

VOL. 2

NO. 19

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 1983.

The House met at 3:00 P.M

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MS. VERGE: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

So that Hon. members of this House of Assembly and the general public of the Province can be better informed about the strike taken by the Newfoundland Teachers' Association that has closed most of our schools, I wish to quote from the directive issued by the NTA to teachers. The NTA has told teachers that they "will not (1) Perform any supervisions, whether timetabled or not, including lunch hour, bus duty, etc.; (2) Complete cumulative records; (3) Complete Department of Education or School Board forms other than monthly returns; (4) Conduct parent-teacher interviews; (5) Attend any committee meetings of School Boards or the Department of Education; (6) Accept any reassignment of duties; (7) Perform any extra-curricular activities."

Further, the NTA told principals and vice-principals that they are to cease being responsible for supervision of students, to cease attending any meetings convened by the School Board and to remain out of the school building until 5 minutes before each session and leave the building 5 minutes after each session

Yesterday, the NTA directed program co-ordinators and other professionals in the bargaining unit who work out of School Board district offices to withdraw fully their services.

MS. VERGE: It seems incredible,
Mr. Speaker, that the NTA President has pretended that
this is not really a strike.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for
Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, this is
information that the public already have, that hon.
members already have. Obviously, it is just a blatant
attempt by the minister to further erode and undermine
the present teachers' dispute. Mr. Speaker, about all
I can say is again to remind the hon. minister that

MR. LUSH: this is not a strike. The teachers voted for a selected withdrawal of supervisory services. That is what it was, Mr. Speaker. And it is a lockout, Mr. Speaker, forced by the government and the school boards of this Province, and that is all one can say.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) instead of making this innocuous statement today would have come in and indicated some positive action that she has taken to try and resolve the teacher dispute in the Province. So my question to the minister is what action has she taken in the past twenty-four hours to try and resolve the teacher dispute in the Province and indicate whether she has taken any new initiatives to try and get education back on the tracks again in this Province? So if the minister could respond to that quickly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, since Question Period yesterday, over the last twenty-four hours there has been no approach by the Newfoundland Teachers' Association to anyone in the provincial government - Treasury Board, the Department of Labour and Manpower, the Department of Education - nor has there been any approach made by the N.T.A. to the Federation of School Boards.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I did not ask the minister what initiatives were taken by the N.T.A or by the Federation of School Boards, I asked the minister what initiatives she has taken - that was the question - what

MR. LUSH: initiatives she has taken in the past twenty-four hours, whether she has been going around with olive branches?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I have certainly been available, I have been sitting by a phone and sleeping by a phone. I have not had any calls from anyone in an official capacity with the Newfoundland Teachers' Association and neither have anyone in the provincial government. And it will not be until the Newfoundland Teachers' Association indicate to the provincial government and the Federation of Schools Boards that they have accepted the realities of the financial situation facing this Province today, that they are willing to accept the provincial government's wage restraint guidelines for the full two years of their contract term, the same as they have been accepted by

MS. VERGE:

10,000 other public servants, that it will be possible to resolve the current dispute that has, regrettably, led to strike action being taken by the Newfoundland Teachers' Association.

MR. LUSH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, what the minister has said, of course, is the same as she has been saying all along, that she had done nothing, and it looks like she plans to do nothing. Mr. Speaker, a further question to the minister. I wonder if the minister can indicate whether she has interceded to see if the collective bargaining process, or the legislation affecting the collective bargaining process for teachers has within it other channels whereby this dispute can be resolved? For example, I cite the process of mediation and the process of arbitration. Has the minister looked into this possibility and has she consulted with the NTA to see whether they would agree with either of these processes?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the legislation does provide for binding arbitration to resolve the dispute between the Newfoundland Teachers' Association and their employers. Indeed, last Fall the Newfoundland Teachers' Association formally requested that government direct the outstanding issues to that process. Government replied, quite correctly, that we would not agree to delegating our responsibility, that has been vested in us by the voters of the Province, to independent third parties

MS. VERGE: to direct the spending of a very large percentage of the budget of this provincial government. After all, the provincial government has budgeted for the payroll of teachers in this Province for the current fiscal year some \$260-odd million. That is pay for 8,500 teachers at an average annual salary of \$30,000.

As for possibilities of resolution through mediation or conciliation, these possibilities are certainly well known to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association as well as the employer side of this dispute. The Department of Labour and Manpower very ably provides these services and

MS. VERGE:

they have been used to advantage in resolving many other major management disputes in our Province. My colleague, the minister responsible, will be able to speak to that, but I understand that an approach was made by the Deputy Minister of Labour and Manpower to the parties in this dispute presently under discussion as recently as a few days ago, but seemingly the Newfoundland Teachers' Association had not interest in talking to him or resuming any other kind of talks that might possibly lead to a settlement of this dispute and an end to the strike.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Again, Mr. Speaker, the minister has three or four pat answers and regardless of the questions she comes out with these answers. The question was whether the minister, in her role as mediator and with her responsibility to see that education is functioning in this Province, has herself interceded to see whether or not the Newfoundland Teachers' Association would agree to any of these processes of conciliation, mediation, arbitration or whatever, has she herself interceded within the past twenty-four hours, or within the past week, to see if the NTA would be agreeable to accepting either of these collective bargaining processes to solve the dispute that we are now experiencing in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you and other hon. members of this House of Assembly have noticed, the member opposite keeps repeating the same questions and then he expresses displeasure when I repeat the same answers. I do not think this is really getting anyone anywhere. I would like to come back to something said

MS. VERGE: by the Leader of the Opposition
(Mr. Neary). Yesterday he made the comment that he could
tell us all where we can get more money for the teachers.
I would like him to tell everyone here just how much more
the average salary for a teacher should be than \$30,000
a year and, indeed,

MS. VERGE:

enlighten us on where we could get that money. Does he think that we should raise our taxes again? Does he think that we should add to our deficit? A few million dollars more, what difference? Does he think we should take it from the hospital budgets, maybe from the Department of Social Services? Maybe we should not be spending so much money on road improvements this year. I would very much like the members opposite to come up with some constructive ideas about the substance of government's package offered to the NTA.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, this is the second day in a row now that we have had questions directed to the Opposition. At least it shows that they recognize that we have the answers over here. It shows that, Mr. Speaker. Now there is a tremendous concern by parents throughout this Province as to what is going to happen if there is a long drawn-out lockout. If this lockout continues for a long time, naturally the parents are concerned about what is going to happen to the students and whether they are going to complete their programmes. It is my understanding that the minister has enunciated some plan in order to allay the fears of parents that their children will not be able to complete their courses this year. Could the minister briefly outline to the House what plans she has, if this lockout is long and drawn out, what plans, what guidelines she has so that students will be able to complete the year? Does she plan to set up correspondence courses from K to 11 or what? And how quickly can she get this kind of thing in gear?

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of
Education.

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad
that I received a question about the students who are
being affected by this strike, action that has been taken
by other people, circumstances over which they have
no control. Over the last two days I and officials of
my department, and indeed all the members of this government
have addressed ourselves to the question of how we can
assist students and their parents who want to study
at home and carry on with their school work during this
strike while their schools are closed. We have come up
with some creative ideas which I will be outlining in a
statement to this hon. House tomorrow.

MS VERGE: We all hope that the strike will be over very soon. The ultimate goal has to be using the collective bargaining process to effect a swift resolution to get a settlement so that schools can reopen and students can return to their classes and receive normal instruction from their teachers. And I do not want to mislead anyone, there can be no replacement for regular classroom instruction by teachers. Students are being hurt by the strike, students will be hurt, there is no getting around that. I think everyone appreciates that some percentage of students can manage pretty well on their own because they happen to be fortunate in having parents who provide enlightened guidance and supervision and support, students who perhaps are bright, have initiative of their own, who will carry on with their reading and studying without the benefit of teacher guidance in their homes. There are perhaps other students who, because of their intelligence and motivation, after missing school - when, of course, usually students miss school because they are sick or because they go away on holidays with their parents - on returning to school can learn at an accelerated pace and quickly make up for lost time. However, the majority are not in this fortunate position. The majority of students need all the help from their teachers they can get, and because most of our courses are structured sequentially, concept B has to be mastered before a student can progress to understand concept C. And if school is out while concept B should have been taught, then students will have a lot of trouble moving from concept A to concept B. So let nobody misunderstand me, I am not suggesting for a minute that this strike is not hurting students, it is

MS VERGE: hurting students, but, as I say,
the Department of Education will mount whatever service we
can very quickly to assist students and their parents at
home where students want to work on their own to keep up
with their school work to do the best they can

MS. L. VERGE: while their schools are closed and while they are being deprived of regular classroom instruction by their teachers. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we fail to achieve our ultimate goal of getting the NTA to see reason and effecting a mutual agreement, a settlement, and getting schools to reopen, if the strike drags on, then, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Education, I and my officials, will address ourselves to the question of changing course content, adapting outlines of curricula, changing the contents of exams to allow for the time missed due to the strike so that when students get back to school, when schools reopen they will be able to pick up where they left off and they will not be deprived of time missed because of the strike.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health.

I understand that medical officials of the Department of the Health through the International Grenfell Association has compiled a report on health care in coastal Labrador and central Labrador. Has the minister received a copy of this report?

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of reports that have been done for Health, there are a number of statements that have come in from various boards, so I do not exactly know what the member is referring to. If he is referring to a statement that was made just recently that there was one done on North West River, there was never one

MR. W. HOUSE: done on North West River for the Department of Health.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the next question to the Minister of Health (Mr. House) is concerning the North West River Hospital. Has the minister's department had any consultation with people either in North West River or Coastal Labrador before his department made the decision to close down the North West River Hospital? Could the minister tell us what were the reasons for closing down the North West River Hospital.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I gave that information to the House shortly after the budget. I gave the information then and I will repeat it now: That the department, with the information that it had received in its various reports of occupancy of these hospitals, made the decision when we saw that the hospital in North West River had about a 39 per cent occupancy and the Melville Hospital in Goose Bay had about a 50 per cent occupancy, we felt reorganizing all of the services in the Melville area that

MR. HOUSE: we could very adequately accommodate the people who needed to be accommodated. That was the basis on which it was done. We did not sit down one night and dream about it, Mr. Speaker. We had gathered information over a long period of time, and we made the decision and we gave six months notice of that particular decision when the budget was brought down. We said we would phase it out within the six month period.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I believe this government has been dreaming for the last several years. In fact it is ironic that the minister should make such a statement and the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) did not know until fifteen minutes before the budget was brought down that it was in the budget about North West River Hospital. I would like to ask the Minister another question. In view of the fact that Dr. Dyson in Lake Melville Hospital has publicly stated that they cannot accommodate the chronically ill patients, what has the minister's department decided to do with the chronically ill patients who are presently at the North West River Hospital?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, shortly after the budget we sent two people down from the department, our personnel officer and our nursing consultant, and then our Deputy and the Assistant Deputy went down later to meet with the board.

MR. NEARY: What time are you going down?

MR. HOUSE: I am going down. I will be down there. Do not worry about it. You do not have to worry. The Opposition does not have to worry about things I am going to do, Mr. Speaker. We are going to do what has to be done.

MR. NEARY: Yes we do.

MR. HOUSE: We are going to do what has to be done. And, Mr. Speaker, I have had no contact with Dr. Dyson. As a matter of fact, my contact is with the board and the administrator of the board. And I am advised that we are going to be adequately able to look after the chronic care people.

I saw a programme the other night, Mr. Speaker, a CBC programme, a very well documented programme, I might add, and I had some opinions expressed on it after and one of the opinions expressed to me is there is one person who required this service and we should keep the fifty-one bed hospital open for one or two people. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, none of these people who are involved will have to go out of Labrador for the service. They are going to get their service in Labrador. There is no such thing as them having to go into St. Anthony for that service.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Premier. In view of the fact that he has received a request from the President of the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees asking if there would be a commission on enquiry into health care along the Labrador Coast and in North West River before a decision is made in the closing down and the phasing out of the North West River Hospital, would the Premier advise whether he will agree to an intensive study into health care in Coastal Labrador and in Central Labrador before a decision is made to close down the North West River Hospital?

MR. HODDER: A good question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the President of NAPE, I guess it was, as the hon. member says, wrote me a letter asking me for my opinions and to, I think, respond to the request by him and his association as it related to some kind of inquiry and I have responded to the President of that association. I guess the letter is in the mail, I do not know if the President has received it, so I would not want to release my answer here before the President receives it. But obviously the government is interested in looking at the health care delivery system for the Province. We have made certain initiatives, taken certain actions on the Island and are now taking certain actions in Labrador. So what the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and his people and the Social Policy Committee of Cabinet and the whole Cabinet have been considering and which was contained in

PREMIER PECKFORD: the budget was to see whether we should not have an independent examination of the whole area of health costs and health delivery system in the Province as a whole. I think we would be doing a great disservice to health care if we suddenly tried to isolate a particular geographic region because we do have serious problems in health care costs all over the Province, in the hospitals, in the whole area, and in chronic care as well. So the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and his people and myself and others have been working very hard over the last two weeks to live up to the commitment that we made in the budget, which was to establish

PREMIER PECKFORD: an independent group to examine the health care costs of the Province, and obviously that would include the hon. member's interest, and that is the Labrador Coast and the Melville area and so on.

So I think that the hon. member can anticipate over the next couple of days of having an independent assessment done on the whole question of health care in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador rather than any one geographic region.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary to the Premier is that when the Premier was campaigning in the last general election and in the previous one, in August of 1979, the Premier told the people of Labrador that they would be consulted on affairs that would affect them. The Premier said in both election campaigns that the people of Labrador would be consulted on affairs that would affect them. Now the closing of the North West River Hospital does affect the people in Labrador. Who has the Premier consulted with? What people in Labrador has the Premier or his government consulted with before they made the drastic decision to close down the North West River Hospital? Not even the member up there.

MR. CALLAN: A good question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, obviously -

MR. WARREN: Not even their own member. He did not even know it until fifteen minutes before the Budget.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The hon. gentleman should realize we have a hospital board in place and we have been examining health care costs in many of the hospitals over the last three or four years.

MR. NEARY: They already said you were incompetent.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If the hon. member wants an answer, I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, to give him an answer, but I cannot answer the hon. gentleman if he is going to interrupt. I listened to him and his question and now I expect him to listen to my answer.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: So, Mr. Speaker, obviously he does not want an answer, I suppose.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). I want to ask the minister whether there would be minimum prices set for lobster this year. The year before last there was a minimum price set and held to, last year there was not. The dollar value of lobster, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STAGG: Anything for a lobster interview.

