



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

First Session

Number 55

---

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

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Friday

7 November 1985

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be able to stand in my position in the House today and make an announcement of significance to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, and all Canadians generally.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today another significant oil and gas discovery on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:  
It is, Mr. Speaker, at the Husky/Bow Valley et al licence in North Ben Nevis, well P-93, on the Grand Banks offshore Newfoundland.

This well, located on a new geological structure called North Ben Nevis, produced oil from two separate zones at the rate of 2,824 barrels of oil per day and 2,010 barrels of oil per day respectively. Another zone

produced natural gas at a rate of 16.85 million cubic feet per day, along with 576 barrels per day of condensate.

Initial analysis of these results by Petroleum Directorate personnel indicate that the ultimate producing potential of this well could be significantly higher.

I have been in contact with the hon. the Federal Minister of Mines and Energy, the hon. Pat Carney, who shares my enthusiasm concerning these very positive test results.

This discovery can now be added to an impressive list of 18 other oil and gas discoveries made offshore Newfoundland and Labrador, including Hibernia, South Tempest, Terra Nova and Whiterose, just to mention a few. I fully realize, however, that further delineation drilling on this new structure would be necessary before the commercial significance of this discovery can be confirmed, but it is a significant discovery indeed.

With the new energy policy direction announced on October 30, 1985 by Miss Carney, I believe that that delineation drilling will proceed. Indeed, the new policy direction should produce an attractive environment for continued exploration and accelerated but orderly development offshore Newfoundland.

These new policy directions will be incorporated into legislation implementing the Atlantic Accord. This, coupled with the proven geological prospectiveness of the Newfoundland offshore, will produce a framework for investment and job creation in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that this

is happy news for Newfoundlanders and Canadians, but that the members of the Opposition will cry about this as well. Probably, left to their own resources, they will get up and question whether it is oil or water out there and probably hope that it is water rather than oil. I can assure the hon. gentlemen there opposite that it is oil, it is a very significant find, and North Ben Nevis, with Hibernia, when it is developed, will be developed in accordance with the provisions of the Atlantic Accord which will provide that whatever returns there are from revenues will be gained by the Province of Newfoundland as if it were on land. Actually, it is on our land, except it is covered by salt water.

It is a great day for Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, and a sad day for the Opposition, but a very, very happy day for Newfoundland. I think that we can look forward, as I say, to future finds such as this on the very rich Grand Banks of our Province. We look forward to seeing it developed in accordance with the provisions of the Atlantic Accord which is an agreement that was entered into by this Province with the federal government which gives us equal joint management.

When North Ben Nevis is developed, we will have the choice of production system. The revenue that is taken will not be skimmed off by Ottawa and given back to us by way of welfare. We will be able to assess the royalties as if they were on land. We will have equal joint management. It is another good day for the future of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

I just wait with bated breath to

hear what our friends in the Opposition are going to do with respect to this, what statements they are going to make, and how they are going to be able to twist it.

Mr. Speaker, as we proceed along this area of development in this Province I think we should reflect back to the past and see what could have happened but at the same time look at the Atlantic Accord and see what the future can bring from North Ben Nevis, from Hibernia, from Terra Nova and from all of the other discoveries that have been made.

The people of Newfoundland, because of the efforts of this government, and because of the co-operation of the federal government, are going to realize their legitimate birthright from the revenues and the jobs that can be produced from it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I accorded the minister silence when he was reading his statement and ad libbing the part that he did not read. I would request that the members opposite accord me the same courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that we - and I speak for the Opposition on this matter today - welcome the announcement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

We say to the minister that if North Ben Nevis or other reservoirs that will be found out there are properly handled, it will be extremely beneficial to Newfoundland one day.

No doubt as a result of the minister's announcement, there will be fluctuations in the stock market tomorrow, there will be excitement and activity amongst the companies who are providing the offshore services and particularly amongst the multi-nationals, in view of the tax treatment, as opposed to the PIP grants. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, real estate values in St. John's will take a surge upward. No question about that.

But now, Mr. Speaker, let me get to the point that has concerned me from day one, since the minister stood up and talked about oil in this Province. If I were speaking for rural Newfoundland today - and I am not, I am speaking for this caucus - and I were speaking on the basis of the disappointments and the let downs that they have had with regard to the Hibernia development, then, Mr. Speaker, my retort to that announcement would be a big sigh, a big so what!

Outside of the Avalon Peninsula, Mr. Speaker, in the Badgers of the world, in the St. Anthony's of the world, in the Deer Lakes of the world, in the Corner Brooks of the world, and all over Newfoundland, as a result of the cynicism, the hypocrisy, the disappointments and the let downs that have occurred in this Province as a result of the way that Hibernia has been developed and what has happened with regard to our oil, the

political cynicism we have seen on behalf of that minister, then, Mr. Speaker, the reaction in Corner Brook today, I will tell the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge), is a big so what, a great sigh.

Mr. Speaker, there should be a big sigh in St. John's and in Come By Chance. On the Avalon Peninsula there should be a big sigh in view of Clause 54. Every time the minister stands up he announces more oil with the full knowledge there will be no refining, Mr. Speaker. We are going to take the massive amounts of oil we have off our coast and we are going to ship it. We are going to be shippers of oil. Mr. Speaker, whether the minister likes it or not, if he stands by Clause 54, the jobs are going outside this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the reaction in rural Newfoundland today is a big sigh, so what. We have to wait to see what the offshore means to us in view of the way that that minister and that Premier and that government have handled offshore petroleum.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is debating the statement. So the official reaction of the Opposition is 'so what.' I say the jobs will be shown through gravity-based systems and will be shown through us being able to levy royalties the same as if they were on land. So the official reaction of the hon. gentleman there opposite is

'so what.' Mr. Speaker, they base their future on a death knell, and a death wish for this Province. This government stands for hope for this Province, which is shown through its policies and which has been evidenced in its offshore policies in the Atlantic Accord.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
To the point of order, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:  
There is no point of order. That was the case of the minister doing what he is best at, Mr. Speaker. He did not like some of the comments I made. He misused the rules of this House to stand up and get into a debate again.

The truth hurts, Mr. Speaker, and it slowly dawning on that minister that the people of Newfoundland realize the truth, in as far as the offshore is concerned in Newfoundland. They realize what that minister and that Premier and that government have done to them with regards to offshore oil. The truth hurts, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, I must rule there is no point of order.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

Today, for the information of the House, I would like to outline what has been done in the Northern community of Davis Inlet over the past ten years with regard to housing for Innu residents.

Since 1975, through the Canada/Newfoundland Native Peoples of Labrador Agreement and previous letters of intent, the government has spent \$2.3 million for housing in Davis Inlet. In the same period, fifteen houses have been constructed. Obviously, each of these houses has not cost in excess of \$150,000 to construct.

Instead, much of the \$2.3 million has been paid out for extensive repairs and renovations. For example, in the years 1978 to 1983 and the year 1984-1985 there has been no new construction funded in Davis Inlet, while \$1.1 million was spent. This money was spent on repairs and renovations alone.

Within the administrative structure of the Native Peoples of Labrador Agreement, the Band Councils decide the relative portions of money to be committed to each programme under their guidance. In the attached appendix, the hon. members will note that from Table A (1) and Graph G (1) that the percentage of funding committed to housing has varied from a low of 1 per cent in 1982-1983, to a high of 55 per cent in 1985-1986 to date. In dollar terms, the amount committed steadily decreased from 1975 to 1980. These fluctuations are a result of changing priorities of the Band Council of Davis Inlet over the years. Government cannot

and will not dictate how community funds are to be spent.

Notwithstanding these millions of dollars, the condition of the housing continued to deteriorate up to the past year. Through the good offices of the MHA for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), my parliamentary secretary, renewed direct funding for housing was facilitated. As a result, the hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) committed through his department and through the Canada Assistance programme \$324,000 for repairs to houses in Davis Inlet.

In 1984-1985 and 1985-1986, thirty houses had or will have repairs made to them at a cost of, in some cases, \$24,000. The hon. the minister has committed \$10,000 towards the exterior repairs as well as up to \$800 for the installation of wood burning stoves. The remaining funding for exterior repairs and funding for interior repairs in these and other houses is being paid by my department through the Native Peoples Agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

In a renewed spirit of co-operation and determination the Band Council at Davis Inlet and the officials of the two departments have worked together to prevent a housing crisis from developing. Though their efforts in excess of forty houses have either been repaired or constructed. There is still work remaining to be done in the next year to complete the upgrading. At that point, we will require only on-going maintenance to ensure that the houses remain in good condition. I compliment and

thank the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) for his department's involvement in helping to alleviate these housing problems.

Since 1975-1976, the government of Newfoundland and Labrador, through federal/provincial funding arrangements, has spent in excess of \$9,000 on housing for every man, woman and child in Davis Inlet. The question which now begs to be answered is "Why do the houses in Davis Inlet require constant repair and renovations at considerable cost to the taxpayer?" The complete answer to this question would require long, involved explanation of historical interactions between Innu people and the government of this Province, so allow me to present a synopsis of the facts.

The Innu are a nomadic people who travelled Northern Labrador following the path of the caribou, the mainstay of their diet. The houses the government built in the 1950's and up to the present have been designed differently from the "one room" living the Innu culture had come to practice. To preserve this cultural lifestyle, the Innu have adapted their houses by removing doors and, in some cases, interior walls. Consequently, the houses have, from time to time, become structurally unsound and have required major repairs which accounts for the large housing expenditures.

For the future, the government hopes to reduce the number and extent of repairs necessary to houses on the North coast of Labrador. I am, therefore pleased, Mr. Speaker, to inform the House of an initiative of the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development and the

Department of Social Services. These two departments have started consultation to formulate a new counselling plan for Northern Labrador. Beginning in Davis Inlet, this counselling plan will teach the native people home economics and home-making skills.

Armed with these skills, the native people will be better able to care for their families and their houses, making a much better life and a brighter, healthier future for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, also included in this statement is an Appendix with some tables and graphs, which I would like to present to hon. members for their information.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I would like to express thanks to the minister for providing the courtesy of a copy of his statement. I did not receive it quite as early as he intended, but that was through no fault of his, of course.

It is an interesting subject in that, if memory serves me correctly - and I have kept closely associated with Labrador situations over the years - long before I ever was involved directly here, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) frequently expressed concerns while he was on this side of the House about the Northern housing situation in Labrador. It strikes me that it has taken quite a while for the sort of actions that the minister now outlines in his

statement. Worthy of note, in that regard, is the fact that the member for Torngat Mountains is no longer on this side of the House but has defected to the other side, so it would tend to indicate, I think, that if you are not in the Premier's back pocket, so to speak, your chances of getting something done in your particular district are very unlikely.

However, on the points of the actual statement, I have been a promoter of the idea, as I am sure the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) is aware, of home-making training for people who do not have the skills inherent in their culture to maintain and live in and look after accommodations of the type that has been provided under various government programmes.

Despite the fact that the minister says that the government does not interfere with how the division of funding takes place, I would suggest that his knowledge of Labrador is perhaps not as great as mine and that he does depend on his Parliamentary Secretary (Mr. Warren) to provide him with information.

Many of the native leaders over a number of years and recently have expressed the feeling that they do feel restricted and constrained by the bureaucracy in their search for an autonomous administration of funding relating to their welfare and their living. So I would question that that statement is really an accurate reflection of what the leaders of the native people feel themselves.

As we are talking about sizeable amounts of money, it would strike me that it is none to soon that

\$9,000 is spent for every man, woman and child over that period of time in that particular community. It is about time really that the government has recognized the fact that home-making training and things of that nature are required up there so that the native people, the Inuit and Innu and all the other peoples in Labrador, can be on an equal footing with the rest of the citizens of this Province.

Another ugly ogre, I think, has raised its head too when you talk about the expenditure of large amounts of government funding in Labrador for housing and anything else. We will deal directly with housing.

We are talking about big bucks, I suppose, in this regard, and there is some allegation amongst many small contractors in Labrador that many of the contracts awarded for housing in Labrador, whether through these particular programmes or the ones administered by the Minister Responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn) down here, that these contracts are frequently awarded without the due tendering process, and whereas I cannot support that, I use the word allegation at this time. That will be closely looked into because there have been some very strong allegations emanating from people in Labrador, particularly small contractors. They say that they can tie it to the fact that many of the contractors who have gotten these non-tendered contracts are direct and public supporters of the Tory Party.

