

Vol. 2

No. 8

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
MARCH 16, 1983
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port on a point of order.

MR. HODDER: This morning we, as usual, asked for invitations for the Budget Speech and we were told that the Opposition got six.

MR. NEARY: Not even one each.

MR. HODDER: Not even one each, six invitations each -

MR. NEARY: No, six invitations total.

MR. BAIRD: Now straighten it up now. How many have you got?

MR. NEARY: Be quiet.

MR. HODDER: This is certainly not normal, Mr. Speaker. There are some 100 seats in the House when you take the Speaker's Gallery as well, and I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if this is something new, whether the Opposition has the same rights in this House of Assembly as the government does. Or is it, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is using those tickets to bring his own supporters into the House for the Budget Speech.

MR. MARSHALL: Are you anticipating that?

MR. NEARY: No, we are anticipating the arrogance and the bigotry of this administration.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there could not possibly be enough tickets around for all my supporters -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: - so I am not bringing all my supporters in by any means. But if one looks at the numbers, there are quite a number of guests whom we have traditionally invited, our fiscal agents, the bankers, heads of unions, members of the churches and so on and so forth who take up a large number of the seats, and Then we have to remember there are fifty-two members in the House and if every member got even one ticket that is another fifty, and there are just so many. There was no attempt whatever, Mr. Speaker, to give more tickets to members on this side than that side. As a matter of fact, I think that some members on this side did not get any tickets.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: I did not get any.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, I think my hon. friend has made a very valid point, Mr. Speaker, that this is a departure from the norm. It is a departure from tradition. Mr. Speaker, I am in this House now going on twenty-one years -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Too long.

MR. NEARY: - and on Opening Day in the House, and on Budget Day, the Opposition members of the House are offered at least one invitation.

MR. HODDER: It is our House too.

MR. NEARY:

This year we have been offered a total of six. It is the people's House. The elected representatives have certain rights and privileges in this House, Mr. Speaker. We have been offered a total of six invitations for eight members. That is not right, Mr. Speaker, it is not fair and it just goes to show how arrogant and bigoted this administration has become in a short time.

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The Chair is not sure this is a valid point of order. It is something that happened outside the Chamber of this House and maybe it is something that the House Leaders or the Caucus chairmen can get together and decide and reach a resolution to.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS.VERGE: Mr. Speaker, today I am launching a campaign called "Join the Class of '83" designed to encourage people who have been out of school for a while to enrol in a post-secondary education program next September.

With the transition from Grade XI to Grade XII as the final year of high school, very few high school graduates will be applying for entrance to the Province's post-secondary institutions next Fall. Therefore, there will be special opportunities for older people and students who were previously unable to gain access to high-demand programs with a limited number of student places.

The following institutions are participating in the "Join the Class of '83" campaign: Memorial University of Newfoundland; the College of Trades and Technology; the College of Fisheries, Navigation, Marine Engineering and Electronics; the Bay St. George Community College; and the 16 vocational schools across the Province. The campaign will be co-ordinated by a committee comprising representatives of the Department of Education and these institutions.

In the coming months each

MS.VERGE: post-secondary institution will be using the news media to inform the public of its programs and the special opportunities for entrance in the next school year. Promotional posters featuring the theme "Join the Class of '83" will be displayed around the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I have samples of the posters here with me. As part of the effort to encourage people to avail of training opportunities, vocational schools will be implementing a policy of accepting all qualified applicants on a first come-first served basis.

I think this is an excellent time for many women to get into trades and occupations now dominated by men.

I invite all members of this Honourable House to inform their constituents of the special opportunities for people to enrol in university programs, technical programs, pre-employment trades training, apprentice programs and business education programs.

I hope many people will "Join the Class of '83".

SOME HON.MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR.LUSH:

Mr.Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER:

The hon.member for Terra Nova.

MR.LUSH:

It seems little enough effort by the government to compensate for the lack of foresight with respect to planning for Grade XII. But nevertheless, Mr.Speaker, one certainly would have to support and endorse the effort to get people to return to a

MR. LUSH:

post-secondary institution. However, with the unemployment so high, one would think that that would not be too much of a problem because, Mr. Speaker, it is the only place to go. We will all have to return to scholasticism and enroll in some institution to take up our idle time. But very seriously, Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that it just will not be a wholesale registration in our post-secondary institutions just for the sake of doing courses. I do hope that there will be some counselling, some wise and prudent counselling, particularly for our young people, because we have so many young people today entering into post-secondary institutions, particularly our trade and vocational schools, without any counselling, without any career counselling as to the types of jobs that they should get into, without any counselling with respect to the kinds of careers that will be in demand, and we find them getting into courses for which, of course, there is no demand in the market place. So we certainly hope that there will be prudent counselling, there will be career counselling, particularly for our young people so that they do not enroll in a post-secondary institution for the sake of finding something to do.

So with that caution, certainly we endorse this effort to get our people from all segments of society to return to a post-secondary institution, particularly next year when, of course, there will be no Grade XI students. We all, of course, are aware of the importance of training, both to our adult people, our citizens who are older, and particularly to our young people.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Before we proceed, I would like to welcome two groups to the galleries today, First of all,

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): a delegation from the town council of Marystown with Mayor Jerome Walsh Deputy Mayor Hugh Farrell, Counsellor Keith Keating and the Town Manager, Jim Mayo -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: - as well as a delegation from the Twillingate - New World Island Development Association with their co-ordinator, Winston Jennings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other Ministerial Statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a couple of questions to the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) to see if I cannot get some answers that I could not get yesterday from the Minister of Finance and the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins).

But today, Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a couple

MR. T. LUSH:

of my questions specifically in the area of Grade XII. I think all of the people of Newfoundland were under the assumption that Grade XII was going to improve the quality of education, that it was going to enhance our move towards equal educational opportunity in this Province and that it was not going to be vice versa. But with respect to a couple of the measures that the government took to save money in order to get the teachers for the Grade XII programme, I think a lot of people in this Province are very concerned. It looks like we are robbing Peter to pay Paul and that we may not be arriving at the stage of improving the quality of education the way that we would have liked.

Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all ask the minister about the measure respecting freezing the allocation of EMR, special education salary units. As the minister knows this is a very, very important area and special education students are students who need special attention and for that reason the government has been giving as many teachers as possible over the years, but now we are going to cut them down. My question to the minister is how many units would there have been spread throughout the Province, how many teacher units would there have been spread throughout the Province without this particular freeze that the minister brought in just last week? How many teachers would we be deprived of in this very sensitive area?

MS. L. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, government has decided to put a freeze or a cap on the number of salary units supplied school boards for special education designated EMR,

MS. L. VERGE: or educable mentally retarded teachers, for just those school districts, Mr. Speaker, where there are presently 10 per cent or more of the regular teachers designated as EMR special education teachers. Now, Mr. Speaker, that freeze is not a reduction, it is not a cut, it will simply mean that for those districts having more than that quota of EMR, special education teachers, there total of EMR salary units will be kept at the present level. There will be allowances for turnovers. For example, if in the Avalon Consolidated School district one of the many EMR teachers retires now, resigns, leaves for whatever reason, the school board will get a replacement salary unit if the board so desires. Likewise school districts will be able to reassign their EMR teachers by, for example, removing a special education teacher from a high school and putting a special education teacher for the first time in a primary school.

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, it is reasonable from an educational policy viewpoint, to put a cap on the percentage of special education teachers for the educable mentally retarded, since statically a much smaller percentage than ten of the student population are in need of special education, and perhaps there has been a tendency in some school districts for too many students to be labelled EMR and put into separate special educational groupings. The current educational philosophy, Mr. Speaker, is to promote integration of all students in sharing and interaction.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that there will be no freeze on salary units for trainable mentally retarded students, Those are students with more severe handicaps who need more intensive supervision and teaching.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

What we have here, Mr. Speaker, is a dramatic change in the way that TMR teachers have been assigned in the past. In the past, of course, they were assigned to the number of students, which is the right and proper way. Today they are assigned by the number of teachers that we have in the system. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the sad part of this particular measure that it is not assigned to the number of students in the system any more, that it is assigned to the number of teachers. And my understanding is that we are going to lose somewhere between twenty-five to thirty teachers in the Province with this particular measure.

So, Mr. Speaker, on to another question one again that I could not seem to get any answer from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) on, with respect to substitute teachers. Substitute teachers, of course, are

MR. LUSH: very important to any system of education, and I understand that in many areas under the present pay system they find it very difficult to get substitute teachers. I am just wondering how much more difficult it is going to be now under this particular system. And my question, Mr. Speaker, is if the minister can indicate to us just how this particular measure is going to be brought in? We know that there is going to be a reduction in the salaries. Does the minister know exactly what the government's recommendations are in this respect? The minister knows that substitute teachers now are paid like all other teachers, according to their qualifications and experience. How will the new measure be structured? What will be the changes? What will be the system? How will they be paid?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I must address some of the remarks the education critic, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) made at the beginning of his last remarks on the change in the allocation

MS. VERGE:

of teachers for educable mentally retarded students.

Mr. Speaker, it is not true that any school district in this Province is going to lose any educable mentally retarded special education teacher.

MR. YOUNG: Right on, dear.

MS. VERGE: The decision is that those school districts, not all of them but just those who presently employ more than 10 per cent of their regular teachers as EMR special education teachers, will be limited in future to that number. And, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, there are sound education policy reasons for doing that because statistically there is nothing like 10 per cent of the student population who require that kind of special education teaching. And it is wrong, Mr. Speaker, to label too many students as EMR. Mr. Speaker, some school districts in the Province do not have 10 per cent of their regular teachers as EMR special education teachers. And, Mr. Speaker, those school districts, if they see fit, will be able to get more salary units for special education purposes. There is no limit on TMR special education units. They are without limit, on demand according to groupings of students who are identified by school boards.

Mr. Speaker, something that most people do not realize is that of the 8,000 teachers now employed in this Province, about 1,000 are special education teachers. Now I wish to address the hon. member's questions about government's measures to reduce the pay for substitute teachers. Mr. Speaker, it is the overall policy of government in being financially responsible to try to bring this Province's arrangement for paying substitute teachers more in line with the arrangements in the other provinces of Canada. The present arrangement

MS. VERGE: in Newfoundland and Labrador is significantly more generous than that of just about any other province in Canada. And, Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about medium term or long-term substitute teaching, we are not talking about replacement teaching for a couple of months while a woman is on maternity leave or while somebody is having an operation. What we are talking about is occasional substitute teaching when a teacher fills in for one day, when a teacher gets a call at eight o'clock in the morning and is asked to report to a school nine o'clock in the morning. In that type of occasional substitute

MS. VERGE:

teaching, Mr. Speaker, even if a teacher wanted to it is not possible for that teacher's full academic qualifications to be called into play, That teacher cannot prepare lessons, that teachers cannot and is not expected to supervise extra curricular activities, that teacher is not responsible for evaluation and record keeping the same way a full time regular teacher is, and Mr. Speaker, that is our policy objective.

At the same time,

Mr. Speaker, as we pay salaries for more than 450 more teachers across the Province in the next school year, our teaching force is going to grow from 8,000 to over 8,500 next year.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, this sounds just like the offshore negotiations. We have a cap put on the number of teachers now that we can have. Then one of the big controversial issues in the negotiation resulted because the teachers could not get the government to commit themselves in writing, and this is what I want to get onto next, the point that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) would not acknowledge yesterday when I was talking about the Ministerial Statement which came about a day or so before the teachers were to vote and was an attempt by the government to pull the rug out from under the teachers in their voting. And yesterday I asked the question about the student/teacher ratio, saying that that was a major part of the contract, that the teachers wanted this included in their contract, this reduction in the student ratio to twenty-three to one.

MR. LUSH: I am just reading, for example, a Daily News account which says, "Negotiators for the teachers are arguing that there is no guarantee the government will do it," that is bringing in the twenty-three to one ratio. It says, "Apparently the government is balking and it is a major issue for both sides since the reduction of the ratio from the present twenty-four to one to twenty-three to one would mean an additional 274 teachers."

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The hon. President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is into supplementary questions and he is making a speech. It is the Question Period.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port on that point of order.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not asking nearly as long a question as the answer that the minister gave to the last question.

MR. NEARY: And it makes more sense what my colleague is saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Again I would have to remind members, both to my left and to my right, that there is only a total of thirty minutes allocated for the Question Period and the questions as well as the answers should be as brief as possible.

MR. LUSH: My question,

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, to the minister is simply, Did the NTA, did the teachers of this Province not want that, a student - teacher ratio twenty-three to one, which would not have cost the government any money, because they had agreed to this in 1981, did the teachers of this Province want that particular item written into their contract?

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

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) indicated yesterday, the pupil - teacher ratio has never been in a collective agreement and it is certainly not the intention of this government to put it in any collective agreement. Mr. Speaker, the pupil - teacher ratio, which is the main component of the formula used by government to allocate salary units for teachers to school boards is in government regulations under legislation. The regulations are made and are changed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council; therefore, the pupil - teacher ratio has never been, in the view of this government, a collective bargaining issue. It is an educational issue, an important educational issue, and, Mr. Speaker, while a commitment was made to lower the ratio a couple of years ago, at that time the deterioration in the economy was not predicted and it was only reasonable for that decision to be reviewed. Therefore, in November, when we made adjustments to the Budget, that commitment, as well as every other commitment and every other social programme, was placed under review and it was not possible, until government entered into the final decisions for the Budget for the new fiscal year, for that commitment to be reaffirmed. I made the announcement of the final decision on the lowering of the ratio to twenty-three to one for next September at the earliest possible opportunity

MS VERGE: after the government decision was made rather than holding it in abeyance until after the Budget Speech tomorrow. Because, Mr. Speaker, it was important for that information to be made available to school boards for their planning purposes and also, Mr. Speaker, I thought it was only fair for the members of the NTA to have that information before their scheduled vote last Thursday. And, Mr. Speaker, I resent the inferences from the member opposite that the timing of the announcement was somehow calculated for political effect.

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the announcement was timed as soon as possible after the decision was made for valid budgetary reasons. After all, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about an extra expenditure for teachers' salaries, directly resulting from the ratio being lowered, of \$8 million.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the significant thing here is that the minister brought in this Ministerial Statement a day or so before the teachers were to vote guaranteeing a principle that they would not give the teachers in writing, namely, the reduction of the student/teacher ratio.

