the adequacy the Premier is demanding?

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we go forward for the next three months or so with the attitude that every single one of our demands have to be met, then there is going to be no progress. If we go forward over the next three or four months with the attitude that 'I have to have everything,' that 'My way is the only way,' then this impasse is going to continue. There will be no progress.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Only subservience to Quebec.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Subservience to Quebec? Mr. Speaker, has the hon. gentleman lost his marbles totally, or what? Is he blowing his stack altogether? Subservience to Quebec! We are Canadians, are we not, Mr. Speaker? Are we trying to save a country here, Mr. Speaker, the state of a country, or are we going to take the go-to-the-wall approach and to heck with the consequences of what we are doing? I do not agree with being browbeaten and scuffled under or trampled over. I have no hesitancy whatsoever in saying to the Premier of Quebec, keep your nose out of our business down here. I do not agree with our Premier on his approach, but I do not agree with somebody else sticking their nose into our affairs either, particularly those comments that would get anybody's back up. I do not agree with it. I have no time for it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

We agree with you on that one.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, solidly, totally. The Premier in his response was absolutely right.

MR. SIMMS:

To Mr. Bourassa.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I would even say to him, I could not have said it as well myself. I cannot give him any better accolade than that, Mr. Speaker.

But having said that, Mr. Speaker, I totally disagree with the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Ramsay). His attitude is by trying to ask our Premier, by trying to ask our Government to participate in compromising and being conciliatory and co-operative in an effort to save the nation, that somehow or another it is being subservient to Quebec.

MR. SIMMS:

He did not mean that.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Maybe it is naivety. The Member is a new Member, I understand that. I am sure the Premier does not support that.

MR. SIMMS:

You must have misinterpreted what he said or something.

MR. RIDEOUT:

There has to be something. I am sure the hon. Member does not really mean that, Mr. Speaker.

To try to save Canada, Mr. Speaker, to try to save this

country there is going to have to be compromising done by all of us. Every Government in Canada, all levels of government in Canada, the ten provinces, the Federal Government, the Territories, all Canadians, if we want to save the country, are going to have to move, we are going to have to make compromises. We are going to have to be tolerant of other people. Maybe tolerance is the key word here, Mr. Speaker. If we cannot be tolerant and understanding of the legitimate demands - the Premier himself has said that the five demands of Quebec, condensed down from twenty-two, I believe, in the days of Premier Levesque, the Premier has said that he has no quarrel with the legitimacy of these demands.

PREMIER WELLS:  
Proposals.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Proposals is a better word, I agree. I think it was Levesque who was using the words twenty-two demands. But it is five proposals now.

PREMIER WELLS:  
Unfortunately, demande in French was translated demands.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Okay.

The Premier is making great progress on his French lessons, Mr. Speaker. He is making excellent progress.

PREMIER WELLS:  
I am giving lessons.

MS DUFF:  
It also means request in French.

MR. SIMMS:

It also means request.

MS DUFF:  
It has a double meaning. You have to be careful not to mince words.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:  
(Inaudible) demande is the most polite way a Frenchman can ask you to do something.

MR. SIMMS:  
You understand everything she said.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
I am totally lost, Mr. Speaker, but I do accept the word of my colleague.

MR. MURPHY:  
If Mr. Crosbie had to know as much.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Yes, if only Mr. Crosbie had known my colleague here was such, he would have had her into Quebec as his official interpreter and he might be the First Minister today.

As I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, before adjourning the debate, the substantive point is this, if we are going to save this country, if we are going to save Canada, all Canadian Governments and all Canadians are going to have to be tolerant of the demands of the others. We are not going to be able to do it by going to the wall and saying, I have to have this, or I am not part of it; Quebec saying I have to have this, or I am not part of it; Manitoba saying I have to have this, or I am not part of it; Newfoundland saying I have to have this, or I am not part of it. Somehow or other there has to be a tolerance and an understanding of wanting to keep this country together.

Mr. Speaker, with that brief introduction to the amendment, I will adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

Debate on the Adjournment  
[Late Show]

MR. PARSONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, needless to say, the comments of the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs maddened me, and I think, when the way the Minister interferred in the Town of Flatrock by the letter that was written gets out, which says really, Mr. Speaker

MR. MURPHY:  
Who paid for the sign?

MR. PARSONS:  
It was paid for the same way they paid for the recreational facilities they have down there, the same way they paid for the new town hall, for which not one single cent came from Government. The people of Flatrock paid for them, and they paid for those signs as well.

MR. TOBIN:  
Who said that?

MR. PARSONS:  
The hon. the Member for St. John's South. I just want to make it clear where the money came from.

Mr. Speaker, I perhaps assumed at one time today, until I read the letter in its entirety, that this letter may have been sent out by some official from the Minister's Department. But that is not the case, Mr. Speaker, because it says on the letter 'I have been asked to inform you on behalf of the hon. Eric Gullage, Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.'

Mr. Speaker, there are some misgivings here in the House. I heard it today, not in debate, but I did hear it, that the small Town of Flatrock was perhaps one of the wealthiest small towns on the Island.

MR. DECKER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:  
No, we are looking at statistics.

Mr. Speaker, I want to correct that fallacy, and that is what it is. Flatrock is a small town where many professional people have moved in over the years, on the outskirts of town. We will take two professional people just as an example, two professors moved in, or two doctors or whatever, and, certainly, up goes the overall wage earners, when you take everything into consideration, household earnings. But, I say to the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, the core of Flatrock people, the fishermen with fixed incomes, the people throughout that small community are by no means wealthy. Mr. Speaker, I also say to the Minister that they cannot afford a 13 mil rate. They cannot afford it. It is just not there to have.

Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of the Minister, all the Houses

today, with the cost of housing or whatever, have been appraised. I did not see the appraisals, but they have been appraised at \$50,000. That is \$650. Again, that is a myth. It is not practical. It is just not there.

The other thing I would like to point out to the Minister is the way this whole affair is transpiring. It is only now that I am realizing what is happening. The Minister comes in here the first part of last year and says he wants a great big city.

MR. EFFORD:  
(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:  
Tell the people of Port de Grave that.

Then the Minister comes in with the amalgamation bit.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
He got support, too.

MR. PARSONS:  
He did not get support for the big city, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:  
(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:  
I will have to address what the Minister of Social Services just said. Because we are free over here, as free as they fly. I do not tell the hon. Member for St. John's East what to say, I do not tell the hon. Member for Kilbride, either, and vice-versa, neither do they tell me.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:  
If the Minister would listen, and

the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. Decker) would let me continue.

MR. SIMMS:  
He is irritable today.

MR. PARSONS:  
He is irritable today, indeed he is.

But I would like to say to the Minister, the number of people I told you moved to Flatrock and those outlining areas, perhaps, they say - my colleague has said to me, they are avoiding taxation. But let me tell you, Mr. Minister, if you go ahead and try to implement that or try to force people, the people who moved in there will move out and then there will be no tax base, you will ruin a little town. You are beginning it. You are doing it now. You are ruining that little town and many others like it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:  
You are trying to force them into what they do not want to do. And I know that Minister. I have known that Minister for years, but I never thought he had the ability -

MR. GULLAGE:  
(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:  
just listen to him. That is the St. John's attitude. I never thought the hon. Minister -

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

The hon. Member's time is just about up. I wonder if he could finish up his questions.

MR. PARSONS:  
By leave?

MR. MURPHY:  
No. No.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. GULLAGE:  
Mr. Speaker, we had some ten communities throughout the Province, as I said in Question Period, which were identified as being critical and in such a situation that Regional Managers were saying that the work should proceed. However, they were not making it to the list of capital works because of their financial situation and, in most cases, the need to have a different mil rate, a different water and sewer rate, or a different business rate or a combination. But certainly they were deficient as far as revenue was concerned, compared to and in ratio to their assessed value. Most of the ten communities have had very little difficulty in bringing their revenue in line.

In Flat Rock's situation, they have been asked to go to 13 mils. The reason for that, quite frankly, is the fact that they were so lowly ranked compared to the other communities that the differential, the amount, the distance they had to go, if you like, to be ranked was such that their mil rate had to be increased more than normal. It is hard to argue that 13 mils is not a little higher than most rural communities in Newfoundland where the average

is probably four or five mils, which is, in itself, too low, and I think everybody would agree. But over time, of course, those mil rates will be adjusted upwards, as they have to be. But certainly 13 mils is not low compared to the rest of the Island, and I cannot argue that, it is obvious, but the ratio of revenue to assessments, as the Regional Manager tells me, is such in Flat Rock that to be able to come up to a situation where they could be ranked, where the ratio would be such to have them ranked, 13 mils is necessary. The only way it could be less than that is when the property tax is put in place and the assessments are done, of course, and they are ready now. This will be their first.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
No property tax there?

MR. GULLAGE:  
No, but it will be. The assessments have been done. They are ready to be put in place of property tax. The only other alternative is to have a lower mil rate, such as ten or eleven, and to put in place a water and sewer assessment.

MR. PARSONS:  
There is not any there.

MR. GULLAGE:  
No, there is not, but that is what we are saying. When it goes in place. It is about to go in place. What we are recommending is that when it goes in place now, it has to be 13. I am saying if it is not 13 it has to be less than that, but you have to add an assessment for water and sewer.

The basic problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the need in this particular

community, the health and the environment need which are the other factors, if you like, when the Regional Managers and the Engineers look at all the communities, the other factors were low relative to the other nine communities we talked about, so they had to make it up on the financial side alone. Having to make it up on the financial side meant going to 13 mils rather than, say, 7 or 8 or 9 mils, which could have been the case with some of these other communities. It is higher than normal, but the bridge they had to overcome was a lot greater than normal in the other communities that were also identified as critical. So there is no other explanation. The revenue in the community has to go up by about two-thirds from their existing revenue, and in order to meet the average of the Province in ratio of revenue to assess value, 13 mils is necessary.

MR. FLIGHT:  
And it will stay.

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

MR. A. SNOW:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I requested my question be placed on the Late Show because I was dissatisfied with the answer given by the Minister who just finished speaking, the hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, responsible for Recreation, Sport and Fitness.

He stated in response to one of my questions that he felt he was fortunate to be the Minister responsible for Recreation, Sport and Fitness. While, indeed, he may be fortunate, the people of

Labrador definitely do not feel they are very fortunate. One could possibly use the analogy of the fox in the chicken coop; the fox may think he is fortunate but the chicken do not.

I was disappointed in this particular Minister, who has a personal knowledge of Labrador. He lived there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
What?

MR. A. SNOW:  
He actually lived in Labrador, so he should have a knowledge of Labrador, and I believe he does. He has a lot of friends still there.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
I doubt that.

MR. A. SNOW:  
He used to have a lot of friends. Of course, he is a former competitor, a former athlete, so he should have a particular knowledge of sport, of the benefit of having the opportunity of competing in a provincial forum, being a former athlete, excelling in bowling. I am surprised that he would put out so much venom towards the people of Labrador.

Last week, we saw his cohort attacking the people of Labrador in the discontinuation of the Labrador Air Subsidy Program, and this wee, it is this particular Minister's turn.

Now, he knows, of course, the reasons why this particular program was put in place many, many years ago. An hon. Member who sits on the other side of the House, the hon. the Member for Placentia (Mr. Hogan) was instrumental in lobbying the

Government of years gone by, while he lived in Labrador, to have a program put in place to allow people to travel outside Labrador, to put them on an equal footing with people on the Island portion of the Province.

On the Island portion of the Province, people are able to travel and compete via a road system, which, of course, as we all recognize, is heavily subsidized by all levels of Government, and what the Government of the day did in the late 1960s and early 1970s was subsidize air travel to Labrador, because that was the only mode of travel in and out of Labrador, and they wanted Labrador to participate in the provincial forum in sports, culture and other activities.

Now, it really surprises me that the Minister would cut back this particular program by such a devastating amount, in recognizing how much it costs. Out of Western Labrador, one air fare return is \$724. A young student, whose parents may be working in the mines, who would want to try out for a basketball team or a volleyball team, to represent this Province, now would have to spend hundreds and hundreds of dollars to travel here to represent his or her Province. I believe it is unconscionable, to quote somebody who seems to use the word quite often in recent months -

MR. DECKER:

It is a good word.

MR. A. SNOW:

It is a very good word, as the Minister of Health suggests. It is unfortunate that he did not apply it when he sat around the Cabinet table and agreed to slash

and gut this program that affected the people of Labrador.

MR. SIMMS:

It seems to me, the Minister is not happy. He is uncomfortable.

MR. A. SNOW:

The Minister of Health probably would have a feeling towards the people of Labrador, in the sense that he lives so close to the boundary of the Member for Eagle River, who, I am sure, is very dissatisfied with this program and, if he were sitting around the Cabinet table, I am sure he would have raised the issues and articulated the views of the people of Labrador and would have been able to convince his colleagues around the table that this was a good program and should continue to be in place. I implore the Minister to reconsider.

In Labrador, we comprise about 5 per cent of the population of this Province. We produce about twenty per cent of the Gross Provincial Product of this Province. And this equalizer the previous Administration had seen fit to give to the people of Labrador has been removed by this Government who talks about fairness and balance. It may be fair to the people in Mount Scio or the people of St. John's, but it is not fair to the people who live in Western Labrador, Eagle River, the Torngat Mountains or Naskaupi district. Again, I want to implore the Minister to reinstate this program to ensure that these people who participate in this particular program will be able to come out and participate with their relatives and friends, they have made over the numbers of years here on the Island portion of the Province, rather than forcing them to either stay home in Labrador or

go to the Province of Quebec to compete.

Just today, we found that the High School Athletic Federation had to discontinue programs in Labrador this year because of the block allocation of funding. So, again, the Minister was misleading the people when he suggested in his release -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, we identified this area as an area where we had to reduce expenditures in the Budget, and we had two choices: We could do as we have done, and that is reduce the subsidy available to each traveler, or, in fact, we could have cut down the amount of people accessing the subsidy. But we chose to do it the way it has been handled now. We are reducing from 75 to 50 per cent and from 50 per cent to 25 per cent. We will, of course, monitor the program over the next few months and see what impact it does have.

As far as the High School Federation is concerned, what I said in Question Period was indeed correct. There will be no impact in this immediate month on their travel, any programs they have in March month. They have a \$75,000 budget normally, which will now go to \$50,000 I am told, so they do have to make adjustments in their budget. I do not know whether or not they are going to make all their adjustments in the Labrador portion of their program. I have heard nothing about that. I will

be very surprised if they would have reacted that quickly to the program and said the cut we are making in our programs is going to be strictly faced off against Labrador. Maybe they have made that comment but I have not heard it. It seems odd that the high school federation would identify the cut in their budget as being necessary against the Labrador travel program but that may very well be so.

