

VOL. 2

NO. 4

SECOND SESSION OF THE
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 1983

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.MORGAN: I have to apologize to my colleague in the Opposition for not having a prepared statement but I discussed this matter with him just before the House opened. I want to report to the House of Assembly the fact that a few days ago national media reports indicated that the Sea Shepherd, on an expedition from Portland, Maine, to our waters off Newfoundland, had left Portland, Maine, with the expressed intent of coming here to obstruct the activity of our sealers, which would mean the obstruction of an economic activity in the waters within Canada. At the same time they expressed the intent that they would carry out, if necessary, the ramming of vessels legally and properly licensed by the Government of Canada to take part in the seal fishery. In these national reports carried by the press media, there was an indication that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation had assigned a crew to be onboard that vessel, the Sea Shepherd. I just could not believe that was true, so I wired the President of CBC and I -

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if I could make this statement in silence.

Mr. Speaker, I wired the CBC President, Mr. Pierre Juneau, with a copy to the executive producer of the Journal in Toronto, and with a

MR. MORGAN: copy to the head of the CBC television here in Newfoundland to get some clarification of these national media press reports. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have now been advised in a telex received from Mr. Starowicz who is indeed the executive producer of the CBC national programme the Journal, and he has confirmed to me that there is indeed a CBC television crew onboard that vessel at the present time. The CBC television crew was assigned from St. John's by the TV programme On Camera, so Mr. Starowicz tells me, a television crew assigned by CBC from St. John's. They travelled to Portland, Maine, and are stationed aboard that vessel now enroute to Canadian waters for the expressed intent of ramming vessels, as I mentioned, that are licensed to take part in their proper legalized activities.

I further confirmed the reports that were carried in the other media that the Journal was also involved, and Mr. Starowicz has confirmed as well in his telex to me that the Journal is involved to the point of having established aboard that same vessel specialized technical TV equipment for the purpose of carrying out direct interviews with that vessel if found necessary and if warranted in the view of the Journal.

In a telephone conversation with Mr. Starowicz I questioned what he thought might be the special kind of circumstances that would warrant an interview with the vessel and it was made quite clear,

MR. MORGAN: well, the possible or potential event of the Sea Shepherd ramming a Canadian vessel.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I view this incident very seriously because here is a situation where the Government of Canada has expressed sincere and positive support for an economic activity carried out by fishermen, Canadians residing in Newfoundland, in this case, the sealers; at the same time, a Crown corporation which reports to the same government is spending taxpayers' dollars to aid and abet this kind of activity carried out to obstruct this same economic activity which is supported by the Federal Government of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, further, I just could not believe this morning - and I listen to the CBC news media regularly - when the time was taken to make a call to the vessel from the Morning Show in St. John's to talk to a Mr. Watson, again to get some clarification of his intent. Again it was made known that if necessary they would ram the vessels but hopefully not to cause any personal damage or personal injury.

Mr. Speaker, further, the CBC left the encouragement to all their listeners throughout the Province that maybe go to Signal Hill and you could see this great incident of the Sea Shepherd coming in to ram one of our vessels, one of our Newfoundland based sealing vessels. And, Mr. Speaker, I can imagine that I probably will not be exposed on CBC, I will be invisible in the next while on CBC, I know that but, Mr. Speaker, the fact is it is indeed a very serious matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: It is a very serious matter because if governments misuse the taxpayers' dollars they

MR. MORGAN: will be called into account by the public. And I am saying that if the taxpayers' dollars are going to be misused and spent irresponsibly by a Crown corporation, they should be called into account as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: And, Mr. Speaker, I have asked the President of the CBC, and asked him in all sincerity, to arrange to remove that crew because these protesters survive and thrive on the kind of media coverage given to them by people like CBC, and their expressed cause is to come in here to obstruct Canadians living in Newfoundland from earning a living.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope you will listen to my request on behalf of this government here and immediately remove the activity now onboard that vessel of having CBC taxpayers' dollars used to aid and abet the activities of the protesters.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I hope that that vessel that we send through the Narrows is big enough to take on the Sea Shepherd, that is all I have to say. If the people who protest the seal hunt are ready to declare war on us, then let us have one. That is what I say to them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in replying to the minister, my conviction has always been perhaps that we should try to ignore the seal protesters in their media efforts. That has been my conviction, because we are perhaps in a war that we cannot win with them. But it

March 9, 1983

Tape 139

EC - 3

MR. TULK: becomes increasingly difficult
to ignore and I agree with the minister, it

MR. B. TULK:

becomes increasingly difficult to ignore the kind of things that are happening in this Province today when we are sending our own Canadian media people to indeed aid and abet the protesters who are on that boat.

MR. J. MORGAN: Incite the protesters.

MR. TULK: Perhaps incite the protesters.

To add insult to injury, Mr.

Speaker, I understand from the minister and I understand from reports that I am hearing that what we are going to see is a programme on The Journal to try and convince - I do not know what they are going to try, but I suspect that once they see that gory mess off the Narrows here in St. John's harbour, we are going to see this show on The Journal across Canada where we hope to develop some markets for our seal products.

Now, Mr. Speaker,

we went through this today in a meeting and in keeping with our efforts to back the sealers, and indeed back the Newfoundland seal hunt, we on this side of the House today sent the following telegram to Francis Fox, Minister of Communications in Ottawa. The text of the telegram, if I can have the permission of the House to read it, is: 'As the minister responsible for communications in this country under whose mantle is included the CRTC, I wish to hereby protest the assignment of a CBC camera crew on board the protest ship Sea Shepherd operated by Greenpeace. Greenpeace is one of the groups primarily responsible for the international damning and racial slurring of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. To have a camera crew on board that ship whose stated intention is ramming any sealing vessels attempting to leave St. John's Harbour this year constitutes a declaration of war upon the Newfoundland people, and to have that

MR. B. TULK: camera crew paid for by taxpayers money and the hard earned dollars of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians is a little too much to ask the people of this Province to accept. Do you not think it an ironic tragic paradox that the salaries of this very same CBC camera crew came from the very pockets of the sealers who are being crucified by this Greenpeace group and its lackeys? I demand that you have the CBC order that crew off that vessel and further that CBC apologize to the people of this Province for this affront.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Let me assure the House and the government and the sealers association in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that indeed we support their efforts and that CBC camera crew should perhaps be taken off the Sea Shepherd and put in this House so we can get better media coverage of the people's business of this Province.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Are there any other Ministerial Statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) when he expects to bring down the Budget?

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I expect to bring in the Budget on behalf of the administration on Thursday the 17th.

March 9, 1983

Tape No. 140

MJ - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Me. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. gentleman could tell the House -

MR. B. TULK: You have him all shaken up again now.

MR. NEARY: No, I have not. I am delighted to hear that. In view of the statements made recently by an official of Moody's, I would think that the

MR. NEARY: hon. Minister of Finance
(Dr. Collins) would be well-advised to bring down an early budget because our credit rating is in jeopardy. And not only that, but maybe the Province is on the brink of financial ruin according to the statements made by the -

MR. BAIRD: According to you.

MR. NEARY: - no, by the officials of Moody's.

Mr. Speaker, what does the Minister of Finance - a supplementary - what does the Minister of Finance have to say about a question that was put to the representative of Moody's, Ms Freida Anchorman, in connection with the future development of Newfoundland which depends to a great extent on the current negotiations between the Province and the federal government over ownership of offshore resources? Does the hon. gentleman think that the failure of the administration to fulfill their mandate, to negotiate an agreement on offshore, will affect the credit rating or the borrowing of this Province in the weeks and months ahead?

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

DR. COLLINS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: A supplementary. Would the hon. gentleman care to tell the House if the government have reached their target, their objectives in connection with the increases in the retail sales tax or were the ministers measures counterproductive and that we will end up the current fiscal year with a severe deficit in current account?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: I think I will have a very full answer to the hon. member's question next Thursday.

MR. NEARY: We look forward to it.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. Could the minister advise the House if there are any medical surgeons presently on staff at the Melville Hospital in Goose Bay?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, there is a medical surgeon who is away for a couple of days on a short leave, but there is also another medical person there who has surgical capability.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary - the medical surgeon who is away for a couple of days, I might advise the minister, is away for three weeks or more - could the minister advise in the case of emergency surgery at the present time what is the intention of the Department of Health in conjunction with the hospital to deal with those patients who will require surgery within the next three weeks?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I am given to understand that the surgeon who we are being questioned about will be back in a couple of days. Anyway, the fact of the matter is that

MR. HOUSE: with regard to any emergency that requires attention, our emergency ambulance programme will take care of getting people to proper facilities. I have been in contact with some people there and there seems to be no problem at this point in time.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago, about ten minutes ago, I spoke to the administrator of the hospital, Dr. Dyson, and he advised me that the medical surgeon will be away for at least three weeks. So I will give the minister that information.

