

VOL. 2

NO. 16

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.

TUESDAY, MARCH 29, 1983

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, in the past, the execution and implementation of joint Federal/Provincial cost shared agreements represented commitments by both governments to social and economic development projects in this Province. These co-operative arrangements have created jobs and employment, provided much needed infrastructure, built tangible public assets and assisted in stimulating development investment.

Over the past couple of years, however, this commitment by the Government of Canada to provide development assistance in the form of dollars to the Newfoundland government has been seriously lacking. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my statement today is to outline the frustrations we have faced in seeking from the Government of Canada a renewed Federal/Provincial operational agreement for the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and, as well, a subsidiary agreement which would provide funding for industrial parks in certain areas of our Province.

To start with, let me first discuss the Development Corporation. It was a year ago March 1st, that initial contact was made seeking a joint approach to continue the Corporation's activities and programs in a renewed agreement. Previously, there have been two successive five year operational agreements - the Newfoundland government wishes to continue with similar arrangements. This Corporation has proven to be a very successful and valuable agency in our overall business development strategy during its ten years of operation.

MR. WINDSOR: From March 1 until July 17, 1982, the expiry date of the five year agreement, a number of letters and telexes were sent requesting notification of a continuing Federal participation in a renewed funding agreement.

The agreement expired on June 17th without any Federal notification of intent. In mid-September the Government of Canada agreed to extend the agreement to December 31, 1982, to permit discussions to take place in the development of a new funding arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, on November 19th, 1982, in St. John's the hon. the Premier and I met with Mr. Lumley and Mr. Rompkey, the Province's Representative in the Federal Cabinet, to discuss a number of outstanding bilateral issues. At this meeting, we reiterated our proposal for a continuing Federal/Provincial financial participation in the Corporation. The Ministers expressed the Federal intention to extend the agreement to March 31, 1984, with an appropriate contribution to the Corporate Loan Fund. Since that meeting we have confirmed the Province's willingness to enter into such an extension. However, we are still awaiting a federal

MR. WINDSOR:

reply regarding a draft extension in order that it may be executed. The combined efforts of our successes in this corporation are quickly being destroyed by federal indecision and indifference. The Newfoundland Government seeks a renewed agreement with federal participation to meet the financing needs of the business community in our Province.

Mr. Speaker, in 1980 the government submitted a proposal to the Government of Canada for a joint federal/provincial agreement on industrial and commercial development. While a number of meetings at the officials level were held to discuss this initiative, no formal response has been received to the acceptability of the proposed program for cost sharing.

One major component of this development proposal was the identification of the need for serviced industrial land in the Province. While we preferred to discuss the total industrial development initiative we agreed to proceed with the federal government to negotiate a program to construct industrial parks only, and to defer detailed negotiation of the other components of our comprehensive industrial development package to a later date.

In July of 1982, the then Minister for Regional Economic Expansion unilaterally announced federal intentions to fund entirely development cost for certain industrial parks and incubator malls. These projects were not the same projects put forward by the Province for our initial start on industrial land parks; provincial priorities had not been discussed nor was the Province consulted prior to the federal announcements. The announcement made no reference whatsoever about the whole question of administration and ownership of parks once completed. Such development initiatives, Mr. Speaker, require

MR. WINDSOR: governments to act jointly and in a co-ordinated approach to ensure their success.

In November, 1982, the Premier and I, at the meeting with the federal ministers in St. John's presented a compromise proposal for industrial park funding by the Government of Canada. The federal ministers agreed to review this proposal and to have a decision in the near future, but to date no formal responses or draft agreements have been received.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland Government has been willing to negotiate in good faith with the Government of Canada. We want a joint and co-operative approach to address the serious economic problems facing our Province today and

MR. WINDSOR: we are ready to sign agreements that will assist in business and industrial development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all I agree with the minister, that in the past - if I may quote the minister - in the past the execution and implementation of joint federal and provincial cost shared agreements represented commitments by both governments to social and economic development projects in this Province. And these co-operative arrangements created jobs and employment in the past. They provided much needed infrastructure, they built tangible public assets and they assisted in stimulating development investment. We agree on that. But the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why we do not have the same sort of co-operation and the same sorts of agreements that produced these sorts of results today, I do not believe is the fault of the minister, himself. But it is obvious to anybody, Mr. Speaker, inside or outside the Legislature, that - and the minister later on in his Ministerial Statement made mention of the fact that Ottawa announced some agreements without consulting the Province. Well, is there any wonder, Mr. Speaker? Is there any wonder? The last big announcement that was made, the last big signing that took place was supposed to have taken place down in the old Newfoundland Hotel. It would have marked, Mr. Speaker, an historic signing, one of the last in an historic building. But no, the Premier ranted and raved and wanted the agreement signed where the seat of government is located. These are the kinds of reasons,

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, why there is a lack of co-operation from Ottawa. These are the sorts of reasons; the petty nonsense of the Premier and his right-hand minister, the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall). It is the actions of these two gentlemen in particular, Mr. Speaker, which have made the negotiating process with Ottawa almost impossible.

MR. W. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) had his own way, if he were acting alone that things in the developing aspect in this Province would be on a much higher plane than they are. I remember, Mr. Speaker, about a year ago attending a meeting in Bay Roberts with that same minister where discussions were being held to talk about the prospects for offshore oil and the development that would be taking place in Harbour Grace. Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the people in this Province only realized how great the prospects for jobs and employment opportunities would be if an offshore agreement were signed - which is another one of those federal/provincial agreements that is stalled - then, Mr. Speaker, I think if the people knew, they would be marching in the streets. And the only thing I have to say, Mr. Speaker, is that I am disappointed in the minister for only one reason, that I am surprised at the minister, who knows of the things that are being lost by this Province and by this administration the thing that surprises me and disappoints me is that the minister still sits where he sits. I am surprised that he has not gone in cahoots with the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) and several others to form a new party or something and leave those gentlemen.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now that the administration have sifted through the ideas of all the other principals

MR. S. NEARY: . involved in making policy on the fishery - the Liberal Party of Canada, Mr. Kirby, the unions and the provincial Liberal Party - now that they have sifted through all these ideas and picked out the best ideas and put their own label on them, I wonder if the Premier could answer a couple of questions, Mr. Speaker, in connection with his newsconference. Just to show the contempt that the Premier has for this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - he held a press conference this morning rather than come in this House and announce his policy, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews), the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn), the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews), attended the People's Conference and voted in favour of a resolution

MR. NEARY: that would send a united message to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the fishery.

Now after hearing what the hon. gentleman had to say, and reading the proposal put forward by the Premier, we are not sure if the administration supports the resolution or not. So I am going to ask the Premier a very simple question and he can answer it yes or no: Does he support without reservation the resolution that was passed yesterday at the People's Conference at the Holiday Inn?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I do not know if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) really knows the rules of the House or not, but under Presenting Reports, after Oral Questions, I have a copy of the proposal here to table for all hon. members in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And I am going to table it under that provision which is there for us to table such things under. So I was going to table it here in the House today, Mr. Speaker. I wish the hon. Leader of the Opposition would learn the rules, because he speaks before he thinks. He should know what the rules of the House are. After Question Period I was about to table the whole thing, and he could have asked me, if he wanted to, whether I intended to table it. That would have been the way to go about it rather than to get up and rant and rave as if I was trying to ignore the Legislature. That is the first thing, Mr. Speaker.

Secondly, I do not know where the Leader of the Opposition spends his time, whether he is half asleep or totally asleep or whatever. I mean, yesterday there was a conference here in St. John's attended by the union - I think it was organized by the union - and the Joint Councils

PREMIER PECKFORD: from the Burin Peninsula
were here, the Action Committees and representatives of many,
many of the communities, and a resolution was prepared which
followed very closely the position that the Newfoundland
Government takes. Of course, one reason for that
was we had consulted with the union before we had gone
to Ottawa, I consulted with them again yesterday morning,
The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) had detailed meetings
with the union yesterday morning before, during, and after
breakfast, early yesterday morning. The Minister of Fisheries
was on target. The Minister of Fisheries was, over the
weekend, down throughout all of the Burin Peninsula, got
a fantastic reception down there, he was almost treated like
a king.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD:

He got a standing ovation at the

PREMIER PECKFORD:

conference. I do not think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) got a standing ovation, did he?

The Minister of Fisheries

(Mr. Morgan) is one of the most popular people in Newfoundland and Labrador today, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: A tireless worker, a man who spends all of his time going around the Province, and wherever he has to go to pursue and promote the fishery of Newfoundland, that is where he goes, that Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And, Mr. Speaker, we are very, very proud that the union, plus all the groups representing the communities down the Burin Peninsula and elsewhere in the Province, supported our position by passing that resolution. So, obviously, we fully support the resolution, because what the resolution does is support the proposal that we presented last week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think that is a deliberate attempt on the part of the hon. gentleman to belittle the resolution and to belittle the conference that took place yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Because, Mr. Speaker, after reading the hon. gentleman's so-called policy that he robbed from all the other principals involved, there are some very fundamental differences between -

MR. TOBIN: Is it a good policy?

MR. NEARY: - the resolution and between the policy outlined this morning at the press conference.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one vast difference between item one in the letter that was written to Mr. Johnston by the Premier and the resolution itself. Item one in the Premier's letter says that there should be a single trawler company created to operate Newfoundland based trawlers. In the resolution it says that consideration should be given to this matter somewhere down the road, that it be considered.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN: Sit down! Sit down! You are making a fool of yourself.

MR. NEARY: Let me read the resolution, Mr. Speaker. " BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED -

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is asking a
supplementary question. He has been into a very long
preamble. He is now reading resolutions, he is reading
excerpts from papers, etc., Mr. Speaker, and I think that he
should be asked to get on to the substance of his question,
if in fact it has any substance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
The Chair has been more
than lenient with members on both sides in asking and
answering questions. The hon. Leader of the Opposition
(Mr. Neary) did rise on a supplementary question and I am
sure that Beauchesne says that a supplementary question
should not need any preamble.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me
ask -

MR. HODDER: That is the first time that has
been brought in now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: - let me ask the hon. gentleman -

MR. HODDER: I do not care if it is in Beauchesne. In
the traditions of this House we have always been allowed
it.

PREMIER PECKFORD: On a supplementary?

MR. HODDER: It is, the long arm of the government.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon.
gentleman a supplementary by asking him -

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker Simms have always
allowed it.

MR. NEARY: - if his proposal in item one in his letter, if his proposal coincides with the last BE IT RESOLVED in the resolution, and does he not think that his proposal as outlined in his letter to Mr. Donald Johnston, Minister of State, does he not think that if this proposal has to be seriously considered and is laid on the table in Ottawa that it will only delay the restructuring of the fish plants that are involved in the deep-sea fishery?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now we see the real Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and the Liberal Party, who is more interested in having some of the plants open and some of the plants closed so we can get on - What the Leader of the Opposition just said - he just showed his hand, Mr. Speaker - he just made a fundamental error in the Liberal Party's approach. What the Leader of the Opposition is saying he prefers to have five plants closed and the rest open, because what we are saying is going to have all of them open, but it might take a little bit more time, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now let us call a spade a spade. The Leader of the Opposition has just said he prefers to see Gaultois closed, he prefers to see Grand Bank closed, St. Lawrence closed, Burin closed and Fermeuse closed so we can get on with the restructuring that the Price Waterhouse people and the companies and the banks want. That is what the

PREMIER PECKFORD: Leader of the Opposition
(Mr. Neary) just said in his question. So he is opposed to having the other five plants reopened in this Province, Mr. Speaker. Now let it go on record. Here we are today talking about a fundamental new approach to the reorganization of the fishery in Newfoundland which the Government of Newfoundland just put on the table. It is going to determine whether Newfoundland communities over the long-term on the South coast and throughout even the East and Northeast coast are going to survive or whether they are going to die. That is what we are talking about.

MR. NEARY: Brief answers, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And the Leader of the Opposition can stand up after seeing a copy of that proposal - and I will table the copy and we will brief him on it if he wants to be briefed - and takes the position, after all the agony and pain that have gone on in this Province in the last three or four months over the close down of some of those plants, takes the cheap, simplistic position that somehow the Government of Newfoundland is going to retard the restructuring process because we are looking at something that is long-term, something that will see all the plants open in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

I condemn publicly now the Leader of the Opposition for taking such a small approach to this problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Brief answers, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, before this day is out, let the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), let the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) in the speech on Interim Supply, let the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk),

PREMIER PECKFORD: let the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), let the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) change his position, let the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and the other two members who are now absent stand in their places and get together with the union, with the people of the South coast -

MR. MORGAN: And support us.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - and with the Government of Newfoundland, too, and support this position so that we can get some sanity back into the long-term future of the fishery of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have heard some silly, off-the-rocker statements from the hon. gentleman who just took his seat, but that has to be about the lowest and the worst I think we have ever heard.

Let me go back to the question, Mr. Speaker. I was comparing the -

PREMIER PECKFORD: You were asking whether we were going to delay the restructuring process.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman. If the hon. gentleman has not had his pill for today, I would suggest he go outside and take it, because we do not want to upset him. I am sorry if I upset the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, but this is a very serious matter. There are vast differences between the resolution and the letter that was written to Mr. Johnston by the Premier. And I

MR. NEARY: pointed out one of those differences. The Premier is making a definite statement about a single trawler company, the resolution says the option of the separation of the fleet and community ownership of processing plants be examined as potential objectives. That is why I asked the hon. gentleman if he was supporting the resolution or just merely attempting to muddy up the water. One -upmanship again, playing cheap political games with the lives of people in these communities where restructuring has to take place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question! Question!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman made a little speech and now he is objecting to my making one. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want the hon. gentleman to explain this difference in his policy and the resolution that was passed yesterday. In the hon. gentleman's policy he says, 'within the processing sector, the existing corporate structure would be maintained with the prospect that these companies may have to be broken down in smaller multi-plant units.' That is not what the resolution says, Mr. Speaker. The resolution says, "Be it further resolved that rather than a simple bail-out of the corporate interests, both governments commit themselves jointly or separately to the public ownership of those deep-sea companies, Fishery Products -

MR. YOUNG: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. minister on a point of order.