MR. HODDER: If the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) thinks that this is a frivolous question, perhaps the member should go back to Stephenville and continue watching hockey as he has been doing all week.

But the dollar value of lobster is greater than that of the seal fishery, the crab fishery or the herring or caplin fishery,

MR. HODDER: and yet there has been little effort to regulate or develop the handling and processing of the lobster.

The question for the minister is does the minister's department have any plans for the coming year to help the industry and will there be a guaranteed minimum price this year?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is right when he says that the lobster fishery is indeed a very valuable part of our fishing industry. Last year the landed value of our lobster was \$9.7 million, approximately \$10 million, the landed value to fishermen.

With regard to the price to be paid this year to the fishermen, that is to be a matter of discussion, in fact this afternoon, at a meeting after Question Period. As of the last few days, I have been in contact with the major buyers, the companies involved in buying lobsters, and asked them to come along to a meeting today in St. John's. I understand that some people are here in St. John's for that meeting. The meeting is called as a result of a meeting which I held last week in Gander with the Fishermen's Union, again at their request, whereby lobster fishermen from around the Province came to that meeting. We discussed a number of issues pertaining to the lobster fishery, one of them being the prices to be paid to lobster fishermen, and other matters like the buying practices of the buyers and the varying prices in different regions, etc.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have no further comment to make with regard to what will be done this year until a full consultation is completed - in

MR. MORGAN: this case, consultation last week with the union and the lobster fishermen and today with the buyers and the companies involved in buying lobster at this afternoon's meeting.

Also, at that same meeting, I will have the Newfoundland Fishing Industry Advisory Board which, of course, is the board that does all the research work in the market place to determine the market conditions.

After today's meeting, I will be in a position to comment further with regard to what prices will be paid this year. But I will say before I do sit down, Mr. Speaker, that we will leave no stone unturned to ensure that the fishermen receive a fair price for lobster again this year.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if the lobster fishermen in this Province receive a fair price for their lobster this year, it will be the first time they have ever received it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, every year we hear of conferences and meetings but nothing comes of it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the minister based on a report which was submitted to the Fishing Industry Advisory Board. Now, we have had a problem in this Province with lobster mortality - mortality from the fishermen to market. There is a high rate of mortality which drags down the price of lobster to the fishermen. What I want to ask the minister is has any of the recommendations which were made to

MR. HODDER: the Fishing Industry Advisory Board re establishment of receiving stations or pick-up points where lobster fishermen could deliver their catches or the establishment of central holding stations or pounds where lobsters could be held until they

MR. HODDER:

are sufficiently strengthened and seasoned for shipment to market, which was something that was sent to the Fishing Industry Advisory Board last year by the Fishermen's Union, it was a report to the Fishing Industry Advisory Board - in the last year has the minister done anything in this Province to improve the handling and processing of lobsters so as to give the fishermen a better price or is this another last minute last ditch attempt to boost up the prices?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman again is totally confused as it pertains to the fishing industry. It seems that all members of the Opposition do not have any clues about Newfoundland's most important industry, the fishing industry. I find it rather strange that they have not any clues about what is going on. Governments do not set the prices for fish species. Government does not set the prices. The year before last, Mr. Speaker, the Fishermen's Union was successful in negotiating with one of the large buyers, in this case from Nova Scotia, a price for lobsters, and based on that union negotiated price we agreed to have all the buyers pay that union negotiated price. And that was done the year before last. Last year the Fishermen's Union was not successful in negotiating a price with any buyer, and so far this year there has been no negotiations concluded with regard to prices to be paid fishermen. All I am saying is that I am going to work in close co-ordination with the Fishermen's Union and at the same time I am going to be in full consultation with the buyers and the companies to make sure, as I say again, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that the fishermen in the Province will indeed receive a fair price for the lobsters this year in the same way

MR.MORGAN: they received a fair price last year for the lobster species.

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): The final question in the Question Period. The hon. member for Port Au Port.

MR.HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I note that the minister did not answer the question about recommendations re the mortality of lobsters. The high mortality of lobsters very often is what drives down the price of lobsters to markets outside of Newfoundland and I would like to make a note that the minister did not answer that question. But I will ask the minister another question. Has the minister given any consideration to holding lobsters, as they do in Nova Scotia, for long periods of time somewhere in Newfoundland? It does not matter where it is, a suitable bay or inlet in Newfoundland, but has the minister given any consideration to the holding of lobsters in pounds so that they can be held and the fishermen can get better prices for them when the Christmas market starts in Europe? Has there been any consideration to holding them as the Nova Scotians are doing in the Bedford Basin?

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries

MR.MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, with regards to the prices being paid the Newfoundland fishermen versus the prices paid the Nova Scotian fishermen, last year throughout the lobster season the difference in price between what was paid the fishermen from Nova Scotia and from Newfoundland was twenty cents a pound maximum in the difference. Now we all know there are transportation costs involved and shipping costs from Newfoundland to the markets in the US, and Boston in particular. Now on the second point, Mr. Speaker,

MR. MORGAN: the part about holding lobsters, or pounding them, the hon. gentleman obviously has a very poor memory, because last year when we sat down with the estimates committee for the Department of Fisheries, and the hon. gentleman was then there at that session, I understand, I explained then we were going to get involved this past year, we had funds allocated for that purpose, to get involved in a project, a pilot project, to have lobsters pounded this year -

MR. STAGG: What year was that?

MR. MORGAN: '83 - to be held until the market closed in the US in particular, and to cull out the female lobsters and to hold the male lobsters, and to sell these lobsters in the US market after the market officially closes.

MR. NEARY: Sit down, boy, and do not be so foolish.

MR. MORGAN: And, Mr. Speaker, the funds were approved last year. The same hon. gentleman who asked the question was at the meeting of the estimates committee last year when we were told that, the funds were approved. Also the question was asked, Who are you going to involve, what company? Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to say that the company we involved, Mr. Speaker, is in the hon. Speaker's district.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The time for Question Period has expired.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: The minister said that I was in his committee when he said that. That was not correct, But if the minister is trying to tell me that at this present time there is a lobster holding facility in my district, he had better come out to the district and look at it, because it is not to be seen by human eyes.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

MR. HODDER: No, I agree, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members' Day, we shall proceed with motion Number 3, moved by the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin).

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, it was a few weeks ago that the debate occurred and I did not realize that I had adjourned the debate. I think that we should use the opportunity afforded to the House with this motion to discuss a very imaginative proposal put forth by the provincial government to the federal government, which has been delegated to Mr. Kirby to examine, which would in effect reopen the fish plants on the South Coast, and particularly the fish plants in the districts of the hon. the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) and the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart). We have not to date heard the response of the Opposition with respect to that particular proposal and it is very unfortunate that we have not. I think it is very unfortunate in the first place that we did not get immediate and unhesitating approval and support from the Opposition to that proposal. It is the only proposal that is before the federal government, or before the public at all, which envisages the operation of these plants that have been closed down. Because what quite clearly happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the Opposition mistakingly were supporting the options that were presented through the federal government. It was not the requisite restructuring of the fisheries in this Province but rather it was a matter of restructuring certain companies. It was a matter of the option that was most favoured by the federal government, which was an amalgamation of Nickersons and National Sea, which are Nova Scotian companies.

MR. S. NEARY: You know that that is not true.

MR. W. MARSHALL: That happens to be true. It happens to be a matter of record, Mr. Speaker, and the fact that the hon. gentleman says it is not true is not going to make it untrue.

MR. NEARY: Just because you say it is true does not make it true either.

MR. MARSHALL: I said the option that was favoured by the federal government was the amalgamation of National Sea and Nickersons, and the amalgamation of Fishery Products, the Lake Group of Companies and John Penney and Sons. The net result of this, Mr. Speaker, would have been to transfer to Nova Scotia a substantial control and a substantial advantage in respect to the fishery in the North Atlantic and that really

MR. MARSHALL: was going to occur. It did not address itself, it pointed the finger at the culprit or the problem with respect to the fishery to the fish plants, which is not correct. There are many problems associated with the fishery and I am sure that it is very difficult to encapsulate the problems in a very short period of time. But the major problem, obviously, has to be with respect to the deep-sea fishery, has to be the method of harvesting fish. And we have proposed a single corporation for the purpose of operating the trawlers, to see that the trawlers are deployed in respect to the resource owned by the people of Newfoundland in a way that can most beneficially and most efficiently supply the plants that need the resource for the purpose of carrying on their operations. That was the first step.

The second step was to keep all the fish plants open, and ultimately the hope of the government would be to get the fish plants themselves, the processing units, down into smaller entities than they are now. You would not have one company owning a whole lot of plants. Because all you have to do, Mr. Speaker, is look at the record. The record shows in this Province that while the major fish companies and the major plants were having a tremendous problem wrestling with the economic situation in which we find ourselves today, at the same time the smaller fish plants showed a much greater measure of success. And I think, you know, that that is significant in itself. And on the Burin Peninsula, for instance, it is obviously, I think, in the best interest of all the people on the Burin Peninsula that the plants be owned by different companies and they be competing on a healthy basis.

MR. MARSHALL: And the other part of the equation, Mr. Speaker, was the marketing, the joint marketing of the fish by the Province, to have a proper marketing scheme such as had never been employed before. So, Mr. Speaker, that is the plan and envisaged in that plan, of course, one of the major concerns, which has to be the supply of fish itself, and this involves getting for the people of this Province the amount of fish that is now taken by the foreign countries because this should not be. While the plants in Newfoundland are not working there is no reason why this fish should go to the European markets or European companies or what have you. And secondly, it requires a commitment on the part of the federal government which controls the fishing licences and the stocks of fish, to permit the stocks to be used in the Province of Newfoundland.

There is sufficient time, Mr. Speaker, within the next little while. Our information is that there will be about a 25 per cent increase in the amount of fish that is available. So it would certainly seem very counterproductive to be closing the plants. Because what would happen, Mr. Speaker, and what was obviously in the plans with respect to this option one that the hon. gentleman there opposite supported -

MR. NEARY: That is not true. You are bluffing.

MR. MARSHALL:

He does not even know what I am saying. What was in the plans; There were freezer trawlers that were to go up and take the Northern cod and bring it to Nova Scotia. And the fact of the matter is that this requires a commitment by all parties. The Provincial Government is prepared to give a commitment, and it requires a commitment from the Federal Government with respect to the whole situation, particularly with respect to the deployment of the fishery stocks and the use of the fishery stocks in this Province. And once again, very sadly, Mr. Speaker, whatever is brought up in this province that goes against the grain of the existing Federal government, the hon. gentlemen there opposite will not support, whether it is good for the people of Newfoundland or whether it is not.

Once again we get the scenario, is my party right or wrong? If it is against the Liberal party we will not support it notwithstanding the fact it might be in the best interest of the people of Newfoundland and notwithstanding the fact that this basic resource, very basic to our own livelihood in many of the communities, is being diverted to communities in Nova Scotia. So, once again, I would like to say just in closing, Mr. Speaker, if I may, that I would like to know where the gentlemen on the other side of the House stand with respect to this imaginative proposal that will come to grips with the fishing problems in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I would like, first of all, to read the amended resolution as put forward by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), where he strikes out some of the whereases that were put forward by the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin).

MR. NEARY: Who was playing politics, right?

MR. TULK: Where perhaps he was playing a bit of politics. Mr. Speaker, as the amended Resolution now reads it says, "WHEREAS the social and economic fabric of Newfoundland and Labrador has been and will continue to be interwoven with a viable fishing industry." That first Whereas, Mr. Speaker, I think was borrowed from a fisheries resolution that we put forward in the last sitting of the House. 'The social and economic fabric', I seem to remember that phrase quite well.

MR. NEARY: That was in our presentation to Kirby too.

MR. TULK: Yes, it was. So the member for Burin-Placentia West did a great job of borrowing that section and because it is ours the member for LaPoile decided well, it is good, and it is good, and therefore we will leave that in the amended Resolution. The next WHEREAS in the amended Resolution as put forward by the member for LaPoile reads: "WHEREAS the fishing industry during recent months has undergone severe economic adversity threatening the very existence of many communities in our Province." That, Mr. Speaker, can be practically borrowed from a Private Member's Resolution that, I believe, I put forward, the first one on the Order Paper for this year. Let there be no doubt that unless something happens, we have said this in this House, we have

MR. TULK: said it since the House opened this session, we said it in the last session, let there be no doubt that once a deep-sea plant in Gaultois closes, for example, once the deep-sea plant in Burin closes, that means the very existence of that community is dead.

So I want to commend the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) for this amended resolution. It is a great resolution, those two whereases. The rest of it, Mr. Speaker, I think he very wisely cut out, something about the Kirby Task Force. The federal government, of course, the Province had to get into the federal government it exercises the jurisdiction in the Province. 'And, WHEREAS it appears that restructuring of the industry may be necessary to ensure future viability' - the member for LaPoile wisely cut that out because there was nothing there to be said anyway. And then, Mr. Speaker, in the resolution part, he went on to call upon the governments of this Province and Canada to exercise without delay their responsibilities for ensuring the continued viability of the industry. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is not a statesman operating in this House then I do not know, really, what the meaning of the word 'statesman' is. The Leader of the Opposition obviously is concerned about what is going to happen to the South coast of the Province more so than he is concerned about playing politics.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. TULK: And that, Mr. Speaker, is more than we can say for some members on the other side of the House and, indeed, for the government itself. The member for LaPoile is indeed very concerned and he shows his concern in his amended resolution. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the things that should go down in his long

MR. TULK: history as a member of this House as one of the great things that he has done in this Province, indeed a great resolution. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has proven that he is a great statesman.

You see, Mr. Speaker, really the member for LaPoile could do nothing else. As I have said, really, he could do nothing else. Because really what is in that amended resolution is exactly what this side of the House has been saying. It was the original intent of our resolution that was brought into this House. Everything that is in there, that he has put back in, is really the intent of our resolution. It was the intent of a resolution that we brought in, saying that the government of this Province should lay its plan of action for the fishery, the processing sector of the industry, upon the table, because that is its primary responsibility.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I think we have to realize, and that is again what the resolution does, we have to realize that the fishing industry, the deep-sea fishing industry on the South Coast of this Province is too important for us to play politics with. It means the jobs of the whole of the South Coast and indeed it means the existence of the very life of the people on that coast and the communities themselves. Without the deep-sea fishery in many parts of the South Coast, as my hon. friend for the South Coast well knows - I see one of them here today, I do not see the other one - as he well knows, without the deep-sea fishery communities on the South Coast of this Province will die.