Now, could the minister advise why have officials of the Department of Health advised the hospital in Goose Bay that the six people that the hospital in Goose Bay has suggested either be transferred to St. John's or St. Anthony, as an emergency will and could possibly develop within the next three week while this medical doctor is away, that they have to pay the first \$500 and thereafter the government will pick up 50 per cent of the remaining cost? Why is this stipulation placed on those six individuals who it is considered will be emergency patients before the doctor returns?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should be advised what the definition of an emergency is. An emergency is a thing that occurs immediately and we take care of that sort of thing. This kind of thing, there is preparation that can be made in advance. We do have, of course, a policy that we will pay after the first \$500; we will subsidize any persons who have any higher costs than that. And this is a policy whether it is in Labrador or St. Anthony or any other part of the Province.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the minister
is forgetting the whole point of my question and the seriousness
that is involved, and perhaps life itself. Here we have six people,
whom Melville Hospital has said will be emergency cases before
the surgeon returns in three weeks. That doctor is taking the
necessary action of sending those six patients out now before
the emergency develops. Now why cannot the minister apply the
same policy of having an individual patient pay the first \$50
and let the government absorb the rest? Those six people will
be emergency cases, the doctor has said that. Why cannot the
minister use the ambulance programme and let these patients
pay the first \$50, not \$500?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, you know, again I
must go back and point out to the hon. gentleman that there is
a procedure to get to a hospital if the doctor so deems - if
the doctor determines an emergency, determines what an
emergency is. We have been dealing with the Director of the
Hospital Services and at this point in time we have not been
advised of an emergency. We have told him that we will
give every assistance that we possibly can and I am sure we
will do just that. If an emergency occurs we will look after
it under our programme.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary
to the Minister of Health.

MR. WARREN: Has the Minister contacted the Newfoundland Medical Association, asking if there are any doctors in and around metropolitan St. John's who would kindly go to Happy Valley, Goose Bay, for those three weeks to avert any emergency that may develop?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the Board of the Melville Hospital has the responsibility of the medical staff, of running the hospitals. They would be contacting the Medical Association but if they requested me to do it, I would do it on their behalf.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young). The question I would like to ask about is the circumstances surrounding the Auditor General's report that \$500,000 was spent over three years for unoccupied space in the Murray Premises that was being renovated for a museum.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: I am sure the explanation is in the Auditor General's report. And I may add that, if the hon. gentleman was in the province, quite recently the matter was dealt with for two or three days by the Public Accounts Committee and I think it was all dealt with fairly and squarely and everything was honest and aboveboard.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, with regard to where I was, I was in my district storm bound. Also, the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Goudie) would have been there if he was attending the conference that he was invited to attend in Port Hope Simpson.

MR. HISCOCK: The question I have to ask the Minister of Public Works is how come that we in this Province in these hard economic times - they are stealing the widow's mite, and the children of this province on Social Welfare. - we are spending \$500,000 on unoccupied space for a period of three years when this was pointed out last year in the Auditor General's report? An extra \$108,000 has been spent since. Why is this, Mr. Speaker? Is it a fact the person who owns this building is the chief fund raiser for the PC Party?

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, may I add that I have nothing to do with the hon. gentleman being storm bound, whatever he was. I will take it upon myself, Sir, to send the hon. gentleman a copy of the Public Accounts with the full details all spelled out and the hon. member can use his leisure time when he is storm bound again to read it.

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

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. gentleman should not treat this matter so lightly in these very pressing time, when taxpayers money is being abused when the Auditor General sees fit to raise this matter in two Auditor General's reports. This is the second time the gentleman has raised it. Mr. Speaker, I understand, from the testimony the hon. gentleman was talking about that was given to the Public Accounts Committee that there is a very serious conflict of interest situation that developed during

MR. NEARY: that testimony, that the government has not done anything about, in connection with a director of that company who is leasing the premises down on the Murray Premises, a director of that company who is also a director of the -

MR. WARREN: The St. John's Heritage.

MR. NEARY: - the St. John's Heritage.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please! I would suggest to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he direct a question. He is getting into a long preamble, in essence making a speech.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I sat in the House of Commons recently and saw the same thing happen.

MR. SIMMS: We have our own Standing Orders.

MR. NEARY: Is that so, we have our own Standing Orders? But, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman if he has taken it upon himself to investigate the possibility of conflict of interest between a director of the company who was responsible for leasing space in the Murray Premises, who was also a director of the St. John's Heritage Foundation, who made the recommendation to government that they use that space? Has the hon. gentleman investigated that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is a little bit off key or something because I never made any recommendation; that was done in 1978 or something.

MR. NEARY: But you cannot deny it.

MR. YOUNG: I cannot deny it, but I do not know anything about conflict of interest, and who owns the buildings, But I did read the Public Accounts Committee's Report and I thought it was very favourable and exonerated us in the Department of Public Works in every way.

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

MR. NEARY: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman does not understand the British system of parliamentary government. You do not say I am not responsible for something. When you are a minister, and the hon. gentleman is a minister, he is responsible for the actions of his predecessor.

MR. DINN: What did Mr. Mifflin say?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wish the representative of Newfoundland Telephone Company would just keep quiet.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman said that he read the report of the Public Accounts Committee. Is the hon. gentleman aware that the report of the Public Accounts Committee has not yet been compiled? So how could he read the report of the Public Accounts Committee. That is still in the process.

MR. SIMMS: Transcript.

MR. NEARY: Oh, he read the transcript. He has not read the report, he read the transcript. Well that is a different matter. Well then if the hon. gentleman read the transcript, he would have seen during the testimony that was taken that a director of the Heritage Foundation, who recommended to government that they rent space down at the Murray Premises, was also a director of the leasing company of which Mr. Ryan, the provincial co-ordinator for the Tory Party, is president. Mr. Speaker, I am asking the hon. gentleman if he has looked at the possibility of a conflict of interest in that situation?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I did read the report. I know it was not the report that was tabled in the House but I read the evidence that was given at the public hearings that transcript, and I feel that I do not have to question the Director of the Heritage Committee or anything like that, no more than the hon. member is responsible. I presume that he is washing his hands clear of the Mifflin Report as far as I am concerned. You know, I mean, I do not know anything about it. So that is all I can say, Sir.

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

MR. HISCOCK: My question is also to the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young). The Auditor General asked the question with regard to rented space why was it not fitted-up on a more timely basis rather than paying \$500,000 for unoccupied space for the period of thirty-five months? Now that we have spent \$500,000 on this and it is still not occupied, is the Minister of Public Works and Services going to have his officials and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) look into having some of this money reclaimed and brought back to the treasury of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is beating a dead horse to death, that is all he is doing, because everything is explained in that report. The Department of Public Works did get a six month lease. As I understand from the officials who are doing up this museum it takes anywhere from four to probably ten years before the place will be ready to be occupied. And I do not know if any of the hon. gentlemen over on the other side have any colleagues or any friends of theirs who will give us vacant space to fix-up for five or ten years without paying any rent. If so I will gladly accept their offer.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: The Minister of Public Works just said it may go on for six or ten years. Is so are we are going to continue to pay another \$2 million or \$3 million? Is that

MR. HISCOCK: what the minister is saying? Under this government, was a cost analysis done that we could provide space for this museum? Why was it moved from the 11th floor anyway?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, wherever the hon. member was storm bound he is not up with Newfoundland times and, apparently he does not know nothing about Labrador. He was storm bound or something down there. If the hon. member would read it all he would know it takes at least six or eight years to prepare a place for a museum. But I must tell the hon. member that the place is ready to be opened partially sometime in June of this year. Things have been going ahead and the curator of the museum says that it cannot be ready until then. We had to pay for the space the minute we went in there to start renovating. The tender has been let and everything like that and it all should be ready. I am sure the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) can explain more about it. I do not know nothing about museums. Probably some of the other members will be over there in due time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HISCOCK: The Auditor General ended up questioning the fact that it was rented.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: The Auditor General questioned the fact that we ended up renting this under a \$500,000 contract instead of doing it more timely. Is the tender

MR. HISCOCK: now sealed so that if it is done in six or ten years we will continue to spend this money and violate the Tendering Act, Mr. Speaker, or are we going to try to get some of this money back and -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: - renegotiate? If it is going to take another six years, another four months or another three years, are we going to renegotiate the contract so that it will be on a timely basis and not on the amount of months that is involved?

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I understand the hon. member was a former schoolteacher, but he does not know anything about the heritage of Newfoundland and getting museums ready. It takes time

MR. YOUNG: Everything is all ready, we are all ready to go. If you want the answer to the question, we are all ready to go. In June it will be opened, although I think the second floor probably will not be opened for another couple of years. They have to get architects and stuff done, statues and clothing done. I do not know what they have to do. If I knew that I would be down there in charge of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: But, you know, as regards to getting money back, Mr. Speaker, probably the only way that I can get money back is I have about 60,000 copies of Our Case and Canada's Happy Province. I might put them on sale and get a few dollars back, but that is all I can do, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HISCOCK: A final question to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: With regards to the tender for this museum, when we decided to move it out from the eleventh floor to the Murray Premises, was the possibility of calling a tender looked at for some other space? Why was the Murray Premises itself picked? And was this put up on tender for this amount of space?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I understand there was a proposal put forward by the Newfoundland Heritage Foundation that in order to preserve the building down there, the Murray Premises, and to obtain a \$500,000 grant from the federal government, they had to have an anchor tenant in

MR. YOUNG: there. And the government of that day, the Cabinet of that day in their wisdom said, 'Yes, we will go ahead and we will rent space.' They felt it was advisable and this is what was done. The location, the Murray Premises would have been demolished, it was ready for the hammer and so forth. And if the hon. gentleman has any worries at all, and if he wants to go down there as a bellboy I will gladly get him a position down there so he can knock and hammer and talk to the statues.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). In light of the Auditor General's assertion yesterday on the magnitude of the accrued liability of the four pension plans administered by the Province of \$500.9 million, and the fact that the Auditor General stated that the future financial stability of these plans might be in jeopardy through the fact that the Department of Finance has been deferring the future pension costs that are accruing to the future, will the minister say if he is willing to submit these four pension plans to a commission for intensive study as was recommended by the Auditor General?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we are very conscious of the need to do something about the pension liabilities of this Province. I would remind hon. members that in 1980 we created a pension fund that had never been created in this Province before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: That was a very positive step.