MR. YOUNG: I want to just indicate to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), Mr. Speaker

MR. NEARY: Oh, here is the expert now!
Coming to his rescue now, are you?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. YOUNG: I may not be an expert , Mr. Speaker, but I have common sense, something that the hon. member has not got.

MR. NEARY: Sit down, boy!

MR. YOUNG: But I think, Sir, that you just ruled that the hon. member should not be reading resolutions and so forth and that is what he is doing in asking the question. I think it is plain ridiculous his ignoring the Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Sometimes it might be in order to permit some preamble. The Chair was listening to see what the question was that the hon. Leader of the Opposition was going to ask. The time for the Question Period is dragging on and the topic is certainly serious, so maybe the questions and answers could be each a little briefer than they have been.

MR. NEARY: Well, what I am asking the hon. gentleman , Mr. Speaker, is if Item No. 2 in his letter to Mr. Johnston meets the provision of the resolution, 'Be it further resolved that rather than a simple bail-out of the corporate interests both governments commit themselves jointly or separately to the public ownership of those deep-sea companies, Fishery Products, the Lake Group, John Penny and Sons and H.B. Nickersons unable to operate without public assistance.'

MR. NEARY:

The Premier's statement is not compatible with the resolution. The Premier's statement, as a matter of fact, is the complete opposite of the resolution. So how can he say that he supports the resolution with that kind of policy?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that, what we are talking about over time, after the two governments get involved - if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) wants an answer directly to that question, I have to, however, go back to explain to the Leader of the Opposition that the resolution that was passed yesterday is not as all-encompassing and as comprehensive as our proposal is.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see.

PREMIER PECKFORD: They only deal with public ownership, we deal with public ownership and more.

MR. NEARY: I see. It is only the people's resolution.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Our proposal is far more comprehensive than that resolution was yesterday. In our proposal is contained the public ownership issue. We have talked to the President of the Union about this and all the people who passed that resolution yesterday, and here is what we are saying: Later on down the road, after public ownership, there might be a different kind of public ownership. The public ownership, like we have on Fogo Island, the people of Grand Bank with the union might want to own the fish plant in Grand Bank, like the people out on Fogo Island did, or in Burin or in Fermeuse or in Gaultois. So we are leaving it open for that public ownership, which in the first instance will be company orientated for it to be even better public ownership, people orientated down the road.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So our public ownership goes even further than the union's. It keeps the door open down the road for there to be even greater public ownership through shares sold to the individuals or the union in the given community where that fish plant is located. we think that is very sound. The union agrees. All the people on the Burin Peninsual agree that leaving that door open for later on down the road for some of these fish plants to be owned by the community, is a very wise and sane policy. Whether it will or whether it will not will depend upon the evolution of the process after the government has been involved on the front end.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman saying that the administration agree with option three as amended? Is that what the hon. gentleman is saying in effect, because his policy statement this morning certainly does not indicate that? The resolution and the discussion yesterday at the People's Conference -

MR. TOBIN: You would like to pick it apart.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the hon. gentleman, not the ignoramous from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), the lap dog. I am asking the hon. gentleman to tell this House and tell the people now in these communities if he agrees, as did the

MR. S. NEARY: conference yesterday, with Option 3 if it is amended, and that is the merger of Nickersons, the Lake Group of Companies and Fishery Products and that all the plants be reopened? Does the hon. gentleman approve of that option, Option 3 as amended?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are going to negotiate out an agreement with the federal government and others that will ensure that these principles are incorporated in that agreement. Now, whether that comes out to be Option 3 or Option 3 amended or Option 2 amended or Option 5 or Option Z or Mickey Mouse or whatever it is called it makes no difference to us.

MR. J. HODDER: Needless to say you will keep on playing politics. You are playing politics.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We are not linked to any one option. What we want to see is a process that sees -

MR. HODDER: You could have had Option 3 as amended.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Right now Option 3 amended by the federal government, or Price Waterhouse has no provision in there for all the plants being opened, it has no provision in there for a trawler company some time down the road, it has no provision in there for communities to get involved if they want, it has no provision in there for the union to get involved if they want to get involved, it has no provision in there that factory trawlers will never be used. And on top of all of that, you have the idea of what is going to happen in the Labrador Coast, what is going to happen in St. Anthony. So, it is a full, full package. Option 3 alone, or Option 3 amended does not accommodate all these principles that we are now putting on the table, nor does it come to grips with how we are going to work out the St. Anthony/Labrador Coast situation. The Government

PREMIER PECKFORD: of Newfoundland's point of view is we are not going to isolate one part of this Province against another. If we are going to have a restructuring where there is going to be hundreds of millions of dollars put in, let us have a restructuring which is a fundamental change in policy. I am just as concerned about Nain as I am Burin, I am just as concerned about Makkovik as I am Gaultois, I am just as concerned about Port au Choix as I am St. Anthony, and I am looking at the whole Province, so it is no good for the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to try to blindfold everybody by bringing out this magic Option 3 amended, whatever that is supposed to mean. Where does St. Anthony come into that? Where does Nain come into that? Where does the Saltfish Corporation come into all of that? So we have tried to do is, first of all, lay down a whole bunch of fundamental framework in which a restructuring of the given plants now can take place. Now after the negotiations are over, if that comes out to be something closely resembling option this or option that, then so be it, but it is too large a problem to start sticking labels onto it. What we are talking about is a fundamental restructuring with all plants open.

The other thing is, Mr. Speaker, which nobody seems to want to talk about and which I mentioned this morning -

MR. HODDER: There was already an option but he has to muddy up the water.

MR. HODDER: We have to wait for another month.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - we should not be focusing on restructuring the companies, we should be focusing on restructuring the industry. And when I talk about restructuring the industry, I want to go back to talking about what is the resource we have to deal with. I mean, this is the craziest process that you have ever heard of that we are involved in right now. We are talking about restructuring a bunch of companies, bailing them out based upon primarily a cod resource. Well, Mr. Speaker, how about the turbot resource, how about the offshore crab resource, how about the offshore squid resource? I understand that in the past year the Poles came over there and took somewhere around 15,000 or 20,000 -

MR. MORGAN: Nineteen thousand.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Nineteen thousand metric tons of turbot.

MR. NEARY: Brief answers, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, that should be landed in Newfoundland to make those plants viable that are not viable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: So give them their base of cod, give them their little bit of flounder and yellow tail and perch, and redfish if we can find the market, and build on that basic resource some of the other underutilized species that are there.

Somebody has to go back and define what is the resource we are talking about and then build an economic strategy based on that resource.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Do not start by taking four steps and then start to look at it. Before you take step number one define what the resource is. And we have never defined what our resource is. Plus how about the foreign allocation of

PREMIER PECKFORD: 20,000 metric tons of the Northern cod stock that is going to Europe that we get no benefit out of. How about the French Treaty that is going to come up in 1986 for another 18,000 metric tons.

MR. NEARY: You are talking about ten years, maybe fifteen years or twenty years.

PREMIER PECKFORD: What we are talking about is not Option A amended or Option 2. Let us go back and talk about what resource that is closer to Newfoundland than anywhere else, and who can we use that resource to build an industrial and economic strategy which will give prosperity and jobs to the people of this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

Let it be recorded, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman would not commit the administration to supporting an option. The hon. gentleman is talking about long-term matters that will take anywhere from one year up to one hundred years to resolve.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is making a speech, Mr. Speaker, and he is also commenting on the answer. There is a certain procedure that can be implemented by the hon. gentlemen if he wishes to. They did not wish to do it last Thursday, but there is a procedure and he is commenting on the answer and making a speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Again I must remind hon. members that there are only about six or seven minutes left in the Question Period and maybe the answers to questions should be brief.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, maybe I will wrap all my questions into one. The hon. gentleman mentioned "now starting negotiation". The hon. gentleman is now going to start negotiations. Is the hon. gentleman aware that maybe on Thursday of this week, as was stated yesterday at the People's Conference, a decision may be made by a cabinet committee in Ottawa on restructuring? The People's Conference favoured Option 3 if it was amended, the hon. gentleman will not commit himself to that. He is now going to start negotiations. How long will these negotiations take? And would the hon. gentleman tell the House if he is aware that these matters are likely to be decided before Easter? And would the hon. gentleman tell the House and tell the people of this Province about funding for the plan he announced this morning? How will it be funded? Will it be funded jointly? Will it be cost-shared with the Government of Canada? What proportion will the Province put in? What is the estimate of the programme announced by the hon. gentleman this morning as far as upgrading the plants, telling us when the plants -

MR. MORGAN: There he goes now.

MR. NEARY: No, hold on now.
- telling us when the plants will open, upgrading the plants? How will it be shared with the Government of Canada? Will it be fifty/fifty, seventy-five/twenty-five, ninety/ten? How will it be cost shared? Could the hon. gentleman give us an inkling of these very important matters?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The first very important matter is that seeing all the communities on the Burin Peninsula and elsewhere around the Province that are affected by this restructuring and the union are on side, we would like to have the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) his party on side, so that no decision is made on Thursday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now that is number one because that is very critical. That is very critical.

MR. NEARY: Option 3 as amended will keep the plants open.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Option 3 as amended is no good unless it has got all the rest in it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: The only option on the table now is one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, this is very important so may I just have the floor? I mean, if I am asked a question let me answer it. It is too important to go skirmishing over like that. Let me just say to the

PREMIER PECKFORD: Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) - you know, he can play all the games he likes - but I am telling the Leader of the Opposition I was in Ottawa last Thursday and was told by all the people there that every one of the options on the table had the five plants closing, and that is still the position in Ottawa. I am telling you that the factory trawlers are still in and there is no position there for the union. There is no consideration of all these things, of the turbot, no consideration of offshore crab, no consideration of offshore squid - that can be traded away over time. All of these things are not there. So what you are talking about amending -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - is amending the whole process that Price Waterhouse was involved in. In order to have any amendment, the amendment has to be an amendment to all the options.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, if you were to proceed along the lines that the Government of Newfoundland is talking about, we could have an agreement. The Leader of the Opposition says, 'How long will it take to do this'? Fifteen to thirty days. No problem. Easy. These things can be done in no time.

Now the total amount of money that the Leader of the Opposition talks about -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Leader of the Opposition just accused me of interrupting him, and he, plus a number of his other members, just insistently interrupted me while I am trying to give an answer to three very important questions.

PREMIER PECKFORD: See not only are they not interested in the fishery of Newfoundland, they are not interested in anything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

PREMIER PECKFORD: They are playing games, that is all they are interested in.

Mr. Speaker, the Price Waterhouse group and all the people in the federal Cabinet have already agreed -

MR. CALLAN: I agree too.

PREMIER PECKFORD: This is important, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) considers this to be important or not - \$257 million. They have already agreed that at least \$257 million is needed. Now this is important for the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to listen to. I want the Leader of the Opposition clear on this. They have already agreed that at least \$257 million has to be put up to bail out the existing companies. Of that \$257 million is under any of their options, all of which have five plants closing down - no talk of turbot offshore, no talk of squid, no talk of offshore crab, no talk of participation by the union, no talk of a social compact with the union to make the whole thing tick, none of that is in there.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And under one of those options, the one that they prefer, they were going to give National Sea, the only viable company of the four or five involved in the restructuring, \$70 million, not to eliminate their debts because they have none, they can take care of their debts, but for capital improvements -

MR. MORGAN: And to purchase freezer vessels.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - and to purchase factory trawlers.

Now, if the federal government has \$257 million available to put into the offshore fishery, let us break out how much of that \$257 million was supposed to go for trawlers and put that amount of the \$257 million into the trawler company, the harvesting company, however much that was.

MR. NEARY: You are out of touch.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, let it be recorded that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is saying I am out of touch because I want to keep the fishery of this Province going and to keep communities viable around this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Everyone agrees except them.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The only ones out of step again is the Liberal Party of Newfoundland.

PREMIER PECKFORD: By the way, Mr. Speaker, is this a dream, having a separate harvesting company?

MR. NEARY: If we do not get Option 3 it will be your fault.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: All over the world, in the fishing nations of the world, the harvesting component is separated from the processing component.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And this week over in British Columbia, one of the largest fishing interests over there is about to separate the harvesting fleet from the processing fleet. So it is not pie in the sky. Take the rest of the money and put it into capital upgrading of the existing plants and take away that \$70 million that was going to go free, gratis, for nothing, to National Sea and put it where it really has to go, into upgrading the plants that need upgrading in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that can all work, it can work easily if there is a will to make it work. Everybody is on side, everybody in Newfoundland is on side. I do not know where the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is.

MR. NEARY: You do not agree with restructuring.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, I agree with restructuring of the industry.

MR. NEARY: But you are going to delay it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Everybody is on side except the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party and they are the ones who will stand accused again if this thing does not go through.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Because we are more concerned about the long-term than we are about short-term, which the Liberal Party always have been interested in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Question Period has expired.

March 29, 1983

Tape 764

EC - 3

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): I would like to welcome to the galleries today, a delegation from the St. Barbe Development Association.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as according to my promise earlier, I want to table copies of our proposal for the restructuring of the fisheries, and I also want to table at the same time a Telex that I have sent to Mr. Rompkey. "Last week I presented the Newfoundland Government's position on fisheries restructuring to the federal Cabinet Committee of which you are a member.

Today I released this position to the public. In view of how important this whole matter is to many Newfoundland Communities and to the future of our Province, I am requesting your support as Newfoundland's representative in the federal Cabinet to this position and by copy of this telegram to the other members of Parliament from Newfoundland.

It is, of course, especially important" -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

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

MR. NEARY: I believe that Your Honour is already aware that these statements that are being laid on the table of the House are not in order. They are not the kind of reports that are made when Your Honour asks for Reports from departments and ministers. The kind of reports that we are talking about are the ones that they have to bring in under statutes of this Province. And it is a cowardly way to do it, Mr. Speaker, because we cannot respond. The things that the hon. gentleman is tabling, Mr. Speaker, are the subject of debate and we do

MR. S. NEARY: not have any opportunity to respond to these statements that are being made. I would submit that the whole thing is completely out of order and if anybody should learn the rules of the House, it should be the hon. gentleman who has managed in the last few years to bring this House down to its lowest level since confederation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): The hon. the Premier, to that point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I happened to sit in the gallery here when the hon. member was a member of this House on this side, when there was another Premier over here, when there was no Question Period, when there was no Late Show, and here the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) can sit over there on a point of order and talk about bringing this House back to less than what it was at the time of Confederation, when he was part of that government that did not even permit a Question Period, Mr. Speaker. The nerve of the man to get up now and try to -

MR. CALLAN: (Inaudible) in Ottawa.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, change your spots all right, Mr. Speaker.