As we have said in this House before, if you kill the deep-sea fishing industry in Gaultois, if you kill it in Ramea, what you are doing, you are centralizing those communities through the backdoor. And that we have said, we have said, we were the first people to say it in this House, that we have said is not good enough and it is not acceptable to us.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I want, if I can in the few minutes that we have, to go back to a day in this Province that we on this side of the House were proud to be a part of and I speak, of course, of the day at Holiday Inns when everybody, even including the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) for this Province, stood and voted on a people's resolution, what has come to be called the people's resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we came into this House overjoyed, we were carried away. Perhaps we trusted the government too much, but we came into this House overjoyed, Mr. Speaker, because of what had happened, we had seen the Provincial Minister of Fisheries, the Provincial Opposition, the unions, all the communities, all of their committees, and

MR. TULK: the federal M.Ps. in this Province stand as one and say to the federal government and to everybody else concerned that indeed you have to keep our fish plants opened. In other words, -

MR. TOBIN: Where is it now?

MR. TULK: That is a very good question, I am going to get to where it is now, I will get to that for you.

We were proud, Mr. Speaker, because in the main industry in this Province, the fishing industry, we had put politics aside, all of us in this Province had felt we had put politics aside. The people had spoken. We came back in this House and we congratulated the people of Burin, we congratulated the government, we congratulated the federal M.Ps., and indeed we felt good and we said, we encourage you to do more.

MR. NEARY: What happened in the Cabinet Room that afternoon?

MR. TULK: What happened in the Cabinet Room that afternoon? What happened? Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this Province had to be the hero. He had to be in the front line. He had to have his cake. So he puts on the table a proposal that he had presented to the federal government.

MR. TOBIN: He what?

MR. TULK:

He put on the table a proposal that he had presented to the federal government.

MR. TOBIN:

No, he did not.

MR. NEARY:

So, tell him that.

MR. TULK:

Oh, our proposal. Are we not being asked by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) to support our proposal. Our proposal. We will get to that, Mr. Speaker. We will get to that. We will tell this government, and the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), that when we came into this House with a resolution that called for unity of purpose, unity to do something about the deep-sea fishery in this Province, that a member in this House, the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) decided to play a cute little trick. Blame it on Ottawa. That is their trick anyway. The Hell with the people of the South Coast, the Hell with the fishery, blame it on Ottawa. 'We', that is what they are saying over on that side, 'we, the Government of this Province, we have to have the praise'. And what happened to, as I said before, what happened to the people's resolution in this Province? The people's resolution which said that not one single fish plant in this Province should be closed, the resolution that everybody agreed with, what happened to it? As I said, the Premier had to have his one-upmanship. He had to have his glory. He had to be in the sun. He had to tell the people of this Province, the people who were sitting in that room all of that day, that really my proposal is the one. Mine is better than yours. A plan, Mr. Speaker, that was at least six months late, six to eight to twelve months late. We warned him last year in this House. I can remember

MR. TULK: the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) standing in this House and asking the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) a question as to whether some of the plants owned by Fishery Products were going to close. We warned what was going to happen. When did he present this great plan? Was it in November of last year? Was it in December of last year? Was it in October? Was it in January? Was it in February? No, Mr. Speaker, March 23rd., 1983. Something that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Premier in this Province, I suspect, very hurriedly put together after hearing all of the things that other people in this House had to say, the Opposition in this House had to say. And it is very clear, Mr. Speaker, as you go through this, what they must have done. The Minister of Fisheries and the Premier must have taken up Hansard and said, "Now we have to go through this and see what the Opposition has said so we can get a few ideas."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are happy. We are happy we finally got them to move. We finally got them after Question Period after Question Period, asking the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) what he was going to do, what his plan was for the deep-sea fishery in this Province, finally, on March 23rd., when everybody else had practically made up their minds as to what was going to happen in the restructuring of the fishing industry on the South Coast of this Province, after everybody else had

MR. B. TULK: practically made up their minds, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Premier decided that they were going to put their plan on paper. They took their little plan, a plan that I say to you quite sincerely they borrowed from the Opposition side of the House -

MR. ANDREWS: You have to do better than that.

MR. TULK: Let the gentleman over there be quiet. Go out and look after the environment, that is as much as he can do.

They took every little thing that was said, and there is no clear indication of that, I suppose, unless you go back through the Hansards of the day. I do not know whether I have the time to do that or not, but if you go back through the Hansards of the day you can see that we have been saying for the last six months - I think I am going to make copies of all this, Mr. Speaker, and send it over to all of the members on the other side so that they understand exactly what we were saying. Not on March 23, but on March 9th there was a fellow by the name of Tulk in this House, and he was saying that we have to keep the fish plants open. The Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), sixteen days later, decided to act. So, Mr. Speaker, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), stood in this House and said we should indeed take a look at nationalizing the trawler fleet in this Province so that we can ensure that the people on the South Coast of this Province have a supply of fish. Mr. Speaker, remember now that was the first part of March, and on March 23 we find our Minister of Fisheries and our Premier in Ottawa saying practically the same thing.

MR. B. TULK: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the first thing that the letter to the hon. Don Johnston says is what? 'That a single trawler company should be created to operate Newfoundland based trawlers.' Mr. Speaker, we said that on March 6th Mr. Speaker, market consolidation, we said that to the Kirby Task Force in July. Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing new in the proposal. It was designed with one purpose in mind, to play a little bit of politics, to muddy up the waters so that the people's resolution - if the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is around the House - so that the

MR. TULK: people's resolution would go under, so that united front that this Province had presented to Ottawa, to the companies, to the Kirby Task Force, to Mr. De Bane and everybody else would go under. That was the idea. You see the one thing that that government cannot stand, on that side of the House, is to have somebody agree with them. If you agree with them they have nobody to confront. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the government of this Province wants to do, confront, confront, confront.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have time to go into the teachers' situation, another example.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. TULK: By leave, Mr. Speaker, let me go on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

MR. TULK: Oh my, they cannot stand the truth.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member have leave to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave has not been granted.

The hon. member for Ferryland,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, certainly we would have been glad to give the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) an extra five or ten minutes. If he would just say some of the things that the provincial Liberal Party stands for we would be glad to give him five minutes or five hours or five days, but certainly for the period of time that I have been here, I have not seen the Liberal Party of Newfoundland, or the members opposite, say very much other than a whole lot of rhetoric and a whole lot of supporting of the federal government in the roles that they take.

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

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

MR. TULK: There is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order.
The hon. member for Ferryland.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, if there were any answers from the Liberal Party of Newfoundland I would be glad to take them. But what I have seen for the seven years that I have been here is basically the Liberal Party of Newfoundland waiting for the federal government to make its position clear and then the Liberal Party of Newfoundland says, 'Yes, that is fine and we will agree with you 100 per cent'. And that is exactly what has happened on almost every issue that I have seen happen in this House of Assembly since I have come here. On fishery matters, on forestry matters, on the offshore oil and gas issue, on the power corridor through Quebec, on any given major issue in this Province, the Liberal Party of Newfoundland has absolutely no position until such time as the federal government tells them what they

MR. POWER: should say and then they say it with all politeness to the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution presented by one of the younger members of the House and certainly one of the members who now has a fishing district that is going through a period of crisis, certainly I say to that member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) that his resolution is one which is very important and very urgent and very badly needed in this Province. It is time that many people in this House and outside, many people in this capital city of Newfoundland began to pay some heed to the real basic industry of Newfoundland, which is the fishery.

MR. POWER: I really believe, Mr. Speaker, that on many, many occasions an awful lot of people do not understand the resolution from the member from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), nor do they understand what the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) says at times, nor do they really understand the import of the fishing industry to Newfoundland. I do not think there are many persons on the opposite side of the House who really believe when they talk about a viable fishing industry that they honest to God in their hearts and souls believe that the fishing industry is important. I do believe sometimes that they have the same attitude over there when you talk about fisheries - it is as prevalent with empty seats now as it is prevalent with their empty heads sometimes, about what is happening with the Newfoundland fishing industry. What happens on many occasions relating to the fishing industry in Newfoundland is like when the Premier mentioned to the Prime Minister that what we really want is not offshore oil and gas wealth, what we really want is not a petro-chemical industry, what we want is some money from a petro-chemical based industry so that we can put that money back into the fishery, back into tree production, back into the forests and back into the tourist and the renewable industries of this Province. That is what we have said. When the Premier mentions that to Mr. Trudeau he shrugs his shoulders, with his little rose in, and he says, well, the world progresses and the world changes and the world advances and you do not really have to get involved in fishery and forestry in 1982 or 1983. And I detect sometimes, on the opposite side of the House, the same attitude. Yesterday when the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was talking about some of his travels to try and promote the sale of Newfoundland fish -

MR. POWER: there is no point in fishermen, or no point in fish plant workers in this Province, Mr. Speaker, producing a product unless someone sells it. We have been very short, Mr. Speaker, in this Province of salesmen. We have in the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) a man who has tries along with the industry and with the union to sell as much of the Newfoundland product as possible on the world market. When the Minister of Fisheries does some of his travelling, the Leader of the Opposition referred to it yesterday as the Minister of Fisheries going around the countryside peddling fish as some old-time salesman might have peddled some products around outport Newfoundland. Peddling in marketing, peddling in sales conditions is referred to as the lower rung of the ladder. You only peddle something which is not important, you only peddle something which has no worth and you sell or market something which has some value. When in answer to the Minister of Fisheries' queries the Leader of the Opposition talks about peddling fish, it to me indicates an attitude of the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition of this Province. They still have the attitude that the only people in Newfoundland involved in the fishery are people who have to be involved. People who are uneducated, people who are unaware, people who cannot get anything else to do must get involved in the fishery, it is all that is left. And I detect that attitude there and that attitude certainly is prevalent in many instances in Ottawa. The member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) by presenting this motion has said

MR. POWER: that he is aware of the fishing crisis in this Province and aware of fishing importance in this Province, as is the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) and the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) and the members for many parts of the coast of Newfoundland. But I detect, Mr. Speaker, in many cases, that the Opposition of this Province simply is not aware of the importance of the fishery in this Province. I do not know if any member of the Opposition knows anyone who fishes because he wants to. I know a vast number of people along the shore that I represent, in the area of St. Mary's - The Capes, who fish because they want to fish. Not because they have to, not because they are not good carpenters, not because they cannot take jobs in other sectors of the economy, they fish because they want to fish, they want to be involved. But they want to be involved in a viable industry, an industry that has some future.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in this motion - and I certainly am going to vote for the motion as presented by the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). I am going to vote against the amendment presented by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary).

MR. TULK: Why? Why?

MR. POWER: Because of the amendment, in the words of the Leader of the Opposition - 'BE IT RESOLVED that the Governments of Newfoundland and Labrador and Canada do exercise without delay their responsibilities.' I can only say that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the provincial government are exercising their responsibilities in every possible way they can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: If anybody wants to travel around the coast of Newfoundland and see those things that the provincial government are responsible for and see if

MR. POWER: We are doing our job, the answer will be an unequivocal yes. We are doing our job.

MR. TULK: Some job. You have the plants closed down.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, if the member for Fogo wants to talk about the plants that are closed in this Province, I can tell him how many plants are open in this Province.

MR. TULK: Let us go to Fermeuse where he has a processing plant.

MR. POWER: I will gladly go to the district of Ferryland. The district of Ferryland has processing units in Petty Harbour, a \$150,000 government guarantee, to stay open last year; the plant in Witless Bay, \$2 million to reopen and employ 600 workers last year; the plant in Tor's Cove, \$250 million guarantee; the plant in Aquaforte, a \$50 million guarantee; the Lake Group in Fermeuse, \$5 million guarantee. That is provincial action on problems that we have in our area. And while all that was being done, Mr. Speaker, there was not one single, solitary cent, there was not one single, solitary bit of input from the federal government. The same is true

MR. POWER: today, The problems that we have in the fishery today that require some kind of federal input, some kind of federal jurisdiction, have not been done. Tell me, where is the restructuring programme? In the resolution presented by the member for Burin-Placentia West he talks about a restructuring plan, particularly for the offshore plants, and I want to emphasize to the member, and to other members of the House, that he is talking about a restructuring plan for the offshore fishery. The inshore fishery which we have control of, which the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has some control of, is in reasonably good shape. It is being managed as well as is possible considering the amount of control that we have. And, Mr. Speaker, realize that we have as a Province only a very limited control over the processing sector, in the words of the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) himself, that he uses in this House, when he talks about the processing sector being- whose responsibility?

MR. TULK: Your responsibility.

MR. POWER: Whose responsibility?

MR. TULK: The Minister of Fisheries.

MR. POWER: The minister is responsible for processing.

MR. TULK: The Province. Okay?

MR. POWER: That is what confuses me about the Liberal Opposition in the Province. The Province is responsible for processing. Mr. Speaker, that is the spokesman for fisheries matters opposite.

Let me tell you what you said on March 16th., on tape number 411; You say, 'Both the federal and provincial governments, Mr. Speaker, as I said last week in this House, are to blame for processing'. He says,

MR. POWER: and it goes on further, "It was not at the time this Minister of Fisheries but the Province and the federal government are both to blame for the mess that the processing sector and indeed the whole fishery in this Province is in." That is what he said on March 16th. Today he says it is just provincial.

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. POWER: And I say that is the problem with the Liberal Opposition in this Province, they simply do not have a position. They change their positions from day to day. They never, never cement the position unless they get it from the federal government first.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that the Provincial Liberal Party does not understand the fishery and is not aware of some of the problems that we have. And I will go further, Mr. Speaker, to say that the reason that we have not seen the restructuring called for in this resolution by the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), the reason we have not seen the restructuring is twofold. First of all, the federal government does not understand the Newfoundland fishery. They do not understand the Newfoundland fishery. In December of this year the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) announced a resource short plant programme. It was a programme designed for all the inshore plants to get 6,000 metric tons of offshore fish to be processed in our plants during the months of December, January, February and March and April, the months when the inshore plants have no product to process and have no work to do. That programme was announced in December by the Federal Minister of Fisheries; to this date not one single pound of that product has been processed in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, where is the resource short programme? Do you know where it is?

MR. POWER: It is up in Ottawa some place waiting for someone to decide when the resource short quotas will be announced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. POWER: Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know when somebody in Ottawa will announce a resource short plant quota for those inshore plants along the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland. I assume they will do it in their typical way, sometime during the months of June, July and August, when the resource short plants are blocked to capacity with trap cod and they do not need it. It certainly has not happened in the three months when resource short plant fish is very badly needed. And I say if that is the understanding nature of the federal government, no wonder we have not got a restructuring plan.