Secondly, I asked the minister yesterday whether or not the item with respect to substitute teachers had been previously agreed to.

I have here a update sent out by the NTA which, of course, says that both sides had initialled the substitute teacher issue. And it says, "The move by government made the potential package invalid". So, Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister, was this not a case of breaking faith, was this not a case of not bargaining in good faith? I think the NTA call it 'contract stripping.' Was this not a case of contract stripping when both sides had agreed to the issue with respect to substitute teachers, that there would be no change, and then when the minister made this statement she brought in a change? Is this not a case of contract stripping?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I again have

MS.VERGE: to take issue with the insinuations of the member opposite about the timing of the announcement about the supply of teachers for next year. Mr. Speaker, the choice was announcing it before the scheduled vote last Thursday or after the scheduled vote. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it was in the best interest of everyone, certainly the school boards, and I believe the members of the NTA, for me to have announced it at the first opportunity, which was before their vote, so they would have full information at that time.

Mr. Speaker, the member's questions about collective bargaining should not be, in my view, raised in this hon. House. There is a process in motion for negotiating and my colleague, the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) dealt with these questions as much as it is in the public interest to do so in Question Period yesterday.

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

MR.WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. I understand that there is a programme in place with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) for an inshore fishing gear programme for Labrador residents. Could the minister outline what the regulations or what the stipulations are for a person to qualify under such a programme?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely astounded! The hon. gentleman has been in the House of Assembly now for - what? - two terms. We have had a programme in place for subsidies to fishermen, for gear replacement and new gear and getting better equipped, on the Labrador Coast particularly, for the last seven years and now he finally asked a question about the programme.

MR. YOUNG: He was in charge of the programme.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I sadly regret that, because the people on the Labrador Coast are important people, and the fishermen in particular, and I regret the fact that the member who represents them cannot supply them with the information required.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his answer. I will ask the minister another question. If the programme is in place for Labrador fishermen, why has the minister's department approved payments out of this programme for six longliner fishermen from Conception Bay?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is referring to a gear replacement or gear subsidy programme which applies to all the Province, not just Labrador, all the Province. We have had a gear subsidy programme in place for the last seven years, not for just Labrador. So the people out in Conception Bay or on the Burin Peninsula or down around Harbour Breton or Gaultois area, any area of the Province, can qualify.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.
MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) does not know what is happening within his own department, where representatives of his own department have rejected applications to his department and said, 'not approved for payment' and other people in the minister's own department have said, 'yes, they qualify under the Labrador programme.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, my third question to the minister is is it true that longliner fishermen from Conception Bay and Notre Dame Bay who are fishing off the Labrador Coast are being paid out of the programme for inshore fishermen in Northern Labrador? Is it true - yes or no?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, we adopt the policy that we do not discriminate. And if a fisherman out in Bonavista Bay or out in Conception Bay qualifies under the criteria qualifies to get federal government dollars, or provincial government dollars in this case, in some form of subsidy, we do not discriminate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MORGAN: If that fisherman is a full-time fisherman and he qualifies for the programme, he will get the money from the programme. End of question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WARREN: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, number one under the requirements says, 'You must be a full-time

MR. WARREN: fisherman', and number two says,
'You must be a resident of Labrador'. Can the minister tell
the hon. House why fishermen from Conception Bay and Notre
Dame Bay are paid under this programme?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WARREN: He cannot answer it, that is why! Shameful!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to put my questions to the Premier but obviously he is not in his seat today, so I have no choice but to drop back to second choice, to the President of the Council, the Government House Leader (Mr. W. Marshall).

My question has to do, Mr. Speaker, with the record number of Newfoundlanders who are unemployed. As of the end of February, 44,000 Newfoundlanders were officially listed as being unemployed, 50 percent of those are in the age bracket of between eighteen and twenty-five years of age, and that is the number one problem, not only in Newfoundland but in Canada. Now the Government of Canada have brought in some make-work programmes to try to cope with the record unemployment in this Province, NEED programmes and community development programmes. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House what plans the provincial government have, if any, to develop special ways and means to try to cope with the record unemployment we have in this Province at the present time, especially unemployment amongst young people?

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, while the matter of unemployment is a matter of great concern to this government, it has always been and will continue to be of national concern. I would point out to the hon. member the rate of increase in Newfoundland was not as high as in certain other provinces, such as Quebec and British Columbia. Be that as it may, the hon. the Premier, as I think the hon. gentleman would see if he reads the papers,

MR. W. MARSHALL: had wanted to take this up in an immediate conference with the First Ministers on the economy but he was, apparently, as reports in the paper indicate anyway, he was thwarted on this by the Prime Minister.

As far as the plans are concerned, Mr. Speaker, we are constantly doing everything that possibly can be done in this Province to develop the resources which we have. In order to develop the resources that we have, of course, we have to retain the resources which we have, I think for the hon. gentleman to ask me that question, I can give him a specific example of the type of things that we are striving to do with respect to employment. It was just the other day with the oil rigs, for instance, the oil rigs on their way to Nova Scotia, and the hon. gentleman applauds the fact that the oil rigs are on their way to Nova Scotia, whereas we did everything we could to get them. We are still determined that they are going to come in to Marystown which has the facilities for the purpose of repairing those rigs.

MR. MARSHALL: We have a lot of plans, Mr. Speaker, for this Province for the purpose of getting our younger people to work, through the utilization of our resources. To that end we made a realistic proposal and arrived at an agreement in principle for the settlement of the offshore, which regrettably has not been taken up yet. But to that end we have also taken an action in the Water Rights Reversion Act, for the purpose of recapturing the power that the hon. gentleman's friends gave away some years ago, with a view to opening up employment in Labrador, and to that end, first and foremost, our main concern is and must and always will be the fishery of this Province. We are doing everything we possibly can, within our capacity and within our resources, to develop this great industry for the future.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are doing everything we possibly can in the situation. We are obviously concerned about employment, but I have to observe to the hon. gentleman, if he were more positive in his support as a Newfoundlander, I think we might have an opportunity of getting further ahead.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Everybody in this Province knows why the rigs are not at Marystown where they should be.

MR. TOBIN: It is because you supported Chretien.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Thirty times yesterday,
Mr. Speaker, you had to call the member for Burin -
Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) to order. Thirty times!
I do not know if his constituents sent him in here to
be -

MR. TOBIN: Only because you were (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - sent him in here to be rude
and arrogant and ignorant or not, but the hon. gentleman
is certainly showing his ignorance in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the rigs that
the hon. gentleman spoke about are not in Marystown because
of the attitude and because of the arrogance and the
stupidity of this government and because of the reason
I gave yesterday, that Mobil and the drilling companies
are afraid that the rigs might be arrested, Mr. Speaker,
because the

MR. NEARY:

hon. the Premier may go off of his head again and do something foolish like he did with the Day of Mourning.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the hon. gentleman to be a little more specific. I believe unemployment is much higher than 44,000 Newfoundlanders. I think it is closer to 55,000 or 60,000, because an awful lot of Newfoundlanders do not now register they have become so discouraged and depressed. They have given up hope and, Mr. Speaker, the outlook is very bleak for these people.

What about the hydro development on the Lower Churchill? What about the Labrador Highway? What about a transmission line to bring the power down to the Strait of Belle Isle? What about the tunnel the administration started in 1975, starting the tunnel across the Strait of Belle Isle? What about these projects, Mr. Speaker? And can the hon. gentleman tell us how many rigs will be on the Grand Banks this year? The hon. gentleman wrote a letter to Mr. Chretien, the man he now criticizes, saying it should be limited to eight, because the hon. gentleman was afraid they were going to overheat the economy. The only thing that is going to be overheated, Mr. Speaker - it is not the economy - is the hon. gentleman, because now I understand there are going to be ten rigs there.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition is entering into the realm of debate.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I understand - I will throw this in with the other question I put to the hon. gentleman - I understand that the hon. gentleman did not want to overheat the economy by having too many rigs on the Grand Banks this year. Now as a result of Ottawa's intervention

MR. NEARY: there will be ten instead of eight. I would like for the hon. gentleman to confirm that and to answer the other questions about the hydro power on the Lower Churchill, the Labrador Highway, the transmission line and the tunnel underneath the Strait of Belle Isle?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I hope everyone notes what an apologist the hon. gentleman is for his friends up in Ottawa. The fact of the matter with respect to the rigs, let us make it crystal clear is the

MR. MARSHALL: phoney, weak-kneed statement made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) who is grasping - that is what he is doing - grasping for some excuse for not standing up for Newfoundland, particularly not standing up for the people of Marystown, receiving the telephone calls, that I know he must have received, condemning him for not standing up for the people of Newfoundland, so what he had to resort to was to the subterfuge. They are trying to say that this Province is going to arrest a rig so that the rigs would not be brought into Marystown. Well, I ask the hon. member, why was the Zapata Uglund into Marystown if people were afraid that it was going to be arrested? There is no such question at all of Mobil being afraid of the provincial government. What Mobil are afraid of, unfortunately, is the federal government because, let it be known, that Mr. Mason indicated to me that they were going to Marystown and subsequently afterwards, after this conversation with him - and I indicated quite firmly and strongly that we would expect him to go to Marystown - there were statements made by the federal government, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, Mr. Chretien - anybody by the name of Jean the hon. gentleman embraces and loves; you cannot say anything about anyone by the name of Jean -

MR. NEARY:

Except John Crosbie.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

- and Mr. Eddy Goldenberg,

who was the assistant, to the effect that they were going to Nova Scotia. In effect what happened was the federal government have forced Mobil to file a plan, which is before the Coast Guard now, to bring these rigs to Nova Scotia. That is nothing short of a disgrace, Mr. Speaker. They

MR. MARSHALL: belong in Marystown and that is where they should be. As I say, the only government Mobil is afraid of, unfortunately, is the federal government. They showed this when they gambled with the lives of workers at the instigation of the federal minister, and they have shown it now as they prepare to tow the rigs past Marystown into Nova Scotia.

Now if the hon. gentleman takes delight in that and exults in that, I feel very, very sorry for him.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Well, he asked the question, Mr. Speaker, and he will get the answer.

MR. NEARY: You have no power to do anything about it.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: As to the Lower Churchill, Mr. Speaker, we are striving to do what we possibly can to get the Lower Churchill developed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: In order to get the Lower Churchill developed it is going to be necessary to get a power corridor through Quebec. We were given a bill, a bill was passed by the federal government which makes it impossible to realize at a very early stage that power corridor because we have to first of all expropriate the land ourselves. We have to make application for the National Energy Board. And in order to make the application,

MR. MARSHALL:

we have to have a customer. But the customer says, 'Before we can agree to buy your power, you have to have a route.' So it is the chicken and the egg situation, there is no way to do it. It is an ineffective act, but we are wrestling with it and seeing what we can do. As to the reference with respect to the number of rigs, Mr. Speaker, we will see how many rigs are there. As far as we are concerned, our proposal stands. Our proposal was a proposal which provided, Mr. Speaker, for the rate of development of national energy self-sufficiency, our proportionate share to be determined by the federal government with certain reasonable checks on it. In return for this, we were to be able to determine how it was to be developed. And from what we have seen with the rigs going by Marystown the last few days, it bears out the wisdom of why we have to have control as to how the resource is going to be developed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

On the other side of the coin,

Mr. Speaker, our proposal also envisaged the right to use that resource to bring our per capita earned income up to the average of other Canadians - no more, no less than that - and that was turned down also, Mr. Speaker. So I ask the hon. gentleman, when he talks about matters of the negotiations, that agreement in principle that Mr. Chretien could not and would not deliver, I ask the hon. gentleman to get up on his feet and tell us what is wrong with Newfoundlanders getting a equal per capita income with the rest of Canada and what is wrong with Newfoundland being able to have a control over the offshore so we will not see floating platforms

MR. MARSHALL: being towed past Marystown
in the same way as we are now seeing rigs being towed past.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

The time for Question Period
has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour
and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to
table the report -

MR. NEARY: If we cannot order them
into Marystown, why not?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: - of the matters transacted
by the Minister of Labour and Manpower during
1982 under the provisions of the Labour Relations Act,
Public Service (Collective Bargaining) Act, Fishing Industry
(Collective Bargaining) Act, Newfoundland Teacher (Collective
Bargaining) Act, the Report of the Labour Standards Board
for 1982, the Report of the Newfoundland Labrador Relations
Board for 1982, and the Labour Standards Regulations, 1983, for
hon. members opposite to read so that they will know
something about what is going on in the Province.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Member's
Day, we will move on to Motion No. 10. The hon.
Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) adjourned the
debate last day and he has about five or six minutes left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned
the debate I was

MR. HICKEY: discussing a couple of aspects of this Resolution. I have not gotten to one section which is rather interesting. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read, "AND WHEREAS" - one of the many whereas in the Resolution - "WHEREAS the communities of Harbour Breton, Fermeuse, Burin, St. Lawrence, Trepassey, Gaultois, Ramea, Grand Bank and others face social and economic extinction because of the virtual closedown of the fishing industry.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the hon. gentleman did not include St. Anthony?

MR. TULK: St. Anthony is the only one open.

MR. HICKEY: St. Anthony is going to be looked after by the Feds. I wonder why? The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is a walking contradiction. He says in the beginning, the onshore processing sector of the fishery is under provincial jurisdiction, and yet he justifies intrusion by the Federal Government into Provincial jurisdiction, into one community, one town in the province, while he says all the other communities face extinction. He blatantly, Mr. Speaker, acknowledges Federal Government involvement, purely on the most blatant, partisan basis that has ever been observed in this province by the Newfoundland's Representative in the Government of Canada, the hon. Mr. Rompkey. But, Mr. Rompkey does not give two damns about the other communities though. You did not see him put any money in the other communities, no, while this province put \$25 million in Mr. Speaker, to keep other fish plants going.

MR. HICKEY: Such blatant politics!
I have never seen the like!