To the point of order, all I was trying to do was table the government's position on a very important matter, table the Telex to a federal Cabinet Committee.

MR. NEARY: Why did you not bring it in in a Ministerial Statement?

PREMIER PECKFORD: If they do not want the information then, that is fine with me.

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! I will have to rule that it was not a valid point of order raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, thank you.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have not finished this yet.

MR.ROBERTS: I thought the Premier had tabled the document. Or is he making a speech? What is he doing?

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, I -

MR.ROBERTS: Well, if he is tabling it, he could have built a table in the time he has had.

MR.SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR.PECKFORD: Are you opposed?

MR.ROBERTS: I have been recognized by the Chair. I am not opposed to anything, I am recognized by the Chair.

MR.SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair made a ruling on the point of order and, I may have been a little hasty, I assumed that the Premier had finished.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No.

MR.SPEAKER: Okay. I will let the hon. Premier finish tabling his documents.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I never got an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to say I was tabling two things, I was tabling the document which was our proposal on restructuring and I was tabling a copy of a telegram that I sent to the federal representative from Newfoundland asking for his support of this proposal. I table, Mr. Speaker.

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if hon. gentlemen opposite would permit I would like to make a brief report in behalf of a Standing Committee of the House of Assembly which, after all, is what this proportion of our orders is about. I would simply like to say, Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my colleagues on the Public Accounts Committee, the Vice-Chairman, the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) and the five others who served with us, that we have completed all but the most minute details on our report for the year ending March 31, 1981. The report is either at the printers or will be there within the next day or so, I understand, and we expect to be able to table the report at this stage in the House, when it meets after the Easter recess or shortly thereafter. I did not mean to interrupt the Premier. I have no desire to interrupt him when he is in full flight like that. But I understood he had finished and I thought I was recognized by the Chair which is why-

MR. NEARY: He was finished a long time ago.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: I was interrupted by a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. The Premier was saying something.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I was interrupted by a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I understand he was interrupted. I had not been aware that he had not been finished or I would not have interrupted him. I think, Mr. Speaker, the Premier is a perfect example of giving a man enough rope and he will hang himself - as long as he does not hang Newfoundland and Labrador with him.

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I want to table the financial statements for the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!

MR.GOULDIE: - Newfoundland Crop Insurance Agency for the year ending March 31,1981,and for the Livestock -

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR.GOULDIE: - Owners Compensation Board , the financial statements for the year ending March 31,1981.

o o o

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR.NEARY: Now we will find out who is interested in the fishery, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to move that leave be granted to move the adjournment of the regular order of business of this House to debate a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the proposals to restructure the fishing industry of this Province.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR.PECKFORD: And they do not even agree with our proposal

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: We will soon find out now who is sincere and genuine.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Where is your proposal?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, for a matter to warrant the adjournment of the House there has to be a matter -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The

hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has made a particular motion and the Chair has recognized the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) speaking to that. The Chair is having some difficulty in hearing the arguments of hon. members so I would ask hon. members to my right and to my left if they would please let the hon. President be heard in silence.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, in order for a matter of this nature, for this proceeding to succeed, the matter has to be matter of urgency of debate. There is ample opportunity to debate that issue. As a matter of fact, we have seen in effect a debate that has gone on in the Question Period, that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) lost so abysmally a few moments ago.

We also, Mr. Speaker, will be proceeding to the matter of Interim Supply. As the next order of business that will be called, in which the hon. gentleman can express whatever views he wishes. So the matter is not a matter of urgency of debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: It is an urgent matter and it is one that was dealt with so effectively by the Government of this Province within the past week and will be in the future. But it is not a matter of urgency of debate that should cause the ordinary business of the House to be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Port au Port to that point of order.

MR. HODDER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. There is certainly urgency of public debate. Not only that but the House Leader opposite (Mr. Marshall) talked about supply in Question Period. Question Period is an inadequate place to debate such a motion and, as well, under the rules of the Committee of Supply members have ten minutes but generally we are limited to talking about the financial affairs of this Province. So, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that it would be in the best interest of this House and of the people of Newfoundland if we were to debate this motion today.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, let us get this clear. As the President of the Council said to this point raised by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), first of all it must be an urgency of debate, not the point that the question is urgent. Secondly, if it is an urgency of debate the Opposition have ample opportunity this afternoon to debate the fisheries policy of this Province under the present orders that are going to be called in a few minutes, under Interim Supply, ample opportunity. We have had it on the Private Members Day.

The Opposition did not even take

PREMIER PECKFORD: the opportunity to use their Late Show last Thursday as a method of debating issues. They left it out. They did not even debate it.

MR. HODDER: I know you are not low.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Opposition has all afternoon to debate the government's position on fishery through Interim Supply, so let them not try to use some kind of ruse on this, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The Chair has heard sufficient argument on this matter. The matter is certainly an important matter but

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): I must agree there is ample opportunity on the Order Paper, the Address in Reply is still there, the Committee of Supply is still there. And as hon. members know the rule of relevancy is and has been most difficult to rule on in Interim Supply, it is a very wide-ranging debate. So the Chair has to rule that this motion is not acceptable, not in order at this time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 2.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please!

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

If the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) would stay in his seat, not only in the Question Period can you ask questions -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Chairman, that is the attitude - here is a minister whom I have been meeting with every day for the last -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

- two weeks and who is playing politics with the Piccadilly fish plant. Now, how do we expect, Mr. Chairman, to trust this government in restructuring or in anything else that they are doing? Now, I stood here in my place, Mr. Chairman, to ask a few questions, since I missed the opportunity in Question Period, of the Minister of Fisheries. The Minister of Fisheries walked out of the House

MR. HODDER: and said that as far as he was concerned he was finished with the Piccadilly fish plant. Now, if that is the attitude that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has, then, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the people of this Province are - he should be replaced, Mr. Chairman, and I fear for the people in the Province who are looking for some justice and fair play from this government.

MR. STAGG: I thought you were going to ask him a question?

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, it has been two weeks now that the people of the district of Port au Port and the people of Bay St. George, for that matter, have been waiting for an answer.

MR. MORGAN: Why did you not ask the question today in Question Period?

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, whether the question is asked in debate, whether the question is asked in Committee, if the minister had kept his mouth shut long enough for me -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) in Committee.

MR. HODDER: Well, Mr. Chairman, for two weeks now we have been waiting for the minister, I have been phoning his officials, and I have been phoning the minister.

MR. MORGAN: The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has all of the information.

MR. J. HODDER: Well, then, if the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has all the information would he make it public? Because I happened to have been in the district this week and the fishermen are ready to fish. The minister owns the fish plant -

MR. J. MORGAN: I am going this weekend, maybe, to meet with all the fishermen, but not with you though. I do not want you with me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Well, that might be to the minister's detriment.

MR. NEARY: Is he threatening you? Repeat what he said.

MR. MORGAN: I do not need you to go with me.

MR. B. TULK: Repeat what he said, that he will not go with the member for the area.

MR. HODDER: I heard what the minister said, that he will not go with the member for the area.

MR. TULK: He wants to play politics with the member from Stephenville.

MR. HODDER: Yes. Politics is more important to this government in every respect than anything else.

MR. MORGAN: Did you say you were playing politics?

MR. HODDER: Yes, we are playing politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Can you play politics? Would you like to play it?

MR. HODDER: Yes, I would like that.

Now, another threat! Yes.

Mr. Chairman, the truth of the matter is that I stood here in my place today to ask a question of the minister as to what is happening. The minister had a meeting with the federal members and the federal members made public on the West Coast that there are

MR. J. HODDER: three people interested. Now, the people of the district want a say as to who is going to operate the plant and they want assurances from the minister that there will be as many jobs afterwards as before. There are some people in the district who are desirous of meeting with the minister. The only questions I have to ask the minister is to tell us in the House of Assembly, to tell us formally, what companies have made representation or have shown an interest in taking over that plant, and to tell the House of Assembly what company he plans to choose. Because the deadline is over now and companies have responded. I know personally of four that are interested in that particular fish plant. I have some options, but the government has the power and they have the resources to be able to check out those companies. The people of the area are only asking

MR. HODDER: that they be allowed to give representation to the minister before the plant opens. I think, Mr. Chairman, that I stood here and spoke on Private Members Day, the Wednesday before last, and I laid out to the House of Assembly the problem in the district, and I had intended to ask a question of the minister today to find out what he was doing. I missed the opportunity and I stand here now to ask the same question. Now, the minister has made some statements that he is going to play politics on the issue and that he is going to go out there and play his little games. I will tell the House of Assembly I do not care what the minister does. Whether he takes me out to the district or he does not take me out to the district, that does not matter to me. But one thing I want the minister to do in the interest of the people of that area is I want him to open the plant, because there are people who are ready to fish and they are waiting to get into the fishery.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HODDER: And I have in no way started any kind of a confrontation in this House of Assembly today. I feel very strongly about the particular issue and I realize that there are people, plant workers, management, all of the fishermen on the Peninsula with the exception of Fox Island River and Black Duck Brook, all of those people are waiting to see what is going to happen. They want to know. They are not putting their nets in the water, they are not getting ready for the herring season and there is generally gloom and doom throughout the area. And all I want to know from the minister - I do not care if he goes out with the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), I do not care if he takes

MR. HODDER: the Premier and the whole Cabinet and holds a Cabinet meeting on the roof of the fish plant, but what I do care is that he opens that plant and that he gets somebody in there who is going to give a measure of employment -

MR. TULK: Instead of yapping off.

MR. HODDER: - gives a level of employment in the area that will get the people who were working in the plant their jobs back. It was the only industry in the area. And just as important, I would like to see some assurance given to the fishermen, because there are people who are actually waiting, they are sort of negative about the whole thing and they will not get committed to the fishery until they hear whether there is going to be a buyer or not.

The other thing I would like to mention to the minister is that the minister said in this House that he was going to take the licence away from National Sea for lobster and herring. Well, that just has not happened. I was in the district this weekend and the people are telling me that National Sea are doing exactly what they said they were going to do. They pulled out of the fish plant at the last moment; now they are back setting up their buyers to pick up the lobster. They have made it known to people that they will be going back for the lucrative lobster, but that is it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you know, these are questions that we would like to have answered because, certainly, if National Sea are in there buying then it is going to be very difficult for another company to come in and make a profit. So I just wanted to ask the minister a couple of questions.

MR. HODDER: But I have never in my life stood up in this House of Assembly to ask a serious question and got the kind of abuse that I got from the minister.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HODDER: He actually said that.

MR. HODDER: I have not seen him play politics yet. I did not get up in any confrontational way, Mr. Chairman -

MR. MORGAN: Your colleague did in Question Period today.

MR. HODDER: Oh, what my colleague did -

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MORGAN: Well, he is your leader.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, this House of Assembly -

MR. MORGAN: Do you agree with him or do you disagree with him?

MR. HODDER: - is no different than any other House in the world, in Canada or in the British Commonwealth. Is the minister telling me that because of the fact that an Opposition -

MR. NEARY: Do not worry, I will send the Hansard down. The Hansard will go to Burin, you need not worry about that.

MR. HODDER: Oppositions work much the same way in every Legislature, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: I will get the Hansard down. This one will go too, do not worry. This one will go down to Burin.

MR. HODDER: And now I am told that the people of my district may suffer -

MR. NEARY: - and Grand Bank and St. Lawrence and Gaultois and all the rest of them.

MR. HODDER: - because I stood up in the House of Assembly and my colleague had upset the minister. The people of my district -

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible)

MR. HODDER: Would the member for Burin - Placentia West - you know, I am feeling serious about this.

MR. HODDER: I mean, this is something that - you know, the member is always talking about his own fish plant.

MR. TOBIN: But your leader is harassing me.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, this House of Assembly is not much different. I sat in the Houses right across Canada or in the Mother of Parliament, the House of Commons in England.

MR. STAGG: Were you there?

MR. HODDER: No, I have not been there but I certainly heard about it and one day I hope to go there. But Oppositions are there to try to find out from the government the government's policies. If something happened in Question Period today that upset the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) I do not think he should take it out on the people from Port au Port. "Come on, 'Fred', we will go out together and we will do that". Mr. Chairman, I have never seen the like of that in the House of Assembly before in my life. And, Mr. Chairman, certainly the minister, I think, owes the people of Port au Port an apology. I mean, I, as their representative, whichever side of this House I sit on, have to bring their views to the minister and to this House. And I have tried to do it in as fair a manner as I possibly can. But to get the type of abuse that I received, it is not only unfair to this House but I think it is unfair to the fishermen, to the plant workers and to the management in the district.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman's political skin gets awfully sensitive these days. The hon. gentleman from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) - his political

MR. MORGAN: skin is really sensitive. I think he is really scared about what is going to happen to him in the next election, if things go the way they seem to be going against him over in the area. That is his main problem.

The hon. gentleman cannot stand in the House and say truthfully and sincerely that there was ever a problem, never at any time was there a problem in connection with the fishing industry in his riding that when he came to me and brought it to my attention that I have not dealt with it as fast and as adequately as possible and usually the problems were resolved. I cannot think of one problem that was brought to my attention by the hon. gentleman regarding a fishery matter that was not dealt with and dealt with adequately.

MR. MORGAN: Now, unfortunately, today in Question Period the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) tried to drive a wedge between the two governments over the restructuring, to try to climb out of the hole he got himself buried in. Because the fact is he was on CBC - and CBC do not carry Morgan these days very much, and I think there is a good reason why.

MR. NEARY: Yes, there is a good reason is why.

MR. MORGAN: There is a good reason why. There is a good reason why and it will be made public in the next five or six days why, and then the public of Newfoundland will know why.

He was on CBC saying that the Peckford Government was closing down -

MR. NEARY: Are you going to sue them?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, please! When the hon. gentleman speaks I very seldom interrupt him, so please now.