The reason we have not got a restructuring plan after all the studies of Kirby and the federal committee, all the study, Mr. Speaker, that we have, the reason we have not got it is that the federal government is afraid to announce what they have decided. They have decided the federal government is responsible for those offshore plants, the programme that they have taken responsibility for through the Kirby Task Force, through their Cabinet Committee, they are afraid, they are chicken to announce to the people of Newfoundland what they have decided. They are afraid to tell the people of Newfoundland what they have decided. They are afraid. They are afraid to go to Burin and go to Gaultois, and go to Fermeuse and say what they think should happen to Newfoundland communities. Because what they are saying and what they would like to say is that a lot of those communities should be closed down completely.

MR. NEARY: Remember, cheek to cheek, jowl to jowl. You are embarrassing the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. POWER: I am not embarrassing the Minister of Fisheries. What I am saying is what this government has said many times, and what it will continue to say, that we intend, and in the programme that we have recommended to the federal government, to keep all of those communities alive and active. We do not believe in centralization of those communities. The federal government believes in it. They believe it for Newfoundland in everything that they do. Instead of the centralization programme of 1967 and 1968 and 1969, they believe now in a different centralization programme which means take a lot of people out of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Alberta, move all the Newfoundlanders out to Alberta.

MR. POWER: That is right. That is exactly what they want to do, centralize Newfoundlanders in Alberta and any place else where they can get a job. But they will not give us jobs in Newfoundland because they do not want us to live here. And the same thing is true, Mr. Speaker, of the fishery.

In this resolution by the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) he talks about making a viable industry in Newfoundland, depending upon restructuring by the federal government. We have not seen that restructuring plan. We cannot see it. They will not show it to us. And what this resolution calls for, and hopefully it will be agreed to by every member of this House, is that we will ask the federal government to agree with this resolution, that when restructuring takes place all of the parties involved will be concerned, that they will not do things in the fishing industry of Newfoundland, that because of its importance, if they realize that, if they realize that, Mr. Speaker, which I have grave doubts about, they will come to this provincial government, the

MR. POWER: Premier of the Province, and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and say the things they would like to do in the restructuring sense.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I have not seen it. I have seen absolutely no evidence from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) or from the Opposition in this Province, or from the Federal Liberal Government that they understand the fishery, that they understand in any way why people are involved in the fishery in Newfoundland. They have not shown me that they understand that people are in the fishery because they choose to be, because they want to be, because it centres around a way of life which many Newfoundlanders want to continue to have. And that way of life, Mr. Speaker,

MR. C. POWER:

is really the way of life of Newfoundland. So if the restructuring programme comes down and does not take into account the places like Fermeuse, the places like Gaultois and Burin and Grand Bank, if they do not take into account not just the economics of the fishery, the social factors, the viability of the fishery, take into account this plan which will open every single offshore plant in Newfoundland and have a viable inshore fishery at the same time, that while this is happening this plan that we have submitted to the federal government, which they have not responded to, I understand, the same as they have not responded to our offshore proposal for oil and gas yet - but that will never happen, I suppose - the same as the response to this one, Mr. Speaker, will be in a diluted way, will be in a way that is an uncaring way and a nonunderstanding way, that they will show in many ways that they do not have the concerns of the Newfoundland people at heart. And they have proven that to us in many ways. If the federal government, if the Liberal Opposition opposite decides to do what is right for the Newfoundland offshore fishing industry and the inshore fishing industry, then this proposal will be accepted and will be acted upon. But I fear, Mr. Speaker, that that will not happen. I fear it because, as I have said, I fear the understanding and the mentality of the federal Liberal government and I fear that they do not have any kind of rationale or understanding for the Newfoundland fishing industry. And I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution, the motion that is presented by the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) who, I might say, by the way, is one of the most active and vocal newer members of this House and is to be commended in his efforts -

MR. S. NEARY: He breaks the rules thirty times a day.

MR. C. POWER: He may break the rules thirty times a day but he does it for reasons of his heart, because he wants and he cares so deeply about Burin and about the fishing industry along the Burin Peninsula. And I have to say that if I were in his place I might break the rules thirty-one times a day. If it got Burin and got communities in my district open and working, I would not care a whole lot about breaking a rule belonging to anyone,

MR. POWER: as long as the people in my district had jobs and had the thing opening. When it comes to Fermeuse in my district, Mr. Speaker, I care greatly. And I am concerned about the big fishing companies that we have had in the Province, the Lake Group which have operated in Fermeuse for a very significant amount of time, who play God with the lives of people, who come in and make profits at times and at other times decide to get out just simply because it is a corporate decision, not because you cannot make money in Fermeuse. When the Lake Group says that in the community of Fermeuse, which supplies jobs for 450 to 500 people all along the Southern part of the district of Ferryland from Cappahayden to Brigus South - when they say to me, simply because they have changed their corporate outlook on things, that they are going to, at any given time, close down that plant and make it an inshore operation, which cannot work, and they put 450 people out of work, and I am supposed to agree fully with those companies, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that neither do those companies care, many times, about the industry in Newfoundland nor do they understand some of the things we have to do. And I say, as the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) has said, that we are going to work as hard as we can with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), our Premier and our government to keep all of those communities operating and viable. But I say it, Mr. Speaker, as in many cases for what the Newfoundland people have gone through in the last ten years, we will do it in spite of the federal government rather than with their assistance.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of a resolution in the House of Assembly is to give members the opportunity to raise matters of public importance, to raise matters relating to public policy with which they are not satisfied, to try to suggest change or to bring up matters relating to their own districts and to word the resolution in such a manner that it will convince hon. members to support it, and also, of course, to put meat on the speeches that follow to further enhance their case and get all hon. members to support the resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I for one, would like to support all resolutions that are presented by hon. members, affecting public policy in this Province, particularly when it affects the fisheries. I would like to be able to support all such resolutions that are seriously put on the Order Paper, that are put on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, with the sole intent of trying to develop policy and develop programmes that will improve the fisheries of this Province.

MR. LUSH: Now, I mentioned that the wording of a resolution should be such that it will convince hon. members, and if that does not do it, then, of course, the content of the speeches that follow.

Now, I must say that in looking at the resolution, Mr. Speaker, I find that the wording is not very strong. It is a very weak resolution, a very weak resolution and I will demonstrate why I think it is a weak resolution. And I read the speech a few minutes ago of the mover of that particular resolution and I found that the speech of the mover of the resolution was very similar to the resolution in that it was very weak, very weak, Mr. Speaker, very weak.

Now, let me start off with the whereases in this resolution. It says, "WHEREAS the social and economic fabric of Newfoundland and Labrador has been and will continue to be interwoven with a viable fishing industry." Now that is a good statement. There is nothing wrong with that particular statement other than I would like to see the word 'economic' put in there somewhere, 'economically viable fishing industry'. But anyway 'a viable fishing industry', and that is okay.

"AND WHEREAS the fishing industry during recent months has undergone severe economic adversity threatening the very existence of many communities in our Province." And that, Mr. Speaker, is certainly a fact. That is a fact. But after there, Mr. Speaker, it gets into a lot of nonsense, it gets into a lot of nonsense and let me come down to the "THEREFORE". It says, "NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House urges the Government

MR. LUSH: of Canada to exercise without delay its responsibility for ensuring the continued viability of the industry." Now I am very sorry that - I should say hon. members know how I feel about the word "urge" and unfortunately it is in our own amendment. But I think that was done accidentally and I will comment on that a little later.

But very generally, if hon. members were to look through the resolutions they will find out, of course, which group of people use the word "urge".

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, a resolution is supposed to be something that is supposed to suggest action, definite action, specific action, action about which nobody can be mistaken as to what kind of action will be taken. But the hon. gentlemen have been so used to supporting their own government, making nonsense resolutions that we say we urge the government, we urge the government. Now urge is a very easy word. It means to try and persuade. So the hon. member did not think about this too much, particularly when he was talking about the federal government.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. TULK: Now they are so used to putting down resolutions about their own government and they do not want to use a strong language, they do not want to use words like 'demand' and 'request', they use the soft words like 'urge'. Now, Mr. Speaker, in our own resolution that is the only suggestion that I would make, that instead of the word 'urge' we put in 'demand'. Demand, Mr. Speaker, is to ask for something as a right, and that is what I think our resolution should say, is to demand, not this soft, easy, foggy word of 'urge', to urge the government. Now, Mr. Speaker, I could not support it, it is not strong enough, I could not support the resolution on the use of that one word alone, 'urge', because if I want the federal government to do something I am not going to urge them, I am going to demand them to do it. So, Mr. Speaker, this soft, easy, nonsensical word 'urge', no, I cannot support it.

Now, the member goes on to talk about, 'to urge the Government of Canada to exercise without delay its responsibility for ensuring the continued viability of the industry'. And in attempting to listen very attentively to the hon. member to try,

MR. TULK: and support this resolution, I wanted the hon. member naturally to tell me what was the responsibility of the federal government with respect to fisheries. And do you know that the hon member never mentioned it anywhere in his speech. He never talked about what the responsibility was. I would have expected the hon. member to outlay , to clearly emphasize, to clearly articulate, to clearly enunciate what that responsibility was and nowhere in the speech did he talk about what the responsibility of the federal government was, nowhere, Mr. Speaker, nowhere.

MR. TULK: Will I send this over?

MR. LUSH: Yes , we had better send it over. Now, Mr. Speaker, how could I support a resolution when the member did not tell me what the responsibility was? I did not know what the responsibility was, so I had no idea whether they were doing it or whether they were not doing it. And that is why the amendment to the resolution is so much better. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the fisheries in this Province, it is a shared jurisdiction, it is a shared jurisdiction. So the amendment

MR. LUSH: by the Leader of the Opposition
(Mr. Neary) puts it in its proper perspective.

MR. TULK: Repeat that for the member for
Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin).

MR. LUSH: Yes. It is a shared jurisdiction
and the amendment by the Leader of the Opposition puts it
in that perspective. It puts this resolution in its proper
perspective in that it urges both levels of government.
As I say, I would like to leave out the word 'urge' and
say that we demand both levels of government to carry
out their responsibilities to ensure that the fishery
is an economically viable industry in this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, the resolution
is a very weak and feeble resolution, as was the speech
given by the mover of the resolution. He did not talk
about what was the responsibility. Now, Mr. Speaker, he
could have told us what the responsibility was, Maybe
he did not like the way the federal government were
executing their responsibility. That is altogether
different. They could be carrying out their responsibility
but the hon. member might not like what that responsibility
is. And, you know, I believe that is what he was getting
at. I may have responsibilities, I could carry them out.
And the federal government, as I understand it, is
responsible for the harvesting sector, everything to do
with the harvesting sector, with the fish in the water.

MR. TULK: Will I send him over our brief
to the Kirby Task Force?

MR. LUSH: They are responsible for
establishing quotas. They are responsible for the issuing
of licences. Now, it is my understanding they do that, that
is their responsibility. They do it. But the hon. member
might not like that responsibility, then the resolution

MR. LUSH: should say something else. But it does not say that. It says that the federal government be urged to carry out its responsibilities. And as I have said, I thought they have been carrying out their responsibilities. They are responsible for the harvesting sector, for the establishing of quotas and for licencing. They do that. As I said, the hon. member may not like the way they do it but that is not to say that they are not carrying out their responsibility. But the hon. member did not say what their responsibility was, he did not say that they were carrying it out or they were not carrying it out. He said nothing about it at all, Mr. Speaker. He lived in the selective past as is the propensity of hon. members opposite to live in the selective past. They go back to selective years and live. And they live in the far, distant future as well, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible)

MR. LUSH: No. In the far projected future, I should say. They live, Mr. Speaker, in selected periods of the past and they live in the far projected future, but they never think about the here now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. LUSH: He went back, Mr. Speaker, talking about the Diefendbaker years, he went back to that. He went back to the Diefendbaker years and talked about the great subsidy that that government gave, he went back to that.

MR. LUSH: He made some reference to Mr. Lalonde's proposal I think, He did not talk about the Clark ten months of office, he did not talk about that, when the Minister of Fisheries was here in Newfoundland, He did not talk about that.

MR. TULK: By the way, did you hear what that former Minister of Fisheries said today?

MR. LUSH: I hear that he is pretty disenchanted with this particular government. He wants now to promote peace and harmony in this Province. He wants a few more olive branches to be handed around by this government. This is what he is saying. He is now beginning to learn how the people of Newfoundland are feeling about this government, so the hon. member is catching on, he is trying to create peace and harmony. That is what he is trying to do, Mr. Speaker, but he is going to have a hard job with this crew, because peace and harmony, these two words are not in their language. Confrontation, adversary tactics, these are the words that are found in the vocabulary of the hon. gentlemen opposite.

MR. TOBIN: I have the (inaudible for you.

MR. TULK: We hope it is better than the first one.

MR. LUSH: The hon. gentleman does not talk about what the responsibility is. As I said, he may not like the responsibility but he did not say that either, He did not say what the responsibility was and, of course, conveniently left out the Province's responsibility in total. So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the resolution as presented by the hon. member because it does not put the thing in perspective, it does not focus on the real situation

MR. LUSH: in the fisheries, it does not focus on how the fishery is structured in this Province. What it does, Mr. Speaker, is to again give hon. members the opportunity to flog the Federal government. That is what it does, because that is the only thing they know how to do. And I expect that the MP for St. John's East would be very upset with this particular resolution because it is an example of this continued confrontation, it is an example of these adversary tactics that they have been carrying on over the past couple of years with the Federal Government. And that is the reason why the member put down this particular resolution. But, Mr. Speaker, the resolution as amended -

MR TULK: He wants to get in on the Fed bashing.

MR. LUSH: - that I can support. That I can support because it puts the fisheries in perspective. It lays the responsibility on both governments where it should properly be. So, Mr. Speaker, that I can support, that we demand that both levels of government carry out their responsibility as it relates to the fisheries. Not one level of government but both levels of government.

MR. T. LUSH: What a lot of nonsense, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) just uttered, to say that he could not support this resolution because the Province was doing everything they could do. Mr. Speaker, what a pretentious attitude. What it demonstrates, Mr. Speaker, it demonstrates the arrogance that pervades this government. It demonstrates the arrogance, the conceit that pervades all hon. members opposite.

MR. TULK: That conceit has my kid out of school today.