The last actuarial study was done in 1977. They are very extensive studies, they are quite expensive studies, they are done periodically, at roughly

DR. COLLINS: five year intervals. So there will be another actuarial study done in the very near future because the last one was done in 1977 and it needs updating.

MR. SIMMS: A good answer.

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

MR. HODDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I understand according to the Auditor General that liability was estimated to be \$500.9 million in 1977. I would like the minister to give some indication - he probably cannot give a specific figure-as to what that liability is at the present time. And I would ask the minister at the same time whether he would consider the possibility of no longer making the provincial pension plan mandatory, because there is always the chance, or that leaves the opportunity for people who work in the civil service of this Province to take advantage of other pension plans such as those offered by the private sector. At the present time they are mandatory. In light of the fact, that we have \$81 million in the pension plan at the present time with an unknown amount as a liability, would the minister consider that move, to make the Civil Service Pension Plan to be not mandatory?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any sentiment in the public service that that be done, that the pension plan not be mandatory. As a matter of fact, when plans are brought, as they have been, into the overall Public Service Pension Plan, the members can make an election to stay with their previous plan or come in under the umbrella plan, and to my knowledge there have been very, very few, if any, who have elected to stay out of the Public Service Pension Plan.

Up until 1980, the payouts for pensions was totally out of the Consolidated Funds.

DR. COLLINS: Now most of the payouts are out of the pension fund that we have set up and I think the scheme is working very well to date. I am not saying that we will not find differences when this new actuarial study is done, I am sure we will. I cannot give any figure to it because the study has not been done, obviously, but to date I think our pension arrangements are as satisfactory as they possibly could be at this point in time.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell the House why his department continues to defer to the future pension costs that are accruing presently at such a significant rate?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure in saying this that no province in this country has a fully funded Public Service Pension Plan because the only way that you would not defer your payouts would be to have a fully funded pension plan. And I am absolutely sure on this point, that no province has a fully funded pension plan.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the fact still remains of a liability of perhaps \$700 million or \$800 million. The government has a liability of \$500.9 million dating to April, 1977, to people who are presently in the public service.

Would the minister tell me are there other alternatives to the current practice

MR. HODDER: of deferring these costs to the future? Has the minister considered any way that he can guarantee that the retirement incomes of employees retiring in the future are secure and that they are under no risk whatsoever? Certainly, the figures here would give praise to

MR. J. HODDER: one who is looking into the future.

I might add that the pension plans across Canada generally are in trouble and under review. We are facing a larger and larger payout on those pension plans. Would he assure the House and the people of the Province that this will be looked into and their pensions are safe?

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member needs that assurance, I am sure that I can give it quite unequivocally. Anyone in the public service or anyone who is depending on the provincial government of this Province, if they are depending on the provincial government of any province, or if they are depending on the national government of Canada in regard to the pensions, I think they can be fully reassured that their pensions will be met in the future.

I think what the member is getting at is what is the method of meeting it. The method can change, and that is why we are going to have the study to see if we should change our method bit, but there is absolutely no doubt that their pensions will be met by all governments.

MR. W. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question or two for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). It relates to the Auditor General's Report, page 25 and 26, Paragraph 36, Mr. Speaker, Continuing weaknesses in control over government air services and recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee not implemented.

"In previous Reports," Mr. Speaker, "the Auditor General has commented on the serious lack of control by the Department of Transportation over the payment of public funds" - taxpayers dollars - "for air services."

MR. W. CALLAN: And the Auditor General, on page 26, goes on to talk about these weaknesses. So let me ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), Mr. Speaker, because I am sure the minister does not need any further background on it, in view of the Auditor General's serious and repeated recommendations, does the minister intend to bring about the necessary changes and controls that the Auditor General talks about regarding air services?

MR. R. DAWE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, the department has done a number of things over the years to improve the accounting procedures with this and other aspects of the department, but specifically as it relates to the matter the member from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) asked, it is clearly explained in the responses, the departmental responses, to the Audit General's Report and it is there for him to read.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I have read them.

Now, let me ask the minister how does the minister explain and how does the minister justify the Minute of Council, the minute of the lily-white Cabinet of May, 1982, which said, 'no records be maintained,' even though the Auditor General on repeated occasions had insisted that accurate complete detailed records should be kept, especially when there are overpayments of hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers money?

MR. W. CALLAN:

The Cabinet says in May of 1982,
'no records be maintained as to the purpose of flights
or the passengers travelling on Government owned or Government
contracted aircrafts. Such policy to be effective henceforth.'
How does the minister explain and justify that Minute of
Council, Mr. Speaker?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated previously, the department's explanations to the Auditor General's comments are enclosed in a booklet that all members of the hon. House have, and I am sure the hon. member has it and he has read it. And if that information is not sufficient, there is a procedure which he can follow to solicit additional information.

MR. CALLAN: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, in the vagueness of the minister's answers, there is a clear demonstration that here there is a cover-up. Let me ask the minister could he tell us how much of the \$7 million - close to \$8 million; \$7,891,000 - which was spent on air services was spent in last Spring's general election flying Tory workers and Tory candidates around from one part of the Province to the other? Is that the reason why the Premier and his Cabinet want to cover up? Is that why they are not documenting? Is that why?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that was so obvious that I heard it expounded from every one of my colleagues on this side - zero.

MR. NEARY: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Attorney General, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), who is also Attorney General -

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Minister of Finance is not the Attorney General.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He did not know the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) yesterday, now it is the Minister of Finance today.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, if I was the hon. gentleman I would be very worried that Mobil is going to thumb their noses at the hon. gentleman, that they are not going to bring the rigs to shore. The hon. gentleman knows that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman is testy. The hon. gentleman is so testy today because they are snubbing their nose at him.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Time for the Question Period has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER:

Being Private Members' Day, we shall proceed with Motion 18 to be moved by the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, could I ask you to keep the Premier quite?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!
The Chair has recognized the hon. member for Fogo and hon. members both to my left and right seem to insist that he not be given the opportunity to speak.

The hon. member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I suppose nobody need stand in this House and talk about the importance of a resolution on the fishery. It is probably our most important industry in the Province. It is our most important industry in the Province bar none. It will be our most important industry in this Province for years to come and

MR. TULK: perhaps forever, because Newfoundland was built on fish, and will continue to grow according to how the fishery goes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like though to point out some of the statistics that tell us exactly just how important the fishery is. If you look, as I did this yesterday, I think, Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech, and I will continue to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, can we have some quietness, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, of our employed labour force in the Province, 23.9 per cent of it is in the fishery, employing approximately 30,000 to 35,000 people. If you look at the total catch value, Mr. Speaker, and try to figure out from that what the value to the Newfoundland economy is of the Newfoundland fishery, you can see that in 1979 the total catch value was \$155 million, and in 1980 it was \$157 million. Mr. Speaker, there is a telling statistic in 1981; there is a statistic in 1981 which tells us that the catch value of our fish in this Province declined. Mr. Speaker, it speaks for one of the things that we know is happening and that is that our fishery is being neglected and being run down by the present government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start off with the first "Whereas" in this resolution. I want to get into the first "Whereas" in this resolution. We want and we are determined on this side that the Province will accept its responsibilities. We are determined that the people of this Province will know what their responsibilities are. The Premier can stand on the other side of the House all he likes, he can sit in the seat all he likes and go on with nonsense about, "I do not have control of the stocks, therefore

MR. TULK: I do not have control of the processing industry." We know that that is nonsense. He does have control of the processing industry. It is the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), I will repeat it again, it is the Minister of Fisheries in this Province who decides whether a plant is going to close. It is the Minister of Fisheries who decides whether a plant is going to open. It is the Minister of Fisheries in this Province who issues and takes away processing licences. Let that be clear: The minister has the ability to open and close a plant.

The Premier, as I said yesterday, came into the House and said, "Look, I have no control of the stocks, therefore I can have no control of the processing sector." Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a question that the Premier has to answer. Government from 1977 to 1983 has issued every processing licence in this Province, every processing licence. They tried to keep one from St. Anthony but they got the flick on that one; that plant was going to be open anyway. And therefore they are responsible for every plant that is in this Province because you cannot operate, and there is nobody going to build a fish plant in this Province unless they have an operating licence, a processing licence. Those licences were issued by this government.

So they are primarily responsible for the number of plants. And if there is an over capacity in the processing sector of the fishing industry, then the provincial government is responsible. They have to accept their share of responsibility. They have to accept their responsibility for the number of plants in this Province. They had jurisdiction then, Mr. Speaker, without stock control, they have jurisdiction now. Let us not have any of that nonsense.

MR. TULK:

Let me point out something else.