We will indeed monitor the program over the next few months. We will have dialogue, I am sure, with the various groups that are involved when travelling to and from Labrador. I understand already that the host grants will be adjusted as far as Labrador is concerned. Where it was normally \$7500.00 as a host grant it will now be \$5000. I think there is some discussion that the groups are going to reduce their amount for people travelling into Labrador. It is something we will have to monitor over the next few months to see how it impacts upon sports and recreation groups. As it sits right now, Mr. Speaker, we had to make an adjustment in the program. We have done just that and hopefully it will not impact too seriously on the sports bodies.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Today I asked the Minister of Finance a very simple, straightforward question and the answer the Minister of Finance gave was about the last seventeen years of the former Government. That was not the question I asked the Minister. I asked the



Minister a straightforward question and I would hope now the Minister would give us a straightforward answer.

MR. EFFORT:

Sit down. Sit down.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I have to say to my hon. colleague for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) that there is a major catastrophe over in the Mackinson's area that we will deal with in a few days. However, I go back to my hon. colleague the Minister of Finance. There has been a cut in the air subsidy and there has been a reduction of \$100,000 in their Student Travel Program. I asked the Minister of Finance (Dr. Kitchen) and I say this to all the Ministers over there, and my hon. colleague for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), the only question I ask of the Minister of Finance was, would he tell us when he would make the next announcement of another major cut in Labrador? That is a straightforward question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, in case the Minister -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is quite a bit of noise going on, conversation by Members on both sides of the House, and I am having difficulty hearing the hon. Member and I am sure other people are having difficulty hearing the hon. Member.

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, just in case the Minister of Finance refuses to answer the question I asked today I, Mr. Speaker, will take the opportunity to advise the hon. Minister what one of his Ministers will be announcing within the next two weeks of a major cut again in a program in Labrador. And, Mr. Speaker, it was highlighted today by the Minister of Health, when responding to my petition on health care in Labrador asked us to check into the Budget and see all the money was there for two nursing stations in Hopedale and Davis Inlet.

Mr. Speaker, within two weeks from now the Minister is going to announce that those two nursing stations will be put on hold, and the reason the Minister is going to give is the planning - and Mr. Speaker let me just tell what this Government has done - this Government has planned a nursing station for Hopedale and for Davis Inlet for a population of 3,000 people in each community. And their planning is almost as big as the community. And Mr. Speaker, the plans are no good for either one of the communities. Now, Mr. Speaker, they do not have time to go back and get their plans done up for this year and now they are going to have no construction of the two hospitals. In fact, Mr. Speaker, and I say this to my hon. colleague for Eagle River (Mr. Dumaresque), - I am sure my colleague for Eagle River is going to be some upset when he hears this, Mr. Speaker - the hospital that is in Forteau, the big nursing clinic that is capable for looking after a population of 3,000. Mr. Speaker, these are the same plans that this Government has developed for Hopedale.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, (inaudible) to see.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, these are the same plans that they have for the community of Hopedale with a population that will never be more than 550 or 600 people. Now, Mr. Speaker, they have the same plans for the community of Davis Inlet, a large nursing station that is capable of looking after 3,000 people for a little isolated community of 500 or 600. Mr. Speaker, that is going to be the next announcement from this Government of slashing again upon the people of Labrador.

I say to the hon. Minister of Finance, in my closing remarks, Mr. Speaker, do not go back to the last seventeen years, go back to the last eleven months.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have always done well by Labrador. Does the hon. Member remember who built Churchill Falls?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Who gave it away?

DR. KITCHEN:

Does the hon. Member remember who opened the mines in Wabush and Labrador City? Do the hon. Members remember what was done in the Moores' Government, the two little explosions on both sides of the Straits? Remember that?

Do not talk to me about what the Tories did in Labrador. They did nothing in Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

In a few minutes I started to look at the number of things in eleven months we have been able to do in Labrador. Let me read them quickly, I will not have time to read them all.

The Minister of Education has announced that there will be \$200,000 for planning a residence for single parents who attend the Community College in Happy Valley, a very imaginative measure. The Minister of Health after years of people pleading with the Tory Government is going to put a second doctor in Forteau. The Minister of Health will be building two community clinic hospitals, one in Davis Inlet and another in Hopedale (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

Among the additional nurses that he will be hiring this year, some will be placed in the Goose Bay Hospital.

We remember who closed the hospital in Northwest River, it was not us. It was them who closed the Hospital in Northwest River.

The Minister has been able to convince the Federal Government to repair the roofs and the windows in the Federal Government building that houses the hospital in Goose Bay. And as soon as the future of Goose Bay is assured with respect to the NATO base or otherwise, so we know what is going to happen at that point, the planning will go ahead for the new hospital or whatever it is in Goose Bay.

My hon. colleague here last fall spent \$1.5 million to open up a branch of Memorial University in Labrador City. (Inaudible) half a million dollars every year is going to be there. And not only that, I understand that the Minister is going up next week to open it.

We continue to subsidize Labrador Airways to keep the cost of transportation down. We continue to fund the air ambulance service that provides the good hospital access to the coast of Labrador. The hon. Minister of Social Work will be sending social workers to Labrador to combat problems with child abuse as he is in other parts of the Province. The Minister of Fisheries will be placing a community stage in Black Tickle, a fish plant in William's Harbour. He has money put aside for the collection and distribution of fish along the Labrador coast.

There will be an enlarged gear replacement program, fish plants in Nain and Makkovik. \$1.5 million I believe for a marine lab in L'Anse-au-Diable, is that right? Works, Service and Transportation, \$3 million to build a bridge across the St. Charles River - \$3 million. The Minister of Mines and Energy has just completed four regional geological studies in Labrador and two economic geology studies to further the geological potential.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister - I believe it is the Minister over here - increased the funding for Them Day's magazine from a measly \$20,000 to \$40,000. The Grant for the combined-

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave, by leave.

MR. SPEAKER:  
It is moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? All those in favour, 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Those against, 'Nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I declare that the 'nays' have it and that the Speaker will be in the Chair at -

MR. SIMMS:  
On a point of order.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, the point of order I wish to raise - I am trying to find the reference here as best I can - it seems to me that on Thursdays at 6:00, or at 5:00, as the Standing Orders should now read, of course, the adjournment of the House, really, is determined in accordance with Standing Order 31, as I recollect.

MR. SPEAKER:  
That is correct.

MR. SIMMS:  
Does it not refer to the House automatically adjourning? I guess that is my question. Perhaps Your Honour could be more precise in explaining it.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:  
To that point of order, Standing Order 31, Section (h): 'At 5:00 o'clock p.m. on any Thursday', which is now 4:30, 'the Speaker may, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 14, deem that a motion to adjourn the House has been made and seconded, whereupon such motion shall be debatable for not more than thirty minutes'. Your Honour, that is what we have been doing for the last thirty minutes, debating the motion to adjourn.

It goes down through and talks about the proceedings during the half-hour, the time limits, and so on, and it says: 'the Speaker shall put the motion to adjourn, and if the motion is carried, shall leave the Chair until Friday, but if the said motion is defeated, the Speaker shall leave the Chair until' now it should be '7:00 o'clock p.m., 'when the order of business considered by the House immediately before the Speaker having deemed such a motion to adjourn to have been made shall be resumed.'

So, Mr. Speaker, that handles it.

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is plainly no point of order.

The Speaker will be in the Chair this evening at 7:00 p.m. and I invite hon. Members to join me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

The House resumed at 7:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

When the House adjourned for the late show, I am informed the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was to speak. He is not here and since we are still on the Amendment we are ready for a speaker. The hon. the Member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was starting to wonder whether or not that minute might ever come, to tell you the truth, because I have been preparing for this speech for quite some time, and I appreciate the opportunity. I spoke twice before in this debate on Meech Lake, Mr. Speaker, when we were in Opposition and expressed some grave concerns about the Meech Lake Accord at the time and I will be doing so again this evening, as this Government has done and will continue to do. We are not trying to kill the Meech Lake Accord, we are trying to repair it, we are trying to amend it, we are trying to make some changes to the Meech Lake Accord that would make it a better document for Canada. We have been working diligently to do that. The Premier has been working diligently to do that and has submitted a number of proposals for consideration by the Government of Canada, by the Prime Minister and his Federal Cabinet and his Federal Cabinet Ministers from all over Canada -- some of his Federal Cabinet Ministers from Quebec who happen to be, I believe, and I think a lot of people will believe, unfortunately, are more nationalist for Quebec than they are for Canada.

I think that has been one of the problems which the people are starting to see, when we talk about trying to get Meech Lake ratified. They are saying let us go along with it for now, we will sign on all the dotted lines and afterwards we will negotiate, but once this document is put forward, then there are going to be some major problems that are going to exist for a long time to come.

There are a number of things we have to look at. We are talking about a vision for Canada and we are talking about where we are going to be. The Leader of the Opposition talks about the danger and so on of the constitutional crisis that seems to be about right now. I went back and read some of the press releases and all the documents in 1981, when the same debate was occurring when Rene Levesque was elected and was trying to negotiate, was attempting to negotiate a number of proposals for the constitution to bring Quebec into Canada, but at that time, of course, Mr. Levesque did not want to even sit around the table, basically. He just wanted Sovereignty Association and he set about a plan to do that. Of course, they had a referendum, so all of this time, in the early 1980's and the late 1970's were very difficult times for Canada in those days.

But of course in those days you had a Prime Minister, Prime Minister Trudeau, who happened to be from Quebec, but who, also was able to say: You have some demands, but they have to be reasonable for everybody else in Canada, and they have to be reasonable demands, so he undertook to try, as best he could to bring Quebec into the Constitution. He tried but it did

not work. They did not want to be around at the time, they did not want to be at the table. That was fine. Basically they did not want to be there and those were very difficult times in the history of Canada and at that time everybody was very concerned, but the fact of the matter is there are enough people in this country that want to keep it together and have always wanted to keep it together, I believe that is a strong majority. So I think we are going to see in the future, over these next few weeks and months, some give and take. But people say to our Premier, some of the Opposition Members and the Opposition across Canada, there is very little of it, but some Opposition Members and leaders are saying to our Premier that we are the ones putting out the blackmail, we are the ones who are saying give us our conditions or else. But it is not us saying that, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing is presenting a negotiating position, and the fact of the matter is that the Prime Minister has totally ignored Newfoundland's presentation and our proposals. Has absolutely ignored them. They have not even given it a second thought, as a matter of fact.

So here we go, now we are into looking at rescinding the resolution so that we can get on a level playing field with the other two provinces who have not ratified the Accord, so we are trying to get on a level playing field and deal with the matter. And it is in the constitution that we can do this and we are undertaking to do it.

Now the Premier and this Government committed that we will try to negotiate and make some changes and so on and get our

conditions met and see what we could work out. But again the Prime Minister and the Government of Canada have absolutely ignored these presentations and our wishes. So are we just suppose to keep going along until June 23 rolls around and then we are into a real crisis. So we have undertaken this process to get on a level playing field, and to help to debate and stimulate the debate in this country so that we can get some compromises made and get some negotiations done. So we are not the ones who are out saying, you know, give us our conditions or else. It is not us at all, we have presented our proposals and they have been very good proposals. I think the majority of Canadians absolutely agree with those proposals.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Members of the Opposition agree also.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, I am sure many Members of the Opposition agree with him really. But you also have the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, and I am very well sure that they agree with them. I know in my own District, I have had a number of people just walk right up to me and say, keep it going and that is the right stand that you have taken. I mean on this issue it is unbelievable the support that is there. And it is not an anti-Quebec feeling at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh no?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Let us be honest. You know to say that people in Newfoundland and Labrador are anti-Quebec, I mean just because they have made a decision that maybe there are too

many conditions being met by a Prime Minister. I mean let us be honest. You know, I trust the judgment of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. So if they are out there and they say, they do not feel that the Meech Lake Accord is going to do justice to Canada well I think they have a right to do that. So I am honest, and I am sure they are. So I do not see any problem with that.

I think our position is very clear and we have waited and been patient, the Premier has been patient. Now we have come to a point in March and with three months to go, and we are into a situation where they are trying to put the heat on the two or three provinces, and they are trying to drum it up and see whether or not everybody would give in and do what Mr. Bourassa wants everybody to do.

Well I have an article here that was put out right after the re-election of Mr. Bourassa in Quebec. And the headlines says 'Post election blackmail.' It was an Ottawa newspaper and it says 'Sign Meech Lake or Quebec separates, Ottawa thunders, but is anybody listening?' Now this is last fall that these types of threats were being made. Now I do not believe that this was the honest way to go. I believe they should have been sitting down and talking about the conditions that we have, the problems we have and the problems that other provinces have with the Meech Lake Accord. The article noted that two of Prime Minister Brian Mulroney's powerful Quebec Lieutenants, Minister Marcel Masse and Transport Minister, Benoit Bouchard, voted yes for Sovereignty Association in Quebec's 1976 Referendum. In 1976

Mr. Benoit Bouchard and Mr. Marcel Masse, two powerful Quebec Lieutenants now in the Federal Government of Canada, were on record as voting for Sovereignty Association, they were in the PQ Party, PQ Nationalists. There are more of them. That is only two they highlighted by the way. The only two they highlighted. Here we go, we have had these people, who are now in our Federal Government of Canada, representing you and me and everybody else. They helped Mr. Mulroney get elected to the National Government of Canada. They could not get their way with the PQ Party so they said let us help Mr. Mulroney get elected. So that is what they went and did. They set out in a determined effort to do that. Now they set out in a determined effort to do that.

These people are in the Federal Government now and they are saying they are representing the interests of Canadians. They are supposed to be representing the interests of all Canada yet these people who voted for a Sovereignty Association proposal to take Quebec out. They are saying we are supposed to say: 'yes well we can agree with the Federal Cabinet and we should go along with Meech Lake, but obviously the conditions they could not get in the Sovereignty Association, they could not get in the referendum that they had, they are trying to get through Meech Lake. It is very simple - that is exactly what they are trying to do. So that if Meech Lake gets through and they get all their conditions that they did not get the other way, they are going to have Sovereignty Association anyway. That is what is going to happen .

If you go back and look at the proposals in 1981: The PQ's blueprint for Quebec, 'The Touched Up Federalism Will Not Do Report.' The PQs blueprint for Quebec is very similar to a number of the things that are in Meech Lake, especially talking about a distinct society and so on. A number of the things are very similar as a matter of fact, if anybody wished to go back and read them, and have a look at what was said during the day and the proposals that were put forward.

The Sovereignty Association poses very similar to a number of the conditions that the present Premier of Quebec, Mr. Bourassa, put forward in the Meech Lake Accord. These proposals from Mr. Bourassa were put forward a number of years later to a new Federal Government which has a number of PQ nationalists who decided to run for Mr. Mulroney and get elected. That is fine. So basically that is the kind of stuff that is happening now with the debate that is going on.