MR. TULK: What are you going to settle for?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, this yappy fellow from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) please, please, please, please! He does not know anything about the fishery, please keep him quiet.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, the fact is they are driving to drive a wedge and that same gentleman was on the CBC network throughout the Province, I have a tape of it, saying that the Peckford Government is closing down the plant in Grand Bank, the Peckford Government was closing

MR. MORGAN: the plant in Burin, the Peckford Government was closing down the plants in Gaultois and up in Fermeuse. And now he is trying to leave the impression - because we stand firmly to keep those plants open - if they do not keep open, to try to still blame the Newfoundland Government for having these plants closed. Then he has the nerve to get up and say, "Oh, my, they are playing politics with the fishery. They are playing politics with the fishing industry."

Well, Mr. Chairman, if making every possible effort to get the plant open in Burin, and get the plant to continue operating at Grand Bank, and the plant in St. Lawrence reopened, and the plant in Fermeuse to carry on as a deep-sea operation and the plant at Gaultois to reopen, and if playing politics is getting the plant at Piccadilly reopened, then I am going to play politics. I will play it every day, day in and day out. And now I guess I will be accused, because in the next two or three weeks I will have the Piccadilly plant reopened, things are coming along the way I want to see them come. I said in this House a little while ago - the hon. gentleman has left his seat now you see. He does not want to hear the facts now you see. He gets up and he raises heck because I was leaving the House and going down somewhere to a meeting and he says, "Look, he would not even listen to what I say in the House. He is taking his colleague with him over to the West Coast." And now that I am going to give him all the information he leaves his seat.

Government will leave no stone unturned to get the Piccadilly plant reopened, the same as the other plants that are closed.

She

MR. MORGAN:

And I am convinced that I will be able to announce the reopening of that plant in a very short time. But if I am playing politics in reopening the plant in Piccadilly, I must be also playing politics in reopening the plant in Burin, or keeping it open, or reopening the plant in Gaultois.

What is all this about the government playing politics in trying to keep plants open?

We get accused of playing politics for keeping a plant open in one of our own colleague's districts but when we keep a plant open or reopen a plant in the Opposition's district it is different. Oh, no, do not play politics then. Do not play politics in an Opposition member's district. How foolish and how silly, Naivete. It is naivete.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman who asked the question and I think he is sincere, I will say to him again there is never going to be a time when any member of the Opposition comes to me with a genuine problem on the fishing industry that I will not do everything in my power, my utmost, to resolve that problem. And the day will never come when I will turn them down. Never, as long as I am Minister of Fisheries. And I say it to this Assembly and to this Committee very sincerely. Always.

And last week when the hon. gentleman came to me about Piccadilly, I said then and I stand by it, that we would take the licences from National Sea, that we would arrange to call for bids from companies and offer the companies who would be interested in bidding all the licences and take them away from National Sea. I said it in the House of Assembly in answering questions. And I stand by what I said. And when the day comes that I cannot stand by what I say in this House I will not be here. Any thing I say in this House I will say outside of the House.

MR. MORGAN: I have been here eleven years now and there has never been a time that what I have said in this House of Assembly, I have always said outside of the House of Assembly. And I said then -

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Innuendo. Mr. Innuendo.

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Chairman, just listen -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - to that little fellow over there from Bellevue (Mr. Callan). You very seldom hear from him in debate, he just yaps across the House. Please, please, Mr. Chairman, I want protection from the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order!

MR. MORGAN: He does not get involved in debate, and he very seldom has the intelligence to get involved in debate. He likes to yap across the House all of the time.

MR. CALLAN: Yes, and there (inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I ask for your protection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Chairman, the situation is that in Piccadilly - I can assure the hon. member that in saying things about taking my colleague, I told him a few days ago and I stand by it, I am willing to go to the district with him and my colleague for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), I will meet with the Fishermen's Committee or Union Committee in here, and I will leave no stone unturned and any information we have of what is going on in Piccadilly, the hon. gentleman is entitled to know as an elected representative of the people.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is wrong to - again I want to repeat - to suddenly say that we are playing politics with the reopening of the Burin plant and the other plants, and at the same time, when we try to get something done in their respective districts that we can no longer play politics. You cannot have your cake and eat it too, as the saying goes.

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Chairman, for the hon. gentleman's information - and he can say that too this afternoon I advised him through the House of Assembly - he is the member for the area; and I do not want to go out and say, well, you know, I got this done and that done. As long as it gets done, I do not care. The information is as follows, Mr. Chairman: For his information, we asked for bids from the companies and five companies in the Western part of the Province gave us submissions or expressed interest enough to give us by telex or telephone conversation an indication that they are interested in taking over the Piccadilly plant. And these companies to date - I can name them off - are Belle Isle Sea Foods Limited, Eastern Fisheries Limited, T. J. Hardy Company Limited, Eric King Fisheries Limited and Notre Dame Bay Fisheries. Now these are the five companies. Now, three of these companies are very serious. So they came to us and said, 'Your deadline of April 25th, we think, is a bit too soon.

AN HON. MEMBER: March.

MR. MORGAN: I mean, March 25th - ' is a bit too soon and we want to get things done as quickly as possible.' They said, 'Look, we do not have time to do all the work that needs to be done, get a proposal done properly and get it in to you, giving you all the information. Will you give us a few more days?' We said, 'Okay, gentlemen, we will give you until April 4th, a few more days.' And those three companies out of the five I mentioned, are very serious. So we said, 'Okay, we want all information in by April 4th.' So I can tell the hon. gentleman now that before any decision is made

MR. MORGAN: by the Department of Fisheries and by this government, as I told him earlier, I will consult with him as the member, I will consult with the Fishermen's Committee or the Union Committee, either out in the area or with them in St. John's, depending on the schedule. And to get a clear understanding of what we are going to do before we make a decision, it is going to be satisfactory to the people in the Piccadilly area.

Mr. Chairman, I say again before I finish my comments that the people in Piccadilly involved in the fishing industry are just as important as those in St. Anthony, the people in St. Anthony just as important as those in Burin, the people in Burin just as important as those out in Trepassey. There is no exception, with regard to who their member is or how they voted in the last election. There is nothing of that nature involved in the fishing industry. I have maintained that position and I will always maintain that position as long as I am in this portfolio. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, yesterday over at Holiday Inn there was a people's conference. A people's conference was called to deal with the urgent problems that are confronting the people who live in communities that depend on the deep-sea fishery. At that people's conference a resolution was passed, Mr. Chairman, a resolution that pretty well covered all aspects of the problems as the people saw them. The resolution was passed unanimously. There were a number of ministers and members of the government benches at that conference. The resolution was passed unanimously, Mr. Speaker, and now today what we see in this House are the same ministers and the same members supporting a Johnny-come-lately plan put forward by the administration that contradicts the resolution that was passed yesterday and weakens the resolution that was passed yesterday at the people's conference. I heard the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) get up and unconditionally, without reservation support this resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you?

MR. NEARY: I think I said I wanted my name put first on the list.

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. NEARY: And today the same hon. gentleman comes in and supports a plan put together in a hurry, put together since last Wednesday by the administration that completely contradicts the resolution and will only, at this point, muddy up the water and delay, Mr. Chairman, delay the reopening of the plants in Burin, Ramea, Gaultois, Harbour Breton, Fermeuse, and all the other communities where - St. Lawrence - and all the other communities where fish plants are presently closed.

MR. NEARY: It will only delay, and the reason I say that, Mr. Chairman, is that these matters that have been laid down, and there are twelve of them, laid down in the Premier's letter -

MR. MORGAN: Do you agree or disagree?

MR. NEARY: It is not whether I agree or disagree, because let me say to the hon. gentleman that what the administration did was sift through the ideas of all the other principles.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Could I have order please?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: What the administration did was sift through the ideas put forward in this House by the Opposition, they sifted through the ideas that were put forward by the union, they sifted through the ideas that were put on the table by the federal government, they put their own label on them and said, 'Here is our policy.' Mr. Chairman, that is what they did. They said, yes, yes, yes. What they did was say, yes, yes, yes to every idea that has been put forward in the last year by the various principles and parties that are involved.

MR. B. TULK: It is the first time we heard from them since the plants closed.

MR. NEARY: It is worthy of note, Mr. Chairman, that the provincial position is almost an exact duplicate or a carbon copy of the one that we outlined here last week and the one that has been outlined by the union, not only last week but last year.

MR. G. TOBIN: After you got your telephone call. After you got your telephone call.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, that all the other principles have issued statements of policy, have stated their position, have stated their opinions, have told of the innovative steps that they would take to restructure the fishing industry, the provincial government has finally said, 'Yes, yes, yes, yes', to all of these ideas and proposals. And, as I say, they picked out the best ideas, put their own label on them and they called that a provincial policy. But, Mr. Chairman, that is not what concerns me now. It is the timing that concerns me now because, Mr. Chairman, if -

MR. TULK: The Premier said they will have to start negotiations.

MR. NEARY: The Premier stated today during Question Period, in answer to a question that I put to him, that they will now have to start negotiations on the proposal that he put forward on March 23. And with the track record of this administration in negotiating with the Government of Canada, Mr. Chairman, I ask you, will any negotiations succeed? And even if they do succeed, which I doubt very much, if they do succeed, Mr. Chairman, how long will it take to negotiate these twelve items in this proposal? It will take anywhere, I would submit, from a few weeks up to 100 years. How long will it take to negotiate

MR. S. NEARY: the foreign fishing fleet out of the 200 mile management zone? How long will that take?

PREMIER PECKFORD: They can do it immediately.

MR. NEARY: They can do it immediately?
The hon. gentleman would start the third world war.

How long will it take to resolve the agreement with the French? How long, Mr. Chairman, will it take to carry out Item 1, that a single trawler company should be created to operate Newfoundland based trawlers? They are not saying as the resolution said - they are not talking about the objectives, they are making a definite statement. They are not saying that the option of the separation - as the resolution says - the option of the separation of the fleet and community ownership of processing plants be examined. They are not saying examine it down the road, they are saying, 'We want it now.' How long will it take to do that, Mr. Chairman? In the meantime,

MR. NEARY: all of these communities that have fish plants that are closed, and yesterday we heard it over at the people's conference, we heard their views, everyone in his turn went to the microphone and said, 'Let us go for option number three as amended, and let us get these plants open. That is our number one priority.' Mr. Chairman, that is what I heard and I was there. And hon. gentlemen voted for it. They voted for that principle when they voted for the resolution.

MR. TOBIN: Are you against this?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should listen to what I am saying. All that will do at this point in time is muddy up the water, it will delay the process. It will not do anything to get these plants open. What the administration should have done -

MR. TOBIN: You got up here today and said they should not be open.

MR. NEARY: I certainly did not, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman cannot make statements like that in this House. The Hansard will go -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - to all the communities on the Burin Peninsula. And the hon. gentleman cannot make untrue statements. The Premier thinks he can make them and get away with it. The Premier is suffering from hallucinations. I know the caucus and the party are trying to deal with his hallucinations; they are having a problem, as we can see from today, because he is still suffering from hallucinations. They do not have it under control yet. When he makes these untrue statements he gets up and he points his finger at a member across the House, and it has no relation to the question, no relationship at all to the topic under discussion, and he

MR. MATTHEWS: Oh, I thought Mr. Simmons was in favour of that last week.

MR. NEARY: So he is in favour of it.

MR. MATTHEWS: Last week or last night?

MR. NEARY: Yes, he is in favour of it last week and today. But what we are finding out today - the hon. gentleman is embarrassed because the Premier and the Administration are not supporting option three as amended.

MR. TOBIN: We are supporting the opening of all the plants.

MR. NEARY: Are you supporting option three as amended, if they can get it amended?

MR. MATTHEWS: You do not even know what it is.

MR. NEARY: I do know what it is, Mr. Chairman. It is a merger between Nickersons, the Lake Group of companies, Fishery Products and J.C. Penny. Now the hon. gentleman knows what it is.

MR. TULK: Now that is the option.

MR. NEARY: Now that is the option. That is option number three, Mr. Chairman.

Now, yesterday the People's Conference said, "Okay, we will go for option three if the Cabinet in Ottawa, the Cabinet Committee will amend it to reopen the plants." Now, Mr. Chairman, you cannot be any more plain than that to hon. gentlemen. But the administration will not support that. They are saying, "Now we want this," and this will take months and years to negotiate.

MR. HODDER: They have muddied up the water.

MR. NEARY: They have muddied up the water,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, and that is what I am concerned about. The people in Burin and Grand Bank and St. Lawrence and Gaultois and Ramea want action now. They do not want any more procrastination on the part of the administration, one-upmanship. What they are doing now, Mr. Chairman, they are trying to upstage the people's conference.

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

The hon. the member for Burin-Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Chairman, I feel the necessity to get involved in this debate today because of the attitude and the approach taken by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), an attitude, Mr. Chairman, that will not be accepted by the people of the Burin Peninsula. I am sure that I can speak not only on behalf of my constituents but also on behalf of the constituents of my colleague from Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews), and my colleague from Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart), and everywhere else.

Now, Mr. Chairman, he wants to talk about options, Option Three and Option Three amended. For the record, and I think it has been said before by the good Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), on the table there was not one option that included the reopening of Grand Bank, that included the reopening of Burin, that included the reopening of Gaultois, that included the reopening of - Grand Bank, Gaultois -

MR. MORGAN: Fermeuse.

MR. TOBIN: - Fermeuse, that was going to be seasonal -

MR. MORGAN: St. Lawrence.

MR. TOBIN: - and St. Lawrence. Not one, Mr. Chairman, not one proposal was being studied by the Federal Cabinet Committee that included the reopening of either one of these plants. When, Mr. Chairman, when was the proposal put on the table to deal with the reopening of these plants on the Burin Peninsula, and who was it put on by? It was put on last Thursday by the Newfoundland Government. That was when the issue of the closed plants on the Burin Peninsula was dealt with and on the South Coast of this Province, it was last Thursday, by none other than the provincial government.

Mr. Speaker, what option were the companies favouring?

MR. NEARY: Last Thursday? What an admission of guilt.

MR. TOBIN: What an admission of guilt, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Only last Thursday they put that proposal.

MR. TOBIN: The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) says, what an admission of guilt.