How many times have we heard the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) stand in his place in this House and threaten that unless certain processing companies did certain things he was going to take away their processing licences? He was going to take away their processing licence. Why is he not saying to Fishery Products now, "Unless you open up the fish plant in Burin, if you close the fish plant in Burin," why is not the Provincial Minister of Fisheries saying, "I am going to take your licence."

MR. TOBIN:

Why do not the federal government step in like they did in St. Anthony.

MR. TULK: Why is he not saying, 'I am going to take your licence?' We will get to the federal government, make no mistake about that, but your job is in this House. The minister's job is in this House. Make no mistake about that, the minister's job is in this House and you cannot hide behind smokescreens. And I do not believe the hon. member will. I do not believe he is going to try. But this fellow down here has been hiding behind smokescreens for years.

Mr. Speaker, let us see what is happening now. Let me paint a scenario for my friend, the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). Let me paint a scenario for him of what the minister is up to. I think he knows. What is the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) up to right now with the present crisis on the South Coast? Mr. Speaker, you can write the script. The minister is sitting in his chair here and in his office, and wherever else he happens to be, and they are saying, 'We are not responsible because we have no control of the stocks. We are co-operating with our federal colleagues.' Now, Mr. Speaker, just imagine that government co-operating with anybody, especially the federal government. You can have the Premier stand up and say in one breath, 'That crowd up in Ottawa - should I say 'That French crowd in Ottawa?' - 'that crowd in Ottawa' and at the same time you have the Minister of Fisheries who says, 'Oh, yes, I am co-operating. I am co-operating with the Kirby Task Force.' Yes, he is. He goes to Ottawa, the Premier goes to Ottawa and he says to the federal Minister of Fisheries, 'Now whatever you decide, that is quite alright with us. We will go along with it. Just let us know in a few days. All you have to do is just tell us what you are going to do. Just let us know.' And the reason, Mr. Speaker, is

MR. TULK: quite clear. He has no plan of action himself. And now, the fellow that says, 'that Ottawa crowd' is allowing them to grab their jurisdiction, to grab the jurisdiction of the Province because he does not want to deal with the problem.

But that is not really what the Fisheries Minister is up to in this Province. That is not really what the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is trying to do. He is waiting for the restructuring of the Kirby Task Force. This is how responsible he is being about this matter, this crisis that is on the South Coast, the crisis in the fishing industry. He is waiting for the restructuring that he thinks is going to come from the Kirby Task Force. And it is going to come. Then he is going to say, 'Well, I have co-operated. I went along, did the best that I could. I co-operated with them, indeed I did. But look what they have done!' He is trying to have his cake and eat it too and, Mr. Speaker, we are politicians in this House and that is politics, that is partly politics. But, as we saw today, surely both sides of this House can agree on something that is of vital importance, regardless of your political stripe can agree on something that is of vital importance to this Province. We did it today with the seal fishery, with the Sea Shepherd, with the CBC camera crews. But why is not the minister doing the same kind of thing? Why is he not presenting a plan to Ottawa, presenting a plan to this House, and then saying, 'Alright, let us ask for support'? I asked him yesterday in the House if there was one community in this Province that he was going to allow to die. I asked him was he against any fish plants closing in this Province and what fish plants. He refused to answer. And he is responsible for the

MR. TULK: processing industry, the
shut-down and the opening up of plants in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I read today in
the paper where the member for Burin - Placentia West
(Mr. Tobin) commented on centralization.

MR. TULK: He is absolutely right. Make no mistake about that: What we are seeing on the South Coast - what we may be seeing on the South Coast; we are not certain - what we may be seeing on the South Coast is the virtual elimination of whole communities moving them somewhere else, moving people out of their homes. That is exactly what we may be seeing. And yet that minister, that provincial minister refuses to do what has to be done. It is centralization through the backdoor, make no mistake about that: The member is absolutely right.

But somebody has to tell this gentleman, this Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), to get off his rear end and to present a plan of action for the processing sector of this industry, for the fishing industry in this Province. Rather than getting on shooting off his mouth all of the time on television and radio about some little exciting issue, why does he not present a plan of action for the processing sector of the fishery to this House and have it debated?

Then, Mr. Speaker, we will pick holes in it. That is what we are here for, to pick holes in it. But if it is the kind of plan that is going to keep rural Newfoundland alive, we will agree with it. Make no mistake about that. He is playing politics, Mr. Speaker, and waiting for the Kirby Task Force so he can try to have his cake and eat it too. That is not good enough, because what he is saying is 'To hell with the South Coast! To hell with the people of Newfoundland!' That is exactly what he is saying.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn to the second WHEREAS. I think the truth of the second WHEREAS in this resolution is self-evident. It says "WHEREAS the processing and marketing components of the industry are in the worst

MR. TULK: mess in the history of the Newfoundland fishery." Mr. Speaker, absolutely nobody can deny that 'the processing and marketing sectors of the industry are in the worst mess in the Newfoundland history.'

Yet we have the most costly Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), I would say, in my opinion, that this Province has ever seen. He spends his time travelling. As a matter of fact, last Spring I stuck the name of the Harlem Globe Trotter on him. He should join the Harlem Globe Trotters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that in all the efforts that minister has put out, if he has put out any - the Premier told us yesterday he was worn out; even the minister got embarrassed, Mr. Speaker - I do not believe that that minister has sold a cod's tail, so to speak. I do not believe he has. I do not believe he has done anything to sell fish from this province.

The best that he can do when somebody reminds him that there is a crisis in the marketing sector of the industry is to stand in his place in the House or say to the media, mostly to the media, that if the fish companies do not perform then he is going to act. Those are his favourite, word over and over and over. We have heard this Fisheries Minister (Mr. Morgan) for years stand in this House and say, now if they do not do something, if the fish companies do not do something then I am going to act, and that gets the minister off the hook once more.

Mr. Speaker, the third WHEREAS of this resolution mentions some communities that are threatened probably on the South Coast of this Province - not all of them - and it does not mention all of the communities that are threatened in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, I have already said what is going to happen to those communities.

MR. B. TULK: I want to do one thing in this House in this resolution today and that is to congratulate and encourage the people from those communities - the people of Harbour Breton, the people of Fermeuse, the people of Burin, St. Lawrence, Trepassey, Gaultois, Ramea, Grand Bank and wherever else they are facing the closedown of an industry. I want to assure those people in those communities that we on this side stand behind them regardless of the restructuring of the Kirby Task Force whatever that might be - and I have no way of knowing. Perhaps it is good that you do not know because we believe on this side of the House that their problems can be solved. We believe that the South Coast can become, over time perhaps, but can become a viable operating fishing community once again. Mr. Speaker, we say that for a number of reasons, we support and encourage those people for a number of reasons: First of all what is happening on the South Coast and in the rest of the communities in this Province is not something that is of the makings of the people, not that at all. In 1977 we drew this line on the map and said that is the 200 mile fishing limit. All at once we thought that because we had drawn a line on a map that there were numerous fish stocks. We did not sit back and say, 'Well, look, we have to wait for those stocks to increase.' We did not say that at all. We did not say that we should develop the processing sector of the industry according as the stocks increase, not at all. We said, 'Everybody is going to be rich, everybody get into the fishery,' and they did. Now the same government that issued the processing licences and the same government in Ottawa that made the DREE grants available, the two fisheries ministers, federal and provincial, encourage the people of this Province to build plants, to build more boats, the same people, the same government in this Province that issued the processing licences and put our people in the state that

MR. B. TULK: they are in, are now saying to them, 'No, we are going to close down your community. We are going to shut down your community.' The same company that in August of this year put a flyer - I think the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) will know whether I am right or wrong - the same company that put a flyer into the Burin fish plant praising it as, I believe it was called, the backbone of Fishery Products - no, the flagship of Fishery Products - Burin was called in August of 1982 the flagship of Fishery Products; that is, their most productive plant, their flagship - that same company today, unhindered by this government is telling the people of Burin, 'Look, we are going to close down your community, you are no longer going to have a community; not only are you no longer going to have a fish plant, you are no longer going to have a community.' Now, Mr. Speaker, we on this side do not accept that. I want to point out one other thing, and it is an idea I believe that is very important to the South Coast of this Province, and that is the idea that the Tail and Nose of the Grand Bank has to come under Canadian jurisdiction if we are going to increase those stocks. I noticed that that was in the Throne Speech.

MR. TULK: We have advocated that concept for some time and one of the long-term things that has to be done for the South coast of this Province is that the Tail and Nose of the Grand Banks have to be brought under Canadian jurisdiction and Canadian management.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): About five minutes.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I want, if I can, talk about the fourth "whereas" of this resolution, which deals with incomes and the cost to fishermen fishing in this Province. As I said before, in 1977 the people of this Province were told by their government, by the Province, by the then Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Walter Carter, "Get into the fishery. Get rich." That was the idea, 'Get into the fishery and get rich.' He made everybody, people who were fishing and not fishing, believe that that was the way it was going to be. And, Mr. Speaker, the consequences of that are the same as we see happening today in the oil industry in this Province - if there is an oil industry in this Province any more. But, Mr. Speaker, the same thing happened. Many people got into the fishery over their heads in the same way they are now getting into the oil industry over their heads. Speculation. The price of gear and equipment from 1977 to 1979 tripled. The price of a simple gill net, a simple web for a gill net increased from \$11.00 a web to something like \$33.00 to \$35.00.