And then, Mr. Speaker,
he goes on - I mentioned it last week but, I mean, it is
so breath-taking that it bears reading again. Just
try this one on for size: "And whereas the provincial
government has the Fisheries department and the minister,
both of which are functionally invisible" - Mr. Speaker,
I draw the attention of the House again to the fact that
the hon. James Morgan, Minister of Fisheries, is indicated
in writing by the hon. gentleman from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) to
be invisible. The only thing that is left for the Minister
of Fisheries to do is to be catapulted into outer space
to draw attention to the fishery. That is about the only
thing that is left for him to do.

MR. TULK: Slow it down a bit now.

MR. HICKEY: The hon. gentleman is having
trouble understanding me, is he not? I know his problem.
I will see if I can slow down a bit for you.

Mr. Speaker, it is so ironic
that those other documents are tabled today by the Only
Living Father - our case.

The section there on the fishery
says, "Cod fishing can be summed up in three sentences:
Catch them. Split them. Trim and gut them. We were
caught by Mr. Smallwood, we have been split by the federal
government and now they are trying to gut us." Instead of
bringing in nothing resolutions like this, Mr. Speaker,
it would be fitter for the hon. gentleman and his colleagues
opposite to stand up for this Province, to take a stand
for this Province and do some lobbying with their friends
in Ottawa to stop persecuting and discriminating against
this Province, to stop punishing the people of this

MR. HICKEY: Province because it happens to be that they do not like the colour of the government that is in office.

MR. TULK: Pardon?

MR. HICKEY: If the hon. gentleman does not believe me, does not seem to be convinced, may I try this one on him, Mr. Speaker, as a classic example: The Shoe Cove satellite, of which they are packing up and loading up today - we asked them to change their minds and they did not respond to our communication. We offered to cost-share it with them and they did not respond to our telex. We offered to pay the full bill of operating and they did not respond to our telex. The latest is that we have offered to buy it and pay for the operation and they have not responded to our telex. Of course, we picked up The Daily News yesterday and found out the Prime Minister had turned it down.

MR. HICKEY: Does the gentleman want some more proof of how the government in Ottawa discriminates against this Province, how the government in Ottawa considers this Province some kind of satellite instead of a fullfledged Province, how it insults the people of this Province? And the hon. gentlemen opposite, the very best they can offer, Mr. Speaker, is to sit down and mealy-mouth a few words every now and then and they do not have the guts, the common guts, to stand up and be counted as Newfoundlanders.

MR. TULK: Let us have a referendum on separation.

MR. HICKEY: Let us have a referendum. Why is the hon. gentleman talking about separation? Separation from what, Mr. Speaker? How can you separate from something that you are not part of? Surely the hon. gentleman is not suggesting that I am in any way suggesting that we separate from the great country called Canada. Mr. Speaker, we do not have to because we are not part of it yet.

MR. TULK: We are not?

MR. HICKEY: No.
Mr. Speaker, it is too bad - I would love to have another fifteen minutes to really torment the hon. gentleman, to make him a little uncomfortable in his seat over there. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying this, this is a nothing resolution. It was brought in purely to kill time, for a few political kudos, to spread the bad word, to spread anything but facts. And, Mr. Speaker, it is too bad that the hon. gentleman does not address the issues such as unemployment and a number of other issues which the hon. gentleman is most familiar with. But he choses, Mr. Speaker, to go the other route.

MR. HICKEY: So, Mr. Speaker, I have tried my darnest to find it in myself to support this resolution and, quite frankly, I have come to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, after a great deal of thinking and pondering the issue, that I really have to vote against it.

MR. TULK: Surprise! surprise!

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In addressing the resolution the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) forgot to say, 'THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the hon. House impress and implore the government and, in particular, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to immediately outline his plan of action for the processing sector of the industry.' Harbour Breton, Fermeuse, Burin, St. Lawrence, Trepassey, Gaultois, Ramea, Grand Bank and many others would like to know that course of action. The Action Committee in Burin is meeting here, in St. John's, tonight at Gonzaga High School and they are wondering what is going to happen and what action the Minister of Fisheries is going to take. But I would like to refer to what the Kirby Commission outlined, Mr. Speaker. It said that if there is going to be a resolution, and if it is going to solve the problems in the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada, it will not be by the Minister of Social Services getting up and saying this is a worthless resolution, that it is only here to occupy time. We have to get rid of this attitude where one party takes on the other, where industry takes on unions, where unions take on the companies. Instead Mr. Speaker, what we need, after 400 years, is co-operation from all sectors, from all parties involved, but are we getting that? Of course we are not, Mr. Speaker. We are not getting it in any way, and we will not get it in the future. The reason why we find ourselves in this situation is because in The Economy 1980 which was published by this government, it said, in 1980, "The provincial boat building industry is currently receiving some stimulus from the revival of the interest in the provincial

MR. E. HISCOCK: fishery. In 1979 there were over 100 longliners in the thirty-five foot to sixty-five foot class under construction in the province as well as a large number of boats in the eighteen to thirty-five foot range. Small local shipyards have geared up to meet the current level of demand for new vessels and this has provided some employment in rural areas of our Province. A healthy

MR. HISCOCK: medium term demand for newly constructed longliners is indicated by the importance that is attached to the longliner fishery in 'Setting a Course', a regional strategy for the provincial fishery that was published in 1977. Local shipyards are therefore in a position to develop strategic and tactical plans to exploit the opportunities that presently exist. The linkage with the inshore fishery gives the local boat building industry locational advantage upon which a viable rural based industry can be consolidated."

In 1977, Mr. Speaker, when Canada extended to the 200 mile limit, this government, the present government of the day, stated that the 200 mile limit was going to be the salvation of all the people in the Province, all the unemployed, so, therefore, go and get larger boats, get larger extensions on plants, give more licences to the crab industry, and other fish processors in the Province. And what do we find, Mr. Speaker? In less than two years we find that Gaultois, Ramea, Harbour Breton, Burin, St. Lawrence, Trepassey, and Grand Bank - and a lot of people forget about not only St. Anthony but Lewisporte, only two years after the bright rosy future that we were supposed to have. That is the kind of planning that we have in this Province.

They said they loaned the fishing industry \$25 million. That came out of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation which is funded 90 per cent by the federal government. So here is the government here claiming it is their money, but it is the Canadian Taxpayers' money.

The other part that I want to get on to, Mr. Speaker, is they said we should be lobbying with the federal government. Well, I am quite pleased to say that in Labrador fisheries the federal government

MR. HISCOCK: is spending \$12.5 million to upgrade the fishing industry along the Labrador Coast. And what is the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) doing? Cutting back on a programme, a 30 per cent gear subsidy. In last year's Budget the Minister of Finance did away with that, and here is the present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) still funding programmes under that which was supposed to have been done away with by the Minister of Finance.

People in Labrador believed that this programme was done away with, and now we hear that people in Twillingate and in Notre Dame Bay and Conception Bay are still being funded. For my part, as a representative of Labrador, if it is a programme that was done away with by the Minister of Finance as a cost saving measure, why is it loans are still being processed and approved by the Minister of Fisheries at the present time?

MR. HISCOCK: But, Mr. Speaker, the sad thing is that after 400 years of history in the fishing industry, from John Cabot to Sir Humphrey Gilbert, and on down to the present time, what do we have? We still are not producing quality fish. Iceland, a small little country like Iceland can put top quality fish on the American market. And with regard to that, after reading the Kirby Commission Report, for those who have not read it, even if we produce quality fish, Iceland has such a firm corner on that market now it will be impossible to break into it. With the high class restaurants and fast food chains, if we do compete in that market then we will lose a lot of our profits. So what he recommends is that we compete on the second level, with smaller restaurants, and also the larger restaurants, the prisons and the armed forces.

But the thing is, Mr. Speaker, after 400 years of Liberal and Conservative administrations in this Province, we find ourselves still not producing quality fish. The fishermen themselves in the Province are saying, "Okay, if we are going to produce quality fish then we need the resources and the money to upgrade the facilities."

To get back to the Labrador Coast, the federal government is putting in \$12.5 million for the fishing industry, for an ice making machine, bait holding units, holding units, and repairing of other facilities. Privately owned fish plants can get up to a 50 per cent rebate from this programme. And who owns the majority of fish plants on the Labrador Coast? From L'Anse-au-Clair to Nain, Mr. Speaker, 100 per cent of the plants along the Labrador Coast are owned by the provincial government. And are they cost-sharing

MR. HISCOCK: on this and saying, "Okay, we are going to expand the plant in Black Tickle, in Cartwright, in Nain, in Makkovik, in Hopedale, in Fox Harbour, in Williams Harbour, in Mary's Harbour, L'Anse-au-Clair and Red Bay"? The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. They are saying, "unless it is a ninety/ten deal we are not going to have anything to do with it."

And what are we saying about the Northern cod stocks? By 1986 they are going to triple in size. We hear the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and we hear the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), and the other members along the South Coast, and here in St. John's, claiming that they want a greater share in the Northern cod stocks.

MR. TULK: Some of them are so disgusting.

MR. HISCOCK: But what about the Labrador Coast itself, Mr. Speaker? Unless we expand those plants, we are going to continue to see over-the-side sales in those areas off Makkovik, off Smokey, and off Black Tickle. And because the Labrador Coast happens to be in the Federal Minister of Small Business, Mr. Rompkey's district, because it happens to be in Mr. Rompkey's district then he can pay the full shot. As a result that is the reason why the federal government had to look after St. Anthony. Grand Bank and all the other ones got some of the \$25 million, loans out of money that was provided by the federal government, The one that did not get any help was St. Anthony. If the federal government, through the Saltfish Corporation, did not help St. Anthony last year it would be like Ramea is today, closed and the doors locked, Mr. Speaker. And that is the reality of it.

March 16, 1983

Tape No. 376

NM - 3

MR. HISCOCK:

The people in Grand Falls,
White Bay, Labrador, are suffering because they happen to
have the federal minister representing them.

MR. HISCOCK: That is smallness in politics. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) says the road from Plum Point to Roddickton is not a priority, he says that the airport at St. Anthony is not a priority, and yet will he help build an airstrip in Williams Harbour or in St. Lawrence or a road, Mr. Speaker, from Red Bay? No. So it is very easy for them to get into cheap politics and say, 'Okay, let the federal minister do it.'

But with regard to the processing industry, Mr. Speaker, in this Province it is completely the responsibility of this government, as well as marketing, and we have done a terrible job in the past, all administrations. And this government that has been representing us for the past twelve years, as far as I am concerned, is at the top of the list.

Where are the dreams of the people in Harbour Grace for the super port? Where are the two loan boards that were set up? One loan board was appointed, they were found to be incompetent and were removed, then another one was appointed. What happened there, Mr. Speaker? What happened when in the 1979 election the loan board overspent by several million dollars? Now you can get a crab licence or any other licence if you are a good P.C. Party member and you do not mind paying a little bit into the coffers? That is the way, Mr. Speaker, that our administration is run.

A lot of people in this Province are saying in many ways we are better off having a lot of the control in the federal government because at least they do not get into petty politics, with the graft and corruption that we have seen in the past.

MR. HISCOCK: The other thing I would like to mention is with regard to the welfare recipients the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) talked about. If he was so concerned about the unemployed and the people on social assistance, why is it that he has done away with the amount of money that they can get for non-prescription drugs? Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that they now find that costs are going up, and the amount which the Social Services Department gives them each month is not going up? Why is it that when they go out to look for jobs they can not find them?

A question that I would like to ask the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) - she said in her Ministerial Statement today, "I think this is an excellent time for many women to get into the trades and occupations now dominated by men." Those women who are on social assistance and those women who are single parents, is she going to allow them to draw assistance and go to university or trade school? I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, the answer is no. It is a nice flowery statement and let the news media pay for it, but those older, mature students who go into the trade school, and find jobs after, at least half of those seats will be paid by the federal Manpower department. The other half, Mr. Speaker, if they are filled, will get twenty-five dollars a week from the

MR.HISCOCK: Provincial Department of Education. That is what will happen , Mr.Speaker, to the older people and to the women who want to get into these trades now. It is an excellent opportunity because of Grade X11 being implemented, but unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we find in this Province that the Grade X11s do not have the equipment that is needed. But to go back to the resolution we find, Mr. Speaker, after 400 years, and another down turn in the international economy, that the fishing industry in Newfoundland is in a disastrous situation. And what are we seeing from the provincial government? We are seeing nothing. We find that \$500,000 is given by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr.Morgan) to the seal industry. Three years in a row I wrote the Minister of Fisheries asking him what he was going to do about a collecting system along the Newfoundland coast, and get into quality pelts? And what was done? That is up to private enterprise. We cannot get into that. After three years, Mr.Speaker.

MR.MORGAN: Stop telling lies.

MR.HISCOCK: Some other time, Mr. Speaker, I will get the letters and I will table those letters in the House of Assembly. That is what I will do, Mr.Speaker.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR.HISCOCK: We will see that the letters speak for themselves. Unless the minister is saying that what he writes is lies. I do not know if that is true. But with regard to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, we are finding out ourselves , as I said, that we cannot compete in the international market because of the tariffs of

MR.HISCOCK: the large countries, and yet the Minister of Fisheries (Mr.Morgan) says, on the one hand, that we have to get away from dependency on the United States markets and we have to get into the European markets. And because Canada gives so many trade-offs in the economic zone - and a lot of people still fail to realize that we do not own the 200 mile limit. It is an economic zone that Canada administers on behalf of the world and we have

MR. HISCOCK: first choice at it. If we can catch the fish fine, but if we cannot catch it then the rest of the world has second choice on it. And with regard to that, Canada has given certain trade-offs on the condition those countries lower their tariffs so the amount of fish that we catch, as first choice, is allowed to go into those markets. And what has happened is the Europeans have not lowered their tariffs as fast as we thought they would. Now, of course, the federal government is retaliating and is now cutting back the amounts of the quotas. The minister and the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) would agree, with regard to the quality of our fish, that if we cannot break into new markets, if we cannot get the Japanese to buy more fish from our markets, if we cannot get that, Mr. Speaker, there is no need to continue to do reports, there is no need to give an extra \$25 million or to buy new trawlers or to expand the plants. Because if the fish are coming back to the Grand Banks the way they are with the Northern cod, then we are going to have a surplus of fish and no markets. The reality is we have to break into those markets, and the only way we are going to break into those markets is by trade-offs. And as I said, Mr. Speaker, we are not facing the facts.