MR. LUSH: It is their conceit and pride, exactly, that have the teachers locked out, Mr. Speaker. That is the kind of arrogance, the kind of pretentiousness, the kind of conceit, the kind of pride. Mr. Speaker, what a lot of nonsense to suggest that this Province is doing everything possible with the development of the fisheries of this Province. Mr. Speaker, what a holier than thou approach. Mr. Speaker, the fishermen of this Province know that that is not true, the people of this Province know that that is not true. Mr. Speaker, I only wish that the mover of this resolution had the - what shall I say? - had the spirit within his bones, within his body to have put the thing in perspective and to have included both governments, and then come forward with a suggestion, then come forward with plans, then to have had the courtesy to have identified the problems in the fishing industry of this Province. He never talked about a problem, he never identified what the problems were in the fisheries of this Province, did not say - of course since he did not identify the problems it was pretty difficult for him to come up with a solution. Because in order to get the solution you have to first identify the problem.

MR. T. LUSH: And the member did not identify any problems. He did it in terms of personalities. He tried to suggest that Mr. De Bane might have been a problem. He tried to suggest that Mr. Lalonde might have been a problem. But, Mr. Speaker, he did not identify the economic problems of the fisheries and, as I said, since he did not identify the problem there was no way he could advocate a solution.

MR. LUSH: The resolution as presented by the hon. member is poorly worded, Mr. Speaker, and the intent and motive, Mr. Speaker, I believe, the intent and motive of this resolution are simply another method of attacking the federal government and trying to exonerate and trying to excuse the failure of this particular provincial government in developing the fisheries of this Province. It is just a smoke screen, it is just a red herring, Mr. Speaker, just another attempt to try and exonerate themselves from their utter failure in terms of dealing with the fisheries of this Province. That is all it is. That is all it is.

But, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly support the amendment as presented by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) who always seems to have that ability to be incisive and to be able to grasp what the problems are surrounding the economy. He is always able to grasp the magnitude of the problems and able to come up with resolutions that really get to the point. So, Mr. Speaker, I think this resolution puts the fisheries in perspective. It puts it in perspective. It is a recognition that the fisheries is a shared jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker, that is what it is. It is a recognition that the fisheries is a shared jurisdiction, that it is a joint jurisdiction, and as such, Mr. Speaker, it should be done in co-operation with the federal government. It should be done in harmony. They should be up there, Mr. Speaker, working with the federal government. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) should be up there with Mr. De Bane talking about what his concerns are, talking about what responsibilities they would like to have, talking about what shared responsibilities they would have. And we will support them, Mr. Speaker. We will support them when

MR. LUSH: we see a genuine move, when we see a move that is concerned - when we see a move by this government that is motivated by the economic concerns of the fishermen of this Province, when we see that and not a political motive, when we see that the motives by this provincial government are for the economic development of this Province for the sake of fishermen. But as long as we see it being politically motivated, as this motion is doing, then, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to support it. But, Mr. Speaker, I am sure there is no hon. gentleman on the other side who can find it within his soul not to support the resolution as amended. It cannot be done. It cannot be done, Mr. Speaker. It cannot be done because they know that is the fact about the fisheries in this Province, that it addresses the fisheries as it is administered in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. LUSH: And I am sure that no hon. member will be able to find it within his soul -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HEARN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to say I hesitate to stand up to follow such a luscious speech from the other side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: The hon. gentleman makes me wonder more and more what the position of the Opposition really is. A few weeks ago we used the word 'demand' in one of our resolutions and we were hammered for being very cruel and callous against the federal government because we said we demand them to do something. Now today in the resolution we have the word 'urge', and once again we get hammered.

MR. STAGG: The hon. member's speech would make you urge.

MR. HEARN: Yes. We are told that it is not strong enough, we should have used the word 'demand'. I am not really sure whether the hon. member knows the meaning of the word 'urge' but I know one thing, if he were out in a dory for about twenty minutes with a good tumble on, he would know the meaning of the word 'urge'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: Mr. Speaker, the resolution on the floor which has been amended - now, I feel sort of proud about this, because the last resolution

MR. HEARN: we had on the floor was amended because it was out of perspective, and we amended that resolution. Now I see that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has learned something from me in my short stay in the House and he has amended the resolution that is before us today. So I am glad that I can teach the hon. gentleman something.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: The words that the resolution starts off with, 'WHEREAS the social and economic fabric of Newfoundland and Labrador has and will continue to be interwoven with a viable fishing industry', those words are of extreme importance to us right now on this Island.

The fishery in Newfoundland, as we have said many times, Mr. Speaker, is the life-blood of our Province. Right now -

MR. NEARY: That is original.

MR. HEARN: It has been said many times by everyone, agreed to by everyone because it is the truth. That is why right now the situation that surrounds the fishery is so serious and a concern of everybody in this Province. We have today many, many problems throughout the Province in relation to the fishery. The major ones, however, concern the areas where we have our deep-sea plants. That includes my own riding, where we have the plant in Trepassey

MR. HEARN: which is operating, thank God, but more especially the various plants that right now are not operating, where we have many, many people right now not knowing what their future is.

Now, we have been told by the previous speaker that the resolution calls for recognition of joint jurisdiction over the fishery. We agree with that. Certainly there is joint jurisdiction. However, what we also have to make quite clear is that we are living up to what we are supposed to be doing. In relation to the inshore plants, the small plants, all of them are in the process now of either opening up, some of them have opened, or will be open during the Summer season. The minister has toured the island, has opened up plants this year that had not been able to open previously due to a tremendous amount of work by the members involved, by the Department of Fisheries, in correlating activities in the area, proper methods of distributing fish etc.

When we come to the offshore plants we already know and we have been told by the members opposite, that jurisdiction for the plants onshore is in the hands of the provincial government. However, we are also well aware that the plans for these plants, for the viability of these plants rests solely right now in the hands of the Restructuring Committee or, perhaps, even more especially in the hands of Mr. Kirby who has been given the green light to try to work out a plan.

The provincial government right now has submitted to Ottawa a detailed plan that will enable these plants to open, all of them. Not some of them, as has been suggested by the people from upalong, but all of them, not only to open, but to operate viably now and in the foreseeable future. In fact, if the plan submitted by the provincial government is adhered to and followed, the future

MR. HEARN: of these plants in the year ahead, when the fish stocks grow to such an extent that we can make sure that there is enough for everybody, not only the deep-sea plants, but also the resource short plant, we will then have a firm, viable industry in Newfoundland, a self-sufficient industry that will not be taking money from the coffers of either the provincial government or the federal government, it will be an industry that can pay.

MR. NEARY: Will the provincial government participate in the (inaudible) then?

MR. HEARN: Mr. Speaker, I am being interrupted by the Interim Leader on the far side. The Interim Leader. We are talking about the federal government right now coming up with an interim solution to restructure the companies, and that would be an interim solution. Restructure the companies: We have tried to do it several times, you put them back on their feet and in a few days time they are back on their rear ends again. This is not a solution, it is an interim solution.

Some gentleman out in my district gave me an idea of interim. He said, 'Look, interim means for a time. It is like an interim leader. It is something you have to put up with until you can get something better'. So, Mr. Speaker, an interim answer is not what we are looking for. We are looking for a long-term proposal, a long-term solution that will solve the problems, the social and economic problems facing the Province of Newfoundland.

MR. HEARN: If the solution submitted by this Province is accepted - and we hope it will be; we presume this is what they are doing now, trying to put it in place - then we will have that basis to work upon, we will have a future to look forward to.

When we look at places like Burin and we look at places like Fermeuse, like Ramea, when we look at places that are affected by the closure of plants, it is not just the economic conditions that we look at, Mr. Speaker, we are also looking at a way of life which is slowly being eroded. A number of people will tell you - they will say, 'Well, Burin is going to close, send them up to Marystown to work. Fermeuse is going to close, let them go to Witless Bay, let them go to Trepassey.' That is not the answer. That is not the answer. Not only can we not provide jobs enough in the new centres for the people who work in those areas, the plant in a community, the plant in any town in Newfoundland, has a lot more to do than just provide jobs for the number of people who operate or work at that plant. The whole social structure is built around that one industry. During the Summer you have a number of young people who find work who will not find it in an outside community, who find work in their own community, you have the business interests, you have the hotels, the restaurants, you have all the stores around that benefit from an industry operating in the place. If people move outside to work somewhere else, these dollars are then put in a different community. You lose contact entirely. This was tried for several years by the former Liberal Government when they tried to pigeonhole everybody, to take them out of areas where they would make a living. That is partly what is wrong with our Province right now. Areas that were viable,

MR. HEARN: areas where people could make a living in the fishery, areas like Merasheen, Red Island, some of the most viable fishing grounds in the world, we uprooted these people against their will and moved them into areas where they sat on the hillsides, and I talked to some of them, sitting on a hillside two miles from the ocean, having no place to put their dory. The dory was in the basement or out in the garage surrounded by trawls and by gill nets. And they said, 'Look, even if we could fish here, we do not know where to fish. We have no facilities whatsoever. So what do we do? We sit back and draw welfare.' That is probably the basis of the present problem that we are facing. It can probably be traced back to the days of centralization. Because many of the fishermen who are now so uprooted, came from many of those viable fishing grounds, did not come willingly, they were forced out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: Mr. Speaker, the fishing industry in Newfoundland will only be what we want it to be, will only be a viable, self-supporting operation if the provincial government and the federal government each do its part. We certainly have done ours and we have made it quite clear that we are willing to co-operate with the federal government in the proposals that they present for restructuring the industry - not restructuring the companies - restructuring the total industry, because it is only by restructuring the total fishing industry that this industry can become the viable industry that we speak of.

One of the main proponents of the new restructuring process is to restructure entirely the catching method, and unless

MR. HEARN: we do that, unless we have control of the catching method, then there is no way that we can guarantee a supply of fish to the various plants that are now in operation, to the various resource short plants. Proper co-ordination, proper catching methods will assure that every plant on this island of ours, every deep-sea plant will be a year-round viable operation, and that the resource short plants will also be able to operate for a longer period of time. It is not only in relation to saying we have so many draggers now assigned to so many plants, it is a matter of proper co-ordination to make sure that fish is delivered where fish is needed.

Last Summer we stood here complaining about a glut situation. We had fish plants, some of them deep-sea plants, that during the Summer buy inshore fish; they could not handle the inshore fish because of the present glut that was underway. Consequently, the fishermen who were catching trap fish, hook and line, etc., had to throw away fish during the only time of the year they could possibly catch it in order to facilitate the trawler that was landing regularly. If the offshore fleet were properly co-ordinated, during peak season the trawlers could be diverted to the resource short plants, to plants in areas of the Province that are not experiencing a glut in the inshore. Do not tell me that the people over there are so naive that they do not agree with this. We could have the co-ordination of the total catching sector so that each plant on the Island, all year round, could have fish enough to keep it going and yet during the glut season the fish could be so distributed that the plants that were crying out for fish last year, could have had processing material enough to operate.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, one of those days the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is going to sit down and listen long enough to learn something about the fishery. When you are little tot in school you are told one thing, if you go anywhere in the run of a day and you listen you are going to hear something new; when you hear something new you learn something; when you are always talking you are just regurgitating stuff that you already know. The interim Leader of the Opposition has been regurgitating this past year, since I have been in the House, consequently he has learned nothing new and in all his regurgitations he has said nothing new. So consequently, it is about time that he listened and learned. Because there are people in this House who grew up in a boat, who know something about the fishery, who know the effect that the present problems have on the people out there, the people who we care about, and consequently we are trying to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support the resolution. I cannot support the amendment because it indicates that we, as a Province, as a provincial government, are doing absolutely nothing about our share in the restructuring of the industry, We certainly are and that has been proven and it will be proven. Consequently, I support the resolution. I congratulate my colleague from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) for bringing it in, and certainly we do urge the Government of Canada to get on the move, time is running out. Time is running out for us.

MR. L. HEARN: Consequently, Mr. Speaker, it is the voice from the wilderness who is not worthy, as I said before, to carry my sneakers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: Mr. Speaker, some day this Summer I am really going to invite the interim Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) up to my district, take him down on the wharf to meet real fishermen, to see real fish and to meet some good Conservatives.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) on the wharf.

MR. HEARN: Yes, I think they do. Do you know why they want him to come down? Because I have said to them, as I have said here in the House, that in the next election I am looking forward to a challenge, I do not see it forthcoming, so the only bit of fun I can possibly have is if the hon. member across will run against me, because they want him. Now, they are asking him to come down and take me on, because that will provide us with a very entertaining election. But, of course, Mr. Speaker, he is not going to come.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by saying I fully support the motion, and it is about time that we got the fishing industry in Newfoundland restructured. We are willing to do our part, we have done as much as we can to date, the next move is up to the federal government. I am not knocking them. I know that they are working on a restructuring process; I hope that they will come out with their ideas in a hurry so we can implement them so that we can get the fishermen back fishing, so they can sell their fish to plants that will be opened, and that the many workers who work at those plants will have jobs, and the many people who are involved in the spin-offs will also benefit from it, so that in the long run this Province of ours will be a little bit better because of the fishing

MR. L. HEARN: industry which, once again, is the lifeblood of our Province.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I, first of all, would like to pursue, just for a couple of minutes, some remarks that I had made in Question Period when the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was here.

MR. HODDER: I do not know if the minister has spoken yet or not but -

MR. ROBERTS: If so he has not said anything.

MR. HODDER: - if so he has not said anything, but I would like to hear what his comments are regarding the lobster fishery in the Province. Now we find ourselves in the House of Assembly again at this time of the year, which is the approach of the lobster season, and as I have told hon. members earlier the price, the dollar value of the lobster fishery is considerably greater than that of the herring, crab or caplin fishery, or, for that matter, the seal fishery, and yet every year at this time we see a flurry of activity. The minister meets with the buyers, he tries to establish a price, he is unsuccessful in establishing the price and then the lobster buyers go into the areas of the Province where the species is found and rip-off the fishermen with great profits to themselves. Now there are two aspects which need to be explored in order for lobster fishermen to get a good price for their catch. One is that we must sufficiently monitor the Boston market and we must ensure that there are not differences of as much as thirty and forty cents a pound for lobster within 100 miles of each other. Whenever that occurs, and that occurs every year, it should be stopped. There is no reason why the minister cannot take a licence here or there. I do not think the minister has ever taken a licence because of the prices paid to fishermen, not since I have been in this House, since 1975, nor any minister, for that matter, has done that. That is one aspect of it, Mr. Speaker. The other aspect is the fact that I am sick and tired of seeing Nova Scotia buyers coming into the West coast of the Province, buying up Lobster at bargain basement prices, taking them over

MR. HODDER: to the Bedford Basin and then getting from \$12 to \$15 a pound for them on the Christmas market.

MR. ROBERTS: How do they hold them till Christmas?