I think that is unfortunate because I do believe the minister's heart is in the right place and that he is trying to do something for Labrador. But let

us dispense the funding and let us award the contract in a fair and equitable manner for anybody who is interested.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before calling Oral Questions, I would like to welcome to the Visitors' Gallery ten boys from Knights of Columbus Terra Nova Council 1452, St. John's, and with them are Steve Dalton and Norm Peddle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

#### Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. It concerns the total abjection of the Premier, the sorrowful sight that we saw last night on On Camera. It was a confession of failure. I would like to ask the minister, in view of last night's confession of failure concerning the decision on FFTs, an issue which, of course, is of vital important to Newfoundland and Labrador, will the minister now come clean with the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and admit that, according to his own worst fears expressed last night on On Camera, the government has failed in its attempt to get FFTs denied in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will come absolutely clean, as the hon. gentleman suggests, because this government over the last several months have lobbied and used every means available to it to have a decision made on FFTs that would be a decision that Newfoundland and Labrador could live with, that would be consistent with the restructuring agreement that FFTs not be allowed to fish Northern cod. That has been the position of this government, it has been the position that we fought for, Mr. Speaker, and, totally clean, I have not been officially informed that any decision pro or con has yet been taken.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Let me ask the minister, then, the next obvious question. The Premier last night I do not believe left any doubt in anybody's mind that he had terrible fears that indeed this decision was going to be made against Newfoundland and in favour of National Sea. Is the minister now ready to categorically state that the decision on FFTs has been taken in a negative way as far as Newfoundland is concerned? Is he now ready to do that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I said in the House yesterday and I will say it again today, we have been receiving signals in verbal conversations with various people, politicians from Ottawa here in Newfoundland

the earlier part of this week, who were saying the same thing. So we have received various signals that a decision is imminent and that the decision is going to be negative from a Newfoundland perspective. All I am saying to the hon. gentleman is that I have not been officially informed as the Minister of Fisheries for Newfoundland and Labrador that the decision has been taken.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me say this to the minister, that, last night I do not believe the Premier left any doubt in Newfoundlanders' minds. I hope that the Premier was not playing politics on that issue on On Camera last night, knowing that the decision was going to be in the positive. Let me ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, is he telling this Legislature that the federal government, of which he claims to be a part, which he told the Newfoundland people would bring a state of Nirvana to this Province, is he now saying that the the Prime Minister, our federal minister, Mr. Crosbie, and all of the rest of them are still keeping him in the dark? And let me also ask him, out of concern for Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker, just where does that leave the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the only politics

that has been played with this issue has been played by the hon. gentlemen and the party there opposite. I mean these are the people, Mr. Speaker, who tried to convince Newfoundlanders that they are against factory freezer trawlers and then voted against the resolution that would make it unanimous to everybody, hither and yon, that in fact the Newfoundland legislature is unanimously against factory freezer trawlers. So the only politics has been played by gentlemen on the other side. Let me say also to the hon. gentlemen that this government, Mr. Speaker, unlike he and his colleagues when there was another administration in Ottawa, will commend when commendation is the order of the day and we will condemn, from a Newfoundland perspective, when condemnation is the order of the day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear hear!

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, let me just ask the minister a very simple question. Is he telling this House that the Premier was on television last night, that he was on Open Line this morning, that Morrissey Johnson was on Open Line this morning proclaiming, or at least leaving the impression to the people of this Province, that the decision had been made. Let me ask him a very simple question: Is he now telling this House and Newfoundland that he really does not know what he is talking about?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, the only person here who does not know what he is talking about is the hon. gentleman. Mr. Speaker, what I am telling the House is that there has not been an official communication to me that a decision has been made. I have heard rumours that decisions have been made, I have heard good signals that a decision has been made but I have not been officially informed that a decision has been made. So the hon. gentleman is not going to get me to consciously lie to the House just to feed the hon. gentleman's ego, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, I obviously do not want the Minister of Fisheries to lie to this House and neither do I want him to in any way mislead the people of this Province. Now, he says that he has not been officially notified of the decision. If he has something good, I do not know what it is if it is going against Newfoundland. But let me ask him this question, and ask him quite simply and sincerely: Has he been unofficially notified by anybody in public office that there is a large percentage of chance, or that, indeed, there is a definite 'yes' to National Sea's application?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not deal in rumour or innuendo and, if I had a secret to share, the hon. gentleman would be the last person in the world I would share it with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

I think it needs to be pointed out again, Mr. Speaker, the forlorn and defeated image portrayed by the Premier last night, not much in keeping with his much-heralded and promised new era of co-operation and harmony and sweetness and light that would exist as a result of having elected two governments of the same political stripe.

My question to the Government House Leader, Mr. Speaker, is: Is this process which we hear about now, surrounding the FFT, an indication of the new era of co-operation that we are supposed to be into, or is it more of an example of the Premier's failing, again, as a negotiator, as he has in the past with previous governments? And, more significantly, Mr. Speaker, why has this government not been able to convince, to persuade their Conservative friends in this Province, Messrs. Johnson and McGrath, and our federal minister, Mr. Crosbie, to come on side? Certainly, these men must be able to bring some influence to bear on

the federal government, so why has this government failed to bring these hon. gentlemen on side?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, what a very impressive and very impassioned speech by the hon. gentleman! I mean, we would give the hon. gentleman leave to take all Question Period, if he wished to.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the hon. gentleman, with respect to the hon. the Premier and this Province, and his standing up for the rights of the people of this Province in all areas, and the hon. member's comments on the Premier being a failure in negotiating and a failure, period, the only way I can respond to the hon. gentleman is to say, 'Do not hold your breath!'

The fact of the matter is, both at present and in the future, the Premier of this Province is and will be regarded as the only leader of a government in this Province throughout our history who has stood full-score behind the rights of the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

He does not have to take a back seat to anybody in relation to that, because there is nobody, really, comparable, for him to take a back seat to.

if the hon. gentleman wants to speak in generalities, he can. But I can tell the hon. gentleman that this administration has a

very proud record of protection of the rights of the people of this Province and, I dare say, after about twenty or thirty years more in office, this government will be able to turn to the people of the Province and hold themselves as a model of people who have conducted the affairs of the Province with pride in keeping and putting the rights of the people of the Province. God help us if we ever had, Mr. Speaker, people of the style of the hon. the quislings there opposite in the way that they were going to look after the affairs of this Province as they have indicated in recent years.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Again, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that the defeatist image portrayed by the Premier last night seemed to indicate that things were not good. Mr. Speaker, the tardy way in which the federal government is dealing with the FFT situation, should certainly cause Newfoundlanders to examine in a sorry light the Prime Minister's campaign slogan that he was not afraid to inflict prosperity on this Province. I ask the hon. the House Leader would he not agree that the only correct word in that statement is the word 'inflict' as demonstrated by this policy and other policies, indeed that federal government policies are going to scuttle the rural economy of this Province, indeed, to obliterate and to annihilate the rural communities of Newfoundland?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is going to be allowed to ask general questions, I assume I am going to be allowed to respond along the same vein. I will tell the hon. gentleman this: I would ask the people of this Province to compare the record of this administration. There was another Progressive Conservative administration in Ottawa while we were here. And this government stood very forcibly against factory freezer trawlers.

MR. RIDEOUT:

We do not always side with our buddies.

MR. MARSHALL:

We speak for the people of Newfoundland, not for a political party. We have spoken against factory freezer trawlers and we will continue to do that. Compare that, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. gentlemen there opposite who are prepared to preside and to participate in the rape of our resources and the feeding of Central Canadians off the birthright of this Province which lay under the sea. They have pretty empty words, Mr. Speaker, when they try to get up and talk about situations like this. This Progressive Conservative Party of this Province stands foursquare for the people of Newfoundland. We are Newfoundlanders and Labradorians first, we might be Progressive Conservatives later. We showed it in the Clark Administration. We are showing it now. Would that the hon. gentleman had the gumption, courage and guts to have done the same thing themselves and we would

not have gone through the Armageddon with their friends, Messrs. Chretien and LaLonde, when they were trying to rape our resources on the offshore of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister responsible for Offshore, Mr. Speaker, for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall), the deputy Premier.

MR. TULK:

The Vice-Premier.

MR. FLIGHT:

The Vice-Premier.

MR. MARSHALL:

I do not like Vice.

MR. FLIGHT:

In view of the Premier's government's obvious inability to get the co-operation of the Mulroney government with regard to Newfoundland's position on the FFTs, an issue so crucial to Newfoundland, would the minister tell me how the people of Newfoundland can have any confidence in the Premier's ability to get a royalty regime in Newfoundland's favour with regard to our offshore, in view of the non-co-operation they just got on an issue that is probably more crucial to Newfoundland, the FFT?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

What a devastating question! I am pinned to the wall, Mr. Speaker!

I have not got a copy of it here, although it is written in my heart - I know it is written somewhere else in the hon. gentleman's mosaic - but the fact of the matter is because of the Atlantic Accord. Despite the terror that was visited by Lalonde and Chrétien, we negotiated an agreement, and today I can stand and say that the people of Canada, through their elected government has agreed that we have the right to assess revenues and royalties as if they were on land, the right to equal joint management, the right to the production system. We have discovered Hibernia. Cry! Cry! Cry! I have announced today that we have discovered North Ben Nevis. Weep! Weep! Weep! We will have other discoveries and there will be great gnashing of teeth on the other side, Mr. Speaker, because we stood as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, we did not act like quislings and allow people to walk over us, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I think the hon. member has gone astray again.

MR. MARSHALL:

I realize it might affront your sensibilities, Mr. Speaker, but the fact is, in summary, because we had the courage and gumption to stick in and have an agreement which has benefited all Newfoundland and all Canadians, a perfect way to carry on in

Confederation, and we are now seeing the benefits and we will see them flow much more in the next year or two.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Maybe the minister would want to tell us, Mr. Speaker, are we seeing once again the price of the Atlantic Accord? Was the Accord given to Mr. Peckford to suit his own political timing on the condition that on all other subsequent Ottawa - Newfoundland issues, the Premier was to keep quiet and that Ottawa and Mr. Mulroney were to get their way?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman read it well. Mr. Speaker, I assume that is a Rexograph that the hon. gentleman is reading. His hon. leader could not stay in the Cabinet because he wanted to negotiate the offshore himself with his own little covey of people. I hear that in the Opposition he does not talk to any of the elected members, again he has his own covey of people and I know in the hereafter he will obviously have his own apostles as well.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic Accord was negotiated after very tough bargaining. As a result, no thanks to the hon. gentlemen there opposite, in the offshore oil and gas we have the same rights as other Canadians. I am very proud

to say it, we got it as a result of tenacity and determination, not because we were prepared to sell Newfoundland and Labrador down the drain as the Liberal Party of this Province was.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, this morning I was listening to the radio and I heard my MP in Ottawa, the member for Bonavista-Trinity-Conception (Mr. Johnson), in commenting on this FFT, say, Mr. Speaker, "There has been too much public discussion on this matter and not enough negotiation." Now how would the President of the Council respond to that comment from one of his Tory colleagues in Ottawa?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I did not hear the hon. gentleman precisely. Am I asked to make a comment on a comment of somebody who commented? That is what I am asking. What is the question?

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I can repeat the question for the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Captain Morrissey Johnson, my MP and yours, was on the radio this morning commenting on FFTs, and he said, "There has been too much public discussion over the FFT matter and not enough negotiations," referring to the

way this government conducted itself. What is the President of the Council's comment on that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I realize the hon. gentleman, as all of them, have a great regard for me, but I do not presume to be a soothsayer, to interpret what people say. I am not in Mr. Morrissey Johnson's mind or anything else. The hon. gentlemen are used to that because they were in the back pocket of the people who were trying to savage this Province over a period of years, but I have not got that clairvoyance. I do not know why, Mr. Speaker, I should be asked to comment on a comment made by somebody who is making a comment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works and Services. I have a press release here that he issued yesterday, NIS 9, in which he indicates that he has appointed three new members to the C.A. Pippy Park Commission. The new members Mrs. Marlene Maynard, Mrs. Jeanette Holden and Mr. Edward White. There is a little bit of biographical information on Mr. White, but the sole biographical data on Mrs. Maynard and Mrs. Holden are that they are residents of St. John's. Could the Minister of Public Works give us some indication of their background and how they are suited for this particular job?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

For the information of the hon. House, I did not make the appointment, he Lieutenant-Governor in Council made the appointment.

MR. CALLAN:

The Cabinet, you mean.

MR. YOUNG:

That is the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, I presume.

Mr. Speaker, all I can tell the hon. gentleman is I presume they are missuses and they are housewives. They were recommended by the Lieutenat-Governor in -

MR. WINDSOR:

Are fully qualified.

MR. YOUNG:

- and are fully qualified. One of the ladies I think comes from the Mount Scio area. Mr. White is Assistant Deputy Minister in my department.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am not at all positive about that. Housewife is an honourable profession and I do not denigrate that as a background but it seems to me that the name Marlene Webber -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:

I am sorry, but names come back to haunt you. Someday, Mr. Speaker, we will have to raise that issue. The supplementary question, Mr.