People are saying to us, everybody should sign Meech Lake because it is good for Canada, and there will be no problem after. Everybody is going to sit down around the table, and senate reform will be able to be negotiated. All the other things that are of strong interest for Canadians will be able to be negotiated. They are saying that on the one hand, and people know the difference. And they are starting to realize. It takes a while but once you get the picture out there and you have a real good look, an honest look, as we would say, you start to see it. This Article also goes on to say something else which is very, very interesting when it comes to this debate and in trying to get

Quebec into the Confederation, into the Constitution, the Article says here: 'Mr. Bourassa used provisions in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms to by-pass the Supreme Court of Canada ruling that found Quebec's French Only sign laws to be unconstitutional. He found them to be unconstitutional so he imposed the Notwithstanding Clause. Mr. Bourassa said that he would not have had to invoke the Charter if Meech Lake were law.

But yet, it really does not mean anything. A distinct society, all that is is symbolism. It is just symbolism. So if he had had Meech Lake he could have done what he wanted to do with Bill 178 and he would not have had any problem doing it. I think everybody in Canada wants to see Quebec in the Constitution. I think most people in Canada want to see Quebec in the Constitution but are we suppose to give everything? Are we suppose to say, okay, every condition you want you can have, and the rest of Canada, or the interests of Newfoundland and Labrador are to be ignored, or those of Nova Scotia or of anybody else? Are we supposed to do just that and then sit down after and try to negotiate, when in essence with the Meech Lake proposals, as they stand now, especially with distinct society as it is in the proposals, you will have in essence, I mean Quebec will have in essence the ability to do what they want to promote their society, a separate distinct society?

If you look it up in Webster's Dictionary it is a separate society, a separate institution altogether. We will have a country within a country and that is basically what we are going to

have. It is most unfortunate. We recognize that Quebec is a distinct society. I very much do, but how far do you go with distinct society and how far does everybody else in Canada go with it? I think Canadians have made a great effort to bring Quebec into the Constitution, a bilingual country, people getting French immersion teaching. I think we have done a superb job and have attempted very much so to meet the needs of Quebec and to spread the French language in Canada. The Port au Port Peninsula in this Province is a growing area where French culture is being promoted. A new school out there just opened and all kinds of improvements are happening. There is nobody against that, everybody is for it, but yet Mr. Bourassa wants his separate society, to do what he wants and to get what he could not get years ago, or get what they could not get years ago. I think it is most unfortunate that at the very least they do not want to sit down to the table and talk about it. They are out in the papers again today saying we are not going to move, we are not going to budge, Meech Lake has to be signed then we will talk. That sounds like an negotiating position to me. We are trying to get them to sit down to the table but they do not want to sit down and we are being told that we are the ones who are being the nation-wreckers of Canada.

Now I have a hard time sitting here taking that I have to tell you. I am not a nation-wrecker and nobody on this side is a nation-wrecker. As a matter of fact we are nation builders and we propose proposals that will help nation build. They can call us what they want but I am not going to say to them that they are



nation-wreckers. I say to them they are entitled to their opinion and so am I. I think that all members of this House are trying to nation build and I believe that in the level of debate we are into that is what we should be saying to each other.

We are trying to nation build. We may disagree about how we are going to do that or how these proposals are going to go but we are nation-builders on this side. I say if the majority of Canadians could get a chance to vote on those proposals would vote for them. There is no doubt about it in my mind. I doubt very much if we are ever going to get to that. It depends. If there is some flexibility and if this Prime Minister we have has the vision of Canada, and what that vision is I am not sure, but we will see what his vision of Canada is. I am going to get into that in a few minutes. When I was coming up with my own arguments, and I have read everything I can find on the Meech Lake Accord and the interpretations from all over Canada, I was sent a brochure, 'Meech Lake, setting the record straight' sponsored by Canadians for unifying constitution with the co-operation of friends of Meech Lake. This document was sent to all Government Members, I believe. I got it the other day. In the document they go on to explain Meech Lake and why people should vote for Meech Lake and why we should pass the Meech Lake Accord as is and let it go through. One of the phrases they get into here, they describe the distinct society clause, and their interpretation of the distinct society clause and how it will effect Canada. They say here that these are the people promoting Meech Lake. Meech Lake provides a

symbolic affirmation for the future which is essential to the self confidence of Quebecers and their willing participation in the Canadian partnership. Symbolic affirmation for the future is what they say here.

They go on to say the distinct society clause tells the courts to be sensitive to that unique and legitimate role of Governments in Quebec. It tells the courts to be sensitive to that unique and legitimate role so they are saying that the courts are going to be sensitive, they are going to have to interpret that distinct society clause which will become law, be part of the Constitution. They are going to have to interpret that and be sensitive to it.

They go on and it says that the clause is then an institutional recognition of Quebec's uniqueness. I am not sure what that means, but I have been researching it and I have been trying to come up with a definition for that. I have not been able to get a clear understanding. It does not say what they are going to be able to do and what they are not going to be able to do.

It goes on to say, in any particular case the precise balance between the protection of minority rights and Quebec's ability to promote a distinct society will be established by the courts. This is the same document now I am reading out of it. A minute ago it was symbolic gesture, the distinct society clause in the Meech Lake Accord. The same brochure is saying that the precise balance between the protection and minority rights in Quebec's ability to promote a distinct identity will be

established by the courts. So the courts are going to interpret every move that the Quebec Government makes and that is brought to the court. And the interpretations are going to be wide open.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is going to happen?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

What is going to happen? I do not know. I would hope that they will do with the distinct society clause what they should do and that would be proper for Canada and proper for Quebec. But then again, you know, how do we know? We do not know. And so what we have asked and all we have asked is that we recognize the distinct society clause of Quebec being distinct, but let us say what it means. Instead of leaving all the ambiguity there, say what it means. And that is not so hard to do, but for some reason or other we just cannot get the Federal Prime Minister and the Federal Government and Mr. Bourassa, to say what it means.

But I know what it means, as this article says. If he had Meech Lake - Bill 178 - no problem. Do what you want. That is what Mr. Bourassa will do. That is what he says he would do. No problem, that is what he will do. But we are being told outside that they will not do that, that this clause word is located in the Meech Lake Accord that there will not be any problem, that it is just there for symbolic gesture to recognize Quebec as a distinct society.

Well, I have read the brochure through and I have been as objective as I can. I have read some exerps from it and, you know, it is more ambiguous than any

document I have seen yet that is talking about the Meech Lake Accord. So I have been trying to be honest about it in looking at it and looking at all the angles. What are we supposed to do? Are we supposed to agree to every demand? We want to agree to as many as we can, but in doing so you have got to be responsible in doing that. And the position of Newfoundland and Labrador has also to be protected and has to be enhanced.

And I believe the proposals we put forward are very positive. They are very positive, they are nation building, they are nation constructing. And this nation-building is going to go on, not only for the next few weeks or months but it is going to go on for a number of years to come. As it has in the past, as it has for the last hundred odd years.

So, when Mr. Mulroney gets up and says - and the threats that pour out - that things are getting very difficult and that we had better do it or else, and when he talks about the vision of Canada that he has and the accomodations that he has to make for his Quebec Caucus, and I think a lot of those Members in that caucus are for Canada, but then some of them have a different vision. And I believe the vision they have is one of two separate states, one Canada and one Quebec.

And I suppose that is what the debate is all about at this present time, that is what it has been about this last number of months. And a division of Canada and what its existence will be if the Meech Lake Accord goes through is what the debate is all about. And I say to anybody, I am not a professional lawyer or anything else, but I have read through all

the different documentation. If there was honesty from the Federal Government on this matter it would be much easier or at least if they were more upfront, it would be much easier for this Government to negotiate and talk and to try to bring forward and to deal with the problems. But they have been ignoring it and I think it is time that they dealt with the matter in a much better fashion, instead of playing off one against the other. I think they have been doing that for too long and I believe the Prime Minister has indicated in a number of press reports, that there is very little strategy as to how to resolve this problem, and it seems as if he has been flying by the seat of his pants, as has been said in the press reports.

I mean to let something go this far and to go this long, being a Prime Minister of Canada, this great country, and to let it go to this end. It has been said that this time there are some very difficult problems in Canada, there is a lot of friction in different parts of Canada and so on, and we are being told now that we might be creating it, we are part of the ones who are creating it. You know out west they elected a senator and for which party did they elect a senator for? A reform party, the reform party who want reforms. Now this was done a number of months ago, this was done out in Western Canada.

MR. MURPHY:  
Alberta, (inaudible).

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
In New Brunswick there is a separate third party started up out there for English rights. They started out. In Quebec

another third party, English rights in Quebec. Got three or four members elected in the last Provincial election. All this stuff is going on in the different parts of Canada, and we are being told now we are the ones who are nation wrecking. I mean let us get the record straight here, we are trying to build it and we are trying to put forward decent proposals and trying to negotiate and we have a good vision of Canada and a very strong one. And this Province contributes a great deal to this Canada, it contributes a great deal.

We are trying to see the thing through. We are trying to see a Senate reform that needs to be done. We would like to see that happen. And I believe it would be very beneficial for this Canada and for this Province, but how are you suppose to do that if all parties are not being honest with each other? And I believe the Federal Government has not been honest with this Province and that is most unfortunate. It has made it very difficult and I think it is most unfortunate because the problems are still festering and the debate heats up and things are getting said. The Premier of Quebec is saying things that we react to and it should not have to happen that way. The Prime Minister should be putting people together and trying to get this matter resolved and it is most unfortunate, I believe, that we are at this point in time. But the debate will go on, and we are going to put forward our strong proposals that the Premier has put forward and I believe in the end, if everybody individually goes and looks at it real seriously and sees the motives behind certain aspects of what has happened here, I think if everybody had a good

hard look at it that there are things that could happen to be very positive and I believe some things are going to happen.

But it will take the Prime Minister's involvement to do that. And I just hope that he is not going to bend to the pressure of some of his nationalist Ministers of Quebec, who he has in his Cabinet, who are saying do not move at all. So if nation-wreckers are going to be applied do not apply them to this Province, but there is another place you could apply them to, and that is where the blame should be laid if there is any blame to be laid at all. I do not think we should be into that. I think we should be trying to do something with it and it is time that Mr. Mulroney got very serious about it and dealt with the matter.

I think also, Mr. Speaker, when it comes down to this Province and its contribution to Confederation that we take no back seat to anybody and we contributed a great deal of resources and we contributed also to the spirit of this Canada. And I find it most unfortunate that a number of things have been said by the Premier of Quebec talking about Newfoundland, that we are going to be like Toronto, and so on, this type of thing. What a way to argue about constitutional proposals! I mean that is no way to be. Let us deal with the constitutional proposals instead of getting on with that kind of stuff. And we have done that. We have put forward some superb proposals to deal with this. But again, you have to have all parties wanting to see it through. I firmly believe, and it is my humble opinion, that if Meech Lake goes through, if it

were to be adopted, you will see, Quebec will have the mechanisms to eventually move away from Canada and be able to set up a separate state.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave, by leave!

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Anyway, just to clue up, Mr. Speaker.

As I have said, I have read, watched, listened -

MS DUFF:  
(Inaudible).

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
No, that is not what I am saying.

MS DUFF:  
Explain your last remark.

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
I will explain my last remark. If they get what is in the Meech Lake Accord, as it is now, as the P.Q. Nationalists Ministers in Mr. Mulroney's Cabinet would like to see happen, if that happens, they will have the mechanism to be able to do what they want. Mr. Bourassa will not need to invoke the notwithstanding clause.

MS DUFF:  
(Inaudible).

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
I can easily explain it. If they are given the right to promote their distinct society as it is, within that constitution, as law, and it has to be interpreted by the courts, they can go -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Quote Bourassa.

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Yes, I can quote Bourassa, again. I mean he feels he will have the mechanism to promote a distinct society, his distinct society.

MS DUFF:  
(Inaudible) now.

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Yes that was a clause they were not supposed to use.

Anyway, I tell you what, I am going to set up shop downstairs, if you want to come down, and we can have a debate on that, and I could go further, but I will not. But my belief is that, and I believe if some amendments can be made to Meech Lake, some changes made, it will be a much better document for everybody in this Canada, and I believe that is what we proposed. So we are nation-builders, not nation-wreckers, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MS VERGE:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the motion made by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon, to amend the Premier's resolution rescinding the Province's ratification of the Meech Lake Accord.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier's resolution, printed in our Order Paper, is a major move for this Legislature and for this Province. It is an unprecedented development, as the Premier himself acknowledges, in an unprecedented process of attempting to amend the patriated constitution.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution reversing the Legislature's ratification of the Meech Lake Accord is a drastic measure. The resolution would have negative repercussions for the Province's future dealings with third parties, be they other Canadian jurisdictions or firms or individuals in commerce. How are third parties dealing with this Province in the future to trust our word?

The resolution represents a reversal of the Premier's own personal word, which he gave to the other Canadian First Ministers at the First Ministers' Conference in November. Mr. Speaker, I have a transcript of what the First Ministers agreed at the conclusion of that Conference, and it says, 'In return, the Premier of Newfoundland has agreed that the legislature will not, in the meantime, rescind the resolution already passed by the Legislature in Newfoundland.'

Mr. Speaker, despite the gravity of this resolution, despite the negative consequences of the Resolution, the Premier is trying to rush it through the House of Assembly and the Premier is shutting out the public from any involvement in this process. And why, what is the excuse? Well the excuse the Premier gives, is that he wants this Province to be on the same footing as New Brunswick

and Manitoba, the other Meech Lake Accord hold-out provinces, but he wants to be taken more seriously, he wants more people in Canada to pay attention to him. Now, Mr. Speaker, throughout the process of discussing the Meech Lake Accord throughout Canada, since the Premier assumed office, his tactics and his timing have been calculated to get as much attention as possible for himself and to get that attention at the expense of the other participants in the process.

Mr. Speaker, Members will recall that it was on the eve of the First Ministers Conference in November when the Premier tabled in this Assembly his proposal for constitutional development, his alternative to the Meech Lake Accord. He then flew off to the First Ministers Conference and dropped his package on his fellow First Ministers. He did not present his proposals in advance of the conference, allowing the other First Ministers time to study his suggestions and to digest them and to prepare themselves to discuss them with the Premier at the First Ministers conference. No, he waited until just before the conference, so that he would get maximum national publicity for himself and he succeeded, but at what cost? Was it helpful in a process of constitutional consensus seeking, was it helpful in an effort to reconcile differences? No, Mr. Speaker, and surely, the Premier's tactics were designed to disrupt, for, the Premier's alternative constitutional proposals are radical. They do not consist of suggestions to augment the Meech Lake Accord, they do not amount to add on to the Meech Lake Accord, they constitute radically different approaches to the

Canadian Constitution. On receiving our Premier's proposal last November, the Premier of PEI, a Liberal Premier, a lawyer, reacted by saying, 'Clyde Wells' alternative is like something from Mars'.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier's real purpose is not to improve the Meech Lake Accord, it is to kill the Accord. The Premier's next strategic move was here a week or so ago, and that was giving notice of his Resolution to reverse this Legislature's approval of the Meech Lake Accord. And when did he do that, Mr. Speaker? He did it the day after New Brunswick Premier, Frank McKenna, launched an initiative designed to open up national discussion about a companion Resolution or a companion Accord which, if successful, would have the effect of resolving some doubts about the Meech Lake Accord. The Premier gave this notice of the rescinding Resolution the same day as the Prime Minister was due to go on National Television to make a major statement about the Meech Lake Accord. Again, tactics and timing calculated to get maximum publicity for the Premier, but designed to disrupt constructive effort on the part of other leaders in the nation to get agreement, to resolve differences, to hold the country together, to include Quebec in the Canadian Constitution family.