MR. HODDER: They hold them in the Bedford Basin. They just hold them there until Christmas.

MR. ROBERTS: Why can we not do that?

MR. HODDER: Well, this is exactly the point that I made last year, and the year before, and the year before that. Why can we not do that?

MR. ANDREWS: They have a Winter fishery there.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see. We do not have a Winter fishery here? Down in my district there is a Winter fishery.

MR. ANDREWS: Not for lobsters.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see. How far away are we from (inaudible) the Southwest Coast?

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, we have never even tried. There are areas of this Province where we can hold lobster for long periods of time until the market - what happens in Newfoundland is that the Nova Scotia lobster comes on stream a couple of weeks before ours do. They get a very good price at that particular time. Then the Newfoundland lobster gluts the market and the price drops, so the Newfoundland fishermen comes in and the price is already reduced.

MR. HODDER: The answer is to do the same sort of thing as they are doing in Nova Scotia and that is to hold our lobster here for the maximum amount of time, until the seasonal glut is over.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: That has never been done. There was some experiments done in Port au Choix but it has never been done in a meaningful way.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STAGG: Is the hon. member coming to the lobster boil this year? You missed it last year.

MR. NEARY: Back to your own seat.

MR. HODDER: Oh, I think I may be to the lobster boil this year.

MR. STAGG: I am not sure if the invitation is going to be extended this year.

MR. HODDER: Well, if the hon. member is going to be there I will not be there, I will tell the hon. member that.

MR. NEARY: Do not worry he will be there the same as he was invited to the RCMP opening. He will be there. The hon. gentleman will not be invited.

MR. STAGG: That is right. The feds did not even invite me to the opening of the RCMP office.

MR. HODDER: Why should they?

MR. NEARY: Why should they? You did not make any contribution to the area, so why should they?

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, there is something else that has to be done with the lobster fishery. And we saw the worst phase of the problem last year when we had a high run off of fresh water during the beginning of the lobster season, because we had a late year last year. But we have the same problem every year to a lesser extent.

MR. HODDER: The fishermen catch their lobster, they hold them in boxes near the surface of the water for a few days, they are exposed to fresh water then when they are shipped to market it is a long, long ride - to the Boston market sometimes, or to the Nova Scotia market, or whichever market they are going to, or whether they are being shipped by air to San Francisco or wherever, it is a long ride. The Fishermen's Union had sent a report to the Fishing Industry Advisory Board asking that this problem of the high mortality of lobsters be overcome. The Fishermen's Union had suggested that we establish receiving stations where the water is such that it will lessen the mortality of lobsters - where it is salt water rather than fresh water and they are mingled with salt water - and that we have pick up points. Because we are not talking about the ground fishery here, we are talking about the lobster fishery which occurs in selected areas of the Province.

MR. HODDER: It brings a lot of money into this Province, and it certainly brings a lot of money into the hands of the fishermen.

MR. STAGG: Who will own the lobsters in the Province?

MR. HODDER: If the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) - Mr. Speaker, the member asks, Who will hold the lobsters in the Province?

MR. STAGG: O-w-n, who will own them?

MR. HODDER: Own them?

MR. STAGG: Yes.

MR. HODDER: I am sure that can be worked out, they can be paid for. They could be owned by the company. I mean, it is a matter of setting up a distribution - we are talking about setting up pick-up points, in the first place. You see, the minister has the ability to take licence or give licence. He is in charge of processing in this Province. This comes directly under the minister's department. And what the Fishermen's Union asked for were pick-up points, where lobster fishermen could deliver their catches, as well as the establishment of central holding stations, and there is what I am talking about, where lobsters can be held until they are sufficiently seasoned for travel. In other words, that there will be areas - we have about three large lobster areas in the Province, and in each one of those areas there will be a place where lobsters can be held for seasoning, because the mortality rate helps drive the price down as well. Now that is a very, very simple solution. And yet each year at lobster time I stand here in the House and I ask the minister what he has done over the past year, and he is meeting again with the processors, and nothing comes of it, and the next thing you know the fishermen are getting a \$1.80 a pound for lobster when they should be getting about \$8.00 a pound for lobster.

MR. STAGG: \$8,00 a pound?

MR. HODDER: Yes, \$8.00 a pound for lobster. Yes, Mr. Speaker, lobster is a luxury. And if the lobster market was handled properly, a lobster fisherman could well see \$8.00 a pound for lobster.

I remember that Romeo LeBlanc, when he was Federal Minister of Fisheries, used to always tell me, he used to say, 'Jim, that lobster someday will be like caviar if we handle this industry properly', and I believe him. Lobsters can be like caviar. It is the small thinking of people like the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) that keeps the fishermen in bondage in this Province. It is the small thinking, narrow-thinking of the people, like the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: I would like to have the odd feed of lobster, but \$8.00 a pound, I mean -

MR. HODDER: Well, if the member cares more about his own gut then he does the livelihood of the fishermen, well, I mean, where are we ever going to get, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: But I would ask, Mr. Speaker, for protection, I have some serious things to say now. These were serious things, but the member for Stephenville is provocative and irritating and arrogant, even in individual meetings. I attended a meeting in my district and the member for Stephenville was there, and I tried my best, Mr. Speaker, to be non-partisan. The member for Stephenville was there, he walked into the meeting of the Joint Councils with all flags flying, partisan, every statement was challenged, arrogant, ignorant. You cannot sit down with the man in a public meeting, when you are dealing with problems common to the area, without him making small, jabbing, digging remarks, talking with great arrogance, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: And you are saying that as a friend, somebody who knows him.

MR. HODDER:

And I am saying that as a friend.

MR. STAGG:

Were we at the same meeting?

MR. HODDER:

Yes, we were at the same meeting.

MR. STAGG:

Where you and I agreed on Piccadilly?

MR. HODDER:

We had no other choice but to

agree on Piccadilly. The only time -

MR. STAGG:

You got up and left.

MR. HODDER: The hon. member left because the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) was speaking and he was saying the same things over and over and over.

MR. STAGG: There are a lot of things that have to be said about Port au Port over and over and over because you have 75 per cent unemployment which the hon. member does not pay any attention to.

MR. HODDER: Here is the member for Stephenville telling me what I should be doing about tourism on the Port au Port Peninsula -

MR. STAGG: They have had 75 per cent unemployment in the hon. member's district for years and he does nothing about it. Then he talks about the fishery. The hon. member knows as much about the fishery as his federal Liberal friends and that is nothing. Then he tries to blame it on me.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. HODDER: Here is the member for Stephenville telling me what I should do about tourism on the Port au Port Peninsula -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, could I have your protection?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the member for Stephenville is telling me what I should do about tourism on the Port au Port Peninsula when he is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Development, who is responsible for tourism. He, at a meeting, was telling me what I should be doing.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course, we know what his administration has done - zero, zilch, zip. And furthermore, that is what they are going to do.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Premier and his Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) issued a document which they called revolutionary, to revitalize the fishing industry. Now, I agree with one thing about that document, it was revolutionary. It is revolutionary that the government is even thinking about the fishery these days, because for years they forgot about it. Mr. Speaker, their plan must have come out of one of the days when they had a recess from the House and they were tired of attacking the federal government, Quebec, the teachers, Nova Scotia, the students, the health care delivery and so on. It was one of those days when they had grown tired of attacking the federal government, health care services, crucifying the people, raising the cost of school books to the poor; they were away from that and they turned their minds to other issues. And anytime the administration even pretends to be addressing an issue, any one of the real economic issues in this Province, that is a revolution in itself.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that I have had with the way in which the administration deals with any issue is that it continues to pass the buck. It gets into the fray just long enough to transfer its responsibilities to someone else. The fishing industry and any other industry in this Province will not survive until at least one important criteria is first addressed by this administration,

MR. J. HODDER: that is, that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), the Premier, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and all the rest of the group of backbenchers over there must first undergo a complete revamping of their philosophy of government. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, as well that the members opposite could do well to take a course at the Fisheries College themselves.

MR. G. TOBIN: Stop reading from your speech. Stand up man-fashion and say what you got to say.

MR. S. NEARY: You had better let the people of Burin know what the administration is going to do about opening that plant down there.

MR. HODDER: Their current policy of confrontation and buck-passing is not working, does not work. The Premier brags about his revolutionary idea, his new plan to save the fishing industry. I would like to point out that the Premier and his former pal Frank Moores, have been running around this Province since 1971 and they have had full and total and complete control, the full responsibility for the fishing industry for all of that time, since 1971, especially in the areas of marketing and restructuring. Where do we find ourselves now, Mr. Speaker? We find ourselves now after years with not even a marketing section down in Fisheries. When the Fisheries Department was down here in the Confederation Building, in 1975 I tried to find the marketing part of the Department of Fisheries and, could not find it. I finally got a letter back saying, 'Here are the names of fish processors in Newfoundland. Why do you not contact them?' Now that was four years ago and there was no marketing to speak of. Now we have a minister who runs up to the Four Seasons Hotel and puts off a little dinner, runs down to Jamaica, runs to Barbados, he is over to

- MR. J. HODDER: Calgary and he has now announced he is going on another trip selling fish.
- MR. B. TULK: Not another trip - trips.
- MR. HODDER: Yes, another series of trips.
- Now, Mr. Speaker, where is the plan, where is the philosophy? What is the minister doing? Would the minister tell us exactly what he is going to be doing? He is the most inept politician and member of the government side to be running around trying to sell fish by himself all over the world. I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that this is his annual vacation.
- MR. TULK: His what?
- MR. HODDER: Annual vacation.
- MR. TULK: Vacations. Use that in the plural.
- MR. HODDER: Vacations.
- MR. G. TOBIN: He was not kicked out of any of the places on the Burin Peninsula when he was down there last week.
- MR. HODDER: The question I would like to ask the government is why did they not issue their revolutionary plan -
- MR. TULK: Why? Were you?
- MR. TOBIN: No, Sir!
- MR. TULK: Do you know what the word is on you on the Burin Peninsula. He is a non-factor.
- MR. HODDER: Non-factor. That is what we were told last night down in the hon. member's district. We were down there last night.
- SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!
- MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!
- MR. HODDER: I would like to ask the Premier a question, but, of course, he is never in the House anymore. He just comes in here and sort of sulks. The last two days

MR. J. HODDER: he has been sulking, standing there like a little boy frightened to death, shaking and shivering. He has. He does not wave his arms anymore.

MR. NEARY: They are trying to get him under control.

MR. HODDER: On Valium.

MR. NEARY: They are trying to calm him down now, trying to change his image. But you will never change his image. Tomorrow he will be up in the chandeliers again.

MR. HODDER: And then he goes back down to the eighth floor and sucks his thumb. Mr. Speaker, the question I would like answered is this: Why is it that they did not issue this revolutionary plan before the fish plants which were under their protection,

MR. HODDER: like Burin and Gaultois and St. Lawrence and all the rest were beaten to the ground and all the plant workers and fishermen were forced into submission by the completely out-of-control fish companies whose only interest is the dollar they can suck out of the workers and the resources, while they last, under their gluttonous mismanagement?

MR. STAGG: The hon. member is reading his speeches again.

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to my notes. And a good speech it is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask why was it necessary for an industry to die before Mr. Peckford flies to the scene like Captain America with his revolutionary plan to save the industry? I would like to know that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: There is only one person on the other side who can read that kind of tripe and he is sitting by you there. You cannot do it. You have to come up with some other stuff. This stuff for is is just terrible.

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker. This is an excellent speech.

MR. TULK: Go back to your hockey game.

MR. STAGG: It is just not you.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, since I only have about three minutes left - and again the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has hidden away from us, he is hiding away from debate as always - I want to tell the Minister of Fisheries the people in the

MR. HODDER: district of Port au Port have been waiting for one month to have their fish plant opened. The union people I was talking to today are out of work. This is the time of year when they would be all working; none of them are working, Mr. Speaker, and the minister who made all sorts of announcements three weeks ago that things would be in hand soon, the minister still tells me that things are not in hand and I would like to urge -

MR. TULK: I want to ask you something. Is that the meeting where the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) made a complete fool of himself?

MR. HODDER: The meeting with the joint councils?

MR. TULK: Oh, it was the meeting with the joint councils.

MR. HODDER: The joint councils, yes.

MR. TULK: It was not the fishermen's meeting?

MR. HODDER: Oh, the fishermen's meeting. He makes a fool of himself at every fishermen's meeting he goes to. You see, the hon. member for Stephenville has been found out. You see, he has no issues in his own district, there is nothing happening there except rents are going up. Rents went up by some 50 per cent on the base after he had campaigned on the fact that he would hold rents back. Rents went up by 50 per cent,

MR. HODDER: yet the only thing that he finds that he can talk about because things are so miserable in his own district is to talk about the fisheries in Port au Port.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!
The hon. member's time has expired.

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OSMOND: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would to commend my hon. colleagues for the speeches that they have made and the support they have given to this resolution. And also at this time I want to thank the ministers and this government for the way they are handling and running this Province during such trying times.

MR. NEARY: A voice crying in the wilderness.

MR. OSMOND: I thank them for their co-operation over the past year.

MR. NEARY: A voice crying in the wilderness.

MR. OSMOND: Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the Opposition for a year now.

MR. OSMOND: An example of what they might be doing in helping to solve the problems in the offshore fishery is an example of how they helped in the offshore negotiations on oil. For instance, I think if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and his colleagues had spent more time in their office supporting this government on the offshore deal, sitting down and writing their Prime Minister, the members, the five MPs, the hon. Mr. Rompkey -

AN HON. MEMBER: That fellow on the West Coast.

MR. OSMOND: - and that fellow on the West Coast - Yes, him too. Instead of doing this, what they were doing, they were in their office trying to dig up and find out where the Premier stayed last night and what he had for breakfast this morning. That is the kind of stuff they were doing instead of helping in the offshore.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they talk about what the provincial minister was doing. I can give them some examples of what the provincial minister was doing.

AN HON. MEMBER: On the weekend.

MR. OSMOND: On the weekend, right!

The provincial minister spends many weekends, when he is out, as you say, running around the country, he is running around the country for the fishery of this Province. As an example, I will just run through a little bit of what he did in my district over the weekend and what we did together. First of all on Friday morning we met with fishermen and fish buyers on the wharf at Woody Point. We also met with fish buyers in Rocky Harbour.

MR. TULK: What has that got to do with the resolution?

MR. OSMOND: This does have something to do with the resolution, I would think, because it is related to what the provincial government is doing with the inshore fishery.

AN HON. MEMBER: More than lobster.

MR. OSMOND: It has more to do with it, I think, or just as much as the lobster topic.