I would also like to ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) with regard to Spain fishing off the Flemish Banks, on the Tail of the Grand Banks, how would he handle them? They are outside the 200 mile economic zone. I know he believes, and a lot of other people believe in this Province, we should have a 400 mile limit. But the international community is not ready for that yet; maybe in five or ten years time they will be. But in the meantime, how would he recommend the federal government should deal with that? And, of course, the answer, Mr. Speaker, is co-operation. We need co-operation in the fishing industry, but we also need co-operation in the international market if we are going to find markets for our fish.

MR. HISCOCK: So I would say to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), Mr. Speaker, and to the other government members, that just because Labrador happens to be represented by the Federal Minister, Mr. Rompkey, in Ottawa, it does not mean that we are not members and residents of this Province and we do not deserve a little more than 10 per cent. And hopefully these marine haulups in St. Lewis, the one in Cartwright and in L'Anse-au-Diable will be expanded, and the government here will not take the arrogant attitude that because it happens to be represented by a federal government minister they will be denied their facilities and their rights.

Now in closing on that remark, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), when he gets up, if he would clarify if this 30 per cent gear subsidy

MR. HISCOCK: that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) did away with in last year's budget is done away with or not. Do the fishermen along the Labrador Coast still qualify for this? If they do they have a right to know because they cannot get it from his officials even though other people are being funded by it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward) The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I guess it would be remiss on my part as the Minister of Fisheries if I did not speak in this debate and respond to the resolution put forward by the Opposition, respond to it and point out the flaws of what the Opposition are saying about the fishing industry.

The last speaker who spoke in the debate talked about Labrador. And the fact is, Mr. Speaker, if it was not for this government, this present government and the previous government under Premier Moores, the fishing industry in Labrador would be, today, non-existent. It was this government which took over the plants along the Labrador Coast, is presently using the taxpayers' dollars to subsidize them and keep them going. We are not doing it in Twillingate or on the South Coast, or in Bonavista or elsewhere in the Province, we are doing it in Labrador. And that hon. gentleman has the nerve to stand up in the House and condemn the government for taking over plants in Labrador. Mr. Speaker, if only we had television cameras here today and could play it back so the people on the Labrador Coast could hear a member here talking in such a manner, a derogatory manner, about the things we are doing for the fishermen and the workers

MR. MORGAN:

along the Labrador Coast.

It is disgusting. I will not respond any more than that to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fishing industry is indeed this Province's most important industry. The fact is that last year, in Canada the export value of fish products was \$1.8 billion- \$1.8 billion worth of fish was exported from Canada. Out of that more than \$500 million worth, to be exact \$550 million, of exports came from this Province. The value, in fact, in 1982 was up \$8 million more than what it was in 1981.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the tonnage of fish caught last year, in '82, was about 1.4 metric tons. And out of that 1.4 metric tons of fish caught in all of Canada, again, Mr. Speaker, approximately one-quarter of that, or more than one-quarter, was caught right here in Newfoundland, right here in this Province. In fact, there was an increase last year, 1982, of 7,000 metric tons more fish landed in 1982 than 1981. Now does that indicate that the fishery is dead? Does it indicate the fishery is all doom and gloom? No

MR. J. MORGAN: does not indicate that he indicates quite clearly and obviously that the fishery is alive and well. However, we have a problem it seems which the Opposition wants to glory in every day in this House of Assembly and keep on saying, 'Well, the processing end is the responsibility of the Newfoundland Government, so why do you not go out and solve the problems in the processing end?' Well, Mr. Speaker, we did resolve the problems in the last year and a half to the tune of \$24 million. What for, Mr. Speaker? I will tell you what for. To keep jobs in many of the smaller and medium sized plants around this Province. To keep the plants going we put up \$24 million. However, despite the efforts we are making in developing new fishing gear, despite the efforts we are making in assisting fishermen - and talking about responsibility, I mean, who really is responsible for the people in the fishing boats these days? It is a divided jurisdiction. Nobody seems to want to explain to fishermen, except when I travel and when the Premier travels and other ministers travel, the members on the government side, to explain to the people of Newfoundland that everything on the ocean, everything on the sea, everything in a boat, fishermen, is licenced by the federal government. The federal government decides what size boats will be used. Now, I know my colleagues are not interested in fisheries here and in Corner Brook, but it is very important I get my points made here.

Mr. Speaker, everything on the ocean is under the federal jurisdiction, licencing of boats, deciding the type of gear, the size of boats and the licencing of fishermen. And then on top of that, Mr. Speaker, the most important thing of all is that the management of the resource is strictly and totally under federal jurisdiction. Jim Morgan has nothing to say about setting quotas, whether it be herring, caplin quotas or cod quotas. We have nothing to

MR. J. MORGAN: say about how much fish goes to foreign countries. We have no control over what fish goes to the large offshore trawlers and goes to the inshore boats, that is all federal government. Now why is it that the present Liberal Party in Newfoundland wants to hide its head in the sand and pretend that the problems today in the fishing industry are all caused by this present Government of Newfoundland and should all be resolved by this Government here in Newfoundland? Now, Mr. Speaker, that just does not make sense. Because the fact is, how can you operate a plant if you have no fish going in that plant? And how many times have we heard the large companies in the past six months, around the Province, say over and over, 'We have to announce the closing of a plant today. We are going to layoff 250 - 275 employees or more.'

MR. MORGAN: Over and over we heard it last Fall. What was the main reason they gave for closing the plants? The one very important major reason, lack of fish. They had no fish for their plants. My colleague from Trepassey can verify that. A large plant was closed all last Fall because of what?

MR. BAIRD: No fish.

MR. MORGAN: Because there was no fish to go in the plant. Now Jim Morgan could not control that fish coming to the plant. Premier Peckford could not do it either.

MR. POWER: Only the feds can do that.

MR. MORGAN: In other words, you cannot have a proper management of the processing sector of the fishing industry unless you can control and properly manage the resource. The resource comes into the plants to be processed. Sure, they will say, you have control over the issuing of licenses; you can take away their license, you can shut them down if you want, or put somebody else in. But what is the point of putting somebody else into Burin, or into Grand Bank, or St. Lawrence, or into Gaultois, or into Ramea, or into Trepassey, or into Fermeuse or Twillingate or elsewhere if there is no fish to be processed? That is the key thing, Mr. Speaker, The Liberals want to hide their heads in the sand. But the fact is that the fish stocks have not been properly managed over the years. Now I do believe, and I say it sincerely, I do believe the new minister in Ottawa is going to take the right steps. I do believe he is going to be very tough in dealing with foreign countries. I do believe he is going to eventually say, no more fish for the foreign countries. And the last gentleman who spoke for the Liberal party said, "Oh, well, the Minister of Fisheries

MR. MORGAN: (Mr. DeBane) in Newfoundland is complaining about the fish going to foreign countries". Well, what more should I do, Mr. Speaker, when we have fish plants closed here and high unemployment in those areas? We have plants closed down and people laid off because of no fish and at the same time you can go out in a large coastguard vessel, or some other vessel, and you can see all kinds of foreign fishing fleets out there taking our fish stocks. What do you want me to do, say, yes, I agree with that? The fact is that last year we gave the European Economic Community, these countries alone, 18,000 metric tons of fish. And what did they do in return? They only bought 2000 tons. They bought 2000 tons of final processed product, but they came and took raw material, a quantity of 18,000 metric tons. Now if that is gaining access to markets -

MR. NEARY: That is wrong.

MR. MORGAN: It is wrong. The hon. gentleman agrees but his colleagues are all mixed up over there. The last speaker is condemning me for stopping and trying to stop gaining access to the European markets. Well the fact is if we have to give away our fish stocks, from our waters, in order to gain access to markets in Europe or elsewhere, and that same fish is going to be taken back and processed and going to end up in the market place in competition to our fish processed in Canada, never, never should we do it.

MR. NEARY: That is wrong.

MR. MORGAN: And I am saying Mr. Speaker that the new Minister in the Government of Canada, the new Minister, Mr. Speaker, is indeed supporting, and I repeat, supporting this Minister's position, the Premier and his government's position in saying cut off the foreigners from taking our fish. And I commend him for that and I hope he can get the support of his Prime Minister and Mr. MacEachen and the External Affairs Minister and others up there to go along with him to stop this.

MR. POWER: The only Liberal with any sense.

MR. MORGAN: The Liberals would like to lead the fishermen to believe, including Fogo Island, including Labrador and including LaPoile district and others, go around leading the fishermen to believe - oh, the Newfoundland Government have got no policies on the fishing industry. What nonsense, they got no policies. Jim Morgan has got no policies on the fishing industry. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we had no policies, why is it, a very, very basic question -

MR. TULK: Stupid.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER (Ayward): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - why is it that the most important Task Force ever appointed on the fishing industry in Canada, headed by Dr. Michael Kirby, why is it that Task Force not only listened to us in detail, not only accepted what we had to say but adopted, Mr. Speaker, adopted a number of major policies that we put forward from this government. And when we put them forward what did we do? We put them in document form - it was called "The Fishing Industry, a Business and a Way of Life". And that document is available now for anyone to see. You read that document,

MR. MORGAN: which shows the Newfoundland Government policy, and that was--what?--six or seven months ago, and then you read Dr. Michael Kirby's major report, and you will see many things that we said in our policies on the fishing industry that have now been accepted by the Kirby Task Force and, more importantly, accepted by the Federal Government. Finally, after all the years, we are finally getting somewhere and the Federal Government is listening to what we have to say on the fishing industry. And we do appreciate that, because we were convinced all along that what we were saying on fishery policies was right, the policies were right for the fishing industry in Newfoundland.

Now, getting back to a serious problem. There is no problem in the fishing industry of any major significance in the inshore sector of the Northeast coast. Fogo Island did well last year. Twillingate was not so bad. White Bay, Notre Dame Bay, Bonavista Bay, Trinity Bay, it was a half decent fishery.

MR. MORGAN: There are some problems in connection with the incomes of the fishermen who are only confined to using gill net fishing gear. They have no licences for other fishing activity and their incomes are down to a level defined by Mr. Kirby as a poverty level.

Now, that is a question which is not addressed by the task force but is a problem. But other than that, on the Northeast coast and in the inshore fishing industry, which landed more fish last year than in 1981, with a landed value of \$8 million more than 1981, the industry is not doing too badly.

However, there is indeed a major problem in one sector of the fishing industry and it is in the deep-sea offshore sector. And we have been agonizing with the companies and others over the last number of months, since last September when my first meeting started, on how to deal with this problem.

Now, the Liberal Party can get up and say, 'Oh, well, it is your responsibility and your jurisdiction, so deal with it, because it is in the processing sector.' But, because the fish could not get to the plants, because the large trawlers were forced out of the gulf bringing fish to the South Coast plants and because of the over fishing on the nose and tail of the Grand Banks - I recall saying in Marystown three years ago at a major fisheries conference, 'Gentlemen, I do not want to preach gloom and doom' - Mr. LeBlanc was there at the same time - 'but,' I said, 'unless you can control the over fishing on the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks all these foreign ships, and these flags of convenience ships from different countries throughout the world, unless you can stop that and

MR. MORGAN: control it and have properly managed harvesting of that fish, you are going to have a problem on the South coast of the Province, in particular, on the Burin Peninsula, because of a lack of fish.'

So there is a lack of fish, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HISCOCK: And how are you going to do it?

MR. MORGAN: Now, if the little cracky from Labrador would keep quiet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: It is a major problem and the major problem is not common to the Burin Peninsula and the South coast. It is common in Newfoundland but it is also common to plants like Canso in Nova Scotia, it is common to the North Sydney plant in Nova Scotia, it is common to the Georgetown plant in P.E.I., closed for the last seven or eight months. It is a very major problem. And all we are saying is it is a major Atlantic region problem in the fishing industry, in one sector, the deep-sea, and surely, the federal government has responsibility. It is fine for the Liberal Party in Newfoundland to say, 'Well, you resolve it, Mr. Peckford and your minister. You resolve the problem and get those plants open.' It is a problem common to Atlantic Canada and surely, the Government of Canada has responsibility to the most important industry in this region. They can help out the oil and gas industry, Dome Petroleum, they can help out the auto industry in Central Canada, so why not help the most important industry in our region of the country? So we are saying to them, 'We want those plants reopened.'

MR. TULK: (Inaudible) Burin closed.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, please, the
hon. gentleman is annoying.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it is a very
serious matter and this government is going to leave no
stone unturned to make sure that we as a government
take the right decision with the federal government.
The jobs in Burin are important. The

MR. MORGAN:

jobs in Grand Bank are important. The jobs in Gaultois are important. The jobs down in Harbour Breton are important, and Fermeuse, and Ramea, and St. Anthony. And we are saying - I only have five minutes left unfortunately. This is a very short debate.

MR. TOBIN:

By leave.

MR. NEARY:

No, not by leave.

MR. MORGAN:

So, Mr. Speaker, if the hon.

Leader of the Opposition gives me leave I will carry on for a further twenty minutes. And I will not get partisan. I will not get partisan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN:

They do not want to hear the facts,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we accept our responsibilities. We accept our responsibilities in a full and a very serious way. We will carry on doing things for the fishermen. That is really not our responsibility or jurisdiction but we will. We will do everything we possibly can to work on these problems in the large companies. But the large companies have had their problems, not merely because of the Newfoundland Government or the federal government, they have a lot to account for themselves. Account for for what reason? Very poor management, no question in my mind; lack of efficiency in their plants; in some cases very poor productivity in the plants. Not all the plants, some of them.

These are factors that could have been controlled by the companies and were not. Now they are in looking for a bail out. As far as I am

MR. MORGAN: concerned, there should be no bail out. Any monies that go into these large companies, Nickerson's, the Lake Group and Fishery Products and John Penney and Sons, must only go in when we clearly understand that down the road they are never going to come back looking for government hand-outs. And we are not going to put good money in after bad so that these companies carry on doing the same bad old things, inefficiencies and otherwise. We have to make sure as a Province, and that is the reason why it is important - the next three or four days are so crucial for Burin, are so crucial for Grand Bank, so crucial for St. Lawrence, so crucial for Ramea, so crucial for Harbour Breton, and Gaultois, and Fermeuse, and even St. Anthony, because there is no final decision made on St. Anthony yet, as of the last few days. We have to make a decision which we are convinced in our minds as the government here, in working with the federal government, and they have agreed they are going to be involved because of the massive funds required, we are going to make sure when we make a decision here, that this government is going to make a decision for the benefit of everyone living in Newfoundland, in all the respective communities.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what a colossal bluff. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows full well that the plants that are closed at the present time in this Province have nothing to do with the nose and tail of the Grand Banks. It has to do with the hon. gentleman's nose and tail not the nose and tail of the Grand Banks.