Mr. Speaker, again the Premier has demonstrated that his real agenda is not amending the Meech Lake Accord, it is not adding on, it is not clarifying, it is radically changing the Meech Lake Accord, radically changing the Constitution of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the real

reason the Premier is not getting the attention he wants from the other First Ministers is that his position is so extreme. How is it feasible for other First Ministers to have meaningful dialogue with this Premier when his position is poles apart from them. Ironically, this Premier talks about other First Ministers being intransigent, but it is really he who is the most intransigent of them all.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other great ironies in this Premier's position is that he is objecting to the unanimity requirement in the new amending formula in the Meech Lake Accord. Now, Mr. Speaker, if it were not for the unanimity requirement in the existing Constitution, the 1982 Constitution, this Premier would not be a player at this point in the Canadian Constitutional Development, he would be a mere onlooker. So it is the unanimity requirement that is in our present Constitution that gives this Premier and this Legislature and this Province the leverage that we now have; it is because of that unanimity requirement that he is getting national news coverage, and, yet, part of his alternative is a rejection of the broadening of the unanimity requirement that the Meech Lake Accord gives.

This Premier is saying no to that widening of the unanimity requirement. Evidently, he would not in some later state of his tenure in office as Premier, want to be a vital player in the constitutional amendment of national institutions; evidently, he would not want his successor in the Office of Premier to be a key player in any future discussion about a Constitution amendment dealing with a national

institution.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier gives us his reason for rejecting the Meech Lake Accord amending provisions that this would make Senate reform difficult. Mr. Speaker, Senate reform is going to be impossible until and unless Quebec is brought into the Constitution. Any political realist would concede that.

The Premier, then, in his alternative, talks about a Triple E Senate as being the answer for this Province, as being the salvation of this Province, as being the vehicle for eliminating the economic disparities among the Provinces of Canada.

Well, Mr. Speaker, his Triple E Senate is really a hybrid of the political systems in the UK and the US. It is not a workable proposition. But even if, for purposes of discussion, we look at the effect of the actual U.S. Triple E Senate, which has worked for many, many years, we can see that there is economic disparity among the States.

Mr. Speaker, I have some statistics here that I will quote. I am sure Members on both sides will be interested in hearing them. The statistics show that there are staggering gaps in unemployment rates among the States. One of the most affluent states, Connecticut, has the lowest unemployment rate in the U.S. - I just found my statistics, Mr. Speaker - Connecticut has the highest per capita personal income in the U.S. In 1988, that was over \$23,000. Contrasted with that, Mr. Speaker, are the States of West Virginia and Mississippi, which both have per capita personal income of less than half

of that. So, obviously, the U.S. Triple E Senate has not brought about equality among the states, measured by per capita personal income, or measured by any other financial indicator.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Triple E Senate has not eliminated disparities and inequalities among individuals in the U.S.; it has not eliminated a gap between the rich and the poor, between men and women, between whites and blacks. The U.S. is a nation of plenty, but with huge contrasts and variations in levels of affluence.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier's second major objection to the Meech Lake Accord has to do with the spending power provision in the Accord, which formally recognizes the role of the Federal Government to spend in areas within exclusive provincial jurisdiction, something the Federal Government has been doing for decades, given the revenue-raising powers that were carved out between the Provincial and Federal levels of Government when Canada began, and given the development of the welfare state, with the state assuming responsibility for delivering expensive education, health and social services programs, all of which are within provincial jurisdiction. The part of the Meech Lake Accord spending power provision the Premier objects to is the provision that would allow provinces to receive block funding for new national programs mounted by the Federal Government that are new and within provincial jurisdiction. The Meech Lake Accord gives provinces the option in that kind of situation, instead of having Ottawa deliver the new national programs, of receiving a block amount of funds and then having the province, itself,

deliver the programs.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, that would be a welcome development. Too often in the past, we have seen examples of national programs designed by bureaucrats in Ottawa with the needs of Central Canada in mind, and, at that, urban Central Canada, designed in such a way as to perhaps be appropriate and fitting in St. John's, but to be quite inappropriate and even wasteful for rural Newfoundland and Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, our Province has a larger rural component than any other province in Canada. Sadly, that rural component is declining, but it is still true that our Province has a higher proportion of our population living in small communities than any other province of Canada, and, therefore, I feel, there are many instances where our Province would be better off if we could have our Provincial Government receive block funding from Ottawa and then tailor the objectives of the federal national program to our own circumstances and have our own Provincial Government deliver the program.

Mr. Speaker, the spending power provisions of the Meech Lake Accord do not apply to programs within federal jurisdiction, they do not apply to federal programs assigned to reduce economic disparity, such as ACOA, and, of course, they do not apply to present federal programs within Provincial jurisdiction, such as funding medicare or funding higher education.

An example often used to illustrate the possible effects of the Meech Lake Accord spending power is a new national day care



program. Mr. Speaker, I hope that does materialize, the long talked about, long promised national day care program. If it does, I believe our Province would be much better served if, instead of Ottawa imposing its designs on us and having federal bureaucrats administer the programs, the Federal Government transferred to the Minister of Social Services for our Province a block of money and then allowed our Minister of Social Services to tailor a program appropriate for small communities around our Province, as well as urban centres, and had his own staff deliver the program.

The Meech Lake Accord says that if that were chosen by a Province, then the province's program would have to conform to national objectives, and in that way there would be some assurance that quality would be consistent across the country. In that way, Mr. Speaker, I believe that our citizens and our Provincial Government could actually get a much better return from the investment of taxpayers' dollars, funded through the Federal Government. I am glad to see that the Minister of Social Services is nodding in agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier's other major objection to the Meech Lake Accord, and this is probably the only one that most Members of the public have picked up on yet, is his objection to the distinct society clause. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if more than 1 per cent of the citizens of the Province have read or heard that distinct society clause in its entirety and I would like to quote it. It says: 'The Constitution of Canada shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with

(a) The recognition that the existence of French-speaking Canadians, centered in Quebec but also present elsewhere in Canada...' and, as an aside, I will acknowledge the French-speaking people in our Province, the indigenous Francophones on the Port au Port Peninsula, in the District of our colleague, the Member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), as well as Francophones in St. John's and Labrador West, as the three main centers of French-speaking people in our Province. So, there is a recognition that French-speaking Canadians are centered in Quebec but also present elsewhere in Canada. And then it goes on to talk about the recognition of English-speaking Canadians, concentrated outside Quebec but also present in Quebec, constitutes a fundamental characteristic of Canada. Who can quarrel with that?

(b) 'The recognition that Quebec constitutes within Canada a distinct society.' That is an obvious fact. Even the Premier concedes that point. And then it goes on: 'The role of the Parliament of Canada and the provincial legislatures to preserve the fundamental Characteristic of Canada Referred to in paragraph (1)(a) is affirmed.' And then the crucial clause: 'The role of the legislature and Government of Quebec to preserve and promote the distinct identity of Quebec referred to in paragraph (1)(b) is affirmed.' And finally, Nothing in this section derogates from, or subtracts from, or takes away from the powers, rights or privileges of Parliament or the Government of Canada, or of the legislatures or governments of the provinces, including any powers, rights, or

privileges relating to language.

Mr. Speaker, that final clause makes it clear that under the Meech Lake Accord there is no transfer of power from Ottawa to Quebec City, there is no shift of legislative jurisdiction from the Federal Parliament to the Quebec National Assembly in Quebec City, nor is there any shift of power from any other province to Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, as previous speakers on this side have pointed out, the vast majority of constitutional law professors in Canada, authorities on the Canadian Constitution, say that this distinct society clause which talks about the role of the legislature and Government of Quebec to preserve and promote the distinct identity of Quebec, does not confer on Quebec any additional powers.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Stephenville (Mr. Aylward) quoted from a booklet put out by Canadians for unifying Constitution. He failed to refer to the signatories to the document. The signatories are numerous and they are listed at the back of the pamphlet. They include such esteemed citizens as Edmond Beauvie, Deanne Cohen, Alex Colville, Trevor Eaton, John Fisher, sometimes called Mr. Canada, Peter Hogg, our friend the constitutional law professor; they include Paul Desmarais, former Chancellor of Memorial University of Newfoundland, Jack Pickersgill, a prominent Liberal politician, and William Lederman, the Premier's old adversary in the patriation court case. So, the great weight of constitutional legal authority is in support of the Meech Lake Accord clause dealing with how the Constitution

is to be interpreted, and that authority has concluded that no additional power is given to Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, now we come back to the question of the process by which the Premier is trying to pass this resolution. As I indicated in the beginning, the Premier is trying to rush this through the House of Assembly and in the process he is denying any opportunity for citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador to take part. What realistic chance is there for our constituents to contribute to this process? There is a handful of people in the public gallery this evening. The press gallery are covering it and, in the case of the electronic media, will probably cover it with a ten second news clip periodically, and the print media will probably give short articles on it. But what is needed is a comprehensive education process, and an excellent way to facilitate that would be for the Premier to move immediately to set up a select committee of this Legislature, made up of Members on both sides, Members holding different positions on the Meech Lake Accord, and empower the committee to carry out a process that is parallel to the Legislative Review Committee process, the process that has been conducted to look at new legislation being proposed by the Government, such as Bill 53, or now Bill 25, on public access to inland waterways. Mr. Speaker, that Bill is controversial and the Committee looking at the Bill and holding public hearings got a huge response. Lots of citizens turned out to give their reaction to that bill, and, Mr. Speaker, many of those people have not been satisfied by the Premier's

response.

But that was an instance, to the credit of the Premier and the Government, where the democratic process was engaged and where citizens were given a real opportunity to scrutinize what the Government was proposing. Now, if that bill is important, how much more important is the constitution of the whole nation, the fundamental law which sets parameters on whatever laws may be passed by this Legislature or any other Legislature or Parliament in all of Canada? How much more important than having public hearings on Bill 53 is it to have public hearings on the Premier's resolution to cancel our support of the Meech Lake Accord? How much more important is to have public hearings on the Premier's alternative proposals?

Mr. Speaker, as I have said in my previous speech, it comes as quite a surprise to many people in the Province, after all the Premier has said since becoming the Premier about the importance of involving the people in the development of the people's Constitution, that he is now saying flatly no to the request to have public hearings now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, please!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MS VERGE:

We are operating within a tight time frame. We are facing a June 23 deadline to ratify the Meech Lake Accord or work out some accommodation and consensus to

adopt a modified version of the Accord. That is only three months away, Mr. Speaker. Now the Premier's fallback is that his resolution provides for the ultimate in democracy, a referendum. But, Mr. Speaker, what is the value of a yes or no referendum on something as complicated as the Constitution, when citizens have no opportunity to see the Meech Lake Accord, to become informed about what it means, to realize the consequences of our Province reversing our stand on the Meech Lake Accord, and without seeing or hearing of the Premier's alternative.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Members would give me leave to finish my thoughts, as we gave leave for the Member for Stephenville?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DOYLE:

Clyde said yes. Clyde said to give her leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Order, boy! Listen to the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To my recollection, at two minutes after eight the hon. Member would finish. Her time has elapsed.

MS VERGE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I realize that my time has elapsed, but I am asking if hon. Members would give me leave for another minute or two.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Does the hon. the Member have leave of the House?

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member should have leave to wind up, but it should be windup, just the same.

MR. SPEAKER:

Okay.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, in the same way we afforded leave to the Member for Stephenville a few moments ago.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that courtesy.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

The final point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that there are many misconceptions about the Meech Lake Accord, and public hearings conducted by a Select Committee of the House would be a way of eradicating those misconceptions. For example, Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many people in the Province

realize that the Meech Lake Accord provides for annual First Ministers' Conferences on constitutional development, and I wonder how many people know that the Premier is rejecting out-of-hand the Meech Lake Accord provision for the fishery to be on the agenda of every First Ministers' Conference every year in the future, as one of only two items, the other being Senate reform? I wonder if people realize that the thrust of the Premier's alternative is shifting power from the Province to Ottawa?

And finally, Mr. Speaker, I doubt if people realize that the Premier's alternative and the Meech Lake Accord itself, for that matter, have nothing to do with the Quebec sign language law, that lies in place because of an notwithstanding clause already in the 1982 Constitution, included in the Charter when Pierre Trudeau was Prime Minister. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GRIMES:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Exploits.

MR. GRIMES:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of hon. Members of the House and beg forgiveness if I start to speak faster than I normally do, or more quickly, because I have so much to say I may not get it in in half an hour. So if I start to rush, it is because I want to say a few more things, knowing I am starting to run out of time.

I would like to begin by commending the previous speaker, the hon. Member for Humber East. For the first time, I think, since I have been listening to the Meech Lake debate, and that goes back several years now, since I first heard it discussed at that famous meeting at Meech Lake, I have heard a Member on the pro side of the debate trying to defend some part of the Accord itself. Granted it was only for about two minutes in the thirty-odd minutes she dealt with one item, and talked about she is convinced that this does not change any of the legislative status in Quebec and so on. She spent a minute or so at that, the first time I ever heard anybody on the pro side deal with any of the issues, because that is not how this debate goes. At least it was an attempt, albeit very feeble and very short. In fact, the supporters, I suppose, are really a bit surprised and they continue to surprise me. In fact, I never hear from them in debating the issue itself. What they have done is a very good job of trying to twist it and turn it around to the point of saying you cannot really talk about this.

The previous speaker, the hon. Member for Humber East, said one of the things agreed to by the eleven First Ministers was these proposals, and as good as they thought they were at the time, ever since they have gone around saying we admit they are flawed, they are not perfect, they are really not very good. They have said that ever since. I do not know what happened that one night, but ever since they have been going around apologizing for this. These are the supporters who spend all their time apologizing for the flaws in this Accord, and the debate goes on.

I would like to look at the two or three problems I see with the debate as it has unfolded in the last couple of years, and more particularly in the last few months. I believe there is something very deliberate on one side of this debate, in leaving it to the last few months, to what we are down to now, when the originators and the creators of this great deal had, by their own devices again, given themselves almost three years to go around and convince people that it was good for them. In fact, they felt that by giving that amount of time, knowing there would be political changes in provinces and across the country, that by June 23, 1990 people would see this as being good of its own merits and that it would be unanimous, there would be no difficulty with each legislature voting for this.