So, Mr. Speaker, we travelled the Northern Peninsula for three days - Friday, Saturday and Sunday.

MR. NEARY: Was that your first time?

MR. OSMOND: Not very likely, Sir, my first time. We went into places where fish plants had not been open for two or three years. The first of May those fish plants are going to be open.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OSMOND: The first of May they are going to be open due to the efforts of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and myself and his staff.

MR. NEARY: Thanks to T.J. Hardy.

MR. OSMOND: By the way, some of the fish plants I am referring to are not T.J. Hardy's plants.

MR. NEARY: Thanks to T.J. Hardy.

MR. OSMOND: We also visited those too and they were up in the other district. They were North of my district. We visited those too.

MR. TOBIN: Whose district is that?

MR. HEARN: Yes, whose district is that?

MR. TOBIN: You are not doing his work, are you?

MR. OSMOND: No, no, not by any means. It was in my interest really because I am certainly interested in the people of the whole St. Barbe coast.

Mr. Speaker, we met with fishermen, fishermen's associations, in stores, fish stores, on wharves, even on pans of ice.

MR. TULK: Was that pan of ice moving away?

If it was you should have left the minister out there.

MR. OSMOND: That was in Flower's Cove, by the way, on the pans of ice.

MR. TULK: Was that drifting off?

Was that ice moving off?

MR. OSMOND: We carried over into Sunday. We met people in Cow Head on Sunday and then on into Bonne Bay. That was three days of the weekend. But

MR. OSMOND: the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is not only doing this. Practically every weekend he is out somewhere helping the fishery of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: His problem is he does not stay out far enough or long enough.

MR. OSMOND: Well, Mr. Speaker, he went far enough because he did go into the Strait district and try to help out some of the plants in the Straits district. So he went reasonably far enough down there, as far as he could go really on that peninsula. And there are certainly going to be results from it.

MR. HEARN: I heard they thought he was the member.

MR. OSMOND: What?

MR. HEARN: I heard they thought he was the member.

MR. ROBERTS: They could not welcome him more. They could not welcome him more.

MR. OSMOND: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: He is only a year late in doing it.

MR. OSMOND: Well, you are never late by doing things like getting plants open. You are never late.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to also comment on some other things. It is the licensing procedure by the federal government over which we have no control. The inshore fishermen, for instance, they have lobster licences, some of them, and they have cod licenses -

MR. NEARY: Salmon licences.

MR. OSMOND: But in a lot of cases they do not have a salmon licence, they do not have a herring licence, and in some more cases they have all the other licences except a lobster licence, so therefore an inshore fisherman cannot survive on lobsters alone and he cannot survive on salmon alone. He needs all those licences.

MR. TULK: And your solution is what?

MR. OSMOND: My solution is for the federal government to take a serious look at it in the line of trying to resolve it and seeing that the inshore fishermen can make a decent living. He fishes for, like I say, six weeks at the lobsters and makes not enough money to get his stamps for the next Winter.

MR. NEARY: What about the national park now, the problems in the national park?

MR. OSMOND: I will probably get to that a little later now, the national park. If you will permit me I will get to that a little later.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak for a few minutes on the way this government co-operates, negotiates, and some examples of how they have co-operated and negotiated in my district and the results. We have, for instance, as one of the hon. members from the other side said, this goodlooking minister from this side, his staff and his people and, as a result of their negotiations in my district we are going to have probably thirty or forty woodsmen working this year in the sawlog operation who would not be working if it had not been for the co-operation of this government.

MR. NEARY: Now how can you get saw logs relating to this resolution?

MR. OSMOND: I am just using an example of where the Opposition is so often saying that this government

MR.OSMOND: is not co-operating and they cannot negotiate and all this. This is something that is ongoing in Hawkes Bay and as a result there is going to be a saw log operation there.

Mr. Speaker, another example is the way the Minister of the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall), as a result of his co-operation and his negotiations and listening to the people on the West coast, both in Stephenville and in the Parson's Pond area, listening to their needs and their views on drilling on the onshore and he has complied with their wishes and as a result there are bids.

MR. OSMOND: out today for drilling on the onshore. So that is a result of how this government can negotiate and work with the people. You mentioned the park. Sure they are building roads in the park in my area, which is what parks should do; this is their responsibility and it is what they should do. I certainly am not behind the door in commending them on that either.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the fishery and the plants all over Newfoundland opened the same as they are going to be in my district this year. I am sure that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), in dealing with the inshore fishery, will certainly see to it that those plants are opened.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by supporting the resolution as first presented and, as I say, I cannot support the amendment. This government is doing its share in the inshore fishery and in getting the inshore fishery into operation, so I cannot support the amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ANDREWS: The former, former, former Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if hon. gentlemen opposite are finished with their attempts at witticisms, let them allow me the ten minutes, I think, I have by the rules of the House because at 5:40 P.M. the -

MR. CARTER: Far too long.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman - now let me get it straight, St. John's North, (Mr. Carter) is it? - is the only member of the House whose shirt size exceeds his intelligence quotient and he insists upon proving it.

Now, I only have about ten minutes according to the rules, and that is fair enough.

I would like to say just a few words on the subject of the resolution and more particularly, the amendment which, of course, is what is before us. I originally was going to reply to the points made by my friend from St. Barbe (Mr. Osmond) who is making what I understand is his maiden speech in the House.

MR. STAGG: Not so.

MR. ROBERTS: Is it not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. ROBERTS: Then, Mr. Speaker, it ought to have been his maiden speech because whatever he said before is of no import.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: What I was going to say to him -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Hon. gentlemen opposite, Sir, are unable to contain themselves. If they have a medical problem they should try to find a doctor, if they have a psychological problem they should try to find psychiatric

MR. ROBERTS: help, and if they have any other problems then I am afraid they cannot be helped because, of course, the teachers are all locked out by this government's policy so they are not able to deal with kindergarten children, including my friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). My friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is an interesting psychological study. Your Honour will notice how he keeps edging up towards the Chair. Now, he was once in the Chair but he has never been asked back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: But he keeps circling around the Cabinet benches, the Treasury benches. His assigned seat is somewhere down just inside the Bar of the House, but 'hope springs eternal', or, as Mr. Smallwood used to tell us all the time in the House, 'While the light holds out to burn the vilest sinner may return,' and that, of course, extends even to my friend from Stephenville.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House is very straightforward and so is the amendment. The amendment, which we are now debating, simply broadens the resolution. The resolution says that the House urges the Government of Canada to exercise their responsibility for the fishery, and that is certainly straightforward. I find no quarrel with that and, I suspect, neither do my colleagues.

The amendment which my friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has moved broadens it to include the Government of Newfoundland as well as the Government of Canada and asks that both be urged to exercise without delay their responsibilities for ensuring the continued viability of the industry.

Now, I do not know what the

MR. ROBERTS: fate of the amendment will
be; I suspect, though, from what little I have gleaned
from the speeches of gentlemen opposite today that the
amendment will be defeated and, of course, if that is
so, it is

MR. ROBERTS:

simply for partisan reasons. There could be no valid reason in policy or in principle, I suggest, for turning down an amendment which simply says that each government must exercise their responsibility. That is perfectly straightforward. But if hon. gentlemen opposite, including the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) who is trying to make his mark by moving this motion - and he will have a chance now to speak quite properly at the end of this debate - if they wish simply to try to use this as a partisan ploy then they will do so and the proof of their doing so will be by defeating the amendment. If, in fact, Mr. Speaker, they are concerned, as they say they are, if their actions are to support their words, if they are not to make liars of themselves by their actions, they will accept the amendment. The amendment simply takes out some of the meretricious rhetoric with which the hon. gentleman has adorned his resolution. I do not know, hon. gentlemen drafting resolutions seem to want to put their arguments in the preambles - and that is fair enough, it is arguable - but this meretricious preamble, which the hon. gentleman has employed, some of that is dropped and it then comes right to the point that the House urges each level of government to act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that this House should do in this session, fast emerging as a barren session, about as barren as The Funks - we all know what The Funks are covered with and this session is going to emerge as just that kind of productive session, the same kind of product as covers The Funk Islands - but if this House should be doing anything

MR. ROBERTS: in this session it is to be concerned with the fishery, and properly so. We have all said it in different ways, and I do not need to repeat what has been said by so many in so many different ways. We would all agree that Newfoundland and Labrador live or die by the fishery and that includes not only the rural parts of this Province, Mr. Speaker, including my own constituency and all others outside what I have always referred to as the Trans-Canada Highway seats, it includes the so-called towns and cities.

You know, was it William Jennings Brien - hon. gentlemen opposite may never have heard of William Jennings Bryan. The Premier doubtless has. I think the Premier is learned and read and he has read -

MR. TULK: He read it in the Grade VII Literature.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. TULK: In the Grade VII Literature.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know where he read it but William Jennings Bryan, a great orator, whatever else his weaknesses were, a great orator and he once said in his 1896 speech, the cross of gold speech, that if you - and I am paraphrasing obviously - if you level the cities of America - he was American - and leave the farms untouched, the cities will grow again. But if you destroy the forms and leave

MR. E. ROBERTS:

the cities untouched, nothing will ever grown again. You could take that and apply it to this Province of ours, Mr. Speaker, that if the fishery does not survive and prosper - first of all survive, and then prosper - then all the rest of Newfoundland will be spume before the wind, will be of no substance, of no merit, or no viability, have no hope for the future. Each government, Mr. Speaker, has certain responsibilities and we are not here today to debate the various Constitutional responsibilities. I think we are all aware of what they are. Some of us may want to change them, most of us may want to change them, some of us may feel that one level of government have not done all that they ought to have done and others of us may feel that another level have not done all that they in turn ought to have done. That is fine too. But surely we can all agree on the common ground that each level of government has a responsibility for coming to grips with the crisis which confronts the fishery in this Province today, a crisis which we have lived with for so long but we do not realize or remember most of the time that it is a crisis, that the private enterprise system has obviously failed to operate effectively in Newfoundland and Labrador in the fishery sector; it has failed. I have been around long enough so that I can remember at least three great crises, they seem to come and go, and they have been solved in the past by liberal applications - with a small l and a large L - Liberal applications of funds, millions and more millions bailed into the fishery and all that it has done is put off the inevitable evil day. It has put it off. We may be able to put it off again, I do not know. Mr. Speaker, we may be able to put it off again,

MR. E. ROBERTS: but that surely is not what we ought to do. What we ought to do is to realize that the fishery as it is now constituted is a terminal case. It cannot go on as it is. Oh, sure, the figure I hear is a quarter of a billion dollars the Feds are going to have to lay out.

MR. B. TULK: Even as high as half a billion.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) says it is as high as a half a billion - an astonishing sum of money. If it would do the job I would say little enough and I would say money well spent. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter remains that simply bailing money into the fishery is not going to solve it. I have very real doubts whether the private enterprise sector can solve the problems on their own. I know this, the only way that the private enterprise sector can solve the problems is if they are allowed to operate by the rules of private enterprise. And I know, too, that if the private enterprise sector is allowed to live and to operate by the rules which govern free enterprise so-called,

MR. ROBERTS: then the result will be a state of affairs which socially is totally unacceptable here in Newfoundland and Labrador. There is no doubt, there can be no doubt that in the economic sense, and I use the word 'economic' in the very narrow sense, several of the large fish plants in this Province should not open - if one looks only at economic criteria. There is no doubt either if one looks only at economic criteria thousands of fishermen in this Province cannot look to the fishery for their living - and that is hardly a radical insight.

I can recall many years ago a very competent and a very experienced and knowledgeable and thoroughly concerned and compassionate Newfoundlander, his name was Ross Young, an uncle of the Premier's, I believe, but a senior public servant, spent his life in the fisheries, and he and I were having a conversation, we were working together on a matter, and he said, 'You know, ten years from now there are going to be as half as many fishermen in this Province as there are today'. And that was not the work of a visionary, that was the work of a realist who looked at the facts. And of course the problem is that if we let economics alone operate that is what will happen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, obviously each of those two conclusions is unacceptable to this House and to the people of this Province, because either of those conclusions if they are implemented would lead to a situation that could spell disaster for the Burin-Marystown area, for the plant at Burin economically, looking only at those narrow parameters, ought to be closed. That is what the business people - my friend shakes his head. You know, I feel it ought to be open, but my reasons are not strictly economic, and what I say to him is that he has to come to the position, and maybe he has come to the position, his Premier

MR. ROBERTS: has at long last, that the private enterprise sector has failed, and I suggest will fail. We may be with the fresh fishery where we were fifteen years past with the salt fishery, where we were in Canada sixty years ago with the wheat industry, the private, so-called private enterprise, the so-called free enterprise. And I happen to believe nothing makes the wheel go 'round like the buck, there is nothing that motivates men to get out and earn a buck and I like living in a society where a guy can try to earn a buck. But there are situations where private enterprise cannot work, cannot work. And the fishing

MR. CARTER: Oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I say to my friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter), the answer is yes. And the Premier in his paper has addressed that. Now the problem is - how much time do I have, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): About thirty seconds.

MR. ROBERTS: Well -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not right of me to ask for leave. My friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) has the right to close the debate.

MR. NEARY: He does not have anything to say.

MR. TOBIN: I was just going to grant leave except you opened your mouth.

MR. NEARY: Then why do you not give him leave?

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know what the hon. gentleman is upset about. I have not said anything at all about him.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, it was the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, my friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) made a perfectly valid comment. My friend from Burin - Placentia West does not like it but that is his problem. If you cannot stand the heat, he should leave the kitchen.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the point is I am not asking for leave. Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It being 5:40 p.m. on Private Members' Day, it is my duty to recognize the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. TOBIN: After listening to the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) I was beginning to become a little bit confused as to whether he was about to display the same attitude that his colleague in Ottawa displays, that now that St. Anthony is open, to hell with the South Coast. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure but I do not think that that is what the gentleman said. It was the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), Mr. Speaker, in July of last year who made that statement and the headlines in the paper read something to the effect that, 'Morgan's advice to Neary, let the plants close'.

MR. STAGG: Neary's advice to Morgan.