Mr. Speaker, this is the time of year when the offshore dragger fleet should be out fishing and every plant in this Province should be working at maximum capacity. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has the face and the gall to stand in this House and say it is the federal responsibility to restructure the processing sector of the fishing industry in this Province. The processing sector is a provincial responsibility. It comes under provincial jurisdiction. And the hon. gentleman can talk about foreign draggers, the nose and tail of the Grand Banks all he wants, the reason these plants are closed at the present time is because this administration had no plans for the fishery. They have allowed the fishery to deteriorate. All they have had on their minds is oil in the last several years. They have ignored every other industry in this Province. They have allowed the fishery to go down - our most basic industry. They have allowed it to deteriorate to the extent now where we have major fish plants closed at the most crucial time of the year when they should be operating, and the draggers should be out fishing. And the hon. gentleman stands up in this House in view of people in the gallery, and in view of all the members in this House, and makes the most ridiculous and outlandish statements about how Ottawa should deal with these problems, deal with these matters.

Mr. Speaker, Ottawa looks at

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland from the vantage point of Wellington Street. Only the other day we were - well, as a matter of fact, today in this House the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) told us that Newfoundland should be managing the offshore oil resources because they are closer to the resources than anybody else. And now

MR. NEARY: we have another minister contradicting that philosophy, that principle, and standing and telling us that Ottawa should resolve the problem.

I have no doubt at all, Mr. Speaker, that Ottawa will do everything it can to try and get these plants back in operation.

MR. TOBIN: But if they do not.

MR. NEARY: But if they do not, Mr. Speaker, therein lies - that is the question, the key question, if they do not, what is this government going to do to make sure that Burin reopens, that Fermeuse reopens, that Gaultois reopens, that Ramea reopens, that Harbour Brenton reopens, that Grand Bank does not close? It is the responsibility of this government to tell the people in these communities and the people in this Province and to tell this House what plans they have, what contingency plans they have to deal with that emergency situation if it arises?

So we are very disappointed that the minister did not stand in his place in the House this afternoon, when he had an opportunity, and tell the House what plans they have to deal with these situations. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in this House yesterday, the fight in Burin is just not to save the fish plant in Burin, it is just not to save the community of Burin, the fight in Burin is to save a way of life in this Province, a tradition, a heritage that is built around the fishery. That is what the fight is all about, Mr. Speaker, and hon. gentlemen opposite would love to be able to pit one community against the other. We hear the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) at it every day in this House. Thirty times yesterday he had to be brought to order by the Speaker, spending his time interrupting the Speakers and being rude and nasty instead of standing up in

MR. NEARY: this House, standing up for his constituents, standing up for the people on the Burin Peninsula.

MR. STAGG: That is what he was doing.

MR. NEARY: That is what he was not doing? He was just doing the contrary. Mr. Speaker, he was just doing the opposite. Mr. Speaker, if members on that side of the House, if members on the government side who are supporting the government have the courage of their

MR. NEARY: have the courage to go against the administration, not toe the Party line, they would stand in this House and say, 'Look, Mr. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and Mr. Premier and my colleagues in the Cabinet, if you do not take the position that these plants, everyone of them will reopen, then you are going to have trouble with me; I am moving over across, down there in the corner, or I am going to lash out against you, I am going to speak out against you'. They cannot talk out of both corners of their mouths. And that is what they are doing, Mr. Speaker, They lay back on their oars all along and they said, 'Kirby has the answer. Kirby is going to solve our problems'. Mr. Speaker, they were misleading the people.

MR. MATTHEWS: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I have order from the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews)? Could you get the hon. gentleman to restrain himself?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: They were misleading the people, Mr. Speaker, they were talking out of both corners of their mouths when they were saying we are going to wait for the Kirby Task Force Report. I was in Burin and I met with the Concerned Citizens Committee and I met with the picketers down there. And I was in Ramea and I was in Fermeuse and I was in Grand Bank, and every place I went I warned the people to whom I spoke not to pay any attention to the sweet talk about Kirby going to solve everything. All the administration here was doing was letting themselves off the hook, Mr. Speaker. They were misleading and deceiving the people in these communities. And, Mr. Speaker, the only thing that politicians understand, especially the government in power, is pressure. That is the only thing

MR. NEARY: they understand. And I am proud to say that I went to Burin and I went to Ramea and I went to these other places where people are fighting for their rights. But I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that this administration and the members for these districts are letting their constituents down. We on this side of the House have taken the position, and I state it again categorically -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I happened to be in the hall, seated right across from the hon. gentleman, in Fermeuse when I heard the hon. gentleman's wishy-washy handling of that situation in Fermeuse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: If I was the hon. gentleman I would hang my head in shame.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: I say, Mr. Speaker, that every fish plant -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. DAWE: Seventy-seven point seven and going up. As a matter of fact, my colleague to my right go more votes, a bigger majority than all of you put together.

MR. S. NEARY: That is all they are concerned about, that is all they are interested in, their ego.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the people in the gallery can see what happens here day in and day out. I hope they can see the ego trips.

MR. POWER: I was in the same hall when you were told off by the leader of the fishermen's union for making those little mistakes. That did not happen to me at that meeting.

MR. TULK: He changed his mind though, did he not?

MR. DINN: Ricky told him off, did he?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will let that go because I do not want to be sidetracked.

AN HON. MEMBER: Because it is true.

MR. NEARY: It is not true. I do not want to be sidetracked by rabbits, Mr. Speaker. We are after bigger game than that. The hon. gentleman was embarrassed by the round of applause that I got in that hall that night. That is why the hon. gentleman is smarting.

Mr. Speaker, let me get back to the topic under discussion. I understand the Premier, yesterday, when he went to Ottawa, one of the matters that he would be dealing with is restructuring. I am told the meeting was to take place in Ottawa on the 15th or 16th at the First Ministers Conference, that restructuring was on the agenda. Now, Mr. Speaker, we still do not know what input, what plans, the Premier of this Province has laid on the table in Ottawa as far as restructuring is concerned. All we know is this: That he told Mr. De Bane at a meeting a few weeks ago that he was against nationalization. That is all we know about the plans of the administration. We are told

MR. S. NEARY: that restructuring means one of two or three options. It will mean one Nova Scotia company one Newfoundland company, or one Nova Scotia company two Newfoundland companies, a combination of three or four companies they have been playing around with. They have two or three options. But, Mr. Speaker, we reject one Newfoundland company and one Nova Scotia company on this side of the House.

MR. TOBIN: What are you supporting.

MR. NEARY: What am I supporting? I will tell you what I am supporting, I am supporting the reopening of these plants and the closing of no more plants. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would go as far as to say this, that never again in this Province should Scotia Square up in Toronto be allowed to dictate what plants in Newfoundland stay open and what plants close. We had the West Country Merchants here in the old days;

MR. NEARY: the West Country Merchants called the shots, now Scotia Square up in Toronto is calling the shots. I would bring legislation before this House, Mr. Speaker, that would forbid banks, or financial institutions, from foreclosing on fish plants that affect whole regions of this Province, that affect whole communities in this Province. I would bar that forever. Never again would I allow it without providing an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. Give the authority to the judge to decide whether or not these companies, these banks, can get away with this kind of nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I heard a statement -

MR. TOBIN: Tell us where you stand.

MR. NEARY: No, you do not have to ask me where I stand, but I ask the hon. gentleman where he stands, and the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) where he stands. They are talking out of both corners of their mouths. That is what they are doing. And they are not fooling the people. If they think they are conning or fooling the people they had better think again.

MR. DINN: Have you still got the contracts for Bell Island?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this government has no plan of action, no plan of action. And I am standing four square behind the people in Burin, and Fermeuse, and Grand Bank -

MR. DINN: You did that for the people of Bell Island too with the contracts.

MR. NEARY: - and Ramea, and I repeat what I said, that as far as we are concerned every plant must reopen.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): A point of order, the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: I just wanted to point out to the House that the hon. gentleman changes his mind quite often. About three months ago he stood in the House and said, "Let the companies go bankrupt."

MR. POWER: But now they have taken a position. Now they have got a position. They have the first position they have had in ten years.

MR. MORGAN: That is right, "Let them go bankrupt," were the words.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: May I carry on, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of public record what I said. I said let Nickerson's go bankrupt. Let them go bankrupt, it would not affect Newfoundland that much. They only have a handful of plants in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Speaker, I said it is a different matter -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - it is a different matter with Fishery Products -

MR. MORGAN: There are some people in the galleries this afternoon. You are playing to the galleries. You say one thing one day and another thing the next.

March 16, 1983

Tape No. 390

NM - 3

MR. NEARY:

restore order?

Mr. Speaker, could you

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

MR. SPEAKER:

MR. NEARY:

restraining hon. gentlemen opposite and restoring order to
the House.

Order, please! Order, please!

Oh, oh!

Order, please!

Thank you, Mr. Speaker for

MR. NEARY: They cannot stand criticism, they cannot stand the truth when they hear it. Everybody in this Province knows that this administration have failed miserably when it comes to providing a master plan for the development of the fishery in this Province. They have let the people down.

MR. MORGAN: That is the reason why Kirby -

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman can forget all about Lady Kirby. The hon. gentleman is the one who is sitting in the hot seat.

Mr. Speaker, I am told that Ottawa will provide \$500 million, a half a billion dollars to restructure the fishery in Atlantic Canada but unfortunately there is no tag put on that half billion dollars to say where it is going to be spent, but this government here, the administration here, will have input in that. And I want to hear the hon. gentleman now stand up and categorically state something that I just said a few minutes ago, that as far as we are concerned on this side of the House, every fish plant that is closed -

MR. MORGAN: They have got the money and they will call the tune.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now the hon. gentleman is changing his tune again. 'They have got the money.' You can find \$1 million for an obsolete radar station down in Shoe Cove.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you support that?

MR. NEARY: No, I do not support it. Mr. Speaker, I support Burin, St. Lawrence, Gaultois, Ramea, Grand Bank, Harbour Breton, Fermeuse, and I think the priority is to get the fishery back on its feet,

March 16, 1983

Tape 391

EC - 2

MR. NEARY: not waste your taxpayer
money on a foolish tracking station down in Shoe Cove
that is obsolete.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Fisheries
(Mr. Morgan) made a statement the other day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously they cannot take it. If I can get over to that public meeting at Brother Rice High School tonight I will be there. I am not sure if I can make it. But wherever there is a meeting being held in this Province about the fishery, about the fish plants that are closed, getting them reopened, if I can get there I will be there. And I guarantee you that when I leave there will be no doubt in anybody's mind where I stand as far as Burin and St. Lawrence and Grand Bank and the other communities are concerned, Gaultois and Ramea. And, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon gentleman and his boss, the Premier, will give up, abandon the idea of trying to con the people in these communities. They know the difference, Mr. Speaker. They know that Ottawa can only do what it can do.

MR. TOBIN: Tell us what you want them to do.

MR. NEARY: Ottawa has to be asked.

MR. MORGAN: They have a half billion dollars so he says.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I have order on the other side?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what should happen is this, that the administration here should have gone to Ottawa with a plan and say, 'Look, here is our plan for the restructuring of the processing sector'.

MR. MORGAN: You would not know about it. And do you know the reason why? Because (Inaudible) do not trust you. It is as simple as that.

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR.NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the situation should be the -

MR.MORGAN:

You are a lost cause.

MR.SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR.NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the procedure should be the reverse of what it is at the present time. The minister and the Premier should be going to Ottawa and laying their plans on the table and saying, "Here it is, this is what we want. Will you help us to implement these plans financially or with expertise?" Instead of that the Premier goes up and says -

MR. MORGAN:

The less you know the better.

MR.NEARY:

The Premier laid no plans on the House, all he said was that we are against nationalization. I am sorry to hear that. I am sorry to hear that the hon. gentleman is a private enterpriser a private entrepreneur, because, Mr.Speaker, the solution to these fish plants is not the same in every community. The solution for Burin may not be the same as the one in Ramea, and the one in Ramea may not be the same as the one in Fermeuse. You are going to have to use different combinations. And the people down in Burin say, give us the plant and give us the draggers and we will operate it. There is no problem down there with productivity. They had the best record , I am told, of productivity in Newfoundland. And so the hon. gentleman can spout off all he wants about low productivity. What about Ramea?

MR.MORGAN:

He is your buddy, not mine.

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

MR. NEARY: By leave, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No way! No way!

MR. SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.
The hon. member for Twillingate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. REID: Mr. Speaker, I have listened
with great interest to the debate on the Private Member's Bill,
a bill which is politically as well as partially inaccurate.
However, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk)
has touched up on some things which have concerned this
House for sometime now. All hon. members realize the present
economic difficulties being experienced by our fishing industry,
yet, Mr. Speaker, the best that the Opposition has had to
offer during this debate has been an attack upon the Minister
of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. REID: - a political speech from beginning
to end from the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), in which
he seemed confused between the Transportation Department and
the Department of Fisheries, and other members opposite
failed to offer one single suggestion or opinion on how to chart
the future course in our fishing industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. REID: One member opposite seemed
irritated that our hard-working Minister of Fisheries travelled
too much promoting our fish products and seeking expanded
markets, while another said that not enough is being done
to advertise the quality of fish, which, Mr. Speaker, has
come a long way, to the point where we have met and surpassed

MRS. REID: our major competitors.
Mr. Speaker, if we are to compete internationally, it is vital that the quality of our fish is second to none.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. REID: As my colleague from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) indicated in his speech last week, this realization abroad is gaining strength thanks, to a large degree, to the continuing efforts of the Provincial Department of Fisheries.

MR. DOYLE: True! True! Very true!

MRS. REID: There must, however, be a concerted effort to keep abreast of new technology and experimentation, and to adapt to the most modern product development. Where cod was once the single fish species prosecuted, and processing involved drying and salting, today even edible species in our waters is now sought and processing is as wide and varied as the fish caught.