MR. STAGG: It should be eliminated.

MR. TULK: I agree.

MR. TULK: The price of equipment: Fishermen have been scald left, right and centre in this Province because somebody believes the government is paying for it, not realizing that it is really the fishermen. You can go into stores in this Province and you can find examples of where an item here is twice the cost of another item there. Mr. Speaker, the Fishermen's Union and the Opposition in this Province, in committee and elsewhere for the last three or four years, have been bringing that to the attention of this minister. And, Mr. Speaker, what have we got? We still have the same situation. On top of all that, the price of fish stayed virtually the same. Consequently many of our fishermen's profits are lower and they are just not making it in this industry.

MR. STAGG: What about the seal hunt?

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, for the education of the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) let me move for one minute to the seal fishery - he needs it. What has happened to it? We have carried on a media fight which we are going to lose, we are going to lose the media fight. We cannot win because when some bleeding hearts perhaps in this country and in Europe and in other countries of the world see some blood on the ice, they automatically become upset. So we are probably going to lose that. We are probably going to lose that fight. We have probably lost it already. I agree with the minister that we should go all the way and take away the EEC quotas. No problem. I agree with him that we have to back our sealers when we get our own CBC cameras on boats and all the rest of it. But the provincial government has not done its homework.

MR. TULK: It has not tried to set up the processing of seal products in this Province. It has not tried to get the finished product, Mr. Speaker, which can be sold. It has not tried to convince Newfoundlanders that they should buy seal products. It has not done it. It has not tried to find markets. What better place in this world to start a seal processing industry, whether it be a home industry or a large scale manufacturing industry, than Fogo Island? What better place? It is in the middle of the seal herds. Why do we not really do something practical? Why do we not try to sell a pair of sealskin boots, a pair of sealskin mittens? Why do we not sell sealskin change purses? Would somebody in this House tell me why I am today wearing something made out of leather from somewhere else? I will tell you why. Because as far as I know - and I looked last week - you cannot buy a pair of sealskin boots in this Province! You cannot buy them!

PREMIER PECKFORD: You can.

MR. TULK: Tell me where.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Plum Point.

MR. TULK: I will have a pair. You cannot buy a pair of sealskin boots. The government has not done its job. Mr. Speaker, this Fall I wrote to the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) a couple of letters outlining to him those things. Mr. Speaker, those letters are available and I think it makes sound common sense that we proceed in that way.

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

MR. WARREN: By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

Now we are going to hear it.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) said, 'Now we are going to hear it,' I would like to say that I am very pleased, as a matter of fact it is indeed a pleasure to sit and listen to the Opposition finally speak on the fishery that is in such complete chaos in this Province. We have been sitting in this House now since last week, Mr. Speaker, and finally we have seen the Opposition address the problems of the fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

I do not believe that this gentleman is intentionally misleading this House but I would remind him that yesterday most of Question Period in this House was taken up with the topic of the fishery.

MR. SIMMS:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order. The hon. member is taking an opportunity to try to defend the position that his Party has taken on a particular issue, that is all.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. It is merely a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. member for Burin -
Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, it is nice to see that the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), whose nerve, obviously was hit by the comments that I made, him being the critic for the Opposition on the fisheries, had the time to run into the House

March 9, 1983

Tape No. 155

SD - 3

MR. TOBIN: to try to clarify and cover up
the position, and then exit again.

However, Mr. Speaker, let me say to
the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) that as I

MR. TOBIN: I read this resolution he has presented, I believe the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, when he began to draft this resolution, there is no doubt in my mind that he was sincere, Mr. Speaker, and probably on the right track. However, as we read the first paragraph, Mr. Speaker, the first "whereas", "The processing sector of the fishing industry is a provincial jurisdiction under the power and authority of the Provincial Minister of Fisheries." (Mr. Morgan).

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is right on, dead on, Mr. Speaker. I do not know of anyone who has denied that, Mr. Speaker. I know that according to the powers that we do have in the fisheries that if the federal government had that one they would have them all. However, I would like to say that I believe the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) was so accurate on this point that he probably researched it himself.

However, Mr. Speaker, he goes on to say in paragraph (2), "And whereas the processing and market components of the industry are in the worse mess in the history of the Newfoundland fishery! and whereas the communities of Harbour Breton, Fermeuse, Burin, St. Lawrence, Trepassey, Gaultois, Ramea, Grand Bank and others face social and economic extinction because of the virtual closedown of the fishing industry," well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the intention of the hon. member of the party opposite is, I think that when we are going to address the situation of the fisheries in this Province we have to certainly speak and put everything in perspective, the whole kit and caboodle, so to speak, of the fisheries must be put in place, and not just deal with certain sectors of the industry. You know, we can talk about processing all day, Mr. Speaker, but what are we going to process in the plants if the federal government does

MR. TOBIN: not live up to their responsibility?
Cabbage?

MR. BAIRD: Give it away to the Europeans.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, I think we should probably stop here and just go back to that marketing processing component again.

MR. WARREN: Do you agree with the resolution?

MR. TOBIN: What is that?

MR. WARREN: Do you agree with the resolution?

MR. TOBIN: I certainly agree with parts of the resolution.

MR. WARREN: Are you going to vote for it?

MR. TOBIN: If you want to stay in the House and listen you shall hear. I have got twenty minutes to speak unless you have changed the rules of the House.

MR. WARREN: Are you going to vote for it?

MR. TOBIN: I will vote as my conscience dictates I vote.

MR. WARREN: So you are going to vote for the resolution?

MR. TOBIN: I will vote as my conscience dictates I vote, not to hide in the blemish and the light of the fickle.

MR. WARREN: It is a good resolution.

MR. TOBIN: - five that you support in Ottawa.

MR. SIMMS: Boy, what a vicious attack!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, I would say that the fishing industry in this Province is in the worse mess that it has ever been in, and I would suggest that the federal government, and I think we should be honest with ourselves, I would suggest that the federal government has - what? - eighty or ninety per cent responsibility for that when you put it all in perspective. It is, Mr. Speaker, disheartening to say the least. And I would say that we should be honest with one another, be honest with ourselves, Mr. Speaker, and be honest with the people of this Province; the problems that are surrounding the fishing industry are as complex as they are numerous and there is no simple solution to them. I think we must all address ourselves to that, there is no simple solution to the problem. However, in order to deal with them they must be identified, and in doing this you would be surprised to find, Mr. Speaker, that plants at Harbour Breton, Fermeuse, Burin, St. Lawrence, Gaultois, Ramea are being closed down, and Trepassey and Grand Bank, some other people say, are on the verge of the same disaster. It is hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, that these are being closed down, hundreds, thousands of people being thrown out of work,

MR. TOBIN: not because of the world-wide economic crisis and not through any lack of effort on the part of the provincial government. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the main cause of this problem is a shortage of marketable species of fish which can be landed economically.

Mr. Speaker, the area which I represent, the Burin Peninsula - and I have said it before and I say it again, - that the Grand Banks, Mr. Speaker, was no strange place to the people of the Burin Peninsula. For hundreds of years more schooners sailed out from the Burin Peninsula and fished those Grand Banks than probably anywhere else in this Province. However, Mr. Speaker, these people kept on advancing and finally it was these people who pioneered the deep sea fishery as we all see it and as it is today.

Mr. Speaker, as one reflects back to the days when our forefathers sailed to the Grand Banks in their fishing schooners, and look at what they thought then, Mr. Speaker, with the fish that was there, in those days it would have been impossible, absolutely impossible, to envisage the day when there would be a shortage of fish on the Grand Banks.

MR. STAGG: You will have to get the federal Liberals involved before we have a shortage of fish on the Grand Banks.

MR. TOBIN: That is exactly true, and I was going to come to that point, Mr. Speaker. But who could ever imagine the day that the plant in Burin would be closed? The fish plant in Burin, Mr. Speaker, the father of all fish plants in this Province, the place that pioneered the deep sea fishery!

MR. TULK: The father of Fishery Products.

MR. TOBIN: No doubt in my mind, the place that created Fishery Products. As I said the other day, Mr. Speaker, the people who made Fishery Products synonymous with the deep sea fishery, no doubt in my mind, absolutely correct.

But, Mr. Speaker, who could envisage the day that these places, the most prolific fishing grounds in the world, could not have met the total requirements of our needs for eternity when you look at what was on the Grand Banks in those days?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, I think that as I read about the fisheries and study about the fisheries, particularly since I got involved in politics - I certainly have no great difficulty admitting that I am a novice in this field and what I am saying is what I believe in, Mr. Speaker, from the research that I have done - but I believe that one of the major problems in the fishery is that in the post-war period, after Newfoundland's entry into Confederation with Canada, control of our fishery was transferred from St. John's to Ottawa. That, Mr. Speaker, is where the problem lies. Unfortunately, the significance of this industry was not recognized by the Canadian Government and the deep sea fishery was neglected.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the greatest neglect on the part of the federal government was not to take action. It was the failure of the federal government to take action against the foreign nations which depleted our fish stocks. It was not until 1977, after some fish species had become commercially extinct and others had become close to it, that the Canadian Government eventually declared the 200 mile

MR. TOBIN: fishing limit.

Had the federal government heeded the warnings and acted upon the pleas of the Newfoundland fishing industry ten years earlier, many of today's problems would not even exist.