Speaker, to the Minister of Public Works and Services on the question of Marlene Maynard, are I correct in assuming that this individual, among other things, I assume, besides being a housewife, is also the wife of a former M.H.A. for the PC Party from St. Barbe district?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Oh, Mr. Speaker, that is a black mark against the lady! But I can assure the hon. gentleman, to my knowledge she has not got any communists leanings and she is no relation to Mrs. Marlene Webber. She is married to a former member of this House of assembly.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Normally, I would not even raise the question, but in the last little while we have heard allegations from the Leader of the Opposition, and replies, I think, from the members on the government side, about the Pippy Park Commission and some controversial moves that are being made by it. My question is, is this a wise thing to do, to put a person who has such ties to the PC Party in a position like that, that I would imagine is supposed to be somewhat impartial? Would the minister feel that is a reasonable thing to do for the people involved? Is it wise to do that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public

Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very wise and very proper way to do it.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the House Leader. In view of the fact that a decision is about to be made on the National Sea application for factory freezer trawlers, and in view of the seriousness of that to the future of Newfoundland fisheries, would the minister undertake to contact our federal member in the Cabinet, Mr. Crosbie, to urge him to use whatever influence he has to have that decision deferred? And, then, would the minister agree, Mr. Speaker, to accept the amendment that we made to their resolution last week and have an all-party Select Committee from this House travel to Ottawa at the earliest time possible and lay out Newfoundland's case to the Prime Minister, to the Minister of Fisheries and, if necessary, to the entire Cabinet?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. member that this government has assiduously made full representation at all times to members of the government of Canada, to members of Parliament - we have circulated to all member

of Parliament - and to people in other parts of Canada. Every conceivable action has been taken. With respect to the other question advanced by the hon. member, I can also say that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) has been in Ottawa, the good and trusty Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) has been in Ottawa, and they have utilized their considerable powers of persuasion and advanced the interests of the people of this Province. The Premier has been in Ottawa advancing this. Members on this side have been advancing it. Really how hon. gentlemen on the other side of this House make the statement about whether this amendment to the resolution should have gone through? The fact of the matter is I would like the hon. gentleman, in all seriousness, to get up in this House and explain how he, as a former Minister of Fisheries in this Province who is concerned about fishermen, could have possibly voted against the attempt to get a unanimous motion against factory freezer trawlers as he did. The hon. gentleman stands on record, to his shame, with the other members there opposite in voting for factory freezer trawlers in this Province.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I will not dignify the statement of the hon. member by even trying to answer it. My record, I think, speaks for itself.

Mr. Speaker, the deputy Premier

has said that all that can be done has been done, the Premier has made representation, there have been public relations programmes across Canada, the MPs have been contacted. Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, if reports are accurate, within twenty-four hours it will be confirmed to Newfoundland just how badly the Premier has failed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. House Leader, what have we got to lose? What do we stand to lose by agreeing to our proposal that a Select Committee of members of the House - and it is not enough for the Premier to say that he does not trust members on this side to go to Ottawa; that is a serious indictment and I will deal with that another time - go to Ottawa? Mr. Speaker, the decision is about to be made. It is against Newfoundland's interests. So sending a committee to Ottawa from the people's House, what does the minister have against it? Why not make that kind of a move? So will he reconsider, Mr. Speaker, today, before this sitting adjourns, to appoint a Select Committee to make arrangements to go to Ottawa to meet the Prime Minister, to meet the Cabinet, to meet the Minister of Fisheries and lay out Newfoundland's case? The Nova Scotian MPs have done it very well on behalf of their Province, it is obvious that our MPs in Ottawa have not, so now let the House do it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would say indeed I would agree with the hon. gentleman, his record does speak for itself, and I will allow his record to speak for itself.

In accordance with our process and the democratic process, Mr. Speaker, it is the elected government of the Province that speaks for the government and articulates the will of the people of the Province. We have done that through the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), we have done it through the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer). Mr. Speaker, any hope of being able to supplement that by the presence of the hon. gentlemen there opposite would be tempered somewhat by the very fact that we would be greeted by people saying, 'Look, you have brought people from the Liberal Opposition along with you yet they voted, in effect, for factory freezer trawlers by voting against the resolution.' In other words, Mr. Speaker, we would be taking people up who are not interested in the interests of the welfare of the people of this Province, but much more interested in playing petty little political games that are not going to, in the long term, beneficially serve the interests of the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:  
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary, the hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:  
The hon. member disappoints me because, on a matter that is as serious as the factory freezer trawler application to this Province, to the future well being of our fishermen, for him to get up in his place, Mr. Speaker, and to be so insulting and blatantly political, I think the minister

should be ashamed of himself.

MR. CALLAN:  
It is unbecoming.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, I should remind the minister, by the way, we on this side represent two-thirds of the people of the Province.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Would the hon. member please pose his question?

MR. W. CARTER:  
On behalf of the fishermen of Newfoundland, the fishing communities, I make one final plea to the minister. Will he this afternoon agree to striking a Select Committee and make arrangements for that Committee to go to Ottawa to place Newfoundland's position before the Prime Minister of our country and the Cabinet?

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, my reaction is exactly the same. The hon. gentleman made a political speech himself. Look, as far as protecting the rights of the people of this Province, this government takes no second place to anyone. It has and it will continue to do so, and we are quite capable of doing so. We have in the past and will in the future. We do not need the hon. gentlemen there opposite who are playing political games. On the one hand, they want a trip to

Ottawa and, when that is turned down, what they do is vote against the resolution to prevent factory freezer trawlers, Mr. Speaker. It is not going to assist or aid anything at all what the hon. gentleman is suggesting. He himself is just playing political games. The people of this Province, by a large majority, elected this government, and this government has shown in the past, as it will in the future, that it is quite capable, under the Premier who takes a backseat to nobody, of protecting and advancing the rights of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. We can do it very effectively.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Deputy Premier as well. Mr. Speaker, nobody in this Province seems to know where our Cabinet representative, Mr. Crosbie, stands on this issue. Now perhaps in these times of harmony the Deputy Premier could stand up and tell Newfoundland and Labrador, unequivocally, where does our Cabinet representative stand on this issue?

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that Mr. Crosbie is quite capable of articulating what his position is. He has never been shy in the past, you know, any more than the

hon. gentleman's mentor, the member for Humber - Port au Port - St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) is very reluctant in taking his position as he has taken it in the past to the detriment of the people of the Province of Newfoundland.

So I cannot speak for Mr. Crosbie. Mr. Crosbie, I know, can speak very eloquently for himself. He is a person who has taken stands for the people of this Province. I know he will in the future as he sees fit.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is just time for a short supplementary and answer.

MR. FUREY:  
Is the Deputy Premier telling Newfoundland and Labrador this is the new consultation that we will see from here on in, that you do not know where Mr. Crosbie stands? Is this what consultation means?

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
I did not say I did not know where Mr. Crosbie stands. He stands for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and he is quite capable Mr. Speaker, of articulating it as well. So I am sure all MPs in the House of Commons will be able to articulate their positions with respect to it. You should not ask me to put words in the mouth of Mr. Crosbie. He is quite able and capable of doing it himself. The only thing I can say is that, as in the past, I am quite sure, as contrasted with the hon. gentleman's mentor, the member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe, he

will stand full square for the people of the Province of Newfoundland in their long-term best interests.

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER:

Pursuant to Section 29 of the Parliamentary Commissioner (Ombudsman) Act, I am pleased to say that I have received the tenth annual report of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the calendar year 1984 and I lay it on the Table of the House.

o o o

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I understand this is the correct place to do this, before moving to Orders of the Day, under Standing Order 23. I want to point out that the Speaker, obviously, has a decision to make, and that is whether the matter is of urgent public importance. I want to point out to the Speaker that, in view of the Premier's statement last night, we wired Mr. Neilsen to this effect, and the hon. Brian Mulroney, that in view of the fact that a decision is soon to be made by the federal government on National Sea's application, in view of the fact that we strongly oppose this, in view of the fact that the Premier has said that he has failed in this matter - and I

would ask the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to consider, again, that we send a select committee; I would ask him to do that - but in view of all that we have telegraphed the hon. Brian Mulroney and the hon. Erik Neilsen asking if all else fails will he agree to meet with anybody who is interested from this House, mainly the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and me from him. And, Mr. Speaker, the particular motion that I move, I ask leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of debating a matter of urgent public importance, namely the apparent decision of the federal government, if the Premier's statements of last night are correct, to approve an application by National Sea Products to operate a factory freezer trawler in the Newfoundland fishery.

Mr. Speaker, if I need a seconder for that it is seconded by the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight). Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation as to why I think Your Honour should consider this a matter of urgent public importance, I hope Your Honour would look at the issue as being very important to Newfoundland, because it does, in my opinion and in the opinion of this side of the House, and I believe in the opinion of everybody in Newfoundland, it is an issue of importance and of urgency to the people and the Province of Newfoundland. I would urge the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to go along with adjourning the House, because it is important to the people of Newfoundland and to this Province that we must not play politics at the expense of the people of Newfoundland. If we continue to do that, Mr. Speaker, then we will

see an erosion of the Newfoundland way of life, as we know it. I would urge Your Honour to consider under the urgency factor here, that indeed we should adjourn the House at this time and have a debate on this very urgent and pressing matter. I urge you to take careful consideration, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, as the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) said, it was so important the other day that the hon. gentlemen voted against it.

Mr. Speaker, the matter of factory freezer trawlers is obviously a matter of great importance to this Province, but it is not the question of whether a matter is of importance, it a matter under the rules, under Beauchesne, pages 91 and 92, as to whether it is a matter of importance of debate.

I would refer Your Honour, as well, since the hon. gentleman quoted Standing Order 23, that if you look at Standing Order 23.(f), it reads: "The right to move the adjournment of the House for the above purposes" - which is what the hon. gentleman was moving - "is subject to the following restrictions:" - and (f)(3) reads: "The motion must not revive discussion on a matter which has been discussed in the same session;" Now, we discussed that, Mr. Speaker, the other day. It was resolved and, to the hon. gentlemen's eternal damnation, they voted against it. For two days we discussed it and, to their eternal discredit, they voted against it. This House has

already made a resolution which has gone to Ottawa, unfortunately not unanimously, but one which gives the position of the Government of this Province and of the people.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The House Leader is obviously trying to play politics. If he wants to discuss the matter under Standing Order 23.(f)(3), let me point out to him that the matter that is of extreme and urgent importance here is not the matter of whether this House supports the National Sea application or not, but the matter of what can be done at this point in time, since the Premier last night looked at us and confessed his failure to us and to all Newfoundland. I hope the Minister of Fisheries. (Mr. Rideout) is right, that there has not been a decision; he has not said there has not been, I hope he does not know what he is talking about. I hope the Premier's fears were not founded last night. I hope that there is a positive reply as far as Newfoundland is concerned. But the urgency of this matter is that the Premier, the leader of the government, the head minister in this Province, has confessed that he has totally failed, and he has confessed that he fears that it is an application that is going to be approved. It has nothing to do with the resolution of last week. The urgency is as a result of what took place last night and what we are scared, we are horrified, will take place tomorrow or the next

day. That is the point of the urgency, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I am going to take a recess for a few moments and then I will rule on the matter.

### Recess

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Call in the members.

Order, please!

I have had an opportunity of studying this motion and looking up some precedents.

'The motion must not revive discussion on a matter that has been discussed in the same session,' and this matter was debated during the last week in the motion by the Premier. Because the discussion was so recent and the House did have an opportunity to debate the matter, I must rule under Standing Order 23.(f)(3), the motion is out of order.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
In view of Your Honour's ruling - and I am not going to question it at all, that is not the point of my standing here - and obviously Your Honour had to take some time because of the urgency of the matter, I understand that, but in view of that, in view of the Premier last night having confessed to his failure, I would

ask the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) if he would give unanimous leave to debate this whole issue.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Does the House give unanimous leave?

MR. MARSHALL:  
No.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
The position, Mr. Speaker, is, as was indicated, that this had been debated before. We dealt with it in Question Period. We are now going to call Supplementary Supply, in which the hon. gentlemen can debate this and debate any other matter that they wish.

### Orders of the Day

On motion, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

### Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
Order, please!

Shall the resolution carry?

MR. TULK:  
No, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Chairman, I want to speak, if I can, to a very, very important

matter, I think, that is happening in Newfoundland today. It has to do with a decision on FFTs, a prime example of what we are seeing happen in this Province. I suppose the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or somebody might try to get up and say that you cannot talk about fisheries because there is not a listing asking for Supplementary Supply for that department.

The issue that I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, is the issue of the relationship between this government and the government in Ottawa and that is obviously very important to the finances of this Province, very important to the development of the Province and very important to how we are going to progress in the future.

Mr. Speaker, we saw last night a man totally dejected, totally down and looking for some way out of what was a very painful situation, I believe. I happen to believe that the Premier of this Province is, in the final analysis, a very good Newfoundlander. I am not going to call him a traitor. That comes from the other side. Mr. Speaker, we saw last night on television a very dejected man because his own government in Ottawa, a government which he had obviously last Spring put a great deal of faith in, namely the Mulroney Government, a government that he had campaigned for in the Province - no, they did not give us Standing Order 23 Jim - a government on which the Premier carried out a prosperity crusade and told Newfoundlanders that when this government was in place that Newfoundland's -

MR. J. CARTER:

That is not relevant.

MR. TULK:

Of course it is very relevant. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to debate with the gentleman for St. John's North. I consider that below me and I do not intend to do it, Mr. Chairman. I do not intend at all to debate with him. I would ask that Your Honour protect me from that terrible onslaught over there, from that empty-headed, whatever he is, galoot.

Mr. Speaker, it is very important and I would ask either the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or the Government House Leader to stand and say that indeed Newfoundland's prosperity is well ensured, that we are in great shape, that we are in good hands and that the Mulroney Government will live up to the commitment that was made by the Premier of this Province last year to the people of Newfoundland. That is that when there was a P.C. Government in Ottawa and a P.C. Government in Newfoundland everything would be very well taken care of.