Mr. Speaker, I have always maintained the Province's need to fully process our fish resource rather than export the bulk of our landings in a raw form. With gradual reduction in foreign fishing off our coast and the projected improvement in the resource over the next few years, Newfoundland will undoubtedly have the opportunity and potential to become the major world supplier of fish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. REID: Mr. Speaker the province can only do so much to bring about this realization. As we have just heard from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), as he stated a few minutes ago, we have contributed \$24 million to aid fish plants around this province. We have had a loud and logical voice regarding the future direction fishery policies should take. We have been aggressive in improving and promoting fish products. In our sphere of fisheries jurisdiction, we have done our homework.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MRS. REID: Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to control the land based fish plants but, however, until this Province has a major say in the quota allocations that ensures the availability of fish around our coast, then our fishery is destined to be managed from Ottawa on a day by day basis.

Mr. Speaker, we need to have cooperation between Federal and Provincial fishery officials. Indeed, I believe that their spirit has been kindled and I earnestly hope that in the months ahead we will see some tangible and rewarding results. To this end, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the signing of the long awaited Rural Development agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MRS. REID: Mr. Speaker, continuing delays on the part of the Federal Government is very detrimental to our many Development Associations who work closely and so hard with local fisheries groups and community groups. Mr. Speaker, sitting in the gallery today is a delegation from the Development Association in my district of Twillingate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MRS. REID: Those are a group of hard-working individuals who are volunteering their valuable time in an effort to improve the living conditions in communities they represent. The fishery is a major concern of theirs. And why? Because it not only means the livelihood of their own families but the livelihood of almost every family in Twillingate district. The people from Bridgeport, Moreton's Harbour, Whale's Gulch, Herring Neck, Cottlesville, Durrell's, Crow Head and every other community and nook and crannie on Twillingate and New World Island depend on the fishery. It means bread and butter on their tables, it means clothes on their children's backs and it also means money to

MRS. REID:

provide their children with a future education. Yes, Mr. Speaker, my people, my district depends largely on the fishery, so much so that it is too serious a matter to be spoken of lightly; it is too important a subject to be kicked around as a political football.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: Truer words were never spoken.

MRS. REID: Mr. Speaker, Twillingate district has had a long and distinguished involvement in the seal fishery or seal hunt.

I would like to add a few words on the ongoing controversy which threatens the very existence of this year's seal hunt. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate decision by the European community is the accumulation of years of emotional protest by Greenpeace and other ill-informed environmental groups who have used the seal hunt issue as their annual fund raising campaign.

Mr. Speaker, this year's seal hunt is, at its best, uncertain; however, it must be stated that both levels of government are committed to the continuation of the seal hunt.

I am hopeful that assistance will be forthcoming and that new markets will be aggressively sought in the Far East and Eastern European community.

Strong measures must also be adopted with regard to the right of the EEC fishing fleets to operate in Newfoundland waters. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the EEC cannot have it both ways. They cannot reasonably expect Canada to accept a most unreasonable and detrimental decision without being penalized in the strongest possible manner.

Mr. Speaker, we do not pursue the seal hunt just for the fun and thrill of the kill.

MRS. REID: The people of our Province are a marine culture, a culture dependent on the sea for their livelihood and existence. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they depend upon the sea for their livelihood and existence. Like the farmers in our Prairie Provinces who depend on farming the land, our dairymen for raising cattle or fruit growers for growing fruit, our people in Newfoundland depend upon the seal for a living.

MRS. REID: Many people in Twillingate district depend on the seal fishery for a living. Yes, that is true. Many people in my district depend upon the seal fishery for a living, to provide their families with the necessities of life. The necessities of life, Mr. Speaker, are not fur coats, not trips to the sunny South, or Caribbean cruises, but the necessities of life are bread and butter for their tables.

The fishermen from my district, Mr. Speaker, the Troakes, and the Legges, the Watermans, the Cannings, the Ansteys are not interested in bleeding money from some wealthy senile group of so-called conservationists in order to cruise around Panama during the Winter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. REID: No, Mr. Speaker, our fishermen are interested only in providing a clean, decent livelihood for their families.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are they senile?

MRS. REID: Senile, yes. They have to be.

Long after the Sea Shepherd, Mr. Speaker, has vanished off our coastline, and the Brian Davies and the Paul Watsons have become functionally invisible -

MR. TOBIN: And the Steve Nearys.

MRS. REID: - I hope and trust that our Newfoundland people will still be persecuting a time-honoured and proud occupation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. REID: Mr. Speaker, to conclude my

MRS. REID: brief remarks, I would simply say that any success that our fishery has experienced has been in spite of, rather than because of, federal involvement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. REID: As licencing policies simply have not worked, and without this Province having some say in how our major resource is developed and managed in the future, then the opportunity presented to us to become number one worldwide will not be. And it is a serious matter, Mr. Speaker, even if the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) does not think so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. REID: Did I hear you say it was -

AN HON. MEMBER: I think so.

MR. DOYLE: Continue on.

MRS. REID: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) saw fit to stoop to personal attack in his motion. And it is unfortunate that the quality of debate on this vital issue from members opposite has been so confused and irrelevant. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that more meaningful debate will follow when my colleague from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) presents his important motion next week.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid) that I was impressed with the way she delivered her speech. I thought it was a masterful presentation although, of course, I disagree with the tack and the comments and the way that she feels and her philosophy on the fishery.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Before the hon. member reaches the core of his speech here today, I wonder if I could interrupt him for one minute. I would like to welcome to the galleries Mayor Lou Bailey and a delegation from the district of Burin - Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I did not stand here today to follow debate on the motion as it has been flowing back and forth on both sides of the House.

MR. G. TOBIN: (Inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: Do not be rude. You were not sent in here for that. Do not be ignorant now.

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

MR. NEARY: Thirty times yesterday he interrupted me and had to be called to order.

MR. HODDER: The member over in the other corner, Mr. Speaker, has been losing his -

MR. TOBIN: And I will continue to be that way as long as the Opposition (inaudible) the people of Burin (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I would like to remind members on both sides of the House that the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has the right to be heard in silence.

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I do not take kindly to the fact that the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) when I stand to speak makes such an ass of himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants to take part in debate without interruption, why is he now trying to antagonize hon. gentlemen on this side of the House of Assembly to rebut what he is saying? If he wants to be heard in silence, why not stop antagonizing members on this side of the House?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman does not know any more about the rules of the House than he knows about the fishery. That is just an indication, Mr. Speaker, of how ignorant the hon. gentleman is of the rules of this

MR. NEARY: House. It was not a point of order, Mr. Speaker. At most it was only a difference of opinion between two members, even if it was that, and I doubt very much if it was that. It was just a deliberate interruption to stall for time, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the Chair to direct members not to be making flimsy and frivolous points of order.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

I rule that there was no point of order.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a few minutes just to talk about the tragedy that was announced here in the House of Assembly yesterday that has happened in my own district, the district of Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, and I address those remarks to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), is it not possible when fish companies come into this Province that there be some code of ethics under which they operate and some code or rules and regulations under which they announce that they are going to leave twenty or thirty communities without services. When National Sea phoned me on Friday morning to tell me that they would not be coming back to the district in the coming year, they did so two weeks before the fishing season was started. Mr. Speaker, there are some twenty communities, small communities to be sure, but there are some twenty communities whose livelihood depended on the National Sea operation. Why did they do it, Mr. Speaker? I think that National Sea decided that they would pull out at the last moment hoping that it would throw the administration into a tail spin that no one would be able to get anybody very quickly and that they would then be able to come in and take out the lobster - the Port au Port area is one of the three large lobster fishing areas in the area - and as well take out the herring and then leave the fishermen alone and let the plant close after that and take the profits from the area.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that we should put up with that kind of tactics by fish companies in this Province. I think that somehow or other we have to come to grips. There are many corporate citizens in this Province, but it seems to me that the fish companies seem to be the ones who just do not care one way or the other. They are still corporate pirates. And the type of action that took place!

MR.HODDER:

I mean, there have been plants closed in this Province, we have been listening to plant closures and shutdowns for the past six or eight months, but in this case they pulled out two weeks before the fishing season started - and we have had very seasonal weather over there this year—to pull out two weeks before the season started I think is totally unacceptable and I think that somehow or other the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), who does have the power, should make National Sea know that this is not acceptable behaviour for fish companies who are doing business in this Province.

Because, Mr. Speaker, when I say that we have 75 per cent unemployment I am going on the low side rather than the high side. In 1975 there was a survey done in the Port au Port area and it showed that there was 40 per cent unemployment in the Summertime, the high unemployment time, and 60 per cent unemployment in the Wintertime, for at that particular time the linerboard mill was operating. Since that time many of the people who work away, who work on the Mainland, who work seasonally in Nova Scotia in the woods camps and who work on the scallop boats in Nova Scotia, all of these people are having trouble finding employment on the Mainland and they are home, they are not coming home, they are home. I walked into one community a couple of weeks ago and I said, "Who is working here?" and the fellow says, "There are only two people working in this community." He said two people in the whole community. The rest of them were on unemployment insurance or on social assistance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the

MR.HODDER: loss of eighty jobs in that
area - and these eighty jobs are sprinkled throughout
the twenty communities , and some communities will
suffer more than others - but the loss
of eighty jobs in that particular area
with the type of unemployment that we have, is equivalent
to the loss of six or seven hundred jobs in a larger
area like St. John's or Corner Brook or Grand Falls.
It is a massive blow to the area.

 But what I want to say
to the minister is that I feel that there must be
some way that we can stop this sort of thing from
happening.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, this is a blow which has come at a time when the fishing season is starting. There is no time to get someone in place. We will try, but we have perhaps 200 fishermen and 70 to 80 plant workers - there were 80 on the union rolls last year - 70 to 80 plant workers who are without work and fishermen who do not know where they will sell their species. They will have no trouble getting rid of their lobsters, there is no doubt about that. The fish companies know where they can make their money.

And I would say something else. National Sea said last year that they lost \$250,000 in that particular plant but, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know who is doing their counting. I can start a business anywhere and lose \$250,000 very easily if I do not care for that business, but when I am diverting products from that particular plant into other plants that I might own in either Burgeo or in the Bay of Islands or elsewhere in Newfoundland, when I am diverting groundfish and herring and taking it right from that particular area and doing the pickling and processing in other areas, then I am sure that paper losses can be very deceiving.

I think that goes for all the fish companies in this Province; I think we have always been ripped off on lobster prices. We have been ripped off in Port au Port, we are being ripped off on the Northern Peninsula and we are being ripped off by the fish companies on lobster prices everywhere across the Province. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe that that particular plant, if any one of us in this House of Assembly, if you yourself, Mr. Speaker, had - and perhaps you did;

MR. HODDER: I do not know - had the expertise and knew about the fishing industry, that that could be a very, very viable plant. The area can be turned around. And I do not give bouquets, but I have asked the minister to find a processor and a buyer or a processor-buyer for the fishermen of Port au Port and for the plant workers. I asked him in the House of Assembly yesterday and he said he would. He said he was confident that he could get somebody there.

- Mr. Speaker, in order to make the fishery in that particular area viable and profitable, there are a number of things that must be done. One of the things that have always plagued the fishermen of Port au Port has been the lack of harbour. Well, I hear a lot of people talk about the terrible federal government, but I will tell you something, Mr. Speaker; in the area that I represent they have built two large man made harbours, two magnificent harbours. Where there were no harbours, there are now harbours. One is at Blue Beach, which

MR. HODDER:

I have mentioned a number of times in this House of Assembly. We have now another \$200,000 contract going ahead to improve that harbour. It is being used by longliners, it is being used by small boat fishermen, yet, Mr. Speaker, we do not have a road. That is a provincial responsibility. We do not have a road that goes to that facility. And that is an area which was serviced by National Sea, and every year, just as the fishing season started, just as now, the roads start to deteriorate and the fish companies have to put on half load limits. Now I am not putting all the blame on the provincial government, but I will say that if the fishery is going to be viable and we are going to attract a new processor into that particular area, we are going to have to do everything possible to make sure that that fishery is viable. And if they only lost \$250,000 last year, which I do not believe, for one moment I do not believe that, but if we only lost that much last year with the condition in which the fishery takes place in that particular area, then I believe that the area indeed can have a very, very viable fishery and we will not have to worry about anybody going in.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if I knew anything about the fishery I would not for one moment hesitate to leave this House of Assembly and go out and operate that plant myself - if I knew anything about the fishery - because I believe that the fishery can be viable in that particular area. I believe that the provincial government has to do the things to make it viable. We have the harbours now. I would not say that we have sufficient harbours, but the situation is pretty good at the present time.

MR. HODDER: We have Fox Island River, which has been developed which has a few problems. We have Blue Beach, which is a magnificent harbour. And we have the man-made harbour at Roses Brook, which is again a good harbour.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have to have three phase power to go to those areas, we have to have proper fish handling facilities, and we have to have the proper fish stores. We have to have the wherewithal in order to proceed with the fishery there. And I would say to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), who is not in the House now, that I will do everything that I can in order to try to get somebody into that area, but I feel that the area has been dealt a rotten blow and I think that it can be turned around. I think that we need government help. I mean, it is sickening when people cannot get down over their fisheries access roads to pick up their fish in a pick-up truck and they have to carry it up in a hand barrell. But the quality of the product is good.