MR. TULK: You are hiding behind a smokescreen.

MR. TOBIN: I am hiding behind a smokescreen? So, Mr. Speaker, the member for Fogo is saying that there is no problem. Are you suggesting that the 200 mile limit should not have been declared?

MR. TULK: No, indeed I am not.

MR. G. TOBIN: Well, he certainly left that interpretation, Mr. Speaker. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, thank God in Ottawa at that time we had as a member, Mr. Speaker, a very distinguished gentleman in the person of the hon.

Don Jamieson. Thank God, Mr. Speaker, that we are not represented in the federal Cabinet by what we have got today, Mr. Speaker. We know where we would be. We would be in deep trouble if Mr. Rompkey had to stand up and fight in the federal Cabinet for anything for this Province. We know where we would be.

MR. B. TULK: Get on about this Province.

MR. TOBIN: When Ottawa finally did wake up to the fact that the East coast fishery was in trouble, did they take the appropriate action to rebuild the industry, Mr. Speaker, in a business and sensible-like manner? The answer is no. Instead they chose to use the industry partly as a trade-off tool with foreign countries and partly as a political tool to enhance the political fortunes of his own party members.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution clearly states the marketing component is in a great mess. And let me just say that for those who have the mistaken impression that marketing efforts by the Newfoundland industry are at fault, let us look at the facts. The facts, Mr. Speaker, is the quality of Newfoundland fish has risen to the point where it is considered by many US buyers to be as good, Mr. Speaker, or better than that of our main competitors, Iceland and Norway.

MR. TULK: What about the advertising?

MR. TOBIN: What about the advertising? When the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) of this Province decides to travel, Mr. Speaker, to promote, to advertise Newfoundland fish products, why does the

MR. G. TOBIN: hon. gentleman call him, Mr. Speaker?

The Great Globe Trotter. Yes, Mr. Speaker, you cannot have your cake and eat it too. You have got to face the facts. For too long you have hid behind and stood up and supported the federal people when they were trying chaos in our industry. We know where the Newfoundland government stands, Mr. Speaker.

MR. B. TULK: They stand nowhere.

MR. TOBIN: These are the facts of the matter, Mr. Speaker, as good or better than that of our competitors, Iceland and Norway, and there is absolutely no big problem in selling high grade Newfoundland fish in the American market. The problem is the availability of sufficient quantity to meet the market requirements. Mr. Speaker, we want to look further on that. In a recent edition of the British newspaper Fish Trader, within the last six or seven months, a headline reads Canada's finest comes to Britain. The article continues: 'During the last four and a half years Fishery Products has worked hard at improving its products to achieve the quality that buyers in the UK are used to from other sources.'

MR. H. ANDREWS: Exactly. We should tell the world that.

MR. TOBIN: That is right.

So, advertising, Well, what is this if it is not advertising? Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. gentleman suggests about advertising, probably we can hear from him. Probably he would suggest sending Mr. Rompkey across the world to advertise for Newfoundland Products.

MR. TULK: He takes your minister with him.

MR. TOBIN: Yes, indeed, he does - and takes Newfoundland down with him as well.

MR. G. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, further to that in the article in News and Views, the Fisheries Products paper, 'the idea of directly linking assets to markets with allocations of Canadian fish stocks to foreign fishing interests is totally unacceptable to the East Coast trawling fishing industry.

MR. TOBIN: 'The East Coast trawler operators are facing serious difficulties due to a shortage of cod fish.

'In 1982 the foreign fleets were collectively allocated 63,160 tons or 126.32 million pounds of cod in Canadian waters. This has caused a two-prong detrimental effect. Firstly, it reduced the closure of certain plants with disastrous results. Secondly, it served to curtail efforts to make substantial inroads in European economic markets. While foreign nations continued to be permitted to fish Canadian waters, there is no incentive for them to relax tariff barriers against Canadian fish products.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, why are some of the plants closed in the Province? Again, Mr. Speaker, I like the way it was addressed by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). 'The fish processing industry is no different from any other enterprise which is dependent upon a natural resource. The key elements are a skilled and willing work force, an adequate supply of raw materials, efficient tools and equipment, and a market for the end products.' Does the hon. member disagree with that, I wonder, Mr. Speaker?

MR. TULK: Read it again, will you?

MR. TOBIN: Okay. 'The fish processing industry is no different from any other enterprise which is dependent upon natural resources. The key elements are a skilled and willing work force, an adequate supply of raw materials, efficient tools and equipment and a market for for the end product.'

MR. TULK: We said the same thing you are saying - no foreign quotas.

MR. TOBIN: Okay, Mr. Speaker, now he agreed with that. And they go on to say, 'In the case of Harbour Breton' - this is Fishery Products - 'in the case of Harbour Breton, two of these key elements are presently absent - raw materials and tools. The availability of

MR. TOBIN: marketable fish capable of being caught by the existing Harbour Breton trawler fleet is non-existent since the Gulf of St. Lawrence was placed out of bounds by federal regulations. In order to fish more distant waters from Harbour Breton, the fleet of eight side trawlers must be replaced.'

Mr. Speaker, I do not have time to get into the trawler fleets the way I want to. I certainly will be introducing my resolution, in two weeks time, I guess, at which time I want to emphasize that a lot more because, as the company says there, they want to increase the catching capacity of trawlers. And as we look at the Kirby Report, Mr. Speaker, the one-man threat, Recommendation 46 says, 'Do not provide direct special assistance for vessels acquisition or replacement but ensure that vessels can be purchased for the most economical source unhindered by tariff or other barriers.'

Mr. Speaker, on that recommendation, I say to hell with Kirby.

MR. TULK: 'The truth shall set you free.' Good!

MR. TOBIN: There is more than one industry in this Province, Mr. Speaker, there is more than one industry in this Province. Mr. Speaker, if the companies have to go out and build trawlers in this Province at the Marystown Shipyard, and import the steel, bring in the steel to build the trawlers with hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxes applied, Mr. Speaker, yet Kirby is saying to the fish companies, 'Go out, bring your boats in.' Well, there is another sector in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that must survive from the fishing industry and that relates to the work force of the Marystown Shipyard and I hope to get into that a lot deeper.

MR. TULK: . You do not agree with penalizing the fishermen for that, do you?

MR. TOBIN: No, that is Kirby's suggestion.

March 9, 1983

Tape No. 159

SD - 3

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, if we can go a little further into all of this, the fish plants and all that, why they were closed,

MR. TOBIN: let me just relate back to the situation at Burin. As I said to the hon. gentleman earlier, just a few days before they closed the Burin plant, Burin has continually been Fishery Product's most productive plant. This fact alone assures the continuation of the operation there. It goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "The management of Fishery Products salute the employees of the Burin plant but there is room for improvement. The company will be taking steps as soon as present problems blow over to upgrade the Burin plant. We are fully aware that these renovations are overdue and we have already begun the planning functions which must proceed the physical change to the plant. This indicates the confidence the company has in its employees". That is what Fishery Products said, Mr. Speaker. And as time is running out - 'And Whereas the Provincial Government has a Fisheries Department and Minister, both of which are functionally invisibly'. I cannot, Mr. Speaker, in all conscience support that. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), Mr. Speaker, along with the Premier, when the Burin situation developed, where were they Mr. Speaker? They were in Burin meeting with the action committee, trying to do something to help the people of Burin, not like the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and his leader did when they were down there. Do not tell me, Mr. Speaker, they went to play politics, the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries of this Province went to assist the people of Burin.

We made money. This government, Mr. Speaker, assisted the people of Burin to have a study done to ensure the viability of their plant.

MR. NEARY: Not true. That is not true.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. TOBIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, what about the

MR. TOBIN: people of Burin! Why did the people of St. Anthony get preferential treatment in the Kirby report? Why not the people of Burin? However, you support that type of action, You would stand behind Kirby and the Federal government when they divide this Province, when they stand up, Mr. Speaker, and support the people of St. Anthony and not the people of Burin. That is what you support, Mr. Speaker. Where is the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Premier of the Province right now? They are at meetings regarding the South coast fisheries, trying to do what they can to assist it. Do not tell me, Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By Leave.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has permission to continue, By Leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, it is too bad that the hon. member from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) did not get going before his time was up, but apparently, the hon. member failed to mention that it was only after the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and spokesman on Fisheries went to Burin, that the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier went down.

MR. TOBIN: A Point of Order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A Point of Order.

The hon. the member for Burin-Placentia West

MR. TOBIN: What the hon. gentleman is saying

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, is not the facts.

The Premier of this Province and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) were in Burin before the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and the spokesman for fisheries knew that a problem existed in Burin. And I would advise the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) that if he is going to speak in this House, he speak the facts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

It is really not a point of order. The truth is that I knew that Burin existed and I knew the Burin problem existed from day one. He is misleading the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

- MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order -
- MR. BAIRD: The former member for Burin used to be a colleague, did he not?
- MR. TULK: He is a nice fellow. He knew more about the fishing industry than you will ever know.
- MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
- MR. BAIRD: I had more salt water run over my eyeballs than you ever saw.
- MR. TULK: That is out on your yacht.
- MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
- To that point of order I rule there is no point of order, merely a difference of opinion between two hon. members.
- The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.
- MR. WARREN: I knew, Mr. Speaker, that when the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) started speaking that he had no intention of supporting this resolution.
- MR. TULK: Supporting his own people.
- MR. WARREN: He said he believed in the first four whereases, but as soon as the most crucial part of the resolution became evident, that the minister is functionally invisible, as soon as we mentioned about his colleague, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) -
- MR. TULK: He is not invisible, but he is functionally invisible.
- MR. WARREN: - the hon. member could not agree.
- Now, Mr. Speaker, every fisherman not only on the Burin Peninsula but in Bonavista Bay, in Trinity Bay, along the Labrador Coast, everywhere -
- MR. TULK: They are saying, "Where is he?"