MR. NEARY: What a gross insult to your constituents.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Chairman, two weeks ago the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) went up and met before the Cabinet Committee -

MR. NEARY: Wait until your constituents find that out.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. TOBIN: - the Cabinet Committee that Mr. Simmons says he has so often met with, and it was the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) from this government that stopped Option No. 1, Mr. Chairman, that had been accepted by the federal Cabinet and that would have permitted the close-down indefinitely, Mr. Chairman, the closedown of the plants on the South Coast and the Burin Peninsula. That is the man who stopped the federal government from accepting it.

MR. NEARY: What is that?

MR. TOBIN: Yes, the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. NEARY: Last Thursday.

MR. TOBIN: No, it was not last Thursday.

Now, Mr. Chairman -

MR. NEARY: Oh, two weeks ago.

MR. TOBIN: - that is how knowledgeable the Leader of the Opposition is, Mr. Chairman, we remember last Thursday when the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier of this Province were in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: We remember it.

MR. TOBIN: We remember it , Mr. Chairman.
We remember it well. Do you want to know why? Because that is the day the telephone was ringing in the Opposition Leader's office, letting him know what was taking place.

MR. NEARY: Wrong.

MR. TOBIN: That is the day the Leader of the Opposition took the stand on the fisheries in this Province, it was when he was told -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. TOBIN: That is right. When he was told what the Newfoundland's Government stand was, that was when the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party took a stand on the fisheries in this Province, Mr. Chairman.

Now, let me say something else, the plant at Burin would have never been closed, Mr. Chairman, if -

MR. NEARY: If they had a good member, it would not be closed.

MR. TOBIN: - if they had listened , Mr. Chairman, to the Premier of this Province when he sent a telegram to Mr. De Bane. He requested, he pleaded with Mr. De Bane 'Please, join with me and the people at Burin in requesting Fisheries Products to keep the plant open'. Mr. Chairman, has Mr. De Bane ever acknowledged that telegram .

MR. TOBIN: I do not know. The people of Burin certainly do not know. We do know, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. De Bane and the rest of them sat idly by and never lifted a finger to help reopen the fish plant at Burin. And, Mr. Chairman, do you know something? we will never forget it on the Burin Peninsula either. There is going to be a time for that.

MR. STAGG:
Roger all this time?

Where was Roger? Where was

MR. TOBIN:

Where was he?

MR. STAGG:

Roger, yes.

MR. TOBIN:

Long before my day, Mr. Chairman,
he got the name 'Roger the dodger'. I certainly did not give
it to him.

Now, Mr. Chairman, they want
to talk about Option 3, amended, the resolution that was
put forth yesterday. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I did support the
resolution yesterday and I support it again today. But
here is the answer; the revolution of the Newfoundland
fishing industry, Mr. Chairman, the revolution that is going
to take place, is when this document has been carefully
Mr. Chairman, considered and presented. This

MR. TOBIN: administration has always been noted, Mr. Chairman, for having its homework done when it comes to making presentations, and I can assure you that this presentation was no different. Last week, Mr. Chairman, I became aware that the Provincial government's proposal was ready to be presented. I have been aware for some time, Mr. Chairman, before I was elected even, that this government cared for the people of Burin-Placentia West, as they did for all rural Newfoundland.

When we became aware that the Newfoundland Government was about to publicly state their case to reopen all the fish plants on the South coast, indeed all the fish plants that were closed, Mr. Chairman, we were very pleased on the Burin Peninsula. This past weekend the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) along with myself and my good colleague from Grand Bank, went to the Burin Peninsula. Friday night we met with the Action Committee and the Town Council in Burin. Well, Mr. Chairman, I can tell you right now that the Minister of Fisheries for this Province was given such a reception in Burin, the same in St. Lawrence, which I am sure my colleague will address later, the same in Grand Bank Mr. Chairman. Everytime he spoke there were standing ovations, no problem. Do you know what I saw yesterday at the meeting at Holiday Inn? The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) standing up and cheering for the Newfoundland Minister of Fisheries for the good work he was doing - joined with the other Newfoundlanders and cheered the Minister of Fisheries for the tremendous work he has been doing for the fishery.

MR. YOUNG: Did he do that?

MR. STAGG: Did he turn into a pillar
of salt?

MR. TOBIN: No, I must say he was straight-
forward about it, no problem. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk)
had no problem standing up and cheering for the Minister of
Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

Now, Mr. Chairman, who else
got it there? Did the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary)
when he spoke? Did Mr. Simmons get it when he spoke?
The Minister of Fisheries was continuously being interrupted by
by the people applauding him for the work he has been doing.

The member says that this could
be a delaying tactic for the fishery. Mr. Chairman, I say
that this could be the saviour of the fishery. What the
fishery needs today, Mr. Chairman, in this Province, is what
this proposal outlines. Put the fishery, Mr. Chairman -
'Do not bail out the companies'. The mayor of Burin has said
it for so long, so many times, that great Newfoundlander,
that man down in Burin, that great Newfoundlander who has
had the courage to stand up and fight, Mr. Chairman, big and
small for the sake of the fishery.

MR. G. TOBIN:

He said it, this Newfoundland Government has said it, 'Do not bail out the companies any longer. Let us restructure the industry and not the companies.' Now, Mr. Chairman, for some strange reason the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and the Liberal Party have taken a negative attitude towards this presentation. I do not know why, Mr. Chairman. I can only interpret it as a fact that they must not want the plants to be reopened, and I think that is a sad day for the Liberal Party of this Province. We know, Mr. Chairman, we have known for some time that the Liberal Party was confused in its direction. We knew, Mr. Chairman, that there was going to be problems.

MR. PEACH: They do not have a leader.

MR. TOBIN: What is that?

MR. PEACH: They do not have a leader.

MR. TOBIN: They do not have a leader. No, Mr. Chairman, I would not go so far as to say that they do not have a leader, they do have a leader, the type of leader that I would like to see leading the Liberal Party, Mr. Chairman, for sometime. Because I would like to be around politics for some time, and I would like to take advantage of every asset I can.

MR. F. STAGG: So, you consider the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) an asset for the Conservative party, do you?

MR. TOBIN: Oh, most definitely he is an asset for the Conservative Party.

However, Mr. Chairman, what option did the people want to accept in Ottawa to restructure the fishing industry? What option was it that the banks wanted? What option was it that the companies wanted? What option was it that Price Waterhouse wanted? What option was it that

MR. G. TOBIN: Mr. Kirby wanted? We know, Mr. Chairman, it was Option No. 1, Option No. 1 that would permit the strong Utopian company in Nova Scotia and a very weak sister in Newfoundland. What else was included in that package? Would it surprise anyone, Mr. Chairman, that in that package was a proposal for freezer trawlers to process the fish that was going to be caught off our coast out there? And I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it was the Premier I heard saying this morning that if that is to happen, if that is permitted to happen, Mr. Chairman, then one day we as Newfoundlanders would look out in that far greater bay and see this great processing ship and we will be able to say, 'That was once Burin.' And, Mr. Chairman, we will look at the other freezer trawler, the processing ship, and we will be able to say that that was once Grand Bank.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. the member's time

has elapsed.

MR. STAGG: By leave, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TOBIN: By leave, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. the member have leave?

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, leave is not granted.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I made a comment on the hon. gentleman who just took his seat there, last Session of the House, that

MR. NEARY:

he is in the learning process. This is his first year, He has not been a full year in this House yet, and I would submit to the hon. gentleman with that kind of language that he just used in this House, Mr. Chairman and the people in Burin will get the Hansard, and the people in Grand Bank and Gaultois and all the other communities will get the Hansard, and they will see for themselves what the hon. gentleman said. And I would submit that if the hon. gentleman wants to make a career out of politics - I do not think he is suited for it, by the way. - but if he wants to make a career-

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is your opinion.

MR. NEARY:

That is right, That is my

opinion, not the hon. gentleman's opinion. I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman, if he is interested in making a career out of politics, that he sit in this House and listen to what is being said and try to learn something. Now I can lead a horse to water but I cannot make him drink. What I am saying to the hon. gentleman and to the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) and the member who represents Gaultois and Ramea, what I am saying to these hon. gentlemen is that they went over yesterday and they supported a resolution at the People's Conference and then they came back and they were probably scolded by the Premier and told, 'Now, boys, look, We are going to look sick because we do not have a policy so, even though you supported the resolution, you are going to have to support this policy that we put together in a hurry. We started last Wednesday, we put it together, we have to have some kind of a statement that we can make to try to show the people that we are doing something.' Mr. Chairman, the hon. members who were at the People's Conference

MR. NEARY: yesterday will remember the trend, the tone of the discussion. And the tone of the discussion was this —

MR. STAGG: Get rid of Neary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentlemen were more interested in getting standing ovations than they were in facing the facts because that seems to be the big point with them today. Mr. Chairman, they did not listen to the facts. The facts are these; It was unanimous yesterday at that conference that everybody wanted to put the pressure on the Government of Canada, on the seven-member Cabinet committee in Ottawa, and they wanted a united front to go out from this Province to Ottawa, a message to go out that everybody was united in one thing. And what were they unanimous in? They were unanimous in wanting the plants reopened immediately and that it would be done through the implementation of Option 3 amended. Now hon. gentlemen are skating on very thin ice, Mr. Chairman. They are figureskating on thin ice after going over yesterday and telling the People's Conference, 'Yes, we are all for Option 3 being amended. We will accept that.' Everybody cheered and clapped and everybody went to the microphone and endorsed it, including hon. gentlemen opposite, and now they are saying no

MR. NEARY: because that Cabinet Committee is going to meet this week -

MR. MATTHEWS: Who told you that?

MR. NEARY: They have already delayed a decision, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman was told yesterday that the provincial government asked for a two week delay, which was granted, and now they are asking for more delays on this presentation.

Mr. Chairman, this document, and I am not debating the merits or demerits of the proposal, this document will only cause further delay and further suffering to the people in these communities where plants are presently closed.

MR. TOBIN: Mre delay will improve it.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman was not there, Mr. Chairman, but there was a proposal put forward at the People's Conference yesterday which, if adopted by the Cabinet Committee in Ottawa would get these plants open right away. And what we asked for at the People's Conference was support from this Province, because there is tremendous pressure not to go with option three, not to amend option three, so the federal MPs in Ottawa and the members on the Cabinet Committee who support option three as amended need all the support they can get. And all they are getting from the provincial government here is half-hearted support. They are getting support with reservations, with conditions attached. The conditions attached are we want all these things done.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!
A point of order, the hon.

member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is intentionally misleading the House, as a matter of fact, I would not say that for one minute or would believe for one minute that he is intentionally misleading the House, but what the hon. gentleman is saying is not factual. The fact of the matter is that the Premier of this Province, in the Cabinet room yesterday afternoon with the union, with the joint Town and Community Councils, with all the councils involved, endorsed the resolution whole-heartedly and sent it off to Ottawa. And I do not think that the Leader of the Opposition should be permitted to bring into this hon. House half truths.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Obviously the hon. gentleman has not learned the rules, that is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I rule that it is merely a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that all well and good, they may have endorsed a resolution, the Premier may have endorsed it, but he did so conditionally. He endorsed the resolution with reservations and that is how it will be interpreted.

MR. TOBIN:

He did not.

MR. NEARY:

He certainly did.

MR. TOBIN:

He certainly did not.

MR. NEARY:

He said, 'We endorse the resolution but our proposals supercede the resolution. They are far-reaching proposals, they go further than the resolution.'

MR. TOBIN:

You should have been there when everybody stood up.

MR. NEARY:

Well, Mr. Chairman, they can stand up all they like.

MR. CALLAN:

They were doing that all last Spring. What did they accomplish?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, they can continue to try to con and dupe the people but their bluff will soon be called, the bluff of the administration.

Mr. Chairman, before this day is over we should have a unanimous resolution passed in this House, there should be a resolution brought in by either the government side or this side and made unanimous that we support unconditionally, without reservation, the resolution put forward yesterday by the People's Conference.

MR. TOBIN:

Let us get the plants open, boy!

MR. NEARY:

What I am telling you is you cannot get the plants open with this. The hon. gentleman is so dense, Mr. Chairman! As I say, you can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink. It will take months and years to straighten out this.

DR. COLLINS:

You are manoeuvring!
You are manoeuvring!

MR. NEARY:

I am not manoeuvring.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this is going to be a very important week as far as the plants that are closed in Burin, Fermeuse, Gaultois, Ramea, St. Lawrence and Harbour Breton are concerned. This is going to be the most crucial week of all. And where is the government? Here, wishy-washy. They are floundering around. They are waffling, Mr. Chairman. The government is waffling on this resolution instead of the minister being up in Ottawa lobbying this very day and saying to the ministers, 'Look, we are united in Newfoundland. We want option three amended. That is what we want.' But is the administration saying that, Mr. Chairman? No, they are not. They are waffling.

MR. DINN: You do not agree with the proposal.

MR. NEARY: I am not talking about the merits or demerits of the proposal.

MR. DINN: Oh, I see. Do you agree or do you not?

MR. NEARY: What I am saying is that it would take months and years to unravel, to straighten this out and it only weakens the position put forward yesterday by the Peoples' Conference.

MR. DINN: They agree with it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, they may very well agree with it and no doubt in the long term there is a lot of -

MR. TOBIN: Anything we do, you criticize.

MR. NEARY: Well, I mean, it is copied from all the other statements that have been made and all the other proposals that have been made. It is just a carbon copy of things that have been said in this House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, as I said, we are pleased to see that all the positions have been finally made public on the crisis in the fishing industry, and we

MR. NEARY: hope, we trust, that the federal and provincial governments will now act to put into motion the positions that have been taken. We are glad to learn, Mr. Chairman, that Burin and all the other fishing communities may be taken care of—may be taken care of! May! May! That is the crucial question. Mr. Chairman, the people in these communities have already suffered too much anxiety and insecurity already and they need immediate action.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I know the hon. gentleman is as embarrassed as his friend, Mr. Simmons, is today. But the fact of the matter is he should have enough confidence to make his speech, not to read it. And it is against the rules of this House, Mr. Chairman, for somebody to read a prepared speech, which the hon. gentleman obviously is doing in his insecurity.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, as usual the hon. gentleman is wrong because that statement that was made by the hon. gentleman is completely untrue. I do not believe anybody on this side of the House reads speeches, especially myself. I think I am quite capable of going off the cuff and that is what I am doing now. I have no prepared speech, Mr. Chairman, but I would say this to the hon. gentleman, that the next time we see

MR. NEARY: a member on that side of the House reading a speech then we will bring it to the hon. gentleman's attention.