I understand the Government House Leader not wanting to move the adjournment of the House because the Government House Leader does not want to hear the truth when it hurts. The apparent truth is - and I have to say apparent because we can only go by what the Premier said last night - we cannot be sure at this point that FFTs are being approved. We do not know for certain that the application by National Sea has been approved over everybody's objection in this Province. Everybody that I can think of in this Province objects to the use of factory freezer trawlers. We can only assume, given the attitude of the Premier last night on On Camera, total

devastation. The man did not know where to go. As a matter of fact I believe if the programme has gone on for a few more hours the Premier would have been again tempted, in the questions that were being put to him, to look very seriously as to whether this Province should stay in Confederation. He was leading into that. The man was throwing up his arms and saying, "Well what can I do?" We have had a Liberal Government in Ottawa, I could not get along with them, I could not get anything out of them, we now have a PC Government in Ottawa, I cannot get anywhere with them. As a matter of fact he said the Prime Minister of this Province does not know anything about the fishery, nothing at all, and therefore, it was showing on his face that he felt totally dejected and totally down.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is very important for the welfare of this Province - I know we are dealing with a money bill - if we are going to have the kind of revenue in this Province that we need, if our people are going to have the kind of life that they need and the kind of lifestyle that they need, and the kind of lifestyle that they want, then it is very important that this matter be addressed and addressed - although factory freezer trawlers are very important - from the overall viewpoint. Perhaps the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) might tell us, since he is supposed to be the person who deals between the two governments - that in this whole issue, the Premier's confessed.

I hope though he does not do that. If he stands up and says that the Premier last night was just carrying on another charade,

another game, then I say to him that the Premier of this Province will have done a disservice to the people of this Province by putting them through the kind of pain, shock and dismay that exists in Newfoundland today because the people of Newfoundland have been terribly let down by the Mulroney Government, they have been terribly let down by John Crosbie, that man who supposedly would not shut up for anybody, and has now been apparently muzzled - perhaps he agrees with the decision - but in any case the best that we can get out of Mr. Crosbie now in Ottawa is whatever the Premier says, regardless of whether it is right or wrong, regardless of whether he believes it is not, he is going to take that and carry it up and pass it on to Brian Mulroney in this case and say, "Could you read the Premier's position?" That is not good enough. The Intergovernmental Affairs Minister knows that is not good enough. This whole government has built their whole being on getting a PC Government in Ottawa. And they have had abject failure.

If the Premier was playing games last night or if he was over-reacting, or reacting too soon, then he has done a disservice to the people of this Province. What he should be doing in the interest of good intergovernmental relations and in the interest of the people of Newfoundland and in the interest of the finances of this Province for the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), is convincing McGrath, who may end up being Minister of Fisheries. Maybe that is the whole idea, that they will make the decision on factory freezer trawlers and then shove Mr. McGrath in so he does

not have to make that decision and suffer the wrath of the Premier that was so evident in 1980. I wonder where that has gone now?

He should also, of course, see what the stand is of Morrissey Johnson in this case. We know where Price stands. The gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) the other day told us where Mr. Price stood and we know that and we commend him for it. That was a good stand to take. He came out, four square, and said he was against factory freezer trawlers.

I heard a rumour just the same, that he got a bit of a flick because he let the letter get around. He should have only just sent it through the inside offices of Mr. Mulroney's office. I heard he got a little bit of a flick. He was a bit scared about that.

I do not know why the grown men who exist in Ottawa, supposed to represent their constituency, cannot stand on their feet and say, never mind this little battle down there, that is not where the battle is, those guys have to take what we all believe in Newfoundland to Ottawa, that is their job. And it was a job of Liberal MPs when they were there. Often times we on this side of the House found ourselves in positions where we had to speak out against our Liberal friends.

MR. BAIRD:  
When?

MR. TULK:  
Where we had to vote against them. If the hon. gentleman could read, we know he cannot listen, and read Hansard - well I do not know, he may be able to read the words but he may not be able to understand it - but if he could

read and understand Hansard then I would invite him at any time time to go out and start reading and see on numerous occasions where we had to vote against a fellow who I have a great deal of liking for personally, a fellow by the name of Jean Chretien. When he did something, and as the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) could tell you, we were supposed to have a meeting with Mr. Chretien at one point, but it lasted only five minutes. We said, "Here is our position. Here is yours. If there is no way the twain can meet, then we may as well walk away from each other." That happened on numerous occasions. We all love to play politics because we are politicians, but the Premier of this Province has to forget the fact he has got a political party in Ottawa of his own stripe and present our case four square, never mind coming in here and playing these silly little games.

Mr. Chairman, I have the feeling you are soon going to tell me that my time is up. But the Premier the other day, came in here, came over to this desk and we proposed an amendment to him that would see that representation was forced out. We proposed that amendment to see that that was done and that representation join with the voice of Mr. Crosbie, the voice of Mr. McGrath, and Mr. Johnson so they could be added to the voice of Mr. Price, Mr. Tobin and Mr. Baker. He said yes first and went over there and talked to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), I would say and reneged on that commitment. The only reason I can see for that happening is the Premier was dejected at that time, totally embarrassed, and the only reason he could give was that he was afraid we were going to go to

Ottawa and embarrass the federal government.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Chairman, I chose to take part in the debate on the interim supply primarily to get my comments registered in this assembly on the issue of factory freezer trawlers because I was absent from the House when the debate took place last week and because the issue is a very large issue all around rural Newfoundland. The issue is important to Newfoundland and is on the threshold of a final decision. My information is that the decision has indeed been made and the Premier's program last night helped confirm information I had received prior to seeing the Premier on television.

In fact, the decision was made, to my knowledge, a few days before they referred the whole matter to the Advisory Council on the Atlantic Coast Fishing Industry. If that is so, it will very much damage the federal/provincial relations that I thought were established and getting of to a good footing in this Province. It was somewhat deceptive and hopefully it was not the case because the Minister of Fisheries here (Mr. Rideout), the Premier, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) and others did put forward the case of

the Newfoundland government to Ottawa and put forward the pros and cons of this kind of new technology coming into the fishing industry. Now I, at the time, thought it was strange to have such a major matter referred to an advisory council, when the matter should first of all, be discussed with the levels of government in the regions, provincial government to federal government. So it is on the threshold of a decision being made, whereby National Sea will get one license to fish underutilized species and northern cod. They will use a factory processing vessel they have already acquired. They have already taken up the options on a vessel as long as two weeks ago. I have done that investigation on my own, to confirm that they had an option in place as long as two weeks ago. Why would a company take options to buy a vessel two weeks ago if they thought they were going to get a negative answer on their application? Obviously, they knew then, they knew two weeks ago they had the okay, indirectly or otherwise, from the federal level of government to acquire a factory vessel because they went and took an option on a used factory freezer vessel sitting in West Germany and that vessel indeed will be the one they will acquire, I would say after tomorrow.

I do not think my assumption is all that wrong that tomorrow it will be announced by Ottawa that they are issuing the license. My position now is that if that is the case, what will it mean in the future? There is no doubt about it, when some of the members of Parliament were here a few days ago on a Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Fisheries and Forestry, they were right. When I

talked to some of them after I presented a brief to them - mostly an oral brief - and made about seven recommendations, which I understand will go into the report they will compile in the end. They were of the firm understanding that, for example, what would it mean to Newfoundland if National Sea gets a licence? Will it have an adverse affect on the Newfoundland fishery? And the answer, unfortunately, at this time is negative. Nothing. It will not mean anything in Newfoundland at this time. One licence to National Sea. They have their own corporate allocation, the corporate quota, called an enterprise allocation. They will be told to catch that corporate allocation using the trawlers they have and this one factory freezer trawler. So there will be no increase in their corporate quota and no increase in their corporate enterprise allocation of Northern cod to National Sea.

So looking at it from that perspective, Mr. Chairman, there will be no adverse affect on the Newfoundland fishery at this time. That is the key issue that this government has addressed.

We are indeed quite concerned and I think to be fair all members of the House of Assembly irrespective of what took place last week in the debate here and how it went, I think all of us as Newfoundlanders are genuinely concerned over this issue and we are all opposed to this kind of new technology.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

First of all, if tomorrow this licence is issued and unless the

Federal Acting Minister (Mr. Nielsen) tomorrow attaches firm conditions to that licence, there will be an open door policy. And who will be in the next week? I will say no longer than next Wednesday afternoon or next Thursday afternoon, I will tell you who will be on the doorstep at the federal level of government, Mr. Erik Nielsen's doorstep, Mr. Vic Young will be there. I say no longer than next week. He will be saying, "well, look, National Sea is now going to supply a product frozen and processed at sea to a market in U.S.A. in competition with us. If that in any way competes with our marketing activity, we want the same kind of advantage. Why treat us different from National Sea in Nova Scotia?"

So there will be long-term ramifications, long-term unfavourable consequences to this Province if the licence is issued without conditions. So I made a suggestion to the Premier two or three weeks ago, and, in fact, I made it today in a telex. I want to read into the records of the House a Telex I sent to Mr. Nielsen. I gave a copy to my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout).

I sent to Mr. Nielsen the following Telex "The Newfoundland Government and most Newfoundlanders involved in the fishery, in particular, are opposed to the use of factory freezer trawlers. However, there is some strong speculation that your government will be issuing a licence to National Sea of Nova Scotia for the use of a factory freezer trawler in the East Coast fishery. I would strongly suggest that consideration be given to attaching certain conditions to that licence along the following

lines." These are the kind of conditions, I think, will hopefully protect and prevent an open door policy on this new technology, in other words, prevent when one licence is issued a free for all and along comes all the companies who want to apply to get a licence and get a licence, which will mean a substantial loss of jobs onshore.

The number one condition I would like to see attached to that licence issued tomorrow, and I am not saying it with any pride issued tomorrow, regrettably issued tomorrow. Number one the licence should be on an experimental basis with priority use of that factory freezer, and this is important, priority use of the factory freezer for the harvesting of the underutilized species within our 200 Mile zone that is presently only being utilized and caught by foreign vessels.

I have no argument today with any Canadian vessel replacing foreign activity. It is far better for our fellow Canadians to have fish than to having it go to West Germany or Russia or Japan or Spain. Let us have our own Canadian company whether it be in Nova Scotia or in Newfoundland - preferably Newfoundland - have these fish stocks. Because we have not got the technology to fish the underutilized species.

The last count I had was approximately forty-six factory freezer trawlers that fish one time or another during the year within our 200 mile zone, forty-six factory freezer trawlers, foreign vessels, processing at sea. So, if we are going to replace some of these vessels with our own Canadian

factory freezer vessels that would at least relieve the burden. If they are going to make a decision, and I say they are going to make a decision to issue a license, then, number one, attach a condition that the freezer trawler only fish the underutilized species now fished by foreign vessels. Number two, and number two has got to be put forward as quickly as possible by the Government of this Province - I know my colleague and friend, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), is in agreement, and I think the Opposition spokesman on fisheries, if he will listen, will agree as well. If we cannot prevent the license from being issued tomorrow morning, let us ensure that this firm condition is to be attached. Number one I just mentioned, that only surplus or underutilized species be fished by that freezer trawler. Number two is an important one, and that is that no additional Northern cod quota corporate allocation be given to National Sea, which would mean that if they are going to have a factory freezer trawler fishing Northern cod they must remove, and my colleague and friend for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), I am sure, will agree with that, they must remove some of their wet fish trawlers. Attach that condition to the license, and not allow a question mark there. For example, next year when they realize their harvesting capacity has gone up because of the factory freezer trawler in their fleet, they can catch more than they have had allocated to them, they will come back and ask for a higher quota. So keep their quota down, based on present harvesting capacity, and by doing that it will mean that we will never see any more Northern cod going to Nova Scotia than is going now.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. MORGAN:  
By leave.

MR. TULK:  
We will give him leave for four or five minutes, Mr. Chairman, because I would like to ask him a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
I had to go out to make a phone call and I did not hear all of his speech, but I think I know the tenor of it. I presume the member is saying that this would be a last-ditch effort to make those kinds of propositions if they do approve factory freezer trawlers?

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:  
There is no question about that. I mean, the Premier and the minister here, and, I would say, all of us in the House, are hoping that there will be no license issued, period. We do not want factory freezer trawlers in the whole fishing industry in Newfoundland.

I am saying, if they cannot say no to Nova Scotia, if they cannot stand up to the pressures of Nova Scotia and that company, if a license is going to be issued we have to ensure that they get no more increases in quota. And if the factory freezer trawler is going to replace two or three of their wet fish trawlers, well, sobeit. Because what it then

means is we are letting a so-called private sector company - they have federal dollars in their company - National Sea, harvest their own quota in accordance with what they want to do and plan. If they want to harvest that quota with dories or sixty-five foot longliners or factory freezer trawlers, sobeit, but no increase in quota. And if they do not get an increase in quota, if that is a firm condition, if Mr. Crosbie announces that tomorrow, or Mr. Johnson, or the Acting federal Minister of Fisheries, if any of them announce that and say, 'Look, there is no question, there will never be an increase in the quota of Northern cod going to Nova Scotia because of this new technology, that will ease the situation somewhat, and hopefully they will do exactly that.'

MR. W. CARTER:  
Do not forget, though, it is a federal government decision.