There are still two that have never ever voted on it in their legislatures. We do not hear much about them because they have not said too much, other than they have had exactly what the Member for Humber East and the Leader of the Opposition are calling for now - a great surprise to me - public input. I was amazed the first time I heard it. I believe the first time I got wind of that was in the lobby of the Confederation Building. I was stepping out of the elevator, and again not to pick on any one Member or single one out, the Member for Humber East happened to be there chatting with a person I also knew, and they were talking about this person - this person does not know much about Meech Lake. I said, 'You are saying that to me? You were a Minister in the Government which passed this, you have been a Member for ten years or so, you were here when this began, and you

are trying to say that it is somehow my fault, or Premier Wells' fault, or the fault of Liberals on this side, half of whom were not even in the House? It was our fault that this constituent from the West Coast of Newfoundland was talking his Member, saying I do not know anything about it. And I was being questioned as if it was my fault, and what was I going to do about it because I happen to be Parliamentary Assistant to the Premier? All of a sudden everything of the past disappeared, and now it is my fault. I did not tell anybody anything about Meech Lake. They had passed the resolution through the House when I was teaching school, and it is my fault! It is my fault! I was flabbergasted. I am not often taken aback, but I admit I was a little taken aback.

Now, as it was, I had taken a little bit of a personal interest in the whole thing myself. I felt I knew a little bit about it. I had recognized that there were already serious objections raised to the content of the actual amendments spelled out in the Meech Lake Accord in at least two other Provinces.

In New Brunswick, I would suggest that the major part of it was, if they still have difficulty, the people of New Brunswick, the persons who showed up at the hearings, they were a little disappointed when the report came out that it did not reflect strongly enough their objections. In fact, the report submitted to the House did not really reflect the strength of their objecting views to the contents of the Accord.

In Manitoba, everybody is well

aware that they have, from the very beginning, expressed serious, grave reservations about the content of the Accord. We find now, of course, that one of the problems being well expressed is the way in which it was done. There is a great lesson in it. Premier Wells has been condemned because he dared say there was something wrong with the fact that rather serious revisions to the Constitution of this country would be cooked up in a back room, three or four o'clock in the morning, by eleven First Ministers, and that everybody else is supposed to accept that without question.

In fact, this is the problem that has occurred: Because we raised objections, we are condemned. We have objections. There was, in fact, a mechanism put in place where they could be expressed, but everybody who dares express an objection is then subject to the one great threat, the fearmongering. It is the only defence supporters have - fearmongering. So we have the fearmongers.

MS VERGE:

Are you afraid of public hearings (inaudible)?

MR. GRIMES:

There will be public hearings if required in this Province. That has been committed by the Premier.

MR. TOBIN:

You are an expert everything? You are an expert of nothing (inaudible), boy.

MR. GRIMES:

I will get to that in just a second.

The other great defence offered is that you cry foul of anyone who

dares question it. Do you know what the big cry is? The people who are raising objections were not there that night.

I have heard, on televised reports, Premier Peterson, in Ontario and in a speech he gave here in St. John's, at the invitation of the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador, I have heard Premier Ghiz, I have heard former Premier Peckford, I have heard former Premier Pauley, I heard Premier Vander Zalm just a little while ago, I heard Premier Getty just a little while ago, I heard the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Mulroney, himself, all saying in defence of the Accord when asked about Premier Wells' objections, or Premier McKenna's objections, or Premier Felmon's objections, 'Well, they cannot really be expected to understand, because they were not there that night. I was there.' These gentlemen said that. That is their defence. They did not talk about the issues, they did not talk about the content, they did not talk about the five basic concerns, the fundamental concerns that are being addressed because Quebec has put them forward, they talked about the fact that well, they are objecting and they are objecting because they really do not understand, they were not there.

Now what kind of a deal is that, if the only people who can understand it in the scrutiny of the light of day are the architects who were there that night? It is not much of a deal in any set of circumstances if the only people who can understand it and fully understand its impact are the ones who sat in the room and made it up.

Sooner or later you have to take it out to the people it applies to; you have to let them have a look at it. And, sure enough, as soon as people looked at it, they raised objections. Then we go back into the other little problem. If you raise an objection, oh, no - we have had it here sure - now you are going to split up the nation; you are risking breaking up the nation. The intention was, again, that the eleven First Ministers would each take it back to their Legislatures, present it, and if it was good enough, their Legislatures would pass it. The Accord does not come into effect unless all eleven Legislatures approve it. They understood that from the beginning. That was going to be fair. That is how the deal cooked up by the eleven would be justified for the whole country, because it would go through the Legislature. It went through here light a ball of what you would not believe. Like you would not believe, it went through here.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) three months.

MR. GRIMES:

We have heard all that. We had the numbers. We heard about the forty-five speakers, the phrase used. There were not forty-five speakers, there were not forty-five different Members of the House who stood up to speak, there were just over twenty. And it was not a three month debate every day, day in and day out, as people were led to believe, it was parts of something like eleven or twelve days, spread over three months and a bit.

Whenever it came to be a point of convenience for the Government of

the day, probably due to boredom or lack of anything else to do, they said, Call the Meech debate for a few minutes a day. Get rid of that now for a bit. We will stick that on today for a couple of hours. We have nothing else to do. What are we going to call today, Mr. House Leader? Oh, do that Meech thing today. We are going to put that through pretty soon any way. And sure enough, even the House Leader of the day in his summation, as was pointed out by the Premier, indicated he estimated sixteen hours. There was also the intimation that maybe it was unanimous. The vote at the end was twenty-seven to ten.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. GRIMES:

Recorded in Hansard.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Twenty-seven to ten?

MR. GRIMES:

Far from unanimous in this House of Assembly. But, again, as in most instances, the Government of the day carries the vote and so we have that kind of a thing. And now, all of a sudden, because of the fact that we are going to rescind, and this resolution says we are going to do that, the attack becomes, oh, my goodness! You cannot go back on your word. You gave your word. And as the Premier indicated as well in his address last night, I will tell you as one Member of this caucus - I know we have the support of all of them - that I am very proud to stand up here and correct the mistake of the previous Administration rather than go around forever and a day saying, it was not our fault. They did it, but we have to live with it.

We have the opportunity provided right in the current provisions, before the thing becomes law on June 23, to fix a wrong.

Surely, if any of the hon. Members opposite are checking with people in their Districts, with their constituents, this has gone beyond political stripe. The people of Newfoundland have told everyone of you, just as they have told everyone of us, that the Meech Lake Accord is wrong. They are proud of what Premier Wells and his Government are doing, and they are very glad that somebody is going to do the right thing rather than just say we have to live with it. We are not doing anything wrong here. There is nothing illegal about this. This is proper procedurally, and it is also the right thing to be doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. GRIMES:

The other big thing that happens now, and the only thing I can attribute it to is the fact that Premier Wells may very well have articulated at the First Ministers' Conference a point of view that many people in Canada were wishing some would express. It had been subdued before, and it was finally presented and placed into the open for public debate, where it should have been from the beginning, and articulated extremely well. People from all over the country responded and reacted immediately, and they said, that made sense. There was no threat in it. There was none of this fearmongering. They were not saying, oh, my goodness, she is going to fall apart. There was



none of this, none of that. And all of that has been explained. But, sure enough, and it has been said time and time again -

MR. TOBIN:

Do you know any French (inaudible)?

MR. GRIMES:

Not the one little bit.

- in terms of this Premier, people who misunderstood written back by the Premier to inform them that that was not what he was about; he respects the position of Quebec in this Confederation and is trying to make their position, as well as ours, stronger in a better more unified nation. And now they understand that and those disillusioned, misinformed people, who thought they had to champion their cause, no longer even bother to write because they know they are writing the wrong person.

But now everything has become pressure; do not deal with the issues, pressure. Time is down, not much time left, pressure. So we here have to take this deal now, and we will fix it later - accept it now and fix it later. Well, I say, some chance!

Just let me take a couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker, to review some of the latest developments in some of the latest news. The plea of the Leader of the Opposition, when introducing this amendment today, was that it is time for Premier Wells to be more like Mr. McKenna, time to be more conciliatory, more accommodating, more of a nation builder instead of a nation wrecker, and so on. Let us see what happened to that great nation-building move by McKenna just a week ago. The Prime Minister of Canada goes on national TV, and after he talked

about the trees, the snowcapped mountains and all that wonderful stuff, and how much he loved the country - great stuff! He sounded like Ronald Reagan to me for awhile - he even intimated, because the media people asked him after, you said you are going to introduce this resolution. Does that mean you are supporting it? He sort of suggested that maybe he was, that this was a good idea, this was a breakthrough, this was progress. But after speaking with his friends from Quebec the next day, he washed his hands of it completely. It did not see the light of day for twenty-four hours, this great progress.

I watched the coverage that evening and everybody was excited because somebody was speaking out loud in public about the Meech Lake Accord. And it was not necessarily all couched in threats that evening. It seemed like they were ready to talk to each other; the key players might even be going to start to have a genuine dialogue about what they might do to fix the Meech Lake Accord. But a day later the Prime Minister, showing great leadership again, squashed it completely. What did we see in the newspaper today from our friends in Quebec, whom we have great respect for? I have many friends in Quebec from my national involvements, and I have always said that in terms of the culture and joie de vivre and so on, I would rather spend time in Quebec than anywhere else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GRIMES:

In their outlook on life, their approach, their fun-loving ways and their love of life, I think they are the closest cousins

Newfoundlanders have in the whole of Confederation. There is no doubt about that in my mind. But what happened yesterday in the Legislature of Quebec with McKenna's breakthrough? The Opposition in Quebec, the Parti Quebecois, moved a resolution on the floor that the McKenna proposals be rejected outright. It passed unanimously in the House. Secondly, the Government, through their spokesperson we in Newfoundland have heard many times, Mr. Remillard, their Intergovernmental Affairs spokesperson, in his comment to the media afterward said he had one regret only, that the resolution did not go far enough, and suggested that all proposals such as the McKenna one be thrown out and rejected by the Quebec Legislature. So, he clearly said I do not care what Mr. McKenna brought in, I do not care what anybody else brings in, in this Legislature it is our way now or no way.

Of course, everybody on the other side and everybody on the PC side in Ottawa says that is fair. So, again, say nothing about Quebec or anybody else. But in a Confederation, why do we buy into the argument that it is okay for one province linguistically different and culturally distinct to be able to say every time they want something and do not get it, I am taking my ball now and going home? That is where it originates every time. I am not going to play anymore. You are not being fair to me.

So, Premier McKenna comes forward with a proposal, not to do anything with the flaws in the Accord which he admits, which Prime Minister Mulroney admits, and which everybody who had

anything to do with it admits - it is flawed - not to deal with the flaws, but to try to get out of the politically embarrassing position that some people find themselves in because they committed to it, he suggested and accommodation whereby we would say, take it like it is. Give us some sign that you will fix it after, and we will vote for it in our legislatures. And, sure enough, less than a week later, you see what sign that they are going to take it now and fix it after? In the Quebec Legislature they say all of it now, forget the stuff after, forget any other proposals. This is it, or nothing at all.

We had Mr. De Cotret, the Treasury Board Minister from Ottawa, here a little while ago. He was asked the question, what about a national referendum? - because we have been asked to have public input and referendums, and so on - what about a national referendum? No, he said, we cannot have that. Why not? The issue is too complex. Another insult! How stupid does he think everybody is? Again we are back to the point that there must be only ten or twelve people in Canada who can understand this thing. I mean, we cannot have it. You are not allowed to go out and discuss it with people, you are not allowed to let people have a vote on it, it is too complex. This is too complex.

And we had the classic example of Mr. Charest, who was down a week or so ago - the end of last week - at a fund raiser, and then on open line and over at the University, and he showed us the federal position and the standard Federal defence of the Accord. When he spoke about the Meech Lake Accord

and the amendments contained therein, all he did, on three different occasions, was take the opportunity to condemn Premier Wells personally. That is the official federal response to any objections to the Meech Lake Accord. In this Province, because this Premier leads a Government that expresses some objections, then he is subject to a personal attack, the kind of thing the Member for Humber East started to get on with this evening.

The supporters of the Accord, other than the couple of minutes I heard this evening, they never, ever proclaimed the merits of the deal. They do not have the face to do it. They always start off by saying, we admit it is flawed. Well, if it is flawed, why can we not sit down and talk about some adjustments or corrections or additions or deletions or amendments, as we are doing here this evening, that might take some of the flaws out of it? And if you think we are going to put it in flawed and all - Sheila Copps says warts and all, those kinds of things - if you think we are going to do that and expect then that all of a sudden, with the turn of the clock, 12:00 in the night from June 23 to June 24, they are going to start addressing the flaws the day after, not likely. Not likely! I will bet my money on no way.

And I think we got the clear signal from Mr. Remillard in the Quebec Government when they looked at Premier McKenna's proposals. He said, 'Not now. No proposals ever. Forget it!' We are disappointed that the Quebec Legislature did not go further and say no change anytime. And we are supposed to be trusting, innocent naive little lambs and walk in and

say, Here, take this because it will make you feel good, because I know you are going to come back tomorrow and you are going to make me feel good. Now I do not think I will wait long enough for that.

So then we get back to the problem again, the fearmongering. Now it is down to strictly that. Time, pressure, split the nation. For some reason, in this Meech debate in this House, not only are we going to split the nation, but the hon. Member for Torngat Mountains has some how twisted that and we are going to split the Province. The sheik of Labrador is going to lead Labrador completely on his own. He has already said that at least six or seven times in the last couple of weeks, that he is going to take Labrador out all by himself. I do not know what he is going to dress in, but he is going to march all over Labrador and they are going on their own. Because the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains led a speech the other day and his opening remarks were, 'After Canada splits up, I am taking Labrador out.'

MR. WARREN:

Right on! Right on!

MR. GRIMES:

Now, with less than three months left, what a contribution to resolving the difficulties and the impasse of the Meech Lake Accord! Bring it down to the most base level and split Labrador off too. - That is going to fix the Meech Lake Accord. And we are going to have them out on their own, sure enough!

I have heard the phrases expressed in this House, I have heard them in T.V. debates, read them in the newspapers: 'Anyone who opposes the Accord does not love Canada.'

You are anti-Quebec. You have risked splitting apart the country.' That is all I hear. I do not hear anything about why it is good for us, why we should accept it, why the provisions in it are going to make a stronger country, why we are going to have a better Constitution. I have heard none of that. As a matter of fact, I did not hear it from day one. And if you check Hansard on the Debate when it was passed in this House, in July, 1988, it was not stated then, either. It was sold on the two great issues: 'Take this, because two things will happen: Senate reform will be on the agenda for a First Ministers' Conference, so you will get a chance to talk about Senate reform' - Wonderful! - 'and there will be a constitutional conference on the fishery.' And the Leader of the Opposition now, who was Minister of Fisheries at the time, and the Premier of the day, touted that second one as the greatest breakthrough for Newfoundland since Confederation. We were going to have a chat about the fishery after we passed the Meech Lake Accord and, therefore, they did not talk about what was in it. Do not look at what is in it. They did not say it was good for you. They said, 'Take it, because for the first time we are going to get a chance to talk on the First Ministers' level about the fishery.' Wonderful stuff! Wonderful stuff!

None of the fearmongering that is attributed to this Government and this Premier is true. I do not think you will find anybody who cares more deeply about Quebec's concerns than our Premier, and he has expressed it many times. But people choose not to believe that. When they get there they say, 'No, that cannot be true.