Last year the Vice-President of National Sea told me that they also were an agent for the Saltfish Corporation, that it was 87 per cent choice fish that was coming off the Port au Port Peninsula that was going into the Saltfish Corporation. They were agents for the Saltfish Corporation. 87 per cent choice fish that that particular operation was turning out. And the fishermen there are good fishermen, albeit we have a short season, but it can be a very profitable operation. The area has a fair scallop fishery at the present time. We have an excellent lobster fishery. In 1975,

MR. HODDER: when the fishermen's co-op went into receivership, National Sea came in; they have been there since 1975. I was talking to some of the people in the union today and they do not want National Sea back. I do not blame them for that. They are very bitter that National Sea would pull out at this particular point in the season. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we can get someone in there to handle the fish products. I suppose, first of all, we have to make sure that fishermen who are now fishing have a market for their fish but, secondly, and just as important, we have to try to keep that plant in operation. If nothing is done, if the government does not move quickly - and they have the resources and they own the plant - if the government does not move quickly, I predict that there will be riots in the streets down there. There is just nowhere for anybody to turn anymore. And if the fishermen do not have buyers for their groundfish, if we do not have the seventy jobs in the plant, then there is just nothing else because they cannot work, there is very little work at the present time. The Stephenville mill is not like the old linerboard mill. The linerboard mill was a very labour intensive mill, the new mill is a very efficient and modern mill and there are not many jobs and there is no hiring these days. There is no construction in the area. The area is flat, it is hurting. This is not only a blow to the Port au Port area, but also a blow to the whole Bay St. George's area, including the districts of my hon. friends, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). This is a blow to the economy of the whole area. There are too many young people wandering around the streets looking for work, asking for social assistance; too many people are looking to make sure they get their unemployment insurance benefits

MR. HODDER: for next year. Mr. Speaker,
I appeal to the minister and I appeal to the government
not to spare any effort to get processors and a buyer
into that area as quickly as possible to see that that
tragedy does not take place.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for St. Mary's -
The Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HEARN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I must say I listened with
delight to the last two speakers, my hon. colleague from
Twillingate (Mrs. Reid), who presented her views clearly
and distinctly and in a very common sense manner, and the
hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), who emphasized
the problems in his own area and once again laid the cards
on the table, as they should be, and put blame where blame
should be placed and gave credit where credit was due.

I, like him, also think
that we are facing in our Province

MR. HEARN:

a tremendous challenge in relation to our fishery and the problems that we face can only be settled by all agencies which are involved working together. We have sort of been in the habit of provincial people kicking the federal and federal people kicking the provincial, and somehow or other, until very recently, the third party involved, the large fish companies, were more or less escaping a lot of the blame. Now, I notice that my hon. colleague from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) mentioned the companies, he referred to them as corporate tyrants, and to a certain extent I am sure that is true and, perhaps when we analyze what the last two speakers have said, then perhaps we should have a new look at the resolution that is before us, because the Resolution that has been submitted by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), when we read the various parts, we have even seen his own colleagues disagree on several of the suggestions made in this Resolution.

The first part of the Resolution states that 'WHEREAS the processing sector of the fishing industry is a provincial jurisdiction under the power and the authority of the Provincial Minister of Fisheries' (Mr. Morgan). And, of course, we all agree with that and I would like to say thank God it is so because it is the only section of the fishing industry right now that is progressing. As we move on from there we have a number of inaccuracies and inadequacies that I think we should clarify. The second WHEREAS states 'the processing and marketing components of the industry are in the worse mess in the history of the Newfoundland fishery.' Now, anyone who can think back prior to ten years ago can remember times when the processing

MR. HISCOCK: sector on the Island was just not efficient at all. I can remember during the Summer, especially during the trap season, when it was practically impossible to get rid of any fish, you just threw away everything that you caught. So to say that we are in the worse period of our time, I am sure that is not quite correct.

The communities listed, I have to take exception to one of the names listed and that is the name of Trepassey. I am not sure who fed the hon. member his information on the communities that are in trouble, but Trepassey right now is operating quite well, on double shift most of the time, and the long range plans for Trepassey are excellent. Last Fall, if you remember, discussing one of the fishery resolutions, I stood here with my plant closed, discussing some topics, to have the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) say to me "What about your plant up there". My answer to him

MR. HEARN:

was, 'Do not worry about the plant because that will be okay in the New Year.' He said it would never be opened again.

I remember repeating to him that I would stand here in February or March and I would say to him, 'What do you think of it now?' And I ask him what does he think of it now because Trepassey was reopened and we said it would be, with a lot of hard work, with a lot of co-operation from the company, from the federal and provincial governments, but it is open and it is working. So we do not fool around when we make commitments.

I certainly think Trepassey has no place on the list of other plants that unfortunately now are closed. Why closed? The blame in the resolution is certainly placed on the shoulders of the provincial government, but control for opening those plants rests in a very minute part on the shoulders of the provincial government. In the case of Trepassey, the plant was closed for a while during the Fall simply because we were lacking products, products we could not catch because of the quota system introduced by the federal government. Many of our plants right now, even though we have been reminded that this is an excellent time for catching fish, and it is, one of the big money makers, of course, right now is the Northern cod, many of those corporate pirates, as they have been referred to, cannot catch the Northern cod mainly because the boats that they have cannot fish in the Northern waters.

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank God.

MR. HEARN:

And, of course, one of the reasons for that is because they themselves have not been investing properly into the industry, they have not been putting back monies that they have taken out. Now I do not think we can put the blame on either the federal or provincial government

MR. HEARN: We will have to put the blame there, where the blame belongs, on the shoulders of the companies involved.

There are a couple of things here that also perturb me, We talk about the sealing industry and we state here in the resolution "WHEREAS the Provincial Government could have saved the sealing industry by setting up processing and manufacturing plants in this Province" etc, our minister and our department is not functional, you know when we look at the amount of money invested by the federal government, \$50,000 to help save the seal fishery, and we look at our own little Province coming out to their support with half a million dollars, ten times as much, \$500,000, I do not think then we can say that we are not doing our part.

The new Minister of Fisheries, in whom I am sure we all have a lot of confidence, who seems to be standing firm in relation to try to save the fishery and to do something about it, Mr. De Bane, on T.V., just a couple of nights ago, stated that he was very upset with what was going on in relation to the seal fishery and left no doubt in anyone's mind what he thought of the boys who are now anchored outside our harbour.

MR. HEARN: However, I feel Mr. De Bane is more or less a voice in the wilderness in the Liberal Cabinet and it does not seem that his own colleagues are supporting his cause whatsoever. The last whereas, "WHEREAS the Provincial Government has a Fisheries Department and Minister, both of which are functionally invisible", I do not think anybody in the House, even the member who proposed the resolution, believes that because he is always talking about the hon. Minister of Fisheries being very, very visible even if it is on TV. The hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) just told the House that he contacted the minister in relation to his own problem. Having spent some time in the Port au Port area and the Picadilly area, I realize how important that plant is to the hon. member. It is extremely important in that section of our Province and I know his worries. When he had the problem he went to the minister, and the minister did not say, 'Get lost, I am not around, I am not going to be around'. He said, 'I will look into it and I will do something about it immediately'. And we saw moves as early as yesterday evening that the minister was making to get the facility in Picadilly operating once again.

Now once again I do not want to go throwing bouquets, as the member for Port au Port said, but certainly facts are facts and this is what we are dealing in. In my own case, I have had numerous - I basically represent a fishing district - I have had numerous occasions to call on the minister and the Department of Fisheries. In fourteen different communities I have had direct involvement by the Department of Fisheries, direct assistance given to fish companies or other facilities in relation to the fishery, fourteen different communities.

March 16, 1983

Tape No. 405

IB-2

MR. HEARN: Not only that, I have had several delegations in in relation to the Trepassey Plant, the St. Bride's plant and other areas that have been in

MR. HEARN:

trouble that I think right now we have sorted out mainly with the co-operation and the knowledge of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Department of Fisheries. Consequently, I feel very, very badly about seeing a fisheries resolution that starts off okay but then goes on to belittle the minister and the department and make remarks that are entirely inadequate. I hate to vote against any resolution and, consequently, I make the following amendment, seconded by my colleague from St. Barbe (Mr. Osmond), that is that we strike out all the words after the second 'Whereas' and replace by adding: "The large offshore fishing companies are in a financial mess in Atlantic Canada"; that we delete the word 'Trepassey' from the third 'Whereas', and that we strike out all the words after 'the fishing industry' and replace by adding: "Be it therefore resolved that this hon. House impress and implore the Government of Canada to outline its plan of action for the deep sea fishing companies."

I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, that until we get the restructuring plan as it will be submitted by the federal government -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

Could I have a copy of that amendment that the hon. member proposes?

MR. NEARY: On a point of order,

Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I would submit that that amendment is not in order, Mr. Speaker. It destroys the

MR. NEARY: principle of the original resolution put forward by my colleague.

MR. SIMMS: What is the principle?

MR. NEARY: Read the resolution.

MR. SIMMS: I read it.

MR. NEARY: I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment is not in order.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the amendment is obviously in order. The proposer of it, you will note, did not get up on a point of order, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) did. The amendment is obviously in order. The Leader of the Opposition does not care about the substance, it is where the substance comes from that worries him. It is like everything with him. But, Mr. Speaker, it certainly is in order. I mean, he has given no reason. One of the reasons for not accepting an amendment is if it negates the main motion. It does not negate the main motion; it is complementary to the main motion and indeed is much more fully explanatory of it. It would, Mr. Speaker, I think, very suitably dispose of the resolution and should invite itself to the unanimous consideration of the House. I say that it is entirely and absolutely in order. The hon. member has not given any reasons why it is not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Is it okay if I adjourn?
Two minutes is all I will need on this because I have
some information on it. I will not be very long.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
Are both sides ready to continue?
To that point of order, while it
deals with the amendment to the motion, a ruling on
whether it is acceptable or not will deal with the point
of order also. I had done some research on this earlier
today because I thought there might be an amendment, and
it appears to the Chair that this amendment does not
negate the original motion and it would offer a more
acceptable alternative for the House to discuss, and therefore
I rule it in order.

The hon. member for St. Mary's-
The Capes.

MR. HEARN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: To the amendment, I must say that
it certainly does not negate the intent of the resolution.
In fact I think what the proposer of the original resolution
was trying to do was to get some action in relation to the
problems in our fishery. I certainly agree with him on
that and I am sure we all do. However -

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, did I understand
Your Honour to say that he had prior warning that there
may be an amendment brought into the House and already
had done his research? Did I understand Your Honour to
make that statement?

MR. SPEAKER: No. I anticipated that there
could probably be an amendment so I tried to do some

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): research on it in anticipation of an amendment.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, further to my point of order. Would the hon. Speaker inform the House if he had been tipped off by anybody on the other side that there was going to be an amendment? Is that why he did his research, because he had prior notice of an amendment being brought in? Because this is a very serious -

MR. SPEAKER: If you would allow me to answer the question, I could answer it quite simply.

MR. NEARY: Yes, answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Every day before he House opens, the Speaker and the people involved with the Chair do research and try to anticipate what will happen that day. And pretty well every day that there is a Private Member's motion to be concluded, there is research done on the possibility of an amendment. That is what was done today - and last week, as a matter of fact. It was done both times in case there was an amendment moved last week.

MR. NEARY: Let me get it straight then, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour is saying -

MR. SPEAKER: It is common practice to do this.

MR. NEARY: - that he had no prior notice that there was a specific amendment to be brought in today.

MR. MORGAN: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: I am asking the -

MR. MORGAN: A point of privilege of the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege, the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, in the rules of the House of Assembly or any Parliament no one

MR. MORGAN: in the Assembly or Parliament has the right to question the Chair. The hon. gentleman is now questioning the Chair. As hon. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, you do not have to answer questions posed by any member of this House. You have made your ruling. That ruling has to be accepted by all concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): To that point of privilege, there is no point of privilege.

MR. NEARY: Thank you. I was just going to say that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: But the points brought up by the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) are well taken and are in fact true. The Chair has made the ruling and it can be appealed through due process to this House.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for
St. Mary's-The Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: Thank you very much,
Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, before I was interrupted
by a voice crying in the wilderness, who is not
worthy to carry the sneakers of the Speaker, that the
hon. member who proposed the motion was undoubtedly
trying to get some action on the fishery but he just
did not know how to go about it. What I did was
actually do him a favour and I tried to put it in some
kind of a clear perspective so that we could put some
emphasis, and perhaps some pressure, on the agency
that really can do something right now about the
problems in our fishery, especially as they relate to
the deep sea fishing plants.

Now I am not, and the
resolution does not, knock the federal government by
any means. All we are saying to them is, "Boys,
please hurry up. Come out with your plan so that
we can get the plant in Ramea, we can get the plant in
Burin, we can get the plant in Gaultois and the other
plants moving, so that we can secure the future of
plants such as Trepassey. Let us know early."

The hon. member for Port
au Port (Mr. Hodder) stressed the time element in relation
to his own plant. It is extremely important in relation
to all plants, and the earlier we can get something from
the restructuring process, the earlier then the various
agencies involved in the fishing industry can put the
total package together so that the future of the fishery
in Newfoundland, which hinges so much upon the decisions

MR. HEARN: that are to be made, the earlier we get the restructuring process plans, the earlier we can implement them. And, Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to leave nobody with the impression that we are trying to pass the buck. We are just trying to put things into perspective, to assure that the fishing industry of Newfoundland once again becomes a secure, viable industry that can employ the many Newfoundlanders that are looking forward to employment in that industry. It is our lifeblood regardless of our emphasis on oil, regardless of our emphasis on our forests, or on mines or anything else, the fishery is our lifeblood, none of us should ever forget it. But right now we are at a crossroads and what we want is some clear direction and this is all we are asking for in this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you, very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): If the hon. member speaks now he closes debate on this resolution.

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, let me first of all congratulate the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) on the best cop-out I have ever seen done in this House, not having to vote on his own government.

Now I want first, Mr. Speaker, before I get into the first 'Whereas' of this amended resolution, I want first of all to say to the member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid), I just want to remind her that I am not going to call her a non-Newfoundlander, I am not going to call her a traitor, and neither am I going to say she was not serious. She gave a good speech in this House but I resent the member for Twillingate standing in this House and pointing at any member in this House

MR. TULK: and saying they are not serious about the fishery in this Province. I do not need to remind the member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid), she grew up on the Northeast Coast, I grew up there as well. I know what it is. I know what it is for people not to have food on their table, and not to have clothing.

MR. TOBIN: Your leader is not serious about the fishery.

MR. WARREN: You are interrupting again, boy. Have you any sense at all?

MR. TULK: The first 'Whereas' of this resolution points out clearly and unambiguously that the responsibility for the processing sector of the industry in this Province belongs to none other than the present Department of Fisheries and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

Now, Mr. Speaker, what it calls upon the minister to do, what the original motion called upon the minister to do was to outline his plan of action. That is all, Mr. Speaker. What is the government's plan of action for the processing sector of the industry which is in such dire straits in this Province? That is what the original motion called upon the government to do. We are calling upon the minister to say what he wants to do in Burin. What does he want to do in St. Lawrence? What does he want to do in Gaultois? Does he want to keep those plants open? Is it his intention to say that not one single plant in this Province will close down or is it not? Is that what he wants to do?