MR. MORGAN:  
It is a federal government decision but, as was pointed out a few days ago, the company, National Sea, is saying, 'Well, you gave us the quota' - the federal government - 'and surely we have the right to harvest that quota as we see fit.' Well, they have some argument in that regard, but even with these conditions, if they do remove a number of their wet fish trawlers and put in one factory freezer trawler this year and one next year for processing at sea, what is going to happen is their overall cost, their overhead cost will be reduced and as their overhead cost for harvesting comes down, National Sea's, then Fishery Products is going to say, 'Well, look, they are becoming profitable, we are still on the borderline so we want the same

technology,' and that is when the problem arises for Newfoundland.

MR. TULK:

Vic Young will be up to see Erik Nielsen tomorrow.

MR. MORGAN:

That is when the problem really arises in Newfoundland. We are going to see the loss of jobs onshore. We will see the company maybe become profitable. We may see National Sea become profitable and somewhat, maybe, Fishery Products International, but it will mean the loss of jobs onshore. Once those big hungry vessels get out there - and they are hungry vessels, they can catch a lot of fish - it will mean that we will eventually have pressures on the federal government to increase the quotas offshore. The more we increase the quotas offshore, the less fish for the inshore fishery.

So the Premier and the government - and it is exactly what they are saying and we are all saying - that it will, down the road, have a very adverse effect on our fishing industry in rural Newfoundland, the inshore fishery. We want, at least I do, to see less caught offshore for the next number of years so that more fish come to the inshore waters.

One more condition I have indicated as well, that is if they are going to issue - and again we are saying if but I am of the opinion they will - a factory freezer license, well let us twist it around that there be some benefit to us as Newfoundlanders. Now, how can a factory freezer trawler be of benefit to Newfoundland if it is owned by a Nova Scotian company? Well, a few

years ago, when we had the glut, and my friend from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) was the minister in the Province at the time, we started that programme of trying to overcome the glut with information desks around the Province to try to relocate the harvesting of fish in certain areas. The onshore facilities could not accommodate it, so they had to move the fish to different parts of the Province. That is the fish distribution system. But it still did not work to total satisfaction. Why? Because at certain times, June and July, there is too much fish to the inshore in the cod trap season and it still could not resolve the whole problem.

What did we have to do? We had to go out and engage, through the union mostly - when I say we, Newfoundland, the Province and the federal government - over the side sales. What did we use for the over the side sales? We used foreign vessels. Why should we, as Canadians, have to use foreign vessels to purchase fish from our fish in our harbours and coves along the Northeast Coast of the Province -

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Northwest Coast.

MR. MORGAN:

- and the Northwest Coast as well, in the hon. gentleman's area, why should we have to do that if we can find Canadian vessels? So let us put a further condition, if Mr. Nielsen wants to appease Newfoundland tomorrow morning, without getting us all totally upset and disturbed down here with the government in Ottawa, then attach a further condition and say to National Sea, during the Summer months of July and August, when

there is little to catch offshore because the catch rates are always down in the Summertime offshore, make your vessel available in the Newfoundland fishery as a floating fish plant to move along to the places where hopefully they will see a glut again - and my friend from St. Mary's (Mr. Hearn), the Minister of Education, is quite aware what a glut means, I went through it a few years ago as Minister of Fisheries in one very bad Summer - so let that vessel be used for that purpose, to buy and process fish directly from fishermen in over the side sales.

I am hoping Mr. Neilsen will listen to those three conditions. I know there is not much time but I did not do this as an MHA. I am not trying to take away anything from my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). I discussed this telex with him earlier today. But Bonavista South is my riding. It depends teetotally on the fishery. Take away the fishing industry and there is no Bonavista South left. The lower part of Bonavista North has the same thing.

Surely Mr. Neilsen can look at them. 'Well, who is this fellow Morgan?' He is an MHA for Bonavista South, a fishing area. Obviously he was involved in the fishing industry as minister. I am hoping he will listen to my views and opinions as one individual so he can say that these make sense. My colleague agrees with them, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) agrees with them. They are making sense. Now I could see the minister not being able to do that because then Mr. Nielsen could come back and say, 'Well, the Minister of Fisheries in Mr. Peckford's Government, in

Newfoundland, is now suddenly agreeing with us issuing licences, but he wanted us to attach conditions to them.' So he could not very well do that. So I am saying, that to me it is a fait accompli, the licence will be issued tomorrow. So I am saying to Mr. Nielsen, "Do not do it, do not just open the door and leave it open wide for FPI next week, Murphy's operations in Nova Scotia next, the Quebec operations in Quebec, and a there are a couple of companies in PEI interested."

MR. PATTERSON:

Not to mention the French in Saint-Pierre and Miquelon.

MR. MORGAN:

That is right, not to mention the French operations in Saint Pierre and Miquelon. So, I mean, rather that leave the door open - the old saying around the bay is, 'Just leave the door ajar,' - put these conditions in to make sure we are not going to get a flood of applications going into Ottawa for factory freezer trawlers which will see the loss of jobs onshore.

I do not know what Mr. Crosbie, Newfoundland's Minister in the Federal Cabinet will say tomorrow, but I understand he will be speaking to the people of Newfoundland, and I do not want to get involved and say that he lobbied for or against or what he did. Let them account for their activities, but this is my view: If this licence is issued without Mr. Nielsen or the new Minister of Fisheries coming back in the next few days, or whenever it may be, for meaningful consultations with my friend, the Minister of Fisheries, it is going to substantially damage provincial/federal relations. There is no question in my mind

about that, because it is so important to our Province. It might not be important or a great big deal to Central Canada - so Mr. Peckford is worried about factory freezer trawlers, what is it all about? So he is worried about a new licence - one licence, one vessel. I know the comments being made. But it is a major issue for this Province and if the Government of Canada is going to ignore the wishes of the people, made in a very logical, reasonable way through the provincial government - and I think the Premier and his ministers did do that, go to Ottawa and sit down with the various ministers up there - and make this decision without coming back and giving the provincial government a chance to put forward conditions, and negotiate conditions, then it is going to damage the relationship between the two levels of government. And that, to me, would be unfortunate, because this is a new term for this government here, we just got elected in the Spring. We have four years to go and Mr. Mulroney has a good three years to go, and if relationships with the new government in Ottawa turn sour so early in the game, I am afraid that we will see some repercussions. So if there has to be an announcement tomorrow, and if they have to approve the application, I hope they will do it taking into consideration all views of Newfoundland and that they will put these firm conditions in place, attached to that licence.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
The hon. the member for

Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, I want to have a few words on this bill. First of all, I want to say, and this is not a criticism of the Speaker's ruling with respect to our motion that we have a special debate on the problem, that if we are operating under rules in this House that would prevent the people's representatives from coming into their House today and debating a matter of such great importance to this Province, then, Sir, I say it is high time that the rules be changed.

We are now forced, Mr. Chairman, to sneak in a debate, to literally sneak in a debate, ten minutes at a time, under a finance bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER:

Now, if the hon. members opposite are in favour of that proposition, fine, they can speak too, but what I say is this, we cannot bring in a situation and introduce a debate in this House that so gravely affects the people of our Province, fishermen and others. Maybe not the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) -

MR. TOBIN:

Why did you not get up and speak the other day? You never opened your mouth.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, I do not interrupt the hon. member. I would ask you, Sir, to instruct him to keep quiet.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Twillingate wishes to be heard in silence please.

MR. W. CARTER:

I can justify what I have done, I hope he can do likewise.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, Sir, if this House is operating under rules that would legitimately prevent a debate on this important issue, well, then, it is quite obvious that the rules need to be changed.

The speech made by my friend opposite a moment ago, I thought was a very good speech. I think he pointed out very well, very adequately the seriousness of the problem facing our Province as a result of what could happen tomorrow. I say what could happen, because we all know, of course, that at this point in time the application has not been approved. We can only go by what we have been hearing, what we have heard the Premier say on television, what we have heard the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) say, and others, that it is quite possible that by this time tomorrow an application will be approved enabling National Sea Products to operate factory freezer trawlers within our coastal waters. If that happens, Mr. Chairman, as the member said a moment ago, you do not need to be a great forecaster or to have a crystal ball to visualize what is going to happen. Because within a week or ten days or even a month, maybe, I submit, as he has already said, that you will find FPI, Fishery Products International, going to Ottawa making a similar application.

And, Mr. Chairman, they will have ample reason to do it, ample

justification to do it. Because it will be obvious, Mr. Chairman, that if National Sea is given approval to operate that kind of technology and if they can effect savings for their company or, maybe, be more competitive in the marketplace, well, then, how can you prevent other fish companies from doing likewise? I would submit to you, Sir, that their application will not stop with one licence. I suggest to you that within twelve months there will be other licences issued to that company and possibly other companies, as well. And if that happens, then I think the whole face of our Province will change, the social and economic structure of our Province, particularly of the rural parts of our Province, will change very drastically.

Once it can be established that it is more practical, it is easier, it is more manageable for the larger companies to operator factory freezer trawlers and process on board, then, I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, they will want to unload their shore operations pretty fast. And, of course, we all know what will happen if they do that. We know that today in Newfoundland, in my riding and other ridings, the riding of my colleagues here for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) and Fogo (Mr. Tulk), in fact, all over Newfoundland, we have fish plants which are the very heart and soul of our Province economically. They provide people with badly needed jobs. They provide women, wives of fishermen, wives of others, daughters and sons and so on, with badly needed jobs, during the Summer months especially. These jobs will not be available in the same number to these people once that new technology is introduced to the fishing industry.

And not only that, Mr. Chairman, there is another side effect to it all, a side effect that may be in the long-term, or it may be in the short-term, but is equally serious. What does this say for federal/provincial relations? Let us look at that point for a moment. And I am not going to get involved in what the Premier has been saying about, you know, elect so and so and from here on in it will be that much easier to negotiate and to get things we need for the Province. We all know what has been said, it is a matter of public record. We all know that if this sort of thing is allowed to continue, if the government of this Province is unable to have any influence whatever on the federal government, as it would appear, certainly, if a permit is issued, then what does that do to federal/provincial relations? What kind of an impact can we make in Ottawa? How seriously are we taken?

My friend opposite suggested one of the conditions in outlining the telegram that he sent to the Acting Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Nielsen, to the effect that there be a conditional permit issued; that there be only underutilized species caught, for example, and that the company be required to operate its factory freezer vessel around Newfoundland's coast during the glut period in the Summer. These recommendations are commendable, Mr. Chairman, but I would suggest to you that if that company can wield enough influence in Ottawa to get a permit to operate a factory freezer trawler, then what chance do we have to have conditions attached to it?

So, as desirable as it might be to have conditions attached, if, in

fact, the permit is issued, I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the chances of enforcing that kind of a situation under the present circumstances are pretty non-existent.

I believe that the matter that we are discussing now is very important. I view the application of National Sea as the proverbial thin edge of the wedge; they are getting in the thin edge. If and when the application is approved, it will be established that they will need a certain amount of raw material to make these trawlers economically viable. It will not take National Sea long to have a set of figures go to Ottawa backing up the fact that they need x number of thousands of tons of raw material, otherwise the whole concept will fall apart. Again, of course, with the strong lobby that they have, and that is obvious, then it is quite possible that they will be given increased quotas. So to suggest that they be restricted to a certain quota, or at least to their existing quota, again I think we will be whistling in the dark.

Ideally, Mr. Chairman, the licences should not be issued. I think the Newfoundland people are against it, this House is against it, the fishermen are against it. I do not suppose there was ever an issue in this Province where there was such unanimous support as the one wherein we oppose the issuing of that licence. The unfortunate part about it - and I make no bones about saying this - is that our man in Ottawa, Mr. Crosbie, who is all powerful, as far as we are concerned, in the federal Cabinet, he is our spokesman in the Cabinet, he is the man who sits around the Cabinet Table and represents the interests of

Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders  
and Labradorians -

MR. TULK:

He does not do it anymore, though.

MR. W. CARTER:

Obviously he does not fill that role anymore, but nevertheless that is his role, that is what it should be - he has been conspicuously silent on the whole issue as have the other two members, Captain Johnson and the former Fisheries Minister, James McGrath.

MR. TULK:

Do you think it is possible that the member for St. John's West might be appointed Minister of Fisheries and that is the reason he is keeping quiet?.

MR. W. CARTER:

Well, I suppose anything can happen in politics. If the minister in Ottawa leaves the federal Ministry of Fisheries in the mess that he left the provincial Department of Fisheries in when I succeeded him, in 1975, then I say, God help the Canadian fishing industry. That is all I have to say on that bit of conjecturing on the part of my hon. friend.

Mr. Chairman, it is a very serious matter and it is rather ironic, I suppose, a bit of a paradox, maybe, that the man who today was answering for the government, the Acting Premier - and who rose in his seat, by the way, objecting to a debate that we proposed - does not have one fisherman in his entire riding. That is why he can afford the luxury of being a little insensitive, maybe. He can afford the luxury, Mr. Chairman, of maybe being insensitive to the problems facing the fishing

industry, because he does not have to go out on the wharf head and try and explain to a group of fishermen what is going to happen.

MR. J. CARTER:

What nonsense! The hon. member has as many fishermen in his district as you have.