MR. WARREN: - everyone is saying that the only thing the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) does is open his mouth.

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. WARREN: That is the only thing, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Fisheries does, open his mouth but very, very little action.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at this resolution in its totality and in summary I have to agree partially with what the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) said, that the federal government should be blamed for some of the inconsistencies. We on this side have agreed. We have said it in this House time and time again, in fact we have said it publicly, that the programmes that the federal government have implemented to better the fishing industry in this Province have just done the reverse, they have worsened it. And I would be the first to admit it, that the policies of the federal government are not in the best interest of fishermen in this Province.

MR. BAIRD: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, at the same time, and I would like for the hon. member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) to say hear, hear after this one, at the same time the policies of the provincial government, the policies of this provincial government are not in the best interest of the fishermen either.

MR. PATTERSON: For example?

MR. WARREN: For example. I thank the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) for asking me, for example. Here is the little blue book. We call it the fishermen's bible - or the minister's bible we will call it. Okay? That book is a guideline for the Provincial Department of Fisheries. It is a guideline.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, give me an example of what the Provincial Department of Fisheries has done not in the best interest of fishermen. And I would like to agree with the hon. member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) that I was, before I came into politics, I was a regional fisheries representative with the Provincial Department of Fisheries. At that time the minister was written -

MR. PATTERSON: Which department were you with?

MR. WARREN: The Provincial Department of Fisheries as a regional representative. At the same time during that year, Mr. Speaker, in May of 1979, a letter was written to the minister saying, "Look, Mr. Minister, one thing with the department that is going to be a step backwards for the fishermen in this Province is that you are almost demanding, you are telling the fishermen to get out of your small boat and go into the longliner."

MR. BAIRD: And the Liberals said nothing at all.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, this has caused a lot of hardship to the fishermen in this Province. And I am sure the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) will agree that one of the worst things that this provincial Department of Fisheries could do is encourage the inshore fishermen, the small fishermen in the twenty, twenty-five and thirty foot boat, "Look, boy, you are making good money and you can make more money. Why not buy a longliner?" And, Mr. Speaker, here is what is happening.

AN HON. MEMBER: And then give all the fish away to the -

MR. WARREN: I am coming to that. And at the same time as this was happening, Mr. Speaker, the federal government decided that foreign ships could come in and take our fish. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no co-operation between both levels of government. So both levels of government are to blame. Not just the federal government or not just the provincial government, but both levels of government. Let me just say that last year off Makkovik, just two miles outside of Makkovik, there were not one, not two, not three, not four, but five foreign draggers, or foreign ships anchored within two miles of the town of Makkovik purchasing Northern cod from longliner fishermen from this Province. And where was that fish taken? That fish was not taken into the fish plants in Labrador to be processed, it was not taken to the fish plants in St. John's, on the Southside of St. John's, it was not taken to Burin, to Fermeuse, Harbour Breton. Where was it taken?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Where? Where?

MR. WARREN: I will tell you where it was taken. It was taken right across the seas over to the European countries. That is where it was taken.

MR. DINN: Who gave the license?

MR. WARREN: And at the same time, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) stood up in this hon. House and said, "I support Mr. Cashin in having over-the-side sales."

AN HON. MEMBER: And what did you say?

MR. WARREN: I disagreed with it because we had a fish plant in Makkovik at that same time with sixty people ready to go to work but there was no work because the longliners from the Island portion of the Province were in there catching this fish and selling it to the Portuguese and sending it across to be processed. And, Mr. Speaker, one day last Summer myself and my wife had the opportunity of going aboard one of those boats for dinner. . And on this boat, Mr. Speaker, there were two Newfoundlanders, two Newfoundland people and every other person, Mr. Speaker, was of a foreign origin. And those two people, Mr. Speaker, were two people who were employed by the Fishermen's Union.

AN HON. MEMBER: What did you have for dinner?

MR. WARREN: Oh, the dinner was elaborate. It was a fantastic dinner.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did they serve fish?

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, let me also say that in Southern Labrador, down around Black Tickle off Black Tickle and off Smokey, the same blinking thing is happening. It is the federal government. And I disagree with them. I have said it publicly and I have said it in a written letter to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. DeBane), "Look, let us process what fish we can first in our own Province, in Harbour Breton, Burin and everywhere else, Nain or Makkovik, wherever the case where be, in Black Tickle. But

MR. WARREN: only after those plants are sufficiently supplied can we then ship our fish out, not before. And we are not doing this. And the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has agreed with Mr. Cashin, he has agreed with the federal government, and this is the worst step that the Minister of Fisheries could ever take, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not here now to defend himself.

MR. WARREN: That is right. He is not here to defend himself. I hope that one of your colleagues can tell him. All you need to do is get Hansard and you will see what the minister said, when he came in with a Ministerial Statement.

MR. DINN: During the glut.

MR. WARREN: That is right. During the glut. But there was no glut on the Labrador Coast at the time.

MR. BAIRD: When you were picking out (inaudible).

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at what will happen this year. Last year there were thirty-six longliners supplying those five Portuguese ships.

AN HON. MEMBER: Burn them!

MR. WARREN: This year, Mr. Speaker, it has already been anticipated—the Council in Makkovik has been told to be prepared—there could be anywhere from sixty to seventy Newfoundland longliners up fishing the Northern cod off Makkovik.

MR. YOUNG: What do you have against Newfoundlanders?

MR. WARREN: What do I have against Newfoundlanders? I am glad the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), who is supposed to be lilly white, should come up with such a statement, "What do you have against Newfoundlanders"? Here is a guideline

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:

What page?

MR. WARREN:

Page 11.

Mr. Speaker, let us see what it says now. I should get my notes there.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Are you reading?

MR. WARREN:

No, I am just getting some names, that is all. Here is what it says, "Eligibility requirements for a fisherman to qualify under the Inshore Fishing Gear programme". Here are the requirements - and I have said this now for the last three days, and I am going to say it until someone comes out and says, Look, the minister has performed his duties in an illegal manner.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is what it says, "A fisherman" - this is in the blue book, Every fisherman in the Province received it - "A fisherman must be a full-time fisherman." No problem there. "A fisherman must be a resident of Labrador in the region specified." Now, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Read it again.

MR. WARREN:

- the region specified was from Cape Henley to Cape Chidley. That is the region specified. And what happens? Let me read off six names.

AN HON. MEMBER:

From Cape Henley to where?

MR. WARREN:

- of six fishermen from Carbonear, and Harbour Grace. I might add, Carbonear and Harbour Grace who have received approval for monies under this programme that is for the Labrador fishermen.

MR. YOUNG:

Name them!

MR. WARREN:

Name the six fishermen? Yes, my friend, I will be only too glad to name them. The names are James Forward, Ross Green, Lorne Green - no Lloyd Green - Alfred Penney, Stanley Pye, and Winston Thorne, or Winston Thomas.

MR. YOUNG:

There is no one from Harbour Grace there.

March 9, 1983

Tape 163

PK - 3

MR. WARREN:

The Harbour Grace one is

Stanley Pye.

MR. YOUNG:

Stanley Pye only comes to

Harbour Grace in the Winter.

MR. WARREN:

Okay. Right. Only comes to

Harbour Grace in the Winter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is what is happening. Those are the fishermen, Mr. Speaker, from Newfoundland who go up to Labrador during the Summertime and fish and qualify, according to the minister, under this eligibility requiemment.

MR. DINN: They are residents up there, are they not?

MR. WARREN: No, they are not residents up there, Mr. Speaker, they are residents of where they vote and in the last election, I understand that both of those were on the voting list in Carbonear and Harbour Grace.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just look at some of the other things that are so important. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has caused the fishery to go into such a turmoil and such a collapse! And let us face it, the reason it did is because of the Ayatollah Premier who got up in 1979 and demanded that Newfoundland would have its day in the sun when we would have the offshore and we would have money rolling out of our pockets. And with that, the Minister of Fisheries said, 'Well, I will lay off fisheries now for awhile. We will forget about the fisheries and we will concentrate and put all our eggs in one basket, the oil basket. However, what did happen, Mr. Speaker? History is going to repeat itself in a few weeks time when the Supreme Court ruling comes down. But we have lost the most vital and most viable industry in our Province. We have lost it, Mr. Speaker, and now it is going to cost millions of dollars for both governments to get our fishery back on keel.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to try to concentrate on making a good speech while being interrupted by members on both sides.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Another thing, I do not mind kicking the federal government and here is one that is solely in the federal government's hands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I have only another five minutes.