MR. MARSHALL: Embarrassed, are you?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not embarrassed because I do not read speeches.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): To that point of order, while it is correct that it is not the custom of the House for people to read speeches, it is quite permissible for people to refer to notes as they are giving their speeches.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is wrong as usual, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This evening in the hon. House

MR. MATTHEWS: we are hearing a very lively, worthwhile debate on the fishery issue. I must say that since being elected to this House, today the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has been at his most inconsistent. I have seen him reverse himself completely, in just twenty-four hours, from the attitude, statements and comments he made yesterday to what he refers to as the People's Conference. But, of course, we are not surprised at that because when you do not have a policy, you do not have a position and you are not prepared. We just heard the hon. member state that he does not read from prepared speeches. While we do not have prepared speeches either, but we do formulate our points of view and put them in sequence and, of course, that is why when members on this side of the House get up to speak they all make a lot more sense than the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

I would also like to say, Mr. Chairman, that it has been very unusual in this House this past two weeks, because we have not heard a word from the opposition fisheries critic, and once again he is missing from his seat. I do not know if he has been railroaded by his leader, but for two weeks, going through this very critical state of fisheries in this Province, we have not heard a word from the fisheries critic of the Opposition. Now, there are a few points that I would like to react to that have been commented on by the Leader of the Opposition and also by my colleague, the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). Now we hear the Opposition accuse this government of taking a late position on the fishery. I would just like to make this point first, that when Dr. Kirby was appointed by the Prime Minister to address the problems of the fishing industry, that Commission was

MR. MATTHEWS: appointed to look into the troubled financial position of the fish companies. That was why the Task Force was established. But what did the Task Force do? They did not address the issues of the financially troubled companies first, they gave a general over-view of the fishery and today we see them still struggling to deal with the troubled financial companies. Yet the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) blames this government for delaying the decision to do something with the companies or to restructure the industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS: So it is not this government, it is Mr. Kirby and his group. I would also like to say to the Leader of the Opposition that he is talking about Option 3 amended. Before yesterday, Option 3 amended was not heard tell of. Now I totally support the resolution that came from the conference yesterday, I totally support it and I said that publicly yesterday. What I am saying Mr. Chairman, is that Option 3 amended did not occur until yesterday, Monday, March 28th, while the provincial position was tabled last Thursday in Ottawa. The Opposition says our position is too late but Option 3 amended is okay. Ten days later Option 3 is okay, but our position was too late ten days earlier. That is what I am talking about when I talk about inconsistency from the Leader of the Opposition and the other members opposite.

Mr. Chairman, if only you could have been on the Burin Peninsula on Saturday, as my colleague from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) had said, if only you could have been there and have seen the reception that our Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) received, and if you could have witnessed the reception that the MP for Burin-St. George's, Mr. Roger Simmons received, I am telling you it was something else. Mr. Simmons almost got thrown

MR. MATTHEWS:

out of meetings on the Burin Peninsula on Saturday, because no option on the table in Ottawa, from option one to option four, included keeping open the plant in Grand Bank, included reopening Burin or St. Lawrence, opening Gaultois, and also they wanted to phase down Fermeuse. That is why Mr. Simmons almost got thrown off the Burin Peninsula because he, being their representative in Ottawa, did not have enough impact in Ottawa to have those plants included in either option. That is why. People in committees there walked out of the meetings. And, of course, yesterday, when I attended the People's Conference at the Holiday Inn and I saw Mr. Simmons and I heard what he was saying, he had gone 360 degrees in forty-eight hours and that is not a bad record.

I would also like to say, Mr. Chairman, that before last week, before the provincial position was tabled in Ottawa, we all know what the Opposition's position was and we have got it here and we can show to members of the Opposition. It was, let the companies go, let them go, which would result in closing down the whole industry. Now what can be positive about that? That was the Opposition position before last week, let the companies go, close down the whole South Coast. And now because we have a position on the Table which includes keeping all the plants open, the Opposition finds something negative about that. Well tomorrow, when the people of the South Coast are made aware by their representatives in this government as to exactly what has transpired in this House today, and they hear what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has said and how he has

MR. MATTHEWS: changed his attitude and his statements from yesterday - and I might go on to say that all communities on the South Coast were represented at the conference yesterday by fisheries committees, town councils, action groups; they were all there and they saw and they heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) - but, oh, what they are going to be saying tomorrow when they know how he has flip-flopped once again in this House on that position, how he has flip-flopped, how he has changed his attitude.

Now, I can remember yesterday
at the

MR. MATTHEWS: conference the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said, 'Oh, well, we supported the reopening of the plants'. Today he has shown his true colours. He refers to our Premier as hallucinating. But I must say, Mr. Chairman, after seeing him yesterday, hearing him speak yesterday, seeing him today, hearing him speak today, that he must have been in a daze yesterday, because the only thing that is the same today is his physical appearance; everything that he has said has been different.

I also, Mr. Chairman, would like to comment on a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition when he said that members on this side of the House who attended the conference yesterday were scolded by the Premier. We had our Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) there who spoke on behalf of this government. And, of course, the hon. Leader of the Opposition would not know, but we all met with the Premier after and we met with representatives from all communities and the Premier gave his personal support to the resolution. Of course, we all know, Mr. Chairman, why the Leader of the Opposition was not at the meeting. We all know he could not be there because we all know it has been quite a while since the hon. Leader of the Opposition has been in the Cabinet room and we just hope it will be a long while more before he returns to the Cabinet room.

I would also, in concluding my few remarks, Mr. Chairman, like to say that I am very, very disgusted and disappointed as a member representing the District of Grand Bank where there are three processing plants located, to sit here today and hear the Liberal Opposition in this Province really come out and say that they are opposed to reopening the plants along the South Coast and keeping others open.

MR. TOBIN: That is shameful! That is shameful!

MR. MATTHEWS: I am telling you, Mr. Chairman, that will go back to the Burin Peninsula as fast as it can and then we will see what happens to the members of the Opposition.

I might also say, Mr. Chairman, that in a former visit to the Burin Peninsula, and in particular to the town of Grand Bank by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and the fisheries critic, they went to the South Coast to meet fishermen and representatives of committees. But I know all too well where the Leader of the Opposition and the fisheries critic went in Grand Bank. They went to the IGA store. Now if they were there, Mr. Chairman, trying to find markets for fish, trying to find markets to sell a bit of fish, I will go along with it. But for some other reason I do not really thing that was why they were there and maybe they would be willing to stand up and tell us who was there and why they were there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): A point of order, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that the member for Grand Bank is intentionally trying to mislead this House, but let me tell the member for Grand Bank that the person whom we met with concerning the fishery in Grand Bank was none other than the Mayor of Grand Bank. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order, there is no point of order, merely a difference of opinion.

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
That is very good. I am very glad to hear that,
Mr. Chairman, because I am sure most of us in this
hon. House have come to know the Mayor of Grand Bank,
Mayor Max Snook, over this past year since he became
Mayor of Grand Bank, and

MR. MATTHEWS: Mayor Snook is a school teacher. Mayor Snook teaches at the John Burke Regional High School in Grand Bank. Now why did they not meet with the Chairman of the Burin Peninsula Fisheries Improvement Committee or the Grand Bank Ways and Means Committee or the Fortune Concerned Citizens' Committee?

MR. TULK: We did.

MR. MATTHEWS: No, no, you did not. No, Mr. Chairman, they did not meet with any of those.

The Salavation of the South Coast Fishery, this is what arrived, the delegation. Where did they go and who did they meet? Not one fisherman in Grand Bank, not one Chairman of a committee in Grand Bank. They met the Mayor. I have all the respect in the world for the Mayor of Grand Bank, he is a personal friend of mine, but that shows your concern for the fishery.

Also, Mr. Chairman, while visiting the districts of Grand Bank and Burin-Placentia West, in Burin-Placentia West there were donations made by the hon. members to committees, but in the district of Grand Bank there were no donations. And I say to you that that was outright discrimination.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MATTHEWS: In concluding, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to publicly in this House support this position, a position that will see my district live, people work and keep three processing plants open.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HISCOCK:

The reorganization of the fishery has finally been announced today by the Premier of the Province, and I will say to the government that those who will play with fire will get burned. And I caution the two members from the Burin Peninsula that before things go back to the people of the Burin Peninsula - the people of the Burin Peninsula are quite intelligent enough to be able to see through what is in politics on both sides. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on a different matter and I want to speak on a matter that is concerning this Province, particularly the City of St. John's, and I brought it up today in the Estimates Committee on Public Works and Services.

MR. MORGAN: He is going to talk about St. John's now. Oh, my goodness!

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) wants to go and try to get the plant open in Burin, then he can. I am concerned with regard to the C.A. Pippy Park Commission and the Ring Road, Mr. Chairman, we have in this city, the Capital of our Province,

MR. HISCOCK: As a member of the House of Assembly, I have a right to speak on behalf of our capital and how it is run, seeing that the people of Labrador pay a lot of taxes here also. As a result of the C. A. Pippy Commission, we have probably one of the best pieces of land in St. John's set aside for recreation. Many of the people here in the city of St. John's cannot afford to go to the parks outside the overpass and the C. A. Pippy Park is their main source of recreation.

I am a little bit concerned about the commission. Number one, it does not have enough teeth, it does not have enough power to be able to decide on what should be done within its boundaries. They had 1900 acres, they wanted more control over it, the Province ended up giving them control over 4000 acres, but there are some people who feel that it should be extended to the boundaries of Windsor Lake.

The Commission is made up of three vested interest groups. The university is one interest group, the city of St. John's is another, and the Newfoundland and Labrador Government is the third. There is a representative of the people who live within the Park, on the commission, as well as a representative of the C. A. Pippy family. So the vested interests are the university, the city and the Newfoundland Government.

I believe very strongly, Mr. Chairman, that the government should make changes immediately in this Commission, that the people who make up this commission should have nothing to do with the city, the government or the university. I believe very strongly that they should be outside, independent people, environmentalists and people interested in wildlife and recreation. The Commission should have authority to

MR. HISCOCK: make decisions, because what is happening now is the master plan is not being upheld. We have seen the Health Science Complex built within the Park, ignoring the master plan. By the way, Mr. Chairman, and for the information of members of the House and the media, the master plan of the C. A. Pippy Park Commission can be changed at a regular meeting with an ordinary quorum. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that under political pressure, when the university or the government wants to put another building in the C. A. Pippy Park or the city wants to put a road through, then, of course, the vested interests are there to see it done.

MR. HISCOCK: I say to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) that if you take this park out of the hands of the vested interest groups and put more independent people on the commission and make it more difficult for them to change their master plan, then we may have a natural wildlife area in the center of our city that we can be quite proud of in sixty or seventy years time. But if we allow the small mindedness of this administration to whittle away at the C.A. Pippy Park, then we are going to find out, Mr. Chairman, that we are not going to have a C.A. Pippy Park as such. All we are going to have basically will be regular forms of recreational facilities.

For example the regular group from the commission at one of their meetings decided where to put the trailer park and after it was set up found out they had made a mistake. I think that the Newfoundland and Labrador horticultural society should have representatives on the commission along with the Newfoundland and Labrador Wildlife Federation and other such vested interest groups as the HUB, the St. John's Cross Country Skiing Association, the City of St. John's, the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides are some other agencies that should be on the Commission.

DR. COLLINS: But not the elected representatives.

MR. HISCOCK: The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can get up and speak on this later, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to this Commission you have two things; number one, you are setting aside so much acreage for government buildings, university buildings,

MR. HISCOCK: and recreational buildings.

But if you are going to put the Outer Ring Road right through the center of this Park, then you are killing once and for all the chance, Mr. Chairman, to have a wilderness area in the center of the city. Because I can tell you this, once the Outer Ring Road goes through, then there is going to be pressure on government and on the city and on the university to build on both sides of that road. But if we limit the Outer Ring Road to the Southern boundaries, then we can preserve the Northern part of that Park near Windsor Lake for a wilderness area. Of course, people then could still have their camping, cross country skiing and other

MR. HISCOCK: But I feel, Mr. Chairman, that this small-minded attitude will prevail and we will give in to the pressures of the day and the needs of the day. Why is it we need the Outer Ring Road, Mr. Chairman? We need the Outer Ring Road through C.A. Pippy Park because we are building an extension to the Confederation Building, building a new Marine Fisheries Institute, with the resultant traffic congestion we will need to build another road. We have seen, Mr. Chairman, the wisdom of this and the last administration, the University and the city to put a road right through C.A. Pippy Park and the University campus in the first place. Now, Mr. Chairman, are we going to make the same mistake the second time? Hopefully, Mr. Chairman, the answer will be no.

The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) and his officials feel that the Southern route should be taken but the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and his officials are advocating the Northern route. So I would say to the members of Cabinet and to the members from St. John's that basically what should be done in this area is to decide once and for all the types of recreation we are going to have; a park with so much space set aside for needed buildings, and then a wilderness area set aside forever and a day. Mr. Chairman, the members for St. John's have a responsibility to this city and to the Province. The member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) asked why a member for Labrador is speaking on the C.A. Pippy Park. Many people from the St. John's area come to Labrador to go camping in the wilderness, also in Northern areas of our Province and outside the overpass. There are a good many people who come into University from Labrador and stay in the C.A. Pippy Park all Summer, as well as a lot of other people from

MR. HISCOCK: other areas. This is the only wilderness area in the Capital City. We are unique, Mr. Chairman, in that we have the opportunity to preserve this. It is not too late to change it now. And I hope that the government will feel fit to make the recommendations that are necessary to the C.A. Pippy Commission to make sure that it does have enough power, that the power is not given to the University, the city or the Newfoundland Government to overrule them, that we have independent people on it and that you cannot change the master plan once the master plan is in place then it is in place.

So, in concluding, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that we have an opportunity here to

MR. HISCOCK: create something for future generations that will go down as a landmark of this administration moreso than any other thing they have done, if they take this opportunity and seize it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman

SOME HON. MEMBERS Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward). The hon. the member for Mt. Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, I could not let these remarks on a matter so vitally affecting the great district of Mount Scio go by without a comment.