MR. W. CARTER:

I am talking about the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

MR. J. CARTER:

That is who I am talking about. What about the Battery?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

I would like to inform all hon. members we have three questions for the Late Show, one presented by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), one by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) to the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall), and one by the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) to the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall).

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, I presume we can flip-flop here.

MR. TULK:

That is all you have ever done.

MR. J. CARTER:

There are a number of points that

have been left out of this discussion which, perhaps, could be brought in at this present time. The member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) said, and I do not disagree with him, that most people are against factory freezer trawlers. Well, I am going to suggest - and this is partly a statement and partly a question because I am not technically versed in factory freezer trawlers - that perhaps the very concept of factory freezer trawlers is an unworkable one.

The reason I suggest that, is because I have been aboard a great many factory freezer trawlers, mostly foreign vessels, and it strikes me that they are designed for extremely distant fishery. Now if Newfoundland had the right to fish off the Antarctic continent, then, obviously, we would have no choice but to go there with factory freezer trawlers. A factory freezer trawler is merely a trawler with facilities on board it for filleting and then plate freezing or fast freezing the final product. And I would guess that there could be times when, if a trawler like that were in good fishing grounds, there would be quite a bottleneck between the time the fish is caught and the time that fish is processed. In the present wet fish trawlers, my understanding is that the fish are gutted, washed and put into ice, and they can be handled almost as quickly as the fish can be caught. But if you are going to filet the fish and filet it with a view to making a final product, then much more care has to be taken and I would guess that it would be very, very easy for a serious bottleneck to develop and fish that had been caught could be lying around for a number of

hours, and the quality would deteriorate, so that the final product would not be better, it would be much worse. I would suggest that the very concept of factory freezer trawlers will work against their eventual adoption.

There is, of course, the cost. I can only guess at it but I am told that a new factory freezer trawler can be upwards of \$25,000,000. I know they do not come cheap, no vessel does. You might be able to get a second-hand one, you might even be able to get two second-hand ones for considerably less, but then you are facing maintenance and repairs. So it is not cheap. I am as much against the concept as any other member of the House is, but I do see some hope in that I think they are probably not practical.

In the meantime, we are perhaps losing sight of the fact that the Northern cod stock is not all under our control and that, I think, is by far the most alarming aspect of this whole situation, far more alarming than what they use. Presumably, if some group have a right to a stock, I do not really care if they harvest it by helicopter. The way they harvest it is not as important as the fact that they are getting into it. I would much rather see the stock kept for ourselves than to see this debate go on about the type of vessel used to catch it. I just do not think it is practical. I am subject to correction, I do not know as much about the technical side of it as I should, but I have seen a lot of those vessels, I know that they are big and expensive and, also, I would guess, that if I were going to invest money in a factory freezer trawler, I would want to have three components to it, one,

the trawl for catching the fish in the first place, two, a sort of a holding compound whereby the fish can be iced down and chilled, and, three, the actual factory where the fish is fileted and made for final product. Even if they are made into cod blocks, there is not much improvement can be made on a cod block once it is frozen, you can only cut it down to size and put it into smaller packages.

I would hope that the very concept itself is an unworkable one. I have just been handed a note and, for the information of the committee, I might read it out: 'I understand that the Leader of the federal Liberal Party is in Halifax and Mr. Barry, the Leader of the provincial Liberal Party, is also in Halifax, and I wonder if the House Leader has made any attempt to contact the Leader of the Opposition with a view to having him discuss this whole situation with the Leader of the Liberal Party, because it is an important question and it would be nice to.'

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:

Anyway, with those few points I will take my seat and the hon. member can get up and speak, if he wants to.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Let me enlighten the hon. gentleman, which is difficult to do. I mean, how can you enlighten someone when sometimes you wonder whether he has a brain or not? Anyway, let me enlighten the hon. member. I can assure him that the Leader of the Opposition in

Newfoundland (Mr. Barry) has spoken to Mr. Turner. And let me make it simple for him, simple, as clear as water, the hon. Leader of the Opposition in Canada (Mr. Turner) is opposed to factory freezer trawlers. Unlike Mulroney, unlike Nielsen, unlike the Tories in Ottawa, he is opposed. And we did not muffle it up, we made that known, unlike the Government in Newfoundland.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

I would like to point out to the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) that although I have known the Leader of the Opposition for many years, I have never yet seen him eat fish. That is a personal matter, I know. I understand that he does not even like fish, so I would like this point to be clarified.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order there is no point of order.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to look at the concept of mad dog to lap dog. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that one very important question has been overlooked in this debate so far. It is a hypothetical question, but it has to be raised. How would the government have acted had the Government in Ottawa been

Liberals? Now that is a very important question, a very, very important question. We look over there and we see the warriors turned wimps, the warriors have been reduced to wimps, they are followers. And what is happening in Ottawa? We see the four Tory MPs tiptoeing through the tulips with Mulroney. Now how ridiculous! On such an important issue to Newfoundland and Labrador, we cannot get an unequivocal, straightforward answer on where Mr. Johnson, where Mr. Crosbie, where Mr. McGrath and, to a certain extent, where Mr. Price stand on the issue of factory freezer trawlers fishing off this Province.

MR. DAWE:

Actually, Mr. Price is against application.

MR. FUREY:

Well, he has had his knuckles rapped and he has been silent since.

MR. CALLAN:

The Price is right, that is why.

MR. DAWE:

No, he has not.

MR. FUREY:

Yes, he has. What is very important about this whole concept of factory freezer trawlers, Mr. Chairman, is that there are going to be other very important issues that will affect jobs in this Province. Let me raise one today, and it deals with the mining industry, Mr. Chairman.

Two nights ago we saw on the CBC programme, The Journal, that the 1982 defunct mine run by Cyprus Anvil in the community of Faro, which is just North of Whitehorse, and which just happens to be in

the riding of the Deputy Prime Minister of this country, will be reactivated, re-opened. There is a private consortium of people out of Toronto who found, Mr. Chairman, \$25 million to pump into the Faro mine, which is a lead and zinc mine in the North of the Yukon. And what is very interesting is that the Deputy Prime Minister of this country (Erik Nielsen) has somehow magically found \$18 million in grants, guaranteed loans and subsidies to pour into this mine. Well, what is going to be the net effect of pouring that hefty federal government subsidy into this mine at Faro? The mining industry across this country is very, very concerned. Adam Zimmerman, Chief Executive Officer for Noranda, has stated that he is very concerned that these people will go in, use this federal government subsidy, this \$18 million grant, guaranteed loan, subsidy, to reduce the world price of zinc. Now can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, the federal government taking taxpayers' money and putting it into the Yukon to put zinc on the market at twenty-seven cents a pound when the world price for zinc is thirty-eight cents a pound? What is going to happen to the 200 jobs in Daniel's Harbour, at that zinc mine in my district, when the Deputy Prime Minister can take \$18 million, dump it into his riding and affect negatively the jobs in the district of St. Barbe at that Daniel's Harbour zinc mine? - all of which brings me to this point, Mr. Chairman: If our Tory MPs in Ottawa are going to be so quiet on such a crucial, fundamental - it is lifeblood we are talking about here, FFTs - if they are going to be so silent on that major issue when other major issues, such as the reactivation of the Cyprus Anvil mine in the

Yukon is going to put zinc on the marketplace at a substantially reduced price, below the world price, who will speak at the Cabinet table to argue for those 200 miners in Daniel's Harbour? Who? Mr. Chairman, we, on this side, are very concerned about what the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) so appropriately called this morning the deafening silence in Ottawa by our four elected Tory representatives from this Province, and it is shameful!

MR. TULK:

The Premier himself said their silence is deafening.

MR. FUREY:

The Premier himself, as the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) says, said their silence is deafening. You know, I believe this concern that I raise today about the Daniel's Harbour zinc mine is very legitimate, Mr. Chairman. We, on the Northern Peninsula, have a tough time with unemployment in the best of times, as the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) knows all too well. We can tell you about pockets of youth unemployment from St. Anthony right down to Wiltondale, encompassing all of the Great Northern Peninsula. We can tell you about pockets of unemployment as high as 98 per cent.

These people across the way, Mr. Chairman, who have been given a mandate, a good, strong mandate to come and govern, to create what they call, 'meaningful and full-time employment for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians' what have they done? They have been in nearly a half year and how many jobs have they created for young people, those 19,000 young Newfoundlanders and Labradorians,

those young men and women? What have they done for them? Does that put the lie to that election, Mr. Speaker? Does that take that election and toss it out the window? Of course it does.

And who will speak for the miners at the federal Cabinet table in Ottawa if we start seeing a reduction in the world price for zinc because of this federal subsidy, guaranteed loan and tax breaks passed on to Faro? Who will speak for those Newfoundland miners at the Cabinet table in Ottawa, when we have four MPs tiptoeing through the tulips with Mulroney? This is a very serious issue, taking taxpayer's money from those miners who pay good taxes to the federal treasury, taking their money and putting it in the Yukon to put them out of work. How ridiculous! Who will speak? Will the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) speak on behalf of those miners? Will he talk to John Crosbie and ask him to bring it to the cabinet table for those miners who are worried about their jobs?

So the principle goes even deeper, Mr. Chairman, that FFTs, beyond the FFTs, when other issues of great importance to this Province arise, such as the issue that I brought to the floor of this House today. Who will speak for us when nobody is speaking for us on such a birthright, such a motherhood issue as factory freezer trawlers in this Province?

'The silence', the Premier has said, 'is deafening.' Well, what happened to that bus and to that crusade for prosperity? Are the wheels falling off it? What is happening? You talked about what great times, what Utopia, what Euphoria, what Nirvana we would

have when we got the right colour in Ottawa. Well, buddy, you got it, overwhelmingly. They are blue up there, they are blue down here, you have a Brian up there, we have a Brian down here, so why did those two Brians not go eyeball to eyeball to get those factory freezer trawlers to hell out of this Province forever if the crusade for prosperity is supposed to be so great? What happened? Will somebody over there tell me? Stand up and tell us what happened to this great crusade for prosperity. Where is the Utopia? Do you want to tell us? Will the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) tell us exactly what he is going to do about this very, very sad situation that is happening, which could cause zinc prices to be driven down to twenty-seven cents a pound by the federal infusion of capital dollars in the form of subsidies, loan guarantees and grants? Will he stand in his place and tell those 170 miners in Daniel's Harbour how secure their jobs will be if, as Mr. Zimmermann and other mining executives across this Nation have said, this will de-stabilize the mining industry across the Nation? Will the Minister of Mines stand up and tell us about those workers in Daniel's Harbour, or is everybody on that side frightened to death of Yukon Erik, the acting Minister of Fisheries, the man in charge of cutting federal programmes back to the bone? Are you frightened to death of him over there? Was the Premier frightened to go with a Select Committee because Yukon Erik would stare him down and say, 'Go home, boy. You fool.'

Would somebody on that side stand in their place today and tell us, categorically, unequivocally, why the hon. John Crosbie, one of the supposedly most powerful men in

Ottawa, has been so silent on behalf of Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:  
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I feel obligated to get involved in this debate after listening to some of the hypocrisy that I have heard since I came back from being down in my district with the Premier and getting involved in the fishing industry and assisting Fishery Products International to the tune of \$8 million from the Burin Peninsula Development Fund. Today, Mr. Chairman, we had the opportunity, the Premier and I as well as my colleague from Burin - St. George's (Mr. Price), the man who has taken his stand as it relates to factory freezer trawlers, a lot louder, I can assure you, than the previous member for Burin - St. George's took his stand as it related to the offshore.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have heard the hon. member, we have heard them all getting up today and talking about factory freezer trawlers and the fishermen in this Province. The fact of the matter is that the members opposite could not care less about the fishermen, the fisherwomen, or the fishing industry in this Province. The

other day the Premier brought a resolution into this House seeking unanimous support of the House, Mr. Chairman, for our case. Unfortunately, that unanimity did not exist.

What happened, Mr. Chairman? The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), in his blind hatred for the man who is Premier of this Province, instructed his caucus not to vote for that resolution. They stood in their places and voted against the resolution which called for unanimity as it related to factory freezer trawlers. The resolution quite clearly stated, Mr. Chairman, that this House go on record as being opposed to factory freezer trawlers.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The poor ignorant boy from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) has to be corrected again. The Premier of this Province brought in the resolution. The Leader of the Opposition brought in an amendment to it. The Premier stood over that desk and said, "Yes, we can accept that." He went back, and when he realized that he was not going to be able to play the little political game that he wanted to play he said, "No, I cannot accept it". As a matter of fact, I believe he sent the hon. gentleman around the back and he came in through that door. He would not send him across the House, he was afraid the media would see him. Is that possible, Mr. Chairman, to have to correct

him? The process that he is outlining is wrong. He knows it is wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is, the member for Fogo is standing in his place and he cannot hide behind the fact that he sold Newfoundlanders down the drain. He stood in this House, Mr. Chairman, with his colleagues, and voted against the resolution that asked for unanimity in this House as it related to factory freezer trawlers not being permitted to fish in Newfoundland waters.. Mr. Chairman, all they were concerned about was a jaunt to Ottawa. The mode of delivering the message was not important.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No. No.

MR. TOBIN:

The message is what was important, and you did not have the courage to stand in this House and support it. You stood in this House and you are recorded in Hansard as voting against the resolution that called for the banning of factory freezer trawlers in this Province.