Another problem, Mr. Speaker, is happening and is going to happen this year. Unless both the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) come up immediately with some regulations pertaining to longliner fishermen - Mr. Speaker, what is happening now all the way up the Labrador Coast and in places along the Newfoundland Coast, too, is that longliner fishermen have forty and fifty foot boats and the small independent fishermen with the eighteen and twenty foot boats are in on the shore line fishing the same area. Now, I believe the federal government, in conjunction with our Province, should come up with some stipulation saying to the longliner fishermen, 'At least move off the land. If you have a longliner you can go off further than a small inshore fisherman can go. Fish off there and let the inshore fishermen fish closer to the land.'

Mr. Speaker, last year there were all kinds of problems in Makkovik and along the Labrador Coast with this incidence and this year it is going to happen again. Not all longliners, I might add, but some longliner fishermen are going to be in placing their nets and gear right on top of the inshore fishermen's. And there has to be a zone, Mr. Speaker. Why should a person with a longliner and with a forty-five foot boat be expected or even have the knowledge and the understanding

MR. G. WARREN:

of saying, 'Okay, look the fish is there, I should go there'. He should move off and look for the fish elsewhere, Mr. Speaker. He has the capabilities, he has the equipment and he has the ship. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this government, the minister, although it is a federal matter, but he definitely should contact his federal counterpart who by the way, he says he is in bed with now, he is cheek to cheek and toe to toe.

AN HON. MEMBER: My colleague? My colleague?

MR. WARREN: If the minister is so cheek to cheek and toe to toe, and so and so and so and so, if the minister is so close to the federal minister I would suggest and, maybe some of his colleagues could pass the word along to him, that the least he can do is to sit down immediately, before the fishery season starts along the Labrador coast, and set up some guidelines for the longliner fishermen. If not this year - he is warned now - there are going to be confrontations, there are going to be problems between the inshore fishermen along the Labrador coast and the longliners from the Island. This has come out. I said the same thing last year. There were a couple of altercations last year and this year it will happen again if there are not some guidelines set up for the longliner fishermen and the small independent inshore fishermen. Mr. Speaker, I believe this is where our minister can act in the best interest of both types of fishermen. And no way should a longliner fish be allowed to put his nets on top of inshore fishermen's property. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I have to support this resolution. I believe at the present time the minister is functionally invisible and I believe, Mr. Speaker, we should make him visible. Here is an example of how the minister can become visible, Mr. Speaker. And by becoming visible -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. the members time has elapsed.

MR. G. WARREN: - I am sure he can meet with the federal minister, Mr. De Bane, and come up with a resolution for those inshore fishermen.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. STAGG: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STAGG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have some direction from the Chair in this matter that I want to raise. Is it right and proper, Mr. Speaker, to have an emergency Cabinet meeting going on over in the Government Common Room while the House is sitting? Is that right and proper? Or should the ministers be in there place?

MR. R. BAIRD: It does not make any difference if there is a quorum here.

MR. NEARY: It does make a big difference, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman does not understand how the parliamentary system works. It does make a difference. Should these ministers be in their place in this hon. House? Mr. Speaker, I would like some directions from the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. L. SIMMS: To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, obviously what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is now raising is not a point of order. A point of order has to do with a breach of the procedures in the House. This is certainly

March 9, 1983

Tape No. 165

MJ - 3

MR. L. SIMMS: not a breach of procedures in the House.

MR. S. NEARY: This is a breach of procedures.

MR. SIMMS: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) being a veteran of the House is well aware of it, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest to you that there is no point of order in this particular case.

MR. NEARY: Their first obligation is in their seats.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:

Mr. Speaker, I would presume

that my time has commenced.

MR. NEARY:

Would you qualify that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Do you want to get up on it?

MR. NEARY:

Pardon?

MR. SPEAKER:

Do you want to get up on it?

MR. NEARY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG:

Mr. Speaker, this resolution -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order!

To that point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, there are no references in our Standing Orders where people have to sit in their seats in the House. It is not a requirement. The people are in the area, but that even is not a requirement. As long as there is a quorum in the House the House can operate and that is the only rule that we have on it.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:

I thank you very much, Mr.

Speaker. You will notice that whenever I get up to speak the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is reluctant to have me enter into the debate because he is used to the problems that are encountered when I have assailed him in the past, so I guess this is just an anticipatory on his part to try to use up the time and to divert me from my role.

MR. STAGG:

Now, Mr. Speaker, this resolution-

MR. NEARY:

On a point of order, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

On a point of order, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, one of the rules

of this House, and I think it is a rule that Your Honour has enforced a good many times, is that you cannot attribute motives to hon. members of this House. The hon. gentleman just attributed a motive to my raising a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, that is unparliamentary. I raised that point of order in the interest -

MR. WARREN:

Name him! Name him!

MR. BAIRD:

It was a spurious point of order and you knew it.

MR. STAGG:

I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

Withdraw. Okay, the hon.

gentleman withdrew, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. gentleman for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:

If there was any imputation

of motives, it was accidental, Mr. Speaker, and certainly I will withdraw that. I do not want to encourage the hon. gentleman to get up on any more points of order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this resolution

on this most important subject that is continuously debated in the House of Assembly, the resolution related to the fishery,

if it were a sincere motion and if its motives were the furthering of the fishery as a productive enterprise in this Province, then I would see some reason in supporting it.

But this resolution is entirely political. This resolution is almost a personal attack upon the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

Now, the Minister of Fisheries is well-known. He is certainly not invisible in his role as Minister

MR. STAGG: of Fisheries.

MR. TULK: He is getting small.

MR. STAGG: He is one of the most visible of ministers. He is known world wide. Certainly within the Province his name is on everyone's lips when it comes to speaking about the fishery. So he is definitely not an invisible minister. Yet one of the recitals in the resolution would say, AND WHEREAS the Provincial Government has a Fisheries Department and a minister both of which are functionally invisible.

Well, now, how would you expect anyone on this side of the House to respect or support a resolution of that type?

MR. STAGG: The member, of course, got up and did not direct himself to this in the least. He only got down to the fourth WHEREAS, as he referred to it, and did not in any way justify or support the resolution as he had put it forward or as he had it written for him.

So this resolution is entirely political. It does not purport to deal at all with the real problems of the fishery. But nevertheless we must deal with it, as the rules of the House indicate that for at least two sessions on successive Wednesdays - Private Members' Days - we must debate a resolution as long as there are members ready and willing, not necessarily able, to debate the resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution is divided into two parts. It directs itself to the processing and marketing components of the industry and attributes the problems in marketing and processing to the provincial government. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Newfoundland does have some control and jurisdiction over processing and marketings, some control, but it cannot have any effective role in that very important aspect of the industry unless the industry i.e. the plants have access to the product. You know, we could say that the Department of Agriculture has jurisdiction over the growth of bamboo, bananas, oranges, grapefruit; and the Department of Forestry has jurisdiction over the growth of the mahogany industry in Newfoundland; the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth would have jurisdiction over parrots, myna birds, koala bears, the migration of kangaroos, lions, tigers, leopards and gazelles. So under the Constitution we have jurisdiction over these things. The only problem with that, of course, is that we have none of these products in this Province. And that, to some extent, is the same problem that we have in the fishery. We have many plants around this Province. They were built honestly, they were built in the expectation that there would be adequate

MR. STAGG: product for their utilization.
But it takes two levels of government to play the fishery's
game in Newfoundland. It takes two levels of government -

MR. STAGG:

it takes the federal level and it takes the provincial level. It takes a realistic and sensitive and apolitical attitude towards the fishery on the part of the federal government, and the provincial government, in order to have this industry perform the greatest good for the greatest number. We submit that the federal level of government has not been apolitical in its control of the fishery. We submit that it has on many occasions, to our great chagrin and to the outrage of the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), allocated vast quantities of our offshore resource to various European countries and to the Japanese. We recall, I believe it was the year before last, that we were having a tremendous problem, the Canadian auto industry was having a tremendous problem with the cars that were coming in through British Columbia, coming into Canada and putting the auto worker of Windsor and Oshawa out of work. So what was the answer? What was the answer that was conjured up by the federal government? The answer was, "We need caplin this year," The Japanese had a problem with their libido. I do not know why, there are plenty of them over there. But they had libido problems.

MR. TULK:

Nothing worse, is there boy?

MR. STAGG:

Well, you know, Newfoundlanders are not noted for their problems with their libido, I would suggest. So what was the answer? Well, the Japanese have this problem so what they need, they need female caplin. The Japanese need female caplin. So to the rescue came Mr. Romeo LeBlanc and the Department of External Affairs and 25,000 tons or some grotesque amount of female caplin were placed at the disposal of the Japanese to feed their libidos and whatever else. Because that is essentially what they use the caplin for. The roe of the female caplin is an aphrodisiac for the Japanese people. And that is what it is.

MR. STAGG: And the up shot of all that was, "Well, here it is, here is an opportunity. We have really got them over the barrel now. They have libidos problems and we have the fish that can take care of that consuming desire."

MR. HOUSE: What about the seal?

MR. STAGG: Mr. LeBlanc or whoever was negotiating it at the time, I guess it was Mr. LeBlanc, and Mr. MacEachen, who I think was the Minister of External Affairs, 25,000 tons of caplin for the Japanese in return for what? - in return for the inscrutable oriental handshake saying, "We will not export too many cars to Canada so that your automobile industry can survive." And that was an oral agreement on their part, not worth the paper it was

MR. STAGG:

written on. So that is the kind of negotiation that the federal government has carried on with regard to the Newfoundland fishery. So the Newfoundlander again, as is our wont