MR. MORGAN: Fogo Island. We are going to close Fogo Island Co-op.

MR. TULK: Well, Mr. Speaker, he may have a problem there because he has very little to do with Fogo Island Co-op.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: They run their own affairs. And I want to tell the minister now that Fogo Island Co-op has -

MR. MORGAN: We gave them all kinds of money,

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

MR. MORGAN: We gave them a crab license recently.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Now let me tell him about his crab license that he gave to Fogo Island.

MR. MORGAN: You do not want anything?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, can you keep Lady Kirby quite, Mrs Kirby , can you keep her quiet? I would like to keep her quiet or otherwise ask him to leave the House.

MR. YOUNG: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services. A point of order.

MR. YOUNG: I understand, Mr. Speaker, that an hon. member from any district is supposed to be referred to by the name of his district.

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

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

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that is just the hon. gentleman making a nuisance of himself.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. YOUNG: Further to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of my Island Cove dialect and I tell the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), or wherever he comes from, that I am proud of it and I can stick my character up against his anytime at all. He is only a snake, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Here! Here!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Is that in order Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: It is correct that when one hon. member is referring to another he should indeed refer to him by the constituency which he represents.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker I want to tell the Minister something about the crab license on Fogo Island. The Minister actually had very little choice on that matter because the Federal Government, which is in control of harvesting, issued three harvesting licenses for Fogo Island. How bad would he have looked Mr. Speaker? he does not want to see me elected for the next ten years - how bad would he have looked if he had not issued a processing license?

MR. MORGAN: There is no license for processing in Twillingate.

MR. TULK: There is no license for processing in Twillingate, we are well aware of it.

Let us talk about the manager on Fogo Island, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. TULK: If we had as good a Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in this Province as we have a manager of the co-op on Fogo Island, the fishery in this Province would be flourishing.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear.

MR. TULK: That is the reason Fogo Island Co-op is doing well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. TOBIN: Where is he from?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: A good man from Placentia Bay.

MR. TOBIN: Trepassey.

MR. TULK: Trepassey, An excellent man.

MR. TOBIN: Trepassey is not in Placentia Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the original resolution calls for the minister's plan of action, and I am sorry to see the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) stand in this House and try to duck the issue. At least he could have voted, as the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) says he is going to do, according to his conscience. I am sorry to see him do that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister stood in the House this afternoon and he made several points which we have agreed with on this side and will continue to agree with. We agree with him that EEC quotas should be cut. Mr. Speaker, let me just state that categorically: If the EEC countries are not going to live up to their side of the bargain, then let us take the fish away from them. We agree with that, Mr. Speaker. Let me tell him something else that we agree on this side of the House, that the future of the South Coast fishery in this Province depends

MR. TULK: on the Tail and Nose of the Grand Banks, and perhaps even the Flemish Cap, coming under the control of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, let me put an aside on that. But, Mr. Speaker, he still cannot stand in this House and not give to the people of the South Coast of this Province, who are today, and have been for the past number of months, fighting for their very existence, he cannot in good conscience stand in this House and not tell the people of Burin whether he is against their fish plant closing, he cannot stand in this House and not tell the people of St. Lawrence whether he is against their fish plant closing and so on down the coast. He has to make up his mind.

MR. MORGAN: Ask your buddy, Roger Simmons, about it.

MR. TULK: Never mind Roger Simmons. Let us hear him in this House. Let us hear him in this House say, 'No, not a single fish plant along the South Coast will close'. Let us hear the minister say it. He has not said it. He refuses to say it. In Question Period he will not say it, will not answer the questions about whether they should or not.

MR. RIDEOUT: One question is whether he thinks they should close and the other question is whether he is going to keep them open. The two questions are not the same.

MR. TULK: Do you ever do either bit of logic at all? No. You got into the gym, I believe.

The Premier's idea the other day of coming into this House and saying, 'We do not control the quotas in this Province, therefore we can do nothing about the processing industry, therefore

MR. TULK: we can have nothing to say about the processing industry', Mr. Speaker, I am almost tempted, as I said before, to call the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), the Minister of Fisheries, Lady Kirby. I am almost tempted. Because we can see in this Province, Mr. Speaker, exactly what is happening. The Minister of Fisheries is playing footsie with the people on the South coast and he is using the Kirby report and the federal Minister of Fisheries to do it. He will sit in his chair and he will wait, and the Premier of this Province will wait until Kirby or De Bane whoever it might be,

MR. TULK: . . . makes the announcement, comes out and says, Yes, we are going to restructure the industry. They may come out and say, we are going to keep Burin closed. They may come out and say we are going to keep Grand Bank closed. Then do you know what the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is going to do?

MR. MORGAN: They have the money!

MR. TULK: Then do you know what the Minister of Fisheries is going to do?

MR. MORGAN: They have the money!

MR. TULK: He is going to stand in this House and say, Well I played ball with them. I tried to co-operate with them, and now look what they have done. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, in the worst crisis, right now on the South Coast of this Province the minister has not moved a muscle to say where he stands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: He came in here yesterday and did the right thing.

MR. MORGAN: Why do you not go ask your colleagues in the Federal Cabinet?

MR. TULK: He came in yesterday and said the right thing. In the case of Piccadilly, he came in here and he said, Unless National Sea are going to go in there and process all of the species, I will take away their licence. Mr. Speaker, he was right. He was right. But what has he said to Fishery Products? Has he said to Fishery Products that unless you go into Burin I am going to take away your fish processing licence in this Province?

MR. WARREN: No, No way!

MR. TULK: Has he done that?

Has he taken those actions?

MR. WARREN: No. No way.

MR. TULK: Has he taken any sort of action that he has available at all? Not one, Mr. Speaker, Not one.

MR. MORGAN: They own the trawlers.

MR. TULK: Speaking of the trawlers,
Mr. Speaker: Is that minister prepared to stand in this House and say he favours nationalization of the trawler fleet? Is he or is he not? Will he answer the question? It is an issue -

MR. MORGAN: I am in favour of (inaudible) it is federal (inaudible).

MR. TULK: You always have been. Why not now? Why is he not prepared? Is he or is he not? Is he prepared to say, 'Yes, we will nationalize the trawler fleet' or is he not? Let us ask him the question.

Mr. Speaker, is he prepared to stand in this House and speak about the social costs that are involved on the South coast? Is he prepared to say that we have to put money perhaps into some plants that in the immediate future are not viable but in the long term may be because otherwise the social costs are too great for this Province? Is he prepared to stand in this House and say that the social costs, as my friend from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) said the other evening, 'The social costs are centralization'? Is he prepared to say that?

MR. TOBIN: I am.

MR. TULK: You have done it. But is the Minister of Fisheries prepared to back his colleague and say, 'Look, there are social costs which we as a people in this Province have to pay for', because both federal and provincial governments, Mr. Speaker, as I said last week in this House, are to blame. It was not at the time this Minister of Fisheries but the Province and the federal government are both to blame for

March 16, 1983

Tape No. 411

IB-3

MR. TULK: the mess that the processing
sector and indeed the whole fishery in this Province is
in, make no mistake about that.

MR. TULK: As I said before, in 1977 everybody was told, 'Get in the fishery and get rich'. We drew a line on the map and we said, 'That is the 200 mile limit'. And without stopping to think that we had to wait for the stocks to regenerate and grow in this Province, without even thinking about that, Mr. Speaker, we said, 'Everybody get in. Here are all the loans that you want. Get in. Get in.' The result is today that we have to face the issues that we have to face on the South coast of this Province and indeed perhaps along the Northeast coast of the Province.

Has the minister stood in this House and answered the question that has been put forward by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) when he said, 'There may have to be different solutions for different places?' Has he done that? No. Has he stood and said, 'The solution in St. Lawrence may be different than the solution in Burin'? No. He has been silent. He has not told us whether he is prepared to pay the social costs or whether indeed there are any choices.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid), the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) that what we are witnessing, may be witnessing - I do not know and neither does anybody in this House; perhaps some people do, the minister may but nobody else knows, I suspect - that we are witnessing along the South coast of this Province the most insidious thing that has ever happened in the history of Newfoundland. Make no mistake about that. We are looking at -

MR. WARRREN: Resettlement?

MR. TULK: Indeed! We are looking at centralization through the back door. We are looking at communities that unless somebody stands -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. TULK: - in this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, we are looking at a situation that unless somebody in this Province

stands for the South coast of this Province we will be looking at a wasteland. There are certain communities on the South coast of this Province that will be a wasteland, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. It is not good enough for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) or anybody else in this House - Liberal, Tory, Communist, NDP or whatever he wants to be - it is not good enough for anybody to stand in this House and play politics while at the same time we are witnessing the destruction of a whole way of life in this Province. It is just not good enough. And that is what is happening.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was about -

MR. MORGAN: Are you in favour of nationalizing the companies, taking them over or something?

MR. TULK: In some cases, yes. If the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) wants our ideas on the fishery, we will extend him the courtesy and the offer to sit down with him and say, 'Look, here is what we believe. What do you believe?' And then we will come into this House, Mr. Speaker, and we will present a united front to either the federal government or, if we have to, to the United Nations of this world. Whatever we have to do we will do.

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

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's point is well taken regarding the viewpoints of the Opposition

MR. MORGAN: Party, because we want the viewpoints of all parties, but we are of the understanding that the federal Cabinet committee has already solicited the views of the Opposition Party in Newfoundland. So I am assuming they have incorporated their views in the position put forward to the federal Cabinet committee.

MR. NEARY: They have not. They have certainly not.

MR. MORGAN: They told us they did.

MR. NEARY: They certainly have not.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!
To that point of order, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: The minister's point is irrelevant, but let me clear up the statement he has just made.

MR. TULK: That is not true. The only thing that we have been asked to do on this side was to present a submission to the Kirby Task Force, and that we did. So that is not true, Mr. Speaker. There is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!
The Chair rules that there is no point of order.

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and to this House in this resolution is that this Assembly should clearly know where we stand. And the Minister of Fisheries as the head of the Department of Fisheries in this Province is directly responsible for seeing that that is done. He can duck behind anything he likes, but the truth of the matter is that when the restructuring of the fishing industry in this Province is carried through it may be too late for some people on the South Coast, it may be too late for some people in some of those communities that I have mentioned.

MR. TOBIN: What are your federal counterparts doing about all this?

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, if the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is at all serious - and I believe he is, I hope he is - then I would tell him now that if the federal government is about to do something that will destroy one single settlement on the South Coast of this Province he has an ally and a colleague right here.

MR. MORGAN: That is a very important statement. That is a very important statement.

MR. TULK: Now let us not hear anymore about the federal government. Let us not hear anymore about the federal government, I say that to the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

But, Mr. Speaker, before

that is done there is a responsibility that this man here has to take and that is, Mr. Speaker, that we in this House have to have our own plan of action. We have to first of all make the statement, 'Are we going to allow one settlement on the South coast of this Province to be destroyed?'. That is the question, 'Are we going to allow one fish plant to be closed?'.

MR. WARREN:

The minister says yes.

The minister says yes.

MR. TULK:

Are we?

MR. WARREN:

The minister says yes.

MR. TULK:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know

that there are people on that side of the House who are, as I said before, good Newfoundlanders and they must be going through tremendous turmoil. The member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews), the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) and the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) must be going through tremendous turmoil. Because, Mr. Speaker, what nonsense for somebody to come into this House and say that either man in this House is not a good Newfoundlander. What nonsense!

The member for Burin-Placentia West stands up and he agrees with my resolution as many of the people on that side do. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say that he is going to vote politically. I will say that he will vote according to his conscience. And I was about to say before the member for St. Mary's- The Capes rose in his place to propose this amendment that indeed -

MR. NEARY:

Which is out of order, which

is completely out of order.

MR. WARREN: Out of order, yes.

MR. NEARY: He did it out of order.

It is completely out of order.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I am going to make the ruling now
shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: I was about to say to the
member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) and everybody
in this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: - that if you are offended
by me telling the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) that
he is functionally invisible, and the key word is functional,
then, Mr. Speaker, I was about to say, 'Let us withdraw
that. I will withdraw it if you will support the motion',
but, Mr. Speaker, that has gone out the window.

MR. TULK: and I am sorry to say the little political game that the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) has just played, Mr. Speaker, that is the real problem that we are facing in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I want, if I may in the next minute or so that I have, to address some of the issues that the minister raised this afternoon. One of those was the income of inshore fishermen. I think he went on to say that there were very few problems in the inshore fishery. But this year was a good year, he said, in Fogo, this year was a good year in Musgrave Harbour, this year was a good year in Twillingate. Indeed it was. There were tremendous amounts of fish caught. Musgrave Harbour this year had the best catch of fish that they have had since 1975. And they will agree and the minister said it, he said, 'The stocks are now being managed'. He said it. They had the best catch of fish that they have had in years. Fogo Island Co-op caught something like 16 million pounds of fish. The best! The best! Sixteen million pounds and six million pounds are twenty-two million pounds. Good in terms of the volume of catch, but, Mr. Speaker, the prices have not changed since 1977, basically have not changed. And the cost of gear has gone up in this Province, and our fishermen, as the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) said this evening, have been ripped off.

Mr. Speaker, I understand my time is up. I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I am sick and tired of hearing people in this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. TULK: - say, 'There are forty-four on that side and eight on this side' and 'Oh, the way people voted last April'. Well, is that not wonderful. But I want

MR. TULK: to say something to the government and that is this: That if the people have elected a government they have a right - and I emphasis 'a right' - when they are being perhaps crushed by conditions over which they have no control, they have a right to expect a helping hand. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in this Province has not given that helping hand. Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

All those in favour of the amendment 'Aye'. Those against the amendment 'Nay'. The 'Ayes' have the amendment.

Those in favour of the resolution as amended 'Aye'. Those against 'Nay'.

The motion is carried.

It being Private Member's Day, I will call it six of the clock and the House adjourns until tomorrow, Thursday at three of the clock. I do now leave the Chair until three of the clock tomorrow, Thursday.