MR. FUREY:

Why did you vote against the amendment?.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, the message was, the guts of the motion was that we were opposed to factory freezer

trawlers. They said, 'How can we get a trip out of this? We will ask for a select committee to go to Ottawa.' The amendment, Mr. Chairman, was for a mode of delivering the message to the federal government. But the really meaningful motion, the motion that was going to go to Ottawa showing the unanimous support of the people elected to the Newfoundland House of Assembly, that message was rejected by the Liberal Party in this Province. They stood in their places and voted against the resolution condemning factory freezer trawlers. Mr. Chairman, there is only one interpretation that can be put on that, and that is simply that they were in favour of factory freezer trawlers and National Sea's application. That is the only interpretation that can be put on that type of conduct.

MR. TOBIN:

And, Mr. Chairman, as was clearly stated this morning on the local radio station, that will haunt the Liberal Party for years.

MR. J. CARTER:

Forever.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, that is it was.

MR. FUREY:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Maybe the hon. member for Burin should -

MR. SIMMONS:

Burin -Placentia West.

MR. FUREY:

I am sorry, Burin - Placentia West - should let his blood pressure just settle down there for a minute. Maybe the hon. member could stand in his place and tell us unequivocally where his Tory buddy, our Cabinet representative at the federal table, stands on this issue? Tell us.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To the point of order, there is no point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

The fact of the matter is, that member can stand up, they can all stand up on points of order, but they cannot hide behind the fact that they have stood in this House of Assembly and voted against a resolution that was to condemn factory freezer trawlers off our shore. You cannot hide behind that.

MR. FUREY:

Condemn Crosbie.

MR. TOBIN:

There he goes again, Mr. Chairman.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

When an hon. member stands in this House, Mr. Chairman, he is expected to be responsible and to be truthful. The hon. member is not being truthful in what he is saying, he knows it, we know it,

Your Honour knows it, and Newfoundland knows it. This party, while we did not see fit to support the resolution, we gave our reasons for that. We made it quite clear, Mr. Chairman, by way of our amendment which was, in fact, an extension of the resolution. You know, our position is quite clear. The hon. member, and I hate to have to do this because he is an old friend of mine, but he deliberately - I should not say 'deliberately', it is unparliamentary - he is misleading this House. He knows it, his colleagues know it, Your Honour knows it, we know it, the press knows it and the people of Newfoundland know it. We have children in the gallery today, Mr. Chairman, and I would suggest, if that is the only type of representation he can make on this very serious matter, that I think this House is sinking to an all time low.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Nothing but political garbage!

MR. BAIRD:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

Mr. Chairman, we have heard that same attitude and the same tactics applied by the Opposition yesterday as they are trying again today. The member is allowed to have his say. I do not think anybody butted in from this side of the House. But now all we have heard are spurious points of order. The attitude of the opposition is ridiculous. Every

member has a right to be heard and so do the members on this side. I would suggest to anybody who does not want to listen to go out in the Common Room out of it, have a smoke and grow up.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, I guess I have to repeat it for the record again because I am not sure the member for Twillingate has heard me accurately.

What I said in the House was simply that there was a resolution put forth by the Premier asking for unanimous support of this House as it relates to factory freezer trawlers. Mr. Chairman, the member for Twillingate was one of people that was sitting in this House and voted against that resolution and when you vote against a resolution, Mr. Chairman, that calls for the unanimous support of this House for factory freezer trawlers, that condemns the action of Nickersons and National Sea Products, whoever put the bid out there for factory freezer trawlers, you are basically saying that you are in support of factory freezer trawlers. It will haunt the member for Twillingate, as well as the member for Fogo. You should hang your head in shame.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:  
I do not normally do this, as your honour knows, I am not one to be up on points of order but I cannot let the hon. member get away with what he is saying. Let me say this to you, Mr. Chairman, we did vote against the resolution and we gave our reasons for it. I should remind the hon. members that he and his colleagues voted against our amendment. Now, Mr. Chairman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:  
We will never know just how beneficial the amendment could have been, but certainly the resolution has not been beneficial. We know that the resolution has done nothing. The resolution that the hon. member presented and approved has done nothing. At least we can take some conciliation in the knowledge that had they voted for the amendment, Mr. Chairman it might have worked. We will never know that now. The hon. member makes a great fuss over the fact that we did not support the resolution. I should remind him that he and his colleagues did not support the amendment which, in fact, would have been an improvement on the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
To that point of order, it is a

difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Chairman, I make no apologies to anyone for voting against the amendment because I could not care less if anyone opposite every went to Ottawa again, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
A point of order?

MR. TULK:  
Has the hon. member's time run out yet?

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
No his time is not up. He has two minutes.

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Chairman, they are wasting the time of the House. The fact of the matter is they are smarting under the direction of their Leader when he voted against a resolution that condemns factory freezer trawlers from fishing off our shores. I can tell you something, when they are looking for fish in a few years time, it might be ten or fifteen or twenty years time, but when they are looking for fish in Fogo.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Tell Mr. Crosbie.

MR. TOBIN:  
Yes, I will tell Mr. Crosbie. I have got no problems telling anybody but anyone who is prepared to sell this Province down the tube, like you are, I am prepared to tell them -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear! Hear!

MR. J. CARTER:  
Excellent speech. Keep it up!

MR. TULK:  
What did John say to you?

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Chairman, they cannot hide behind the fact and they cannot say, "What about Crosbie?" I do not know about Crosbie.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:  
I do not know where your members are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Greening)  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. TULK:  
A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
On a point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
I would like to have a bit of information clarified here. I understood the hon. member to say he had talked to the hon. the member for St. John's West, and then I understood him to say he does know where he stands.

MR. TOBIN:  
I never said that.

MR. TULK:  
You mean to say he did not tell you?

MR. TOBIN:  
I never said anything.

MR. TULK:  
Or did he just say to go home?

MR. TOBIN:  
A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TULK:  
What did he say, Mr. Chairman?

MR. TOBIN:  
I said I would talk to Mr. Crosbie, I did not say I had talked to Mr. Crosbie.

MR. TULK:  
You mean you have not?

MR. TOBIN:  
I will talk to Mr. Crosbie.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Chairman, you mean he has not spoken to him?

MR. TOBIN:  
I will talk to Mr. Crosbie or anybody else-

MR. TULK:  
The Executive Assistant to the Premier has not spoken to him.

MR. TOBIN:  
I will not talk to anybody else who would sell this Province down the drain. I tell you I have spoken, Mr. Chairman, to the man who represents the riding federally that I represent and I can tell you he has taken a very definitive stand as it relates to the offshore.

MR. TULK:  
You have not spoken to the federal

minister? Well, is not that interesting! He has not spoken to the federal minister.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is there is no point of order. The hon. gentleman is smarting because yourself and your Leader plotted the decision that conned your caucus into supporting factory freezer trawlers. I can tell you something else, your caucus are not too pleased with you on that matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
Order, please!

To that point of order, I rule there is no point of order.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred, made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted. Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

We have three questions for debate at 5:30 p.m.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, today, we tried to get a debate going, and the question I asked the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) yesterday pertains to that, I expect -

MR. TOBIN:

Trying to suck in through the backdoor because you cannot get in through the front.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, there is something going on here. I do not know what it is.

MR. BAIRD:

I do not believe you know anything that is going on.

MR. TULK:

The member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) seems to be upset about my welfare for some reason or other and, you know, that is unusual. I wonder is he really, or is the truth coming out?

MR. FUREY:

They are hurting.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I asked the Minister of Fisheries a question having to do with FFT and it had to do with the feeling that was around in this Province that indeed, the acting Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Nielsen, in Ottawa, was about to approve National Sea's application.

Far be it from me to accuse the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Fisheries in this Province (Mr. Rideout) of misleading this House. I do not intend to do that.

An hour before I asked the

question, I believe, there was a programme being taped called **On Camera**, and I believe the Premier may have been there at the same time I was asking the question. When I asked the Minister of Fisheries did he have any doubts, he did not reply. I cannot say he misled the House, Mr. Speaker, because he did not. He did not reply.

At the same time, and an hour before that, his Leader, the Premier of this Province, was outside this House being taped, as far as I understand, saying he was afraid of the consequences, that he was a defeated man. He was confessing that he was a defeated man. He was confessing that the Prime Minister of this country, his buddy, his political ally, did not know anything about fish, did not know anything about the Newfoundland fishery, and that he was rejecting the Premier's efforts to stop National Sea from getting a factory freezer trawler.

At the same time as I was asking the question of the Minister of Fisheries in this House, I believe the Premier was on tape - at least, he knew the answer - saying that Mr. John Crosbie, a great champion of Newfoundland, was indeed no longer the champion of Newfoundland and that Mr. McGrath and Mr. Johnson had let him down terribly.

I ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) to stand in this House and tell us if they believe they have lost the battle, if they believe that National Sea is going to get that application.

MR. CALLAN:

If they lost this battle, I hope they have not lost the war.

MR. TULK:

I also hope we have not lost the war.

I also ask him to stand in this House and tell us how come, when we have the nirvana of politics, according to the Premier, and the Prime Minister and himself and the rest of them over there, how come they could not even get - and surely, they have the responsibility as the government of this Province - John Crosbie, Jim McGrath and Johnson alongside. What is the problem? Are the telex machines broken down? Have you suddenly become scared or just what is the problem?

Why is it that all we can get is the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) going up and sitting down and having tea and crumpets with the federal Minister of Forestry (Mr. Merithew) and being told to go home, a promise that the now Prime Minister made when he was running is not going to be kept and that is in the name of a forest research center? Why do we have to have those kinds of things?

The member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) has just slipped us a bit of information. He, the great champion of the fisheries, has not spoken, he said, to John Crosbie. He will speak to him. Oh, he is going to speak to him, he says. Yes, he is going to speak to him tomorrow. I hope not, but probably after the decision is made against us. Why? What are you scared of? The Premier said we cannot go to Ottawa. You cannot have a Select Committee go to Ottawa. I think that is the key. He said, "You cannot go because you may embarrass Mr. Mulroney and the

federal Fisheries Minister."

Mr. Speaker, let us be very clear and very honest about this. Why do we have that situation today?

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what I am going to tell the hon. gentleman. I am going to tell the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that there is a difference between the backbone of the people on this side of the House and those on that side of the House. That is what I am going to tell the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

When he gets up, Mr. Speaker, and asks about our interrelationship with our colleagues in Ottawa, I say to him, where was he when John Chretien and Pierre Trudeau and Marc Lalonde were crucifying Newfoundland and Labrador? Where was he? Did we hear any screams, Mr. Speaker? Did we hear the hon. gentleman and his colleagues standing in their places and vilifying their Liberal friends in Ottawa? Did we hear that, Mr. Speaker? They took it lying down, Mr. Speaker.

So that is the difference between the government of determination and backbone on this side of the House and the Opposition who have no backbone and no determination on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
And I remind the hon. gentleman that I did not interrupt him in his five minutes.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, I am allowed to interrupt on a point of order. It is legitimate.

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

MR. TULK:  
I have to correct the hon. gentleman. I am going to make him a promise, that even though we were not the government of the day in Newfoundland, I am going to do a bit of research for him tonight through Hansard and I am going to pull out where on numerous occasions - and I am going to send it over to him - this side opposed our so-called friends in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
The facts and history, Mr. Speaker, speak for themselves. The fact of the matter is that on any issue that is so important to Newfoundland and Labrador, this government will fight the battle, no matter who the political party is in Ottawa. That is the commitment of this government, Mr. Speaker. We do not have to stand and apologize to one Newfoundlander, particularly, Mr. Speaker, one jealous, disenchanted Liberal Newfoundlander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The next question is from the hon.

member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) who is not satisfied with the minister's answer with regard to the Lougheed question.

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I rose and asked the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) a simple question. A question, Mr. Speaker, that everyone in Newfoundland believes they have a right to know. It is the people of Newfoundland who are going to pay Mr. Lougheed. It will be the tax dollars that they pay to this government that will pay Mr. Lougheed. They are entitled to know, Mr. Speaker, just as surely as they are entitled to know how much an MHA earns, what his travel allowance is and what are his office space costs. The people of Newfoundland are just as much entitled to know how much it is going to cost this Province to have Mr. Lougheed as a consultant.

Why would the Minister of Energy not get up in this House and give the Opposition that information? Why would he not get up, Mr. Speaker, and tell us what it is costing us to have the expertise of Mr. Lougheed? We on this side, Mr. Speaker, have great respect for Mr. Lougheed, we have great respect for his expertise and we are delighted that he is coming to work for the Newfoundland Government. As I said earlier, this government needs a Lougheed, they need a lot of Lougheeds, when one looks at their performance on the offshore this past five years, Mr. Speaker. God knows that they need help from whatever quarter they can get it.

Mr. Speaker, there appears to be

an uncanny relationship between our Premier and Mr. Lougheed, the ex-premier of Alberta. It was four or five years ago, Mr. Speaker, that our Premier, the only premier in Eastern Canada, supported Mr. Lougheed in getting the price of oil up to world prices that caused us today in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, to be paying \$3 a gallon for fuel oil, for heating oil. That was Mr. Lougheed, Mr. Speaker, it was supporting Mr. Lougheed's position that got up in that situation.