I appreciate the remarks from the member opposite, although it does look a little bit like he is leaping aboard the bandwagon, once it gets moving.

We have had, Mr. Chairman, as your hon. knows, meetings between members of government, the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) and myself. I was present at a meeting of the Concerned Citizens who have organized a committee to make representation to government concerning Pippy Park. The member for St. John's North has already been out tramping through the northern part of the park, together with certain members with surveying skills who will go unnamed, Mr. Chairman, but who may later get the recognition that is due them. Mr. Chairman, as this government has shown itself to be many times in the past, we are hopeful that we will get a reasonable response from government on this issue. I know that government is very aware of the concerns of the citizens, not just from Mount Scio but people from all over the city, who are concerned that Pippy Park remain as attractive and as successful a place of recreation and enjoyment as it has been for the last few years.

I might say that, as I said to the committee of citizens a few years ago, this administration,

MR. BARRY: when the name Pippy Park came up, I was not all that impressed and when the Pippy Park Commission was referred to, there was nobody who really snapped to attention. But, Mr. Chairman, to a certain extent, the problem which is there now has arisen because of the great success of the Pippy Park Commission in recent years, because of the appointments that have been made to that Commission by this government. I was instrumental in seeing that we had one of our residents, right from the area, on this Committee and that person has been very aware at all times of the needs of the citizens in the Nagles Hill - Mount Scio area and has had the opportunity of making representation right to the Commission as part of the commission.

MR. BARRY:

We had the opportunity of appointing the new Chairman and while, regrettably, he has been seriously ill for the past little while, Mr. Graham Mercer has proven to be a ball of fire in getting things done. What happened really was that even though this plan for this Outer Ring Road and this highway system has existed for about, I think, seven or eight years, and even though it was published in the newspapers and so forth, there was not that much public outcry for two reasons:

Number one, they had greater worries and greater concerns that detracted their attention from this area of the city; but, Number two, because Pippy Park was not really six or seven years ago of that much importance to the citizens of St. John's because its development was just starting, It is because of the aggressive and intense interest of the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), who has shown his very humane concern -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

- for the recreation needs of the people of St. John's, who has brought in some of the out-harbour delights that those of us from the Bay are accustomed to experiencing, those of us who did not need the wilderness areas in Brigus or Upper Island Cove, We have our own little wilderness areas without our commissions being setup, But here in the city of St. John's everybody recognizes that the Pippy Park has reached the stage right now where it is a very attractive sight, a very attractive area, providing a very important function for the people of this city. And as the member for Labrador has said, for those visitors from outside the city who, when they come in, would prefer to have a little bit of wilderness area around them,

MR. BARRY: The member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) and myself and other members in the St. John's area particularly have had certain discussions, there will be further discussions, and I am sure that we will be able to see some progress in ensuring that we meet the traffic needs of the city, which any growing city has to do if it is going to grow, if it is going to provide jobs and so forth. Secondly, that we keep these features about our city such as the Pippy Park, which is also a very important segment -

MR. TULK: I am serious about the traffic problems.

MR. BARRY: Yes, and the member for St. John's North has pointed out that traffic problems around the Confederation building are getting almost as bad as the traffic problems in the member's district. Right on.

MR. TULK: We have them but they are different from yours. We have gravel roads.

MR. BARRY: Well, I think the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) has shown himself to be very sensitive, particularly in the area of the Codroy Valley and the bridges and the Trans-Canada Highway area. I am not sure whose district that is but he has shown himself to be evidently concerned and be prepared to expend considerable numbers of dollars -

MR. NEARY: They were mostly Federal dollars.

MR. BARRY: Well, looking at all the money that the member is putting out on the West coast of this Province, I am sure that the Federal riding of Humber-St. George has to be changed the next time around. Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, the Pippy Park problem is being considered by government, it has its supporters here on this side of the House and I am sure that we will get a very sympathetic response from government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman I was out of the

House when I was viciously attacked by the member for

Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) but I only want to reiterate what

I said earlier, Mr. Chairman. I am not

MR. NEARY:

talking about the merits or demerits of the proposal that is on the table. What I am saying is that it will take weeks and months and years to resolve.

MR. TULK:

I will deal with that one.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, my friend will deal, with that in due course. I want to change the subject for a moment. I want to read the hon. gentleman some excerpts from Hansard of April 24th, 1975, that they may find very interesting.

DR. COLLINS:

April 24, 1975?

MR. NEARY:

April 24, 1975.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Will you table it so that we can see it.

MR. NEARY:

Oh, yes, I will table it, but I want to read some excerpts from it because hon. gentlemen might find them very interesting, and then we will have a little guessing game and see if they can guess who made these statements.

Here is one—"The main part of the revenue, I think, Mr. Speaker, we should concern ourselves with is the amount that has to be provided this year by way of borrowings. The borrowings of this province, although not a matter of alarm to the people, certainly have to be matter of great concern to every man, woman and child in this Province."

Now, Mr. Chairman, remember the public debt at that time was just slightly over a billion dollars and we were only borrowing that year \$165 million. This year we are borrowing \$285 million.

DR. COLLINS: How much were we borrowing there?

MR. NEARY: We were borrowing that particular year \$165 million. So, Mr. Chairman, I am throwing out these little quotations just to see how hon. members today with the borrowing of \$280 - odd million dollars with the public debt \$3.5 billion, how hon. gentleman who made these statements feel today.

Then in another section on Page 5092, "The fact that we do have to borrow, and we are faced with it, has to be a matter of grave and deep concern for the people of this Province". Who made that statement?

MR. STAGG: Joey Smallwood.

MR. NEARY:

This is 1975.

And who made this statement - let us have a little guessing game now - who was concerned about the public debt and borrowing so much money at that time and concerned about the revenue that was coming in? Listen to this, 'I do not believe that it is good either for budgetary purposes.'

This particular members said, 'There is no point having a real budget if you cannot presume to control your budget properly. Nor can you make people aware of what is being borrowed nor can you get the fullest type of fiscal responsibility that is required unless all borrowings are approved by this House of Assembly. I would hope in the years to come to see no government coming in again and asking for more money to borrow than it has set forth in its budget.' Who made that statement? Three guesses, and the last two do not count.

And here is another quotation, 'And the public debt' - which was \$1.2 billion at that time - 'has to be a matter of concern although not a matter of alarm but something that we should be very concerned about' so this hon. gentleman told us. A public debt of \$1.2 billion, and we were borrowing \$160 million that year.

Now, let us get another statement here, 'I pointed out in this context in this debate though to show, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to the ever-mounting direct debt of this Province and the normal contingent debt we are going to have placed on us also a huge debt for the development of the Lower Churchill because the future of ourselves and indeed our children's children are going to be bound up in all of that. I have grave

MR. NEARY: Is he going to be consistent and leave the Cabinet today over these fiscal matters as he did back in 1975? Is he going to get up today and be consistent in his thinking and condemn the record borrowing and condemn the deficit in current account? And is he going to get up and express concern, as he did back in 1975, about the public debt which at that time was \$1.2 billion, today \$3.5 billion? Is that same hon. gentleman going to be consistent, Mr. Chairman? Is he going to stand in this House in the best interest of the people of the Province or is he going to now run for cover? Is he going to get up now after I sit down and try to justify these statements then as compared to now?

And listen to this, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman was talking at the same time, in 1975— and we saw the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) take the hon. gentleman to task recently about his references to the Supreme Court about his reflection. Very unprofessional like.

MR. TULK: The Premier says the hon. member for Mount Scio does not know what he is talking about.

MR. NEARY: The member for Mount Scio does not know what he is talking about. Well, in connection with the matter of the offshore being taken to the Supreme Court, what did that same gentleman say in 1975? 'I have grave reservations', he said, 'serious reservations about this matter being referred to the Supreme Court of Canada'. Mr. Chairman, I am not saying that. As I said before, all of the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada are federally appointed judges. And as such I am not saying that they would be biased, but I would say emotionally they would have to be tied to the central power. It is only natural. They are federally appointed, they reside in Ottawa, and their emotions would tend towards the central power. I

MR. NEARY: hope the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is listening to that, and wondering who made that statement on the opposite side of the House.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) say it again?

MR. NEARY: Well, I will give you another one. Indeed the present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada,

MR. S. NEARY: a man by the name of Bora Laskin is a committed federalist.

DR. COLLINS: I would say Daniel Boone made it safe.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Daniel Boone? Well, the hon. gentleman is probably as ancient.

And as far as I am concerned of the Supreme Court of Canada not being the best forum for us, I do not think that we as a government should be satisfied with an adjudication by the Supreme Court of Canada. Just listen to that, Mr. Chairman, that was in 1975, and that same hon. gentleman still sits in the House. Now, he has done - and we have heard so much in this House in recent days about flip flopping, about right angle turns, complete turn-about by hon. gentleman, I wonder how the hon. gentleman feels, Mr. Chairman, when he hears statements like he made back in 1975, about people being reminded of these statements in the House? How does the hon. gentleman feel? How does the hon. gentleman feel about the record borrowing today and how does the hon. gentleman feel about the public debt today, \$3.5 billion, and nothing to show for it? And how does the hon. gentleman feel about Orders-in-Council that forbid departments to tell how taxpayer money is being spent? How does the hon. gentleman feel about that today? Hon. members must have guessed by now which hon. member I am referring to. In case they have not you whistle and I will point, to the hon. gentlemen, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS: A big revelation. How do you feel about remarks you made last week?

MR. NEARY: What remarks?

MR. DINN: The ones about closing all the plants.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentlemen are scald today, I guarantee you. They know, Mr. Chairman,

MR. S. NEARY: that they have various parts of their anatomy in the wringer and they are likely to get squeezed when they laid down a proposal almost right on the eve of a major decision being taken in Ottawa. They come in and muddy up the water by laying down a proposal that can only delay the process, instead of bringing a resolution into this House unanimously supporting those in the federal Cabinet who support Option 3 as amended. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman has not made a speech. We have been here three weeks, I have not heard anything about Labrador West, the Wabush Mining Company or Iron Ore of Canada and their problems. It is amazing, Mr. Chairman, how hon. members there opposite get away with not serving their districts and their Province and their country. How do they get away with it, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I have been driven to my

MR. MARSHALL:

feet by the hon. member. Of course we had a harbinger of that a little while ago when he said he was going to bring - you know, he cannot make a speech of his own. He has to read from his research assistants and when the research assistants run out of material he drags up old issues of Hansard and starts reading them back. The hon. gentleman is really tired in his leadership and his representation. As to what the hon. gentleman stated in his remarks, each and every thing that I said in 1975 I wholeheartedly endorse at the present time, each and every thing.

MR. SIMMS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now there was one little problem, Mr. Chairman, so I will go into the history a little bit so that we can just know and we can cite. I am very concerned about the public debt but just let us cite the responsibility for it. I remember ever so long ago, when my hair was less gray, the hon. gentleman was less gray, I was over there and the hon. gentleman was sitting somewhere in that vicinity and his great leader was sitting right here in this particular place. I remember getting up in a debate on the Budget at the time and I said, 'Do you realize that the public debt of this Province - now this was in 1970-71 - is \$1 billion?' Well, it was like you almost shot the hon. gentleman who was sitting here at the time insisting that it was not \$1 billion. I remember the hon. gentleman looking over as he used to be - now, I do not know what they called those instruments you used to have years ago in the back of the car for signal directions; they were little dogs, you know, that had the flashing eyes that went from left to right type of thing. I suppose you would call them noddy dogs. And that is what the hon. gentleman was, a noddy dog. He looked over there with his mouth wide

MR. MARSHALL: open that anyone would dare disagree with his leader of the day, and he and all the rest of them, in all their fury with the few of us over there, insisted that the debt was not \$1 billion. Well, Mr. Chairman, it was \$1 billion, it was exactly \$1 billion, a little bit more than that. Now one mistake that all administrations since have made, we should have taken that \$1 billion, you see, and we should have put it in one account and we should have added the interest to it every year as it went up, because nowadays everybody knows that you do not just borrow money and pay back the principle, you do have to pay back interest. And anyone who has wrestled with the interest rates in recent years knows this full well. So what we should have done is we should have put it in one account and each year we should have put the interest as it accumulated on it. And what would it have shown? Well, I suppose, at an average interest rate of 13 per cent a year on \$1 billion - What is that? It is \$130 million. So what we have borrowed every year since 1972 in total has been, of new borrowings that is - if the hon. gentleman looks at the accounts, he will find it varied between \$140 million a year, in new borrowings, to \$180 million.

MR. MARSHALL: Now right from the first \$130 million of that was attributed to the inherited debt. And if you want to take that for a period of thirteen years and multiply \$130 million, you would get \$1.7 billion added to the billion dollars. So there you are. Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman knew how to do arithmetic he would realize that he is directly responsible today for approximately \$2.8 billion or \$2.9 billion of the public debt, because the interest did not stop on it, Mr. Chairman, the interest went on. And that was a legacy with which we were left. If the Province had been administered properly over the years there would not have been any appreciable debt, the borrowings of this Province would have been in the vicinity of about \$30 million or \$40 million or \$50 million, each year, that is all, which would just be peanuts, which we could handle quite easily, and we would be able to do all of the things that we would like to do in hospital services and education services. So, sure I am concerned with the public debt, just as concerned as I was in 1975, Mr. Chairman. And I point to the hon. gentleman once again, as I did in 1975, because I suspect in that speech he would have had reference to this very fact, that he, in fact, is responsible, and his administration, for most of it.

As to the comment, 'More money should not be borrowed than was budgeted for', if the hon. gentlemen want to look at the record of the Peckford administration since 1979 they will find that in effect some \$110 million, I believe, roughly, was received in revenues at the end of the year, more than had been budgeted originally. In other words, we have improved instead of detracted from the position of the government. So our record is pretty good. And our record, Mr. Chairman, shows full well that is recognized

MR. MARSHALL: by international sources. Look at the results that have occurred from the rating agencies. Quebec has gone down, New Brunswick has gone down, Nova Scotia has gone down with their credit ratings. They have had them all reviewed. What has happened with ours? We have had consideration to having ours raised. But for the general economic times in which we are in, Mr. Chairman, our credit rating would be raised. The fact of the matter is that the credit rating agencies are very impressed with the management of this administration.