You cannot be speaking in opposition to this and care about Quebec. It is not possible; the two cannot happen. It just cannot happen. It is not possible.'

What we have, then, is the fact that we are supposed to deal with the concerns of Quebec and then we will see about the rest. But I keep saying, 'But what about our concerns? Why can we not deal with those now instead of waiting until the 24th? What is magical between the 23rd of June and the 24th of June? Why should our concerns have to wait? What about the concerns in Manitoba? What about the concerns expressed in New Brunswick? What about the concerns that Premier Vander Zalm expressed in British Columbia?' No, no, we cannot talk about any of that now. Do not talk about any of that. That is taboo, you cannot do it.

What about the concerns expressed in Alberta? As I recall, they led the charge on Senate reform and the need for it, and they still believe in it. What about the concerns in the Territories, that they might never have a chance to be recognized and accepted as a province? What about the concerns of women ignored in the Accord? What about the other minorities? Oh, no, they all have to wait. For some magical reason no one can explain to me, everything has to wait. And you are some kind of a treasonous person, trying to split apart the country, if you insist on your right to have your concerns addressed at the same time as the others. There is something wrong with that. And the fearmongers, a bunch of them on the other side, spouting the same thing we heard from the representatives in Ottawa, that is all they can come up with, that

you are going to split apart the country.

The Leader of the Opposition, just this afternoon, when introducing the amendment, said, 'It is time for us to be nation builders, not nation wreckers; be conciliatory. Do not be provocative. Do not do these things that might break apart the country.' And that is all he could say, it might break apart the country; not a word about why it is good for you, not a single word; not a word in 1988, when it was passed. And now we get the great outcry: 'public input'.

When this Premier, on behalf of this Government, introduces proposals - because there are no proposals in this motion that we are debating - there will be lots of time for input. The Premier has already guaranteed that. You will get whatever is required, public hearings, or an actual referendum or a vote. Whatever is required at the time, will be guaranteed when the new proposals of Newfoundland are introduced. They are not on the table now. There is a resolution to rescind, to revoke and to correct the mistake made by the previous Administration. I am proud to be part of it and I hope, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I will get an opportunity to speak further in this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I think I would like

to acknowledge all the speakers who spoke before I have that privilege, and I must say I consider myself to be in the midst of a fine group of Newfoundlanders and a fine group of people who expressed themselves in the way they should. First of all, I have to say it to the Premier. We have never discussed at length Meech Lake, but we did meet for a very short period when we talked about it. I will not what the discussion entailed, it was very limited, but I think two of us agreed that we were not on the same side of the fence. That is good! There is no problem there. I listened to the Premier. For the whole hour I sat here and listened. His speech was good, it seemed to be right from the heart, and what he was thinking, but the points he addressed were not the points I thought he should address.

Then I listened to the Leader of the Opposition, and again, I suppose because I am partial and I would be less than truthful if I said otherwise, I listened to the Leader of the Opposition tell it how I saw it was and that inspired me, to say the least, but, again, I certainly feel the rights of every Member of this House have to be appraised as this debate continues.

I listened also to the - I am sorry he is not here, but I see him out there - hon. Member for Pleasantville. Some of the boys said, going down in the elevator yesterday evening - we were going back and forth - 'well, he shot you down'. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if that is true or not. He said, 'I do not know if the hon. Member can stand on his own two feet.' Mr. Speaker, with size fifteens, I think that was the wrong phrase at that particular

time, and I think I would be very hard to knock down. But I have to say to the hon. Member for Pleasantville, that he certainly did his homework and he expressed himself well. I think he is, perhaps, the mouthpiece for the Premier when the Premier is not here. But you expressed yourself eloquently! I will have to mention everyone now.

We will have to go to my colleague for St. John's East. Sometimes she and I disagree. When it comes to amalgamation or whatever, we do not always agree, but, I must say, yesterday her speech again inspired me. A superb, excellent speech! I would be remiss if I did not mention my friend and colleague on the opposite side, the Member for Stephenville. Again I have to say his speech, I think, was from the heart, and that is the way it should be. This is what this country is all about, this is what this Legislature is all about.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He should be in the Cabinet.

MR. PARSONS:

Yes, I have to say that if I were the Premier, I would be considering it

Then I have to go to Humber East, and what can you say? Every time that hon. lady rises in this Legislature, what comes forth is inspiring, not alone to this side of the House, but to everyone, no exception.

Then the hon. the Member for Exploits, who just left, again, a very fine speech. He is my hockey buddy. I meet him over to Brother O'Hehir every time I get a chance to go up to a hockey game. He gave a fine speech. He is among

the Oldtimers. I am there playing with the youthful side of it, but whatever, he is there.

When I begin, I shall have to go back to the Member for Pleasantville, and his concept of what this is all about differs 100 per cent from mine. Because I really believe the hon. Member, and he has that right, my father had that right and I did too, to say that we could do it on our own. The hon. Member for Pleasantville believes that if Canada were to split up tomorrow, Newfoundland could be as viable, as prosperous and to have the future that we all hope for, for my children but moreso for my grandchildren. That is the point where I cannot resist taking you on. Because I do not think, of all the statistics that are out there, people have come up with this: Oh, we can do it. We put \$1.4 billion last year to Ottawa, they gave us back \$1.3 billion. We can do it, just by that statistic alone. But I think we are being hoodwinked. I really do. I think you are making a mistake in even entertaining that idea.

DR. KITCHEN:

(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

No, I do not mind an interruption. The hon. the Minister of Finance said: 'Do not be scared' or whatever. I am not scared at all. But I am scared for the future of the Newfoundlanders and Labradorians all of us people represent. I am not being derogative, but sometimes the Minister of Finance really scares me, especially when he got out slipping on that ice. That really scares me. But I will have to go back to that standing

on our own two feet, standing alone.

Mr. Speaker, hon. Members across the way, especially the Minister of Development, sometimes shouts across 'the old anti-confederate.' I am being truthful in saying 'yes, my family and I were anti-confederates, and proud of it at that particular time. But, Mr. Premier, I will say to you that you should learn from what I experienced. I saw the light and I hope by my being up here today, and other people, that you will see the light as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:  
Yes, Mr. Speaker, my father was an anti-confederate, as solid as they come. Oh, my, how well I do remember. I will tell you about it.

When the referendum was on - there are not many fellows here. I can look at those young fellows across the way and say 'Oh, my goodness, baby boomers.'

MR. DECKER:  
(Inaudible) the hockey team.

MR. PARSONS:  
Oh, yes, the hockey team over there, a few fellows like that. The hon. the Minister of Health, I do not mind it.

I remember the old referendum: Mr. Fudge, the first Premier of Newfoundland, the hon. J.R. Smallwood, the Bradley's, Michael Harrington, Don Jamieson was involved.

MS DUFF:  
He was reporting.

MR. PARSONS:  
He was reporting at that particular time. And I used to remember going home and listening to the radio, and what a lot of you young fellows over there do not realize is that there were not that many radios then.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Herb Kitchen had one.

MR. PARSONS:  
We had one, too. Thank God for that! My father had ingenuity enough, will enough to go elsewhere and find a job for himself so he could afford it. But there were lots of people who could. And I remember a group of people coming in in the evenings, boy, and we would listen to that referendum - Peter Cashin, you know. And my father would be there and I tell you you could hear a pin drop, because he was so intent on it. And when Fudge would come on, or Smallwood he would say - my mother's name was Agnes - 'Ag, get me something to eat; something to break it up so you could not listen to it. But when the Responsible Government aspect of it would come on, you could hear a pin drop. He was so intent on getting the message to us. He had the message, as he thought, and I thought the same thing at that same time. I thought the message was perfection. I thought it was the greatest message that ever we could conceive, because I thought at that particular time that we could do it on our own. I really did. A boy, at the time, but I thought we could do it on our own. And my father went to his grave with that same idea, that we could do it on our own. But do you know something?

After a few years of mingling

around, working in different areas, and seeing and appreciating the goodies that came from being part of Canada, I saw the light. For the ordinary people, not for the lawyers, the doctors, or the philosophers, not for those people, but for the ordinary Newfoundlanders. It was the best thing that ever happened. How can you go down in Ming's Bight, or how can you people go any place, in Placentia, in Harbour Grace, in Grand Bank, in Terra Nova, even here in St. John's, and come out openly and tell someone today that Confederation was wrong? It was not wrong, and I will be the first person to admit it. It was the greatest thing that ever happened. Now I want to set the record straight with the Member for Pleasantville. It cannot be done. The only thing that I can offer to you, not expertise, no, Sir, I do not have the expertise, is saying that I travelled that road. I saw my father and I saw the people who were anti-Confederates, including me, who was a little tag-a-long. But I learned a lesson and I hope today that the hon. Premier will learn a lesson. He has to be taught it, and he has been taught it by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. TOBIN:

He should listen.

MR. PARSONS:

The Premier should listen. He must be a smart man; he became a lawyer, he went to college and he has to have something on the ball. I always looked up to him, sort of, and said, you know he seems to be a fine fellow, has Canada at heart and certainly Newfoundland and Labrador at heart. But I sometimes wonder, and nothing derogative, nothing

insulting, but I sometimes wonder about the Premier's ego. His ego. His self-centered feeling.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) doing very well.

MR. PARSONS:

Oh, yes, I agree. I could be wrong again. Oh, I am not saying I could not be wrong again. I could be wrong again. And I hope I am. But I think the Premier may have backed himself a little bit in a corner, he may have, and his ego will not now let him backtrack. What did our hon. Leader say? - backupable. Well, my phrase to him is just back up slightly.

He can get a letter, or a telegram, or a phone call from some lady in PEI or some lady in Nova Scotia, certainly. We have people out there who, if you come up with a cause, they are for it, it does not matter the cause. I am not saying that is prevalent in this instance, but I am saying there are people out there who will go with any cause, go with any feeling; as long as the tide is high, we will float on it. But, I say to the Premier, perhaps this tide might run out.

Before I finish speaking about what the hon. Member for Pleasantville said, I hope he changes his mind. I hope my few words tonight can impress upon him the derelict manner in which he spoke when he said Newfoundland can make it on its own. Because if that were to get out to all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, that we have a spokesman for the Premier who advocates separation, who says we can make it on our own, that is the ultimate, no matter what you say, my ears are closed.



AN HON. MEMBER:

Did you not say we would be better off on our own?

MR. PARSONS:

I said, at one time I thought we could. God forbid! And may God rest my father's soul, because he thought the same thing. I would never say anything derogatory about him but he was wrong, and so is the Member for Pleasantville. Do not ever say it again. We cannot do it. It is a great country and I am so proud to be part of it. Confederation means just that. Confederation means a binding together of a group of people, a group of provinces, who want to make life better for each and every one. From Labrador to Vancouver, everyone is in the same boat.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to address some of the things the Premier has said. Again, I listened to him for an hour, the first time I had the opportunity to listen to what the Premier was all about. He mentioned Senate reform and about the good things that would come from Senate reform. Mr. Speaker, there is not one person on this side of the House who believes the contrary. In fact, each and every one of us, and I have spoken to each Member on this side of the House, believe that the Senate has to be reformed in one way or the other. I earnestly believe that the Senate, if it cannot be reformed, should be abolished; it serves no useful purpose.

I have seen legislation that was passed in the House of Commons, and I will go to specifics and mention the UI Bill that went to the Senate and was held there at the people's expense. I do not think they have that right. I

agree with the Premier, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition, and I agree with every Member in this House in saying we have to have reforms as far as the Senate is concerned. I believe it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Keep her going now.

MR. PARSONS:

I will keep it going as long as I see fit. As long as my half hour lasts, I will keep it going. I have many things to say.

I was surprised at the Premier. He came across himself, although he said otherwise, that he was a constitutional expert. He did not say it, but other people have been saying it, right across this land of ours: He is a constitutional expert. But the Premier said here the other night, and I am only verbating him, that he was not, that he does not claim to be. He might be, but he does not claim to be. Let us go back now. Let us be realistic. The Premier has not got all the brains in Canada. Perhaps I do not have very many, very much, or whatever, but the Premier does not have it all.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He has a lot of it.

MR. PARSONS:

Perhaps so.

And if I were on that side of the House, I might be saying the same thing if I wanted to get a seat in Cabinet. If I wanted a seat in Cabinet I would be saying the same thing, I would be singing the Premier's praises. But, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's reform as it pertains to the Senate is out, it is out. It is poppycock. Do you think that Quebec or Ontario is going to agree with it in any

sense of the word? Do you believe that they are going to agree with it? You need not ask it. Where is Peterson in this Meech Lake Accord? He is on side. Where is Joe Ghiz? He is on side. Where is Buchanan? He is on side. Who are all those people? All lawyers. McKenna, where is he? He is coming on side. All lawyers, all Liberals and they all agree with Meech Lake except our hon. Premier. Now he has that right.

MR. TOBIN:

Repeat that for the record that the Member for St. John's South (Mr. Murphy) says that Joe Ghiz wishes he had his time back.

MR. PARSONS:

Well I did not hear him, but my hon. colleague for Burin - West said that the hon. Member for St. John's South said that Joe Ghiz wishes he had his time back. I doubt that very, very much.

A half hour does not give you any time to get involved in this. But you know what I am going to say to the Premier. There were tactics used during the last Federal election that I would not want to be part of. In fact it was disgusting, disgusting to say the least when a person who was running as a candidate went into some old age home and said, 'look, you are going to lose your old age pension.' But let me say this to you, Mr. Premier, that that is a possibility if Canada splits up - there is a possibility that we could lose it, that we could lose our social programs. Where are they in the United States?

Let me go back to the Member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Crane) when him and I were in Washington only a few months ago. Just a moment

now, when we came out we were talking to the cabbie who drove us out. Where do you guys come from? I said Canada.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

Just be quiet for a minute and learn something. It is a job to teach you, but just learn something. He said, 'Where do you guys come from?' I said, 'Newfoundland.' He said, 'What do you people do when you get sick down there?' I said, 'We have medi-care.' He said, 'But who pays the bill?' I said, 'The Government pays the bill. I said we all pay it through taxation, but the Government pays the bill.' He said, 'You mean to say I do not have to pay anything?' I said, 'You do not have to pay a cent. All you have to do is have your card.' Too bad he is not here, the Member for Harbour Grace. He will attest to this. He said, 'It is some good for you fellows that us fellows cannot afford to go to Canada.'

AN HON. MEMBER:

They do not pay taxes sure.

MR. PARSONS:

Oh yes. We all pay taxes, but it is a good system. But what I am saying to you, if Canada breaks up, if this country disintegrates -

AN HON. MEMBER:

The sky will fall.