MR. TOBIN: I am sorry, 'Neary's advice to Morgan, let the fish plants close'. Mr. Speaker, that is the philosophy, that is the attitude of the Liberal Party that has them sitting on the other side of the House today with only eight seats, while we on this side have forty-four.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I introduced this resolution I did it with good intentions. I did it to try and entice the members opposite to join this government, Mr. Speaker, to join the people on this side of the House who care about what is taking place in the Province of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, I did not introduce this resolution in the House for partisan reasons. I introduced it because I cared, Mr. Speaker, about what is taking place in this Province today, about the situation that our fisheries is in. That is why the resolution was introduced, not in a partisan manner whatsoever. It was to try to ask the gentlemen opposite, such as the member, Mr. Speaker, for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) who wants to interrupt - and if I was him, Mr. Speaker, I would interrupt too, when you consider that my colleague

MR. TOBIN: from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg)
spent three days in Port au Port district working on behalf
of his people at their request to try and get something
done out there. If I was him, Mr. Speaker, I would be
upset as well. Now, Mr. Speaker, look, he is going.
And I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the efforts of my
colleague from Stephenville will be well respected by the
people of the Port au Port district.

However, Mr. Speaker, now that

MR. TOBIN: we have put the resolution to the House and now that the eight gentlemen opposite - I would not be so unkind, Mr. Speaker, as to refer to them as anything else even though the rules do not permit me to, despite what I might think at times.

MR. WARREN: There is no way (inaudible).

MR. TOBIN: The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has finally spoken. As usual, Mr. Speaker, I did not understand what he said and I am not sure anyone else did. However, this resolution was introduced to try to get the political parties which represent the people of this Province in the House of Assembly to unite and to put forth to Ottawa a strong stand on the fisheries of this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Opposition has failed again. They have again, Mr. Speaker, turned their backs on the electorate in this Province. They want to draw it into a political issue, which is not the point at all. Mr. Speaker, I can say here and now that I am far too big to play politics with the fishing industry in this Province. I am far too big to play politics with the lives, Mr. Speaker, of the fishermen of this Province.

What is in this resolution that they cannot support? I noticed when the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), Mr. Speaker, got up to speak, there was no substance whatsoever in what he had to say. All he did, Mr. Speaker, was attack what I had to say. I forget what he said about the speech. Oh, yes, it was a very weak speech, I did not use aggressive words, the working was not aggressive. Mr. Speaker, I believe that what was demonstrated by the member for Terra Nova was very poor. In fact, it proves that he is indeed a very effete politician.

MR. STAGG: Effete? E-f-f-e-t-e?

MR. TOBIN: E-f-f-e-t-e. Mr. Speaker, that is what I feel the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) demonstrated here this afternoon. The substance, Mr. Speaker, of his knowledge about the fisheries would be no greater than the average student in some place like New York, Paris or Toronto. Mr. Speaker, the substance of his knowledge is about that great.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the hon. gentleman ask questions this last couple of days and what has he said? I mean, Mr. Speaker, his knowledge on the questions that he asks proves one thing to me, and that is that I consider him to be an ineffective plagiarist. And he gets up to speak, shadowboxing. You know, you should see him, Mr. Speaker, the way he shadowboxes. That proves one other thing, his shallow knowledge of the fishing crisis in this Province today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we can go on and I can refer back to the day when he got up and said there was nothing said. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has talked about what has not been said and about the federal government putting up so much money. What about what I said when I spoke last week, Mr. Speaker, when I introduced this resolution? What about Chrysler Corporation, Mr. Speaker? What about the \$1 billion to Dome Petroleum, Mr. Speaker?

MR. STAGG: And what about the Japanese caplin?

MR. TOBIN: Yes, what about

MR. TOBIN: the Japanese caplin?
Mr. Speaker, we know the monies, the resources, the finances that have been put into other areas. What about the \$700 million for the airport in Quebec? What about that great budget, the propaganda section of the budget, Mr. Speaker? Two hundred and thirty-five million, I think, was it last year for that, an information section of the budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) spoke after me when I introduced this resolution. He appealed to me, he said several times, Mr. Speaker, and Hansard will show it, 'Where do you stand? What option do you support?'. What option do I support! What an insult to the people of this Province, trying to put pressure on someone on this side of the House to support an option that did not include the reopening of the fish plants on the South Coast. Here is the option, Mr. Speaker, that includes it, put forth by the Government of Newfoundland. Why does the Leader of the Opposition not take his place in this House and show his true colours and support Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the option. The Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues supported an option in Ottawa, but they never had the courage to say what option they were supporting. Here is the option, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: Are you going to vote for Joe Clark?

MR. TOBIN: What is that?

MR. WARREN: Are you going to vote for Joe Clark?

MR. TOBIN: Am I going to vote for Joe Clark? I can tell you one thing, there is no one in the Conservative Party in this Nation who lacks backbone as you and your colleagues do when it comes to fighting for the people they represent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: I can tell you that if we have to decide on who we are voting against, we will compare them to you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they want to know if the people of Burin will tell you where they stand. The people of Burin, he says, will tell you where they stand. I can tell you where the people of Burin stand and there it is, thousands of signatures gone off to De Bane requesting that their plant be opened. It is right there, Mr. Speaker. Look, look, there it is. Not gone to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) here, not gone to the Premier here but certainly gone to the federal government requesting their plant be kept open. Now, two weeks ago Mr. Kirby was called in again by this great Cabinet committee in Ottawa that is restructuring the fishing industry, he was called in and then after Mr. Kirby left the meeting Mr. Rompkey makes this great appearance in front of a CBC camera man, 'We have given instructions, we have given the great saviour of the fishing industry instructions to go out and negotiate'. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is two weeks ago and to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker - and I have some pretty good sources - Mr. Kirby has not yet had one negotiating meeting on this issue. Now, Mr. Speaker, do you think that is bad? Well, let me tell you some other

MR. TOBIN: information that I heard,
and I cannot believe it, Mr. Speaker, it is beyond me.
It is totally dumbfounding, the other information my
sources give me, that Mr. Kirby is leaving the country
for a week to ten days. Is that not dispicable?

MR. TOBIN: He is leaving this country with the fishing industry in this Province in the state it is. That is where the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and his colleagues stand, that is who you support. Well, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. WARREN: Where is the Minister of Finance?

MR. TOBIN: Where is the Minister of Finance? He is where he deserves to be, on a good holiday. He deserves it. And I can tell you something else, that Mr. Kirby was hired by the federal Cabinet, Mr. Trudeau, Prime Minister Trudeau hired this great man with so much knowledge on the fishing industry and do you know something -

MR. NEARY: Your own colleague, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), would not even come to the hearing.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

MR. TOBIN: Do you know something, Mr. Speaker? When the Prime Minister of this country realized what he had in Mr. Kirby, did he put him in fisheries? He sent him straight to CNR. That is where he put him. That is the man who is restructuring the fishing industry today.

Mr. Speaker, do you know that when Mr. Kirby got involved in the fishing industry he was so far out of his field in restructuring the fishing industry of this Province that even the Prime Minister of Canada recognized it. Just imagine! That is how far out he was, the Prime Minister of this country could recognize it. Now, is that not shameful? Is that not shameful, Mr. Speaker?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the

MR. TOBIN:

restructuring, Mr. Speaker. This presentation that was put forth by the provincial government, by the Premier, laid for the first time on the Table of the Cabinet committee, a plan that would save the fishing industry, a plan that would save the communities that I represent along with my colleagues for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart), Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) and everywhere else. There is the plan, Mr. Speaker, that went on the Table to be accepted. Not the options that were there, not one, Mr. Speaker. And we can talk about the great resolution that was passed and I supported and continue to support it, supported by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), supported by the Premier -

MR. HODDER:

I cannot hear you and

I cannot understand you.

MR. TOBIN:

Is that right? Well,

Mr. Speaker, I do not find that hard to believe because I realize since I came in here that the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has no great ability to comprehend. I had realized that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

And now you have found

out the reason, he cannot hear.

MR. TOBIN:

That is right.

The reason why he is not able to comprehend is because he is deaf. Well, Mr. Speaker,

MR. TOBIN: this is the option that was put on the Table. And I can tell you that when the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) for this Province, that good and great Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, that hard working Minister of Fisheries, when he came to the Burin Peninsula two weeks ago and told the people of the Burin Peninsula where he stands and where the Government of Newfoundland stands as it relates to their plants, that this government, Mr. Speaker, was committed to the reopening of the plants, would accept nothing else from Ottawa -

MR. NEARY: There is nobody paying any attention to you, boy.

MR. TOBIN: Now, Mr. Speaker, would accept nothing else from Ottawa. I travelled with the minister to Burin and you can ask my good friend from Burin, Mr. Speaker, that great Mayor, that great fighting Newfoundlander who is detested by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) because he had the courage to fight for the people he represented unlike the leader. When his community started to flounder in Burin, Mr. Speaker, the Mayor stood up and fought like a true Buriner. What did the Leader of the Opposition do when Bell Island started to fall. He ran to LaPoile. And that is why he will do nothing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: That is why he detests the Mayor of Burin, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: I have to admit you are right.

MR. TOBIN: I know I am right. I would not say it if I was not right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the document that is going to save Newfoundland, that is going to save the communities, save the Newfoundlanders.

MR. TOBIN: And , Mr. Speaker, we went into Burin. What a reception the minister was given! What a reception! Absolutely unbelievable, the gratitude that was displayed by the people in Burin. Then, Mr. Speaker, he joined my colleague from Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) and they went into Grand Bank and St. Lawrence, standing ovations, Mr. Speaker, everywhere he went. Mr. Speaker, do you know that in that same area, that same day, there was another politician creeping around, crawling around, was not seen by too many people -

MR. STAGG: Did he have a brass band with him?

MR. TOBIN: No, he did not have a brass band with him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can tell this hon. House today that when the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) for this Province went into the meeting not one person stood up and walked from the room, not one, Mr. Speaker. They stood up in the room and showed their appreciation to the minister. But this other politician, a fellow, Mr. Speaker, by the name Mr. Simmons - he is so often unheard of and unseen on the Burin Peninsula we even forget about him. But in any case do you know what happened?

MR. NEARY: Do not get personal.

MR. TOBIN: Do not get personal. I did not walk out of the room on him, Mr. Speaker. I would have stayed to listen to him. It was not me. It was other people who walked out of the room. Why did they walk out of the room on their federal representative and stand up and cheer their provincial . representative. Why would they do that?

MR. STAGG: Why?

MR. TOBIN: I can tell you why they would do it.

MR. STAGG: Well, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was down there and made a mess of it for the federal member, I suppose, was it.

MR. NEARY: Smear tactics through character assassination, personal abuse, you are stooping to an all-time low.

MR. TOBIN: I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, why they did it. They did it because of the lack of action, Mr. Speaker, or the inaction on the part of the federal government. That is why they did it. Because the federal government, Mr. Kirby and his gang should not be supported by the Liberal Opposition in terms of putting options on the Table that do not include the reopening of plants on the South Coast. You people should be standing in this House as Newfoundlanders as we have done, Mr. Speaker, and thank the Premier and his government for giving jobs back to the people of Burin and Grand Bank and Gaultois and Harbour Breton. Instead of that you are criticizing. Instead of that you are disappointed, Mr. Speaker, because this government has stood up and fought for Newfoundlanders. It upsets you. It hurts you. Do you know why? Because you are probably the victims of circumstance, I will give you that much. But the federal Liberal Government in this country were studying a proposal that did not include the opening of these plants.

This government, this good Tory government included the reopening of these plants. Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: The plants will open thanks to Ottawa.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, we got St. Anthony open thanks to Ottawa. That is what we got open thanks to Ottawa. Why could not the people of Burin, why could not the people of Grand Bank and Gaultois and Harbour Breton expect the same treatment from the Liberal Government as the people of St. Anthony?

MR. NEARY: Does your government take an equity position in the new deal to open these fish plants?

MR. TOBIN: Our government, Mr. Speaker, has demonstrated, they already have taken equity positions in these plants.

MR. NEARY: That is what I am saying, what are the chances?

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. TOBIN: In the deep sea fishing industry in this Province this government has \$61 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TOBIN: And another \$25 million last year. Mr. Speaker, obviously I have touched a nerve with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) by telling him, Mr. Speaker, that this government is committed to opposing any plan in the fishery that sees factory trawlers out there harvesting the fish while plants like Burin and Grand Bank and Gaultois are permitted to die.

MR. STAGG: The Russian system.

MR. TOBIN: This government is prepared to -

MR. STAGG: The Gulag system they are talking about.

MR. TOBIN: What is that?

MR. STAGG: The Gulag system. They capture the people and send them to sea for six months.

MR. TOBIN: This government has already taken an equity position, it is my understanding, in these plants.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not got time to get into the quota systems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that nerves have been touched of the hon. members opposite. Yes, Mr. Speaker, and if I was not standing up and fighting for Newfoundlanders the way I should be and the way I am I would be embarrassed as well

MR. TOBIN: but I cannot be embarrassed on that issue, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Tell us now. One, two, three, tell us, come on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) can try to stifle me any way he can but I will not back down from supporting the people of this Province. I will be unlike the Leader of the Opposition. I will stay in Burin-Placentia West and I will be re-elected in Burin-Placentia West. And I can tell you something right now, that the Leader of the Opposition -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, I know that my time is running out but I would have liked to have gotten into the quota system. I would have liked, Mr. Speaker, to have gotten into EEC markets and the allocation of fish.

MR. SIMMS: Right, the tariffs.

MR. TOBIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the tariffs that have been applied.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, I will get back at it at a later date.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

All those in favour of the amendment 'Aye'. Those against the amendment 'Nay'. The amendment is defeated.

All those in favour of the resolution 'Aye'. Those against the resolution 'Nay'. The resolution is carried.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I would like to advise that the Resource Committee will meet at seven-thirty this evening here in the House of Assembly to review the estimates of the Department of Mines and Energy and the Petroleum Directorate. The Resource Committee will meet tomorrow evening at nine-thirty in the Colonial Building to review the estimates of the Department of Fisheries. Government Services will meet tomorrow morning at nine-thirty, am I right?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is right.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes. At nine-thirty tomorrow evening on the Department of Fisheries.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Tomorrow morning.

MR. MARSHALL: Well it says tomorrow evening here. That is why I am saying it is -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It is tomorrow morning.

MR. MARSHALL: Well it is tomorrow morning but I am reading tomorrow evening here. So there must be an error. So it is tomorrow morning, is it? Okay, all right. Now, I will go again.

Mr. Speaker, the Resource Committee seven-thirty this evening in the House of Assembly. For the members opposite that is here. The Resource Committee tomorrow morning at nine-thirty in the Colonial Building. That is down there. The Government Services will meet tomorrow morning at nine-thirty in the House of Assembly. That is here for the Department of Municipal Affairs. Okay?

MR. NEARY: Who is going to handle Mines and Energy, you or the minister?

MR. MARSHALL: Both of us in unison.

April 13. 1983

Tape No. 986

IB-3

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL):

Order, please!

This being Private

Member's Day the House do adjourn until tomorrow,
Thursday at three of the clock.