MR. MARSHALL: So there is not a thing that the hon. gentleman has stated that I would not reaffirm, Mr. Chairman. I have no occasion at all to say that there was any inconsistency of what I have said before and what I say now. I reaffirm everything that I have said.

MR. NEARY: Will you tell us about the Supreme Court?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes. Every single sentence that I have ever said, Mr. Chairman, I remain consistent with. Not like the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, I can be consistent from 1975 to 1982. The hon. gentleman has shown today that he cannot be consistent from one day to another.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon. gentleman's policies were brought into effect what would happen would be - he is moaning and groaning now about the fact that it might delay the opening of the plants, but the avenue which the hon. gentleman was going to take was going to see the plants at Burin, the plants at Grand Bank, at St. Lawrence, at Gaultois and at Fermeuse close forever and a day but for the avenues that have been put forth in this very cogent policy by the provincial government and presented to the federal Cabinet Committee on fisheries restructuring. If the hon. gentleman had his way, he is so slavish to the federal government that what would happen would be that the fish that will now be processed in Burin and in Grand Bank would be processed in Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman could not care less as long as he is able to continue in his support of the federal government, because whatever the federal government says, the hon. gentleman thinks is right.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, just to show the inconsistency, what the hon. gentleman was proposing and embracing was Option 1. Originally, up to yesterday, he was supporting Option 1 which was a merger of Nickerson and National Sea and which was a merger of the Newfoundland companies. It related to company restructuring and did not address itself to restructuring of the fisheries. We have brought in a plan for restructuring of the fisheries. Now the hon. gentleman finds himself very acutely embarrassed by it because we have forced things to the stage where today, Burin, Grand Bank, Gaultois, St. Lawrence and Fermeuse have hope, whereas the day before yesterday and the days

MR. MARSHALL: before that they had no hope because of the positions taken by the hon. gentleman. So the hon. gentleman need not worry , in my case, Mr. Chairman, and in the government's case, who have been very consistent. As the hon. gentleman, you know, shillies around and retracts from one position and the other in an effort to curry favour, there are less and less people in the Province who pay attention to the hon. gentleman. And we have seen the witness to that in the speech by the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) today .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: When the critic for Fisheries (Mr. Tulk) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) go down to talk about fisheries in Grand Bank, what do they do? They hide away, I understand, in somebody's house because they are afraid to go out and face the fishermen. And the fishermen did not want to see them. Make no wonder the fishermen did not want to see them, Mr. Chairman, when the hon. gentlemen's policy was to keep Burin closed down, Grand Bank closed down, St. Lawrence and Fermeuse.

MR. ANDREWS: Ramea, Gaultois, and Fermeuse.

MR. MARSHALL: So, Mr. Chairman; that is the provision.

MR. NEARY: You cannot worm your way out of this.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman need not worry, as I say, about consistency. The only thing that the hon. gentleman is consistent in is in his own inconsistencies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Very well spoken.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, I have been driven almost to the edge of insanity by the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: You did not have far to go.

MR. TULK: House Leader (Mr. Marshall) on the other side. Such a broadside, Mr. Chairman, has never been delivered before, and he was aided and abetted by the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) and the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin).

MR. STAGG: I have not even been involved yet. Carry on.

MR. TULK: No, it is too bad. I do not know what I would have done if you had been up before.

Mr. Chairman, I think what we are seeing developing in Newfoundland now in regard to the fisheries problem that we have on the South Coast, and, indeed, the fisheries problem that we have perhaps throughout Newfoundland, is a scenario that I predicted some two or three weeks ago in this House, predicted some two or three weeks ago in a Private Members' resolution, where I said that we would see -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Be quiet, please!

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, can you keep that crowd down over there, they are disturbing me again.

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

MR. TULK: I am soon going to have to get some of those pills, if they keep going.

MR. NEARY: Like the Premier has.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, we have seen the scenario develop where the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Premier did not have up until last Thursday a policy on the opening of the plants on the South Coast. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is what we have seen. Now, at the last minute, when they figure a decision is going to be made that may affect the plants on the South Coast, and may indeed close down some of them, they said. It is just possible that in restructuring some of the plants may be closed down, so

MR. B. TULK:

let us put something on paper, run off up to Ottawa and say, 'No, you cannot do this and you cannot do that.' Last Thursday the position went on the table. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have got a question for the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews). Where has his government been since last - when did the plant in Burin close? The member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) should know that. Sometime in November?

MR. MATTHEWS: November, yes.

MR. TULK: November. Where has the government been with its position?

MR. MATTHEWS: Burin is not in my district.

MR. TULK: I know it is not in your district but you are from the Burin Peninsula, so you know.

Now, I would like the telephone operator to go plug in a few calls. He may be good at that but that is all he is good at.

But where has this government been? What an admission of guilt that they had no policy. This is their policy on the opening of the plants in Grand Bank, it was put on the table last Thursday in Ottawa. That is their policy. That is the government that is supposed to point the direction for fisheries development in the processing sector of the industry. They put their policy on the table last week.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier then this evening went out of his trees again and got up on the other side and said, 'Well, does that crew on the other side agree with my proposal? Do they agree with this thing that I suddenly put together last week and carried up to Ottawa? Do they agree with that?' Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Premier a question, I will

MR. B. TULK: ask the government a question, I will ask the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) a question, is it really important to you whether we agree or not?

MR. MATTHEWS: No.

MR. TULK: No, Mr. Chairman. The answer is no, not really. What is important and what has been the most important thing that has happened in this Province since the plants started to close, happened yesterday. And I do not mean yesterday after 4:30 p.m., I mean yesterday morning at Holiday Inn. That is the most important thing that has happened. What happened yesterday, Mr. Chairman, was we saw or we hoped we had seen a unity of people to go to the federal government, to go to anybody that we have to go to and say, 'You will not close a single plant in this Province.'

MR. MATTHEWS: We did that a few days ago.

MR. TULK: But what is happening today? We are getting the confrontation set up by the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). They are trying to set up a confrontation to split people in this Province to say no you do not agree, to split them so that unity is destroyed. Because the truth is that they do not want, they do not care whether there is a plant on the South Coast opened or not. The Minister of Fisheries and the Premier are too eager to play politics and play their own little games. The Premier has to have his one-upmanship, he has to be 'Mr. It'. You cannot accept anything from the Burin Action Committee, or the joint councils, or the Fishermen's Union, you cannot accept that unless the Premier has his one-uppance, and that is what he was trying to do within the last couple of days.

Mr. Chairman, let me take this thing if I have time, and run down through some of the things that are here. The letter: The Premier summarizes his position in a letter to the hon. Don Johnston on March 23. What is his

March 29, 1983

Tape No. 804

MJ - 3

MR. B. TULK: first demand of the federal government?
What is his first demand in restructuring? Now, is the
telephone operator listening to me because I want him
to get educated. That a single.

MR. TULK: trawler company should be created to operate Newfoundland based trawlers. Now is that not a shocker? What a shocker! That would bowl you over in your seat. It would frighten the life out of you except for the fact that I have heard the Leader of the Opposition on this side and myself in Private Member's Resolutions, stand up and say that we should nationalize the trawler fleet. Did I ever hear you say that?

MR. NEARY: It seem to me I have heard that song before.

MR. TULK: It seems to me that I heard that about three weeks ago. The next thing he says, in the next part, he wants to keep the same corporate structure that we have now and make a few smaller companies. A little bit new but when did he think it up? Last week. He wants market consolidation. That is his third point. He wants market consolidation. What did we say to Kirby in July? What have we said in this House?

MR. DINN: Let the companies die.

MR. TULK: If the telephone operator could read I would send him over a copy of Hansard and he would put away that little article he has there from the Daily News because he would know it is completely wrong.

MR. DINN: Oh, is it?

MR. TULK: Yes. But the telephone operator cannot read so I am not going to even bother with Hansard, not even going to bother. I may come over one of these days and sit down in the seat next to him and read it to him.

MR. NEARY: Send him over to the annual report of the Telephone Company.

MR. TULK: Market consolidations: The Premier wants market consolidations. I think it was the first part of July that we presented our position on that

MR. TULK: . . . to the Kirby Task Force.
No problem, that is our policy, we cannot go against that.
The fourth one, an administrative detail, the fifth an
administrative detail.

MR. TULK: Then he goes on in a sixth demand: "In order to improve labour/management relations, the Fishermen's Union should be given an opportunity to participate in the recapitalized companies." That is public ownership, and where I come from, public ownership is not a bad word. We have the greatest Co-operative in Newfoundland. As a matter of fact, it may work very well in St. Lawrence. I understand the Premier was saying that this morning.

MR. NEARY: Is that right?

MR. TULK: I understand he was saying that this morning at his press conference.

MR. NEARY: How long ago since we said that?

MR. TULK: It was two months ago since we said that, that St. Lawrence is probably a good spot to develop a Co-operative in the same manner as you have on Fogo Island. And the Premier was referring to Fogo Island. I am some glad to know that the Premier knows where Fogo Island is.

"The plants at Burin, Fermeuse, Grand Bank and Gaultois must be upgraded" - a big statement. That is perfectly, I think, legitimate. "It must be agreed that the recapitalized companies will not acquire factory trawlers for the harvesting of Northern cod" - now, what a big statement! I mean, what Newfoundlander who comes from an inshore community or a deep-sea port would not agree with that? But you cannot have factory trawlers.

MR. NEARY: I heard the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) saying a few months ago to bring in the foreign capital.

MR. TULK: That is right.

The twelfth thing that he says in this policy is that the freeze on the construction of

MR. TULK: new processing plants must be continued."

MR. NEARY: That is a provincial responsibility, by the way.

MR. TULK: Yes, it is. And if we are not the people who stood in this House and said that we have an over-capacity created by governments in the processing sector, then I do not know who did. Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to yesterday. I am disappointed - and I want the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) to hear me say this - I am disappointed with his behaviour and with what I heard the member for Grand Bank say this evening. He is a man who serves his constituents well, but to take the low road that he took this evening, he would do much better to follow the example of the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) and say nothing.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. TULK: To take the low road that he took this evening is not becoming.

MR. STEWART: I am going to get up.

MR. TULK: You are going to get up? Hopefully. I will have another little flick at it too!

The member for Grand Bank took the low road this evening and let his politics influence the unity that we had established yesterday and tried to break it. The unity that we had established yesterday was something again that we called for three weeks ago in this House. I said to the Minister

MR. TULK: I said to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), when the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) put in that amendment, I said to him then that what we have to do in this Province is go out of this House united. We have to be one group looking for one thing, namely the opening of plants in this Province, every plant in this Province. And yet you get the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) standing up - and I have to say this to him, Mr. Chairman, that it was a bit low. I hope that he does not follow through with those kinds of things.

Mr. Chairman, what we are looking at here is too important to have the one-upmanship of the Premier, where he has got to have his glory all around him, where the light has got to shine around him all the time. It is too important for that.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to call on the member from Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews), from Burin Placentia-West (Mr. Tobin), from St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn), from Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) and say to them, 'If your government wants to play politics with the fishery and with your communities, do not follow their example'.

RESOLUTION

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st. day of March, 1984, the sum of four hundred and forty-two million nine hundred and seventy-four thousand five hundred dollars (\$442,974,500).

On motion, resolution carried.

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Four And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service".

On motion, short title carried.

On motion, Clauses 2 and 3 carried.

On motion, Schedule carried.

MR. MARSHALL: I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion that the Committee rise and report having passed a resolution and recommend that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report that they have adopted a certain resolution and recommend that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion, report received and adopted.

On motion, a bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Four And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service", read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 3)

MR. MARSHALL: Order 31, Bill No. 33.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Election Act". (Bill No. 33)

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which would amend the Election Act to enable documents which would normally be destroyed to be retained one year after the election. As it presently exists now, the Chief Electoral Officer must destroy all documentation pertaining to the election within one year of the election. What this bill will do is

MR. MARSHALL: it will enable the poll books, the supplementary list of electors and the list of those sworn in at the polls to be retained with the other documentation, of course, the ballots and what have you being destroyed.

MR. NEARY: For how long?

MR. MARSHALL: For as long as it is necessary. And the reason for the bill, Mr. Speaker, is that it is being done at the request of the Chairman of the Committee on Elections, and the members of the Committee on Elections, because they want to give consideration to the possibility, in their deliberations, of a permanent electors list, and this material will be of value to them.

MR. MARSHALL:

So that is the reason for it. Subsection (2) provides for the destruction of ballot papers and other documents, but the poll books and the supplementary list of electors and the oaths would be retained for that purpose.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, we on this side have looked at the bill and I have spoken with the members on this side of the House. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Election Expenses Committee is a non-partisan committee made up of members on both sides of the House. The Committee, I understand, is looking for a permanent voters list for the Province and were the provisions of the old act to be carried out, then some of the information would be lost to the House. So we have no objections whatsoever to this particular bill, or on passing it as quickly as possible, at this particular time.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: I thank the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Election Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 33)

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): Order, please!

A bill, "An Act To Amend
The Election Act". (Bill No. 33)

Motion, that the Committee
report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report the passing of Bill No. 33 without amendment.

On motion, report received and adopted, bill ordered read a third time presently, by leave.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Election Act", read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 33)

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the House that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor will be here shortly. I think he is enroute so perhaps if members would agree and Your Honour would agree, we could have a short adjournment pending his arrival.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that the House adjourn for a few minutes to await the arrival of His Honour?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed!

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Admit His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

It is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, Her Faithful Commons in Newfoundland, to present to Your Honour a bill for the appropriation of Interim Supply granted in the present Session.

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Four And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service".
(Bill No. 3)

HON. W. A. PADDON (Lieutenant-Governor):

In Her Majesty's Name, I thank Her Loyal Subjects for their benevolence, and I assent to this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of the Province has at its present Session passed a certain Bill, to which, in the name and on behalf of the General Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Election Act". (Bill No. 33).

HON. W. A. PADDON (Lieutenant-Governor): In Her Majesty's Name, I Assent to this Bill.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House I would like to advise that the Government Services Committee will meet in the House of Assembly at nine-thirty on Monday, April 11th. to review the Estimates of the Department of Transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, April 11, 1983 at 3:00 p.m. in the afternoon, and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, April 11th. at 3:00 p.m.