MR. PARSONS:

Ignorance is bliss and I do not accept that coming from a doctor. The sky will not fall down. It did not fall down on my ancestors, it did not fall down on yours either. They survived because they are survivors. And they will

survive now if Clyde breaks up this nation. They will still survive no matter. But they will not have as good an existence as what they have now. They will not because Canada is the best country in the world and what the Premier is advocating across this land - not alone in Newfoundland and Labrador, but on the mainland of Canada. He will get people to listen to him. There is no mistake at all about it. I am surprised at his tactics. He is using the same tactics as were used in that forum in an old age home on the West Coast, scaring us, telling us that Quebec is going to be up there, and all the rest of us are going to be on a pittance.

Do I agree with what Bourassa said? I do not, and no one on this side agrees with what he said. But the point remains, Bourassa is one person. We are talking about twenty-six million people.

MR. WALSH:

Seventy-eight per cent agree with us.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, and 88 per cent do not know what you are talking about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Newfoundlanders do not know what they are talking about?

MR. PARSONS:

That is exactly our point. That is the point the Opposition Leader made in the first instance, that my colleague from Humber East made: Have public hearings. You say, 'Why did you not do it? Why did you not have public

hearings?' Two wrongs do not make a right. We were wrong! We were wrong!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

I say to the Premier now, do not bring this resolution to finality. Do not do it. Let us have public hearings. Let us go out there, the same as we did with Bill 53. No one knew about 7.2 until the hon. the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island and the Member for Torngat Mountains brought up what was the essence of Bill 53.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The rot!

MR. PARSONS:

The rot! To take something away from Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. And the people did not know one iota. They did not know what was going on. The Minister did not tell them, absolutely not. Until the Committees, public hearings - boy! Did I ever get some fright when I attended those public hearings! People saw, for the first time, what this was all about. And people will see tomorrow if we have hearings in St. John's, Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Gander. We will have public hearings in Labrador. We will send down a group of people, like the Chairman. I must say, that Committee on Bill 53 was an excellent group, the finest, soundest, most intelligent Newfoundlanders you would want to meet. And, boy, they did their job! They did their job! And I am sure, I am positive, I am really enthused with it that we can form a Committee.

MR. EFFORD:

What (inaudible) Meech Lake?

MR. PARSONS:

Well, just a moment, now. The Minister of Social Services is so confused. He does not know anything about Meech Lake. He does not know anything about any lake. He knows nothing about nothing!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) lake.

MR. PARSONS:

What do you know about the fish? Do not answer it. It will give me an opening. Do not answer it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the only other thing I really want to stress: We have heard the Member for Exploits (Mr. Grimes), we have heard other hon. Members, talk about all the aspects of Meech Lake. The assistant to the Premier talked about Meech Lake. One thing that comes from the Lake was never mentioned.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

You mentioned in passing. The fishery. That fishery is more important than anything else we could talk about in this Legislature. That is why our forefathers came here to settle in this Province, the fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

It is not 'if we do not like the French'. The only part of Meech Lake that gets involved with the fishery is our ex-Premier made sure that the fisheries would be on the agenda of the First

Ministers' Conference every year. And, you know, our Premier has never said one word against McKenna. Because what he said, in essence, what he delivered to the Federal Government was that it would stay on for one year; after that, it would come off.

Our Premier never said one iota. He did not say it should not happen. He never said one single thing. All he said is we have jurisdiction enough, we cannot seem to handle what we have now. Let me say this to the premier, that we would not be in the mess we are in today if we had more to say about the TAC. We would not be in the mess we are in today if we had more to say about licencing. And the Premier looks at it and says, ah well we have enough jurisdiction. We never said on this side that we should get all the jurisdiction.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

Yes, the hon. Member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) agrees with me. Sure he does. He is a sensible man and he has to agree with me. I am not saying that the Premier is not sensible, but I go back to what I said when I started my speech. It is the Premier's ego. He cannot be wrong. I want to close my few remarks by saying to the Premier, I am the senior person in this House and I say to the Premier-

AN HON. MEMBER:

God bless you.

MR. PARSONS:

He is getting up there you know.

I say to the Premier, look I learned, I lived to say to myself

that I was wrong and I say to the Premier, look you will go down in history.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

MR. PARSONS:  
By leave just to finish up.

I would like to say to the Premier, you do the same as I did. I am not saying that I am a perfectionist but I do not think that you are either. I think that you should now start to consider what the implications are if this nation were to break up. You would not be a nation builder, but a nation destroyer.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for LaPoile.

MR. RAMSAY:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, to speak in this debate, although there is an amendment added to our motion, I feel privileged to speak to this as the youngest Member of this chamber possibly, notwithstanding the reference of the other hon. Member, there is a possibility, weight aside, that I should by virtue of my age possibly live longer than any of the Members here. Therefore, possibly get to see some of the effects of what we are now doing, and the effects it will have on the nation. This is pretty heady stuff, at the age of 27, to be participating in a debate that is going to somehow have an effect on the future of

the your country. So I do not take it lightly.

I have researched the different options with regards to the debate and I have considered them all and weighed them out as the hon. Member for St. John's East (Ms. Duff) has stated. I have come to a conclusion different from hers. I have come to a conclusion that the version of Canada that we as a Liberal caucus support and possibly we do not say that we will be perfect in our representations, we do say that we have ideas that will help to address the various aspects of our country that are wrong. The institutions within our country that are wrong.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that tonight I will try to build a case for the Meech Lake Accord. Let us build a case for Meech Lake as Meech Lake is now written.

Now there are some aspects of that with regards to the current Senate that have to be brought to light. I am sure that as the hon. Member opposite who speaks in favour of the Meech Lake Accord and has said so eloquently in her delivery yesterday I think it was, that she has read some dissertations on Meech Lake by Hogg and also by Robertson.

I have an excerpt from a book that was written by Gordon Robertson namely A House Divided, Meech Lake, Senate Reform and the Canadian Union. In this Book, Robertson stated and I will quote him from Chapter 7, the situation in which our Senate has had powers that are virtually equal in law to the House have been workable only because of the way our Canadian Federation is structured now is workable only because Senators

have recognized that, in fact, whenever there is a contest of wills, as we have seen with Bill C 21, and have seen in the past, the Senate must in the end yield to the elected House of Commons. They must yield. There is no convention of government, responsible to the Senate, only to the House.

MR. TOBIN:  
(Inaudible).

MR. RAMSAY:  
Well Mr. Mulroney sends a senator to negotiate Meech Lake all over the country.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. RAMSAY:  
Oh, yes he is a Member of the Cabinet because of the way that it works, but still is that correct for the people of Canada to depend on an unelected official to go around to try to build this compromise that they speak of. I think not.

As far as Robertson goes there are some points he makes with regards to Meech Lake. Robertson with regards to Meech Lake bring back a little bit of the past and he speaks of Senate, the Senate being the key to Confederation in 1867. It was a way to bring the compromise that was necessary to build Canada.

Now that may be the key to this current impasse. The spirit of compromise in the Senate may be the key. If we are willing as a caucus to bend a bit, then maybe the panacea is Senate reform. Maybe this is the thing that will assist us in bending a bit to just what is required to help keep our nation the strong Canada that it

currently is.

Now Robertson also said in his dissertation upon Meech that Senate reform is very important in the west, in Western Canada. And we realize this, we realize that Senate reform in Western Canada is currently very, very strong with Alberta's moves to have a senator elected, the first elected Senate appointee, I suppose, their appointee for the Senate who has yet to be chosen by the Prime Minister as being a credible choice, but that is their way of more or less forcing Mulroney's hand.

It also is of increasing importance in Atlantic Canada because of various issues that the National Government has decided to force, the issues that they have decided to force on the people of Canada in the various regions of the country regardless of the effect that they have. What is good for Central Canada must be good for the rest of the nation, is the mindset of Central Canada politicians.

Now Robertson also gets into the aspect that Senate reform has little interest in Ontario and Quebec, very little interest. The Opposition of our House of Assembly are like all politicians, in general, in Ontario and Quebec. They are saying, abolish the Senate. Let us abolish the Senate. Get rid of it. It does not serve a purpose. But it does serve a purpose if it works in the proper way, as it does in the United States. And then they will say well, look at the United States, you have States of the U.S. that have economic difficulty. I would suggest that the economic difficulty of the various States has little or

nothing to do with their voice in the Federal Government, but a lot to do with their wealth of resources, a lot to do with the States history, corruption of politicians, in some cases, very inward mindset of some political people in the smaller States. There are many different possibilities that can cause economic disparity.

But I would say their voice within the Federal Government in the U.S. is a very strong one because of the U.S. Senate. And their Senate is something that evolved from their origins with their Constitution, the US Constitution, and we see now, nearly eight years later from the time we patriated our own Constitution to a point where we could work on our own Constitution, we see now others saying the break-up of the country is near and all these fearmongering tactics that do not allow us the time to allow evolution. We have a Quebec which is standing now and saying, Meech or nothing. Now is that the way to bargain? Is that the spirit of compromise of which the Member for St. John's East (Ms. Duff) speaks? I do not think so. We see today, with their unanimous support of a resolution striking down the companion resolution of Premier McKenna, it makes one wonder if possibly a separatist element was involved in the drafting of the Meech Accord in the way it is now drafted. So that drafting it that way, assuming that Legislatures would not approve it given the time period that we are now faced with and thereby causing Quebec, one way or the other, through the backdoor or through the front door, to get what they want. I feel that is something we should keep in the back of our minds.

Also, to get back to Robertson, to paraphrase somewhat, he says, they, when their interests coincide, he is speaking of Quebec and Ontario now, hold the preponderance of power in Confederation by reason of their population, now Robertson said this and it is pretty basic to the way that our House of Commons operates with one vote, one person, and the preponderance of votes in the House of Commons being those of Ontario and Quebec, the two economic solitudes of Canada, they being the one economic solitude, Ontario and Quebec, as the joint machine of economic force in the country and the other regions being subservient, a word I mentioned earlier which caused the hon. Leader of the Opposition to lose his head somewhat. In a House divided, Robertson said in the opening, and if a House be divided against itself that House cannot stand. He quoted that from the gospel of St. Mark. Meech Lake the Accord will serve to create a House, Canada, divided against itself with Quebec as the single solitude with a legislative ability to preserve and promote their view of Canada, and Canada having to bow to Quebec with regards to its Anglophone population, having to bow to the policies of Quebecois in their sign language policy and whatever they would choose. Maybe they would choose to mirror the French in France and their system of Government. Let us change our system of Government. Maybe these are the things they would do. That is one of the people who are against changing Meech Lake in any way. A solid supporter of Meech Lake has written quite a few articles in the Globe and Mail.

I want also to look at Peter Hogg,

someone who has been battered back and forth somewhat. He talks of Senate reform with the Meech Lake Accord. Hogg states that, and it is pretty much as it stands within the Meech Lake Agreement as it is now written, senators appointed from the province under Section 25, he comments on them being temporary until reform senate is agreed upon. He also mentions that if no amendment is made in the future then Section 25 remains intact so the way that they see senate reform is through the Meech Lake Accord.

Peter Hogg, also states that the new section 25, although it is intended to be temporary, is not drafted as a temporary measure, so those who drafted this section of the Meech Lake Accord did not have this drafted as a temporary measure and therefore it could turn out to be a permanent measure.

He also states, if section 25 becomes permanent, it will possibly evolve into a House of the Provinces, this is Peter Hogg's view of Canada. A House of the Provinces, Senators will be holding to the provinces and not necessarily to central Government and he also states that this would probably change the character of the institution, making it more assertive in representing Provincial or Regional interests. How? They are not elected. Under Meech Lake, as it now stands, there is no elected Senate, it is an appointed Senate, appointed by the provinces, so how are they going to be representative of provincial, when we have Robertson saying, that the Senate must, in the end, yield to the elected House of Commons. So if Meech is allowed to go through with the unanimity clause, which allows for no changes unless all agree, will

Quebec ever agree to allow a Senate that is going to be able to veto Legislation, change Legislation in any way? I think not.

Mr. Speaker, there is a quote I have here which I wanted to read to hon. Members, and the quote states that, it is from John Marshall, and it states that 'The people make the Constitution, the people, and the people can unmake it. It is the creature of their own will and lives only by their will' and that is the US, all right, but a Constitution is a guide for the country. Our constitution should be made by the people, input by the people. This is the first, the last number of months, the first bit of input that the people have had into our Constitution of any kind of consequence whatsoever. In the past, let us push it through the House and they speak of public hearings. It is a fine time to speak of public hearings as being so necessary. They say two wrongs do not make a right, I agree, but, the way things are going now, the general public of Canada are going to be debating this issue, it is in every newspaper, every time you turn on the news, it is on the news. We are talking about it a lot and then they say, well, you did not mention the fishery. The problems we currently have with the fishery can be attributed to the lack of a strong central Government and also, to the lack of a Provincial effect on national policy. In developing national policy, in changing the Legislation that is enacted and the regulations that are enacted by the Federal Government in Central Canada.

I also wanted to get into a couple of other things. We note that a



former Leader of the Opposition, federally, Robert Stanfield, has come into the Meech Lake debate, of late. This Gentleman speaks of two solitudes as well. He always thought that Canada will be better with two solitudes. Quebec and Canada. This is the man who is quite in favour of the Meech Lake Accord. Realizing that the Meech Lake Accord does create a Canada with two solitudes, Quebec and the rest of Canada. Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of other things that I would like to get into.

Ms Duff in her dissertation yesterday - I think it was yesterday, the 28th - spoke of what we should do as a Government. She stated it is time we took it out of this realm and put it into the real politics of the Canadian nation. You have to put the substance in the context of the reality of what we are dealing with. You have to allow room for interpretation and room for compromise. We see today the spirit of compromise that exists within the Province of Quebec. It is a very, very small iota of compromise on their part.

I spoke earlier today of subservience on our part. They say the only way that the country can stay together, the only way that they will be happy is if we bend to their view somehow, allow Meech to go through as it now is and we will fix it later. Now I feel that our amendment package that the Premier has presented to the public is one which is very compromising. It addresses the five concerns that Quebec brought to the table as far back as Rene Laveque's day. Twenty-two at that time was mentioned, but five that pretty well encompass his twenty-two.

We would change the aspect of the distinct society to put it into the preamble to the Constitution and take it out of the body of the constitution implying Legislative power for Quebec. What else would we do? We would change the Senate to allow for an elected, equal number of Senators per province and effective having the power to originate legislation as they now do and also having the power to vote on legislation in several ways. To vote on legislation on the basis of Provincial and regional methods. To vote on legislation for the Quebec Senators on cultural and language matters. And also to give a general regional representation that is no longer being well served by the Government of Canada in their economic policies.

Another aspect of Meech Lake which we would change, Mr. Speaker, is 95 C-1. It varies it to require that the constitutional intrenchment of any immigration agreement negotiated between the Federal and Provincial Governments could only be entrenched through the level of approval required under the general amending procedure. Amending the procedure under the general amending procedure, the general way, seven provinces fifty per cent of the population. The way currently in the Accord if passed ten provinces that we cannot get to agree right now. And they feel we are going to get Senate reform. I somehow doubt that unanimity will ever happen if Meech Lake goes through.