Mr. Speaker, will the minister get up - I am not going to get on with any trite politics - I am simply asking him, will he get up and tell us and tell the people of Newfoundland, who will be paying the bill, how much is the Lougheed package going to cost this Province?

Mr. Speaker, there is another situation here and the minister knows this. Premier Lougheed, being a great Albertan, said many times, as I said earlier in the question, that he is Alberta first. The minister knows, as anyone knows anything about the oil industry in this Province knows, that Newfoundland will be competing with Alberta and any other oil-producing province for the exploration dollars that are available from the Mobil's and the Husky Bow Vallies and the Chevrons. Mr. Chairman, where will Premier Lougheed come down if he has got to give Newfoundland advice that competes with the better interest of his own province?

Mr. Speaker, there may be another factor applied here. It is very obvious now from the fiasco of the FFTs that our Premier, Mr. Peckford, and the government, has

not got too much influence with Ottawa. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that they are not getting along, they are being ignored, they were passed the Atlantic Accord and said, "Here, take this, and we expect you to keep quiet for the next four years." Mr. Lougheed is not of any great value to Mr. Mulroney anymore. He is the ex-premier, as the minister says. He may not be of any great political value to Mr. Mulroney. But maybe the Premier in recognizing in his own inability to negotiate with Mr. Mulroney to even be able to convince our Federal MPs to negotiate with Mr. Mulroney, he recognizes the fact that he is getting nowhere. He may be going to have or hope to have Mr. Lougheed run interference between the Newfoundland Government and Ottawa.

But whatever the reasons, Mr. Speaker, we are retaining the ex-premier of Alberta, Mr. Lougheed. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) made a good point by the way, he is coming in as a consultant. Over the years Mr. Lougheed has been known for his great public relations ability. He has the best price advisers in this country to look at pricing regimes and look at the federal/provincial agreements in oil. Mr. Lougheed's strength was in negotiating with Ottawa. Maybe that is the service we are looking for and not necessarily the technical advice that we are going to need to put the package together that will see this Province prosper when we finally get to the production of oil.

Mr. Speaker, whatever reason we have retained the ex-premier of Alberta, the people of Newfoundland have a right to know. It is their money, it is

their tax dollars. I remember, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Energy stood in his place when he was not in Cabinet and demanded of his own Premier, the Premier he was supporting, the price tag of everything that happened in that government. I remember when he stood there and he was applauded for it, Mr. Speaker, all over this Province.

Now I am simply asking the minister to take the same position now. Regardless of how respected he is, regardless of what he is or who he is, he is being paid out of the public purse of this Province, and the people who are paying that bill have a right to know, Mr. Speaker, how much the package is going to cost.

They have a right to see that contract. I ask the minister again, why it is he is not prepared to table the contract or any document pertaining to the retention of Mr. Lougheed? Mr. Speaker, there is nothing trite or political about that. I am simply asking for the information that the people of Newfoundland are entitled to.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, it is a common thought in Newfoundland that Newfoundlanders are their own worst enemies, but you see a living example over there in the hon. gentleman. They also elect their own worst enemies.

When the Premier got up and made his announcement, and in my response, we made it quite clear, the hon. Mr. Lougheed will be paid a fee up front of \$40,000 per year, plus travel expenses, no more or no less. Why is the hon. gentleman trying to discredit the appointment of Mr. Lougheed?

I might say, it was repeated today. I heard it on the radio, which is typical of a type from time to time, a shallow type of thinking in this Province where it is reported, I heard on the radio this morning following the gentleman's question reporting, he said, "oh the people of Newfoundland would like to know how much he is being paid?"

That reporter and the hon. gentleman knew how much he was going to be paid because the Premier said it right here in this House as to the amount he was going to be paid.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I say we gave it up front. But we also say that every single solitary nickel, dime, cent, and dollar that we pay to that distinguished Canadian in assisting us in our upcoming negotiations on the fiscal regime are going to be dollars well spent. The hon. gentleman does not even know what it is all about. In negotiating the fiscal regime, we sit down with the companies and we sit down with our partners in Ottawa.

MR. FLIGHT:

Just like on the FFTs.

MR. MARSHALL:

Will the hon. gentleman keep

quiet? We sit down and we negotiate a satisfactory fiscal regime to bring on Hibernia. We are into a new area. We have got one of the most trustworthy people in Canada to advise us with respect to it, and I am very proud that we are able to get his services.

Now the type of thinking of the hon. gentleman and the reporter on the radio, who just repeats it verbatim, is the type of thing that we have received. Make no wonder, Mr. Speaker, over the years we were vassals of Britain for 400 years and the hon. gentleman tried to make his vessels of Ottawa. That is the reason why.

The fact of the matter is that we are negotiating an agreement over Hibernia. We can negotiate this agreement because we have the right to set royalties as if they were located on land. As a result of the Atlantic Accord, we are in the same position, Mr. Speaker, as Alberta with respect to the development of Hibernia. So what better person to get than the former Premier of Alberta, a champion of Provincial rights, a person who helped us every month and every day when we were going through that awful fight with the hon. gentleman's friends their opposite in trying to get our legitimate birthright, which we finally achieved. What better person could we get to advise us than Premier Lougheed?

Instead of concentrating on what he is being paid, which is low and which nobody could dispute, the hon. gentleman should concentrate on the positive aspects that in negotiating -

MR. FLIGHT:

Where is the contract?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:  
- in negotiating the royalty regime, in negotiating benefits that will come to the people of this Province we are able to get the services of Mr. Lougheed. He should be glad of that. But he is not glad of it because he represents a party that would like to build their own fortunes on gloom and doom and depression. He would like to see the young people of this Province not get jobs and to see unemployment at the present rate that it is now. As we battle to bring unemployment up to the average in Canada and above it, Mr. Speaker, we count ourselves fortunate that we got the services of Mr. Lougheed.

I thank the hon. gentleman, who is showing that he is, you know, Newfoundlanders are their own worst enemies, so, in that sense, he is a true Newfoundlander. He should concentrate on the positive rather than tear down.

He knows how much Mr. Lougheed has been paid. So why does he want to highlight it? Because he wants to tie down and because, quite frankly, he has not got the breath, none of them have, and the understanding to understand what we are about in bringing jobs to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and getting the same rights as Albertans have.

The hon. gentleman for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) knows. I am sure he appreciates the fact that we have the same rights with respect to our offshore as Alberta. So we have the ex-Premier of Alberta in

to help us and I am very proud we have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:  
If the hon. gentleman was a little boy his mother would wash his mouth out with lye soap for what he said. That is an expression from ages ago. Politically, the hon. gentleman is a consummate disgrace when he gets up in this House and he makes that kind of attack on the integrity of a person of the stature of Mr. Lougheed, who we are very pleased to have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is dissatisfied with the answer given by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) regarding the lack of negotiation by this government with the federal government in Ottawa.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAIRD:  
Get the hay.

MR. CALLAN:  
Earlier this afternoon I was asking the President of the Council what he thought of Captain Morrissey Johnson's comments this morning on the **Open Line** programme, the programme that the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) thought nobody listened to except welfare recipients. But others listen

because somebody phoned in this morning from Rankin Inlet, I think, in the Northwest Territories. But, Mr. Speaker, Captain Morrissey Johnson said that the reason this government -

MR. DAWE:

Why do you not run federally?

MR. CALLAN:

I intend to, the time will come.

MR. TULK:

And unlike you, he will be elected.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, Captain Morrissey Johnson said that this government lost its fight with the federal government, their Tory friends in Ottawa, he said, over factory freezer trawlers because, and I quote what he said, he said there was too much public discussion over this matter and not enough negotiation. I do not know if the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid) was listening to the Open Line programme, he was ahead of me, he was just pulling his pickup truck into the Fort Hotel so he had to hear it if he was listening. If he wants to, on the way out of town, he can drop into VOCA and get a transcript of it because I remember it verbatim. He said, "there has been too much public discussion over this matter," referring, of course, to the phony fight by the Premier, where he introduced the resolution, the charade, that is all it was. The Premier knew and I dare say, Mr. Speaker, that everybody on the government benches probably knew what the Premier knew three weeks ago, that factory freezer trawlers were a fait accompli for this Province three weeks ago.

The Premier admitted it last night

and the Fisheries Minister admitted it in today's paper. Last night he admitted it, and he admitted it again today, even though he squirmed as he did just now in trying to answer a question by my colleague.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is your question?

MR. CALLAN:

The question is the same question that was asked today at 3:45, would the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) not agree that the whole thing is a charade and it has been from day one?

Just now the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) said that we did not fight against our Liberal colleague in Ottawa a year or more ago when they were crucifying Newfoundland. Well, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundland was not being crucified at all because the Premier cannot have it both ways. He cannot in one pamphlet say that the Liberals in Ottawa are crucifying us and in another pamphlet talk about all of the good things that came from Ottawa. We saw them last night on **Here and Now**. We saw the picture of the pamphlet with the owl titled: **Whooo Can't Negotiate?** The Premier listed of all the things that Ottawa had given us since 1979, since he became Premier. It is nothing only a bluff, Mr. Speaker.

If the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the President of the Council, the Vice-Premier, the gentleman responsible for the Petroleum Directorate, if he wants to be honest and show the integrity that everybody says he has, he will get up on his feet, Mr. Speaker, and admit that what

Captain Morrissey Johnson said this morning is correct and it did not just start with factory freezer trawlers, it started back in 1979 when the Premier won four elections on bashing somebody else, an enemy from afar. Will the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) get up and admit that Captain Morrissey Johnson is correct when he says that?

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Oh my! Oh my! Oh my! Mr. Chairman, you would think they would keep Billy Goat Gruff confined to his pen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is getting up in the House and asking asinine questions! Today he talks about negotiate. The hon. member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and our illustrious Premier, who sticks up for the people of Newfoundland, were down today - you talk about negotiation - to Burin. What were they doing in Burin? They were signing an agreement that they had negotiated with respect to the Burin plant, the same Burin plant that Senator Kirby, the hon. gentleman's colleague, was going to close down.

MR. TOBIN:  
And the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons).

MR. MARSHALL:  
And the member for Fortune - Hermitage and all of the hon.

gentlemen there opposite. When they went down there, Mr. Speaker, they went by the plant in Grand Bank which we negotiated the opening and the continuance of. That is thriving down there, as well as up the Coast. Even though I come within the overpass and I know it is quite a distance but you have Harbour Breton that we negotiated that is now down there working. And up a little while further we have Gaultois. So what nonsense about we cannot negotiate! We can go on with the Atlantic Accord and we can go on with it all.

Now, the hon. gentleman thinks he has a small little political point but it is a very small little political point because the hon. gentlemen there opposite have no faith in Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker. I do not know what decision will emanate from Ottawa one way or the other but this I do know, that the the people of Newfoundland do not need factory freezer trawlers in order to produce high quality products in this Province. They do not need factory freezer trawlers because, Mr. Speaker, we live in an area in the North Atlantic. We live, in effect, on a large factory freezer trawler and we have all of these plants that are operating today that will be able to compete and compete quite effectively with anybody in any part of Canada.

Imagine the hon. gentleman getting up on a point to keep this House to the adjournment and he is dissatisfied because of a question he asked me about what the member for Bonavista - Trinity - Conception (Mr. Johnson) said and what comment had I to make on his comment when he was making a comment somewhere else. I mean,

how asinine! Mr. Speaker, no wonder Joey rejected them and turned them lose. Make no wonder, Mr. Speaker. After two or three years of being in with Mr. Neary and being in with the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry).

MR. CALLAN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

It is quite obvious that the minister, or at least he gets a minister's salary, is at a loss for words to defend what Captain Johnson said this morning. So what does he do? He gets up and he gets involved, number one, in what somebody looks like, and then personalities, as he did with the Leader of the Opposition on television saying he was unstable. The same thing was happening a few years back, Mr. Speaker, when they talked about Mr. Smallwood being senile. That was what they did in 1970 and 1971 and 1972. If the minister does not intend to answer the question, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that he sit down, rather than get into personalities, innuendo and dirt.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, I must rule there is no point of order.

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I am so sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I upset -

MR. CALLAN:

I am glad your hands are in your

pockets and not mine.

MR. MARSHALL:

Sir, I would not have my hands in the hon. gentleman's pocket. I would not put my hands anywhere near the hon. gentleman, I can tell you that. The hon. gentleman is very touchy. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the consummate gall. Here is a fellow, who this week has gotten up and voted for factory freezer trawlers, getting up and asking me to comment upon what some member of parliament said. When hon. gentleman can stand up for Newfoundland, the same way the members on this side of the House, then he can afford to speak. I am sorry I called the hon. member a 'Joey reject'.

MR. CALLAN:

Will you apologize to the Leader of the Opposition for calling him unstable?

MR. MARSHALL:

I apologize, yes. The hon. gentleman is not necessarily unstable, but he very frequently is in the stable.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have answered the hon. gentleman effectively, I hope. I would suggest if the hon. gentleman wishes to employ himself constructively that he should plan a little bit more what he brings up in the late show in the House.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

It is now six o'clock. It is moved and seconded the House do now adjourn. All those in favour "Aye", those against, "Nay". Carried.

The House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.