Now some would argue that and say why do we want it anyway. If we are not going to get all the parties to agree, why should we change the constitution if you do not have Quebec as a signator for Senate reform. Well currently

Quebec is part of our Constitution although not a signatory to it. They enforce Federal laws according to the constitution. They guide the workings of their Government according to the Federal Constitution and we are now trying to bring them into the Constitution, which is admirable because they, as was spoken the night of the long knives, a well concocted version of political negotiation by Rene Levesque to save face at home, although as one could read from John Chretien's book, all he wanted was the constitutional veto and he would have signed it. He would have signed the 1982 constitutional amendment if he had been given a constitutional amendment veto. One only has to read that book to see this. So was Quebec left out of the Constitution? They agreed to it all. The last minute Levesque said I want my veto. No veto.

To save face this concoction of the night of the long knives was brought about and Mr. Levesque could save face and hopefully win the next election, such was not the case and I speak of Mr. Levesque as, I suppose somewhat of a nation builder, the man did bring it to a referendum. He was not content to take his country on out without the referendum, a referendum fairly fought and Quebec choose to stay as part of Canada.

And I would support the view, Mr. Speaker, that if Meech Lake does fall by the wayside the future of Canada will include Quebec, the people of Quebec will see a Canada that they can be a part of with good public debate and information that is out and around now. I think the only thing that we here in Newfoundland possibly fail to

do is to show the people of Quebec, if not through the French language, what is happening in Newfoundland, how we struggle with these difficulties of Meech Lake. To prove to them that we are concerned about the people of Quebec.

There are a lot of reasons, I suppose people talk about getting our back up against the wall. Talk about how the people of Newfoundland have been ill-treated by the people of Quebec through Churchill Falls negotiations that somehow or other we end up now with a mere \$30 million versus their \$800 million - estimated at \$800 million a profit from the Churchill Falls development.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that if we were able to inform those people of the way that Newfoundlanders feel, a camaraderie for the Quebecois, their culture, our culture which are probably the only two solitudes of culture in the country, the only two places where culture exists that can actually be identified of any size I suppose throughout the whole Province of any consequence. I think that the people of Quebec would see and understand that we are not trying to do anything to hurt the effect of bringing them into the constitution. They would realize that this is but a part of the nation building process and the nation will not come to a halt, the wheels will not stop turning on the 23 of June.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RAMSAY:

I will finish up by quoting Monsieur Remillard, the Intergovernmental Affairs Minister

in Quebec, quoted in a recent article in the Globe and Mail as saying, 'The more it', the agreement he is referring to, 'is explained the more it is understood.' I would say the more it is explained the more it is understood to be the wrong thing for the country, Mr. Speaker. The more it is understood to be wrong. Others would say the wrong thing, but we should see what we can do for the betterment of our country. We should get down on a wounded knee and say, well we are going to do it for our country because we know it is not a good deal for us, but we should do it for the country.

Mr. Speaker, our amendments that we have brought in here allows for that, if the rest of Canada stands and says we will support the Meech Lake Accord our Government has stated that they will and I will support this, we will allow Meech Lake to pass through our House of Assembly and our support will be given for it to allow the Governor General of Canada to sign it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to end with one little quote, a quote I used on the first day of this Debate, as a little booster for Members on this side of the House, to emphasize the gravity of the subject we have to deal with. It speaks of something that is possibly timeless. It was spoken by Aristotle, and the quote is: 'A state is not a mere society having a common place established for the prevention of mutual crime and for the sake of exchange. Political society exists for the sake of noble actions and not of mere companionship.'

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave, by leave!

MR. RAMSAY:

Mr. Speaker, to clue up, as the youngest Member, I hope I have been able to give some view of the difficulties with Meech Lake, some of the reasons why I feel we must amend it, as most of my colleagues here say.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. RAMSAY:

All of my colleagues, well on both sides. But I would feel also, Mr. Speaker, that Members on the other side of the House certainly would have to think that Canada will not break apart if Meech Lake does not pass. It is but another day, the 23rd of June, in the constitutional development of our nation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to make just a few comments on some of the speakers who have gone before me.

The last speaker, the Member for LaPoile (Mr. Ramsay) made a very good speech, I must say. He did a fair amount of research. He did

mention some of the points or clauses in Meech Lake which other speakers were criticized for not doing by the Member for Exploits (Mr. Grimes). He forgot to mention any of them, by the way, when he did speak. I am sure it was just an oversight. But the Member for LaPoile, who just finished, made some of the best arguments, Mr. Speaker, for the wish that we have on this side, that the people of Newfoundland be allowed the opportunity of coming to public hearings and being heard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker, the Member for LaPoile quoted from the American Constitution, and I just got a bit of it. He said, in other words, that the people who make the constitution - and he went on with a bit more - but it was the people who make the constitution that was the important part. And, in this Province, Mr. Speaker, the people are not going to have an opportunity to make the constitution unless we have public hearings to give them that opportunity, Mr. Speaker.

I think also, I heard a couple of times in this Debate, references to the United States. We had a quote from the Constitution of the United States from the hon. the Member for LaPoile. We have had reference, or reported reference, at least, that the Premier was reported as saying - I cannot say he said it, because I did not hear him say it. But he was reported as saying that if Canada broke up maybe we would be better off joining the United States.

MR. WARREN:  
True.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker, I do not think these comments are just by coincidence. There seems to be a feeling by a few at least and maybe more on the other side that the United States is some example to be held up for us in Canada to try to meet or try to achieve what they have achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I personally feel as a Canadian as a Newfoundlander, that we have achieved more than the United States has ever achieved in our country. I am much more proud to say that I am a Canadian than I would be to say that I was an American.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
I think Canada is the best country in the world to live in. I believe that sincerely. Even though my forefathers like the forefathers of the Member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) probably did not agree with me. I know that my grandparents probably would not have agreed with me. But if they were alive now, I believe all those people who did not support Newfoundland joining Canada would have a different view of what was trying to be achieved when we did join Canada. Mr. Speaker, I think even my forefathers would have a different view today.

Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing from the other side about this equal representation in the Senate and how good it would be. We hear back to the American example of their Senate. Mr. Speaker, just a

few more statistics. I know there were statistics made before in this House about the example of how does the American Senate make that country more equal to the different States.

From an economic point of view, from some statistics that I have, I know that the health care spending per capita in Newfoundland Mr. Speaker, from Public Accounts 1987 - 1988 were \$1,107 per capita. The per capita spending on health care in Maine, which is a part of the country which has an equal Senate, \$83 US. There is a difference in the Canadian and US dollar, Mr. Speaker, but not by any stretch of the imagination can the health care be made up from \$1100 Canadian to \$83 US.

Mr. Speaker, health care and hospitals in West Virginia on a per capita basis is about \$78. In Puerto Rico, Mr. Speaker, which I would expect is a very poor place and would get as much assistance from the central government or from the states as is possible.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not a State.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

No, I know that is not a State.

But it would get assistance as a poor region or territory or an area which would have to be helped more. Mr. Speaker the per capita spending on health in Puerto Rico is \$122 US.

Mr. Speaker, not one of them come close to what the per capita spending in this Canada that we have, even with the existing Senate that we have now, which is unfair to Newfoundland. I do not disagree with that.

Mr. Speaker, the education spending per capita in Newfoundland is \$806. In Maine, it is \$552 US. In West Virginia, it is \$661 US. It is getting fairly close.

Unemployment spending which is a statistic that I am not proud to promote in this House, I guess, but it is a part of our social net and an important one for this Province, Mr. Speaker.

The unemployment per capita spending in this Province, Mr. Speaker, is \$1,320. I would like it to be zero but the reality is that we certainly need it right now. The per capita spending on unemployment insurance in Maine is \$44.00 US. Their unemployment rate is not as bad as ours but Mr. Speaker I do not think it is that much greater than ours. West Virginia \$66.00 US; Puerto Rico again, not a state but an area which is helped out by the United States, its spending is \$30.00 US, Mr. Speaker. Now, this equal senate that we all hear about, this Triple E Senate, which is going to be the salvation of Canada in the future, I do not believe, using the comparisons that the hon. Members are making with the US senate, is not going to help, is not going to have the great affect on improving the economic condition in this Province as is expected by some people.

Some people across the way, some people probably in Western Canada, seem to be extremely supportive of this, but I do not think that this equal senate will make that great a difference on improving the economic conditions in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is very

obvious, and there is no doubt that it is obvious, but I would be much more comfortable speaking here today on the fisheries, on rural development, on farming, or pretty well on any issue except Meech Lake. I am one of those Newfoundlanders, and one of the elected people in this House, and I guess we all try to do this, who tries to get a feeling for what their constituents want. I know they are interested in jobs, I know they are interested in development, rural and urban development. I know they are interested in the fisheries, but I am not sure they are overly interested in Meech Lake. The reason they are not interested in Meech Lake, and polls show this, I do not think being a politician is any great revelation, being a politician who tries to listen, but the reason they are not overly interested in Meech Lake is because they do not know anything about it. They have not been told, they have not been given enough information about Meech Lake.

Mr. Speaker, one way to allow them to get information on Meech Lake would be for their elected representatives to go along as a Committee of this House, go out the same as we do with the Legislative Review Committees that we have set up, and go to the areas of the Province where people would, I am sure, come at least to find out what the Meech Lake is all about. They would come to the meetings if not to make presentations but to listen to those who are making presentations. And I am sure there would be presentations. There would be a lot of presentations against Meech Lake, and there would be presentations for Meech Lake. And probably, as

the hon. Member for Carbonear (Mr. Reid) said, there would be a lot of presentations against Meech Lake. I do not disagree with that. I would say because the people in my District do not understand Meech Lake there is a tendency for people who do not understand an issue, who would like to keep things as they are until at least they understand it, would probably vote against Meech Lake because they do not understand what it is all about. And it is hard.

I do not say that I understand what it is all about, Mr. Speaker, because I went through the last debate in this House and I listened because I wanted to understand what it was all about. I listened in Cabinet when it was explained to me what the purpose of Meech Lake was, by a person in that room, Mr. Speaker, by a person who negotiated this Meech Lake deal, and I understand some of it. I sat through the debate in this House, Mr. Speaker, when after the new Leader was elected, the Premier of our Province now, I sat through the debate in this House and listened to his points of view, Mr. Speaker. And I was in this House before he was elected and I listened to the view of that Leader of the Opposition at the time. And, Mr. Speaker, Justice Barry now, who was former Leader of the Opposition, and his caucus at the time, had concerns the same as a lot of Canadians, but they were supportive of the Meech Lake Agreement as brought back to this Province by the Premier of the Province at the time. And Mr. Speaker, it is strange to me that most of those people who were undecided at the time and supportive of the statements of the interim leader of the Liberal Party at the time,

the Federal Member for Fortune - Hermitage, no, it is where ever it is - Burin, St. Georges or whatever it is. He was supportive and the Members now, most of them are in Cabinet are also very supportive of that deal. They have an excuse, the same as I do, I suppose now, is that they did not understand it. That is probably their reason. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier is saying that it is totally inaccurate, I do not know. I guess the party line was laid down at the time and it had to be, and when the new leader, the present Premier of the Province was elected, he was opposed and I give him credit that he has not been wishy washy on this matter. He has been opposed from day one and he remains opposed to Meech Lake. He is pretty well on the same track now, as when he was leader of the Opposition here, which I must say, I do not think is right. I am not sure, I am not a great philosopher but he was dead set against Meech Lake from day one, he has brought in a Resolution in this House when other Premiers of this country are trying to resolve the impasse, his Resolution is going to completely hamper any possibility of Resolution of the impasse that now exists in Meech Lake. I do not impute any motives to the Premier. He stuck to his guns from day one, and I certainly would not want to be accused, as some of our Members have, over here, of making a personal attack on the Premier, so Mr. Speaker, I will choose my words carefully, because I would not want to that. But I think the Premier and his Government could be somewhat more accommodating in this process. They could be working for solutions to the Accord, Mr. Speaker, solutions to and - Mr. Speaker all the people who support

the Premier, I would say, and all the people who support the Prime Minister of Canada are looking for a solution to this impasse, they are not looking to destroy this Province, they want to keep Canada as it is, and improve it, that is what we all want as far as I know, but the way to do that is through negotiations, Mr. Speaker, not by presenting a resolution to this House, to rescind what has already been put in place.

Mr. Speaker, he could hold that up I suppose, he could have used the weapon of rescinding the motion while he was at his meetings as he did at one time. But since the new initiative taken by the Premier from New Brunswick has been put in place there never did seem to be an effort by our Premier to try to add to that initiative and come up with some type of a solution for the problems which our country now finds itself with, Mr. Speaker.

We have been accused on this side in our debate of fearmongering. And I suppose that could be a justified criticism. I do not believe it is. But the start of the fearmongering in this issue and in this debate came some time ago, or I heard it some time ago, and it was when the Premier was considering what Meech Lake is going to do to this country or this Province in particular. And I believe it was the Premier who said that if Meech Lake is approved this Province is condemned to poverty forever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker, if that is not fearmongering I do not know what it is. There has been no comments

made on this side that would be any worse. Mr. Speaker, there are comments being made on this side that we fear for the breakup of our country. I do not think that is fearmongering, Mr. Speaker. That is a legitimate concern. Members on the other side of the House I would say also fear for the breakup of this country.

I think the way, Mr. Speaker, we could help keep this country together is to try to be accommodating and try to find solutions and not try to put obstructions before those who are trying to work on a solution. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the resolution that the Premier has brought to this House is creating an obstructionist attitude. It is not doing anything to solve the problem, Mr. Speaker. It is offering more confrontation between the leaders of the country, which we do not need.

Mr. Speaker, I remember some of the things that the present Premier said when he wished to be Premier, when he was on this side seeking to be Premier of this Province. If he was Premier of the Provinces there would be an air of co-operation, Mr. Speaker, between governments in particular. I think I have heard, I am not sure, that even the unelected Minister in our Province, Dr. House, is a bit perturbed by what is happening with this Meech Lake Accord and the consequences of the Meech Lake Accord, with the friction between our Provincial Government and the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker. I think Dr. House, when he accepted the job he now has, had expected there would be much more cooperation between Governments than there is now. I think he is going to have even a more

difficult job in achieving what he would like to do.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
I though we were going all night. I was expecting to go all night .

Mr. Speaker, I have a pile of paper here on this desk, and I would like to continue on. Maybe it would be just as well to throw it all away because we are probably not making much headway in convincing Members opposite that public hearings are the key to what should happen in this Province. If we had public hearings and the public came out in droves to say yes, we support the Premier, as it would appear they do, I admit it. If they came out after explanations on Meech Lake and said they do not wish to be a part of Meech Lake or they felt this resolution to rescind was necessary, maybe, Mr. Speaker, they would convince the political people on this side and it would be very easy for us to say, yes, let us agree with the Premier and get on with business.

But, Mr. Speaker, the key to it all would be the public hearings and allowing the people of this Province to tell us, Mr. Speaker, what they want for their Province, so we can be sure.

Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

On motion the House at its rising ajourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 9:00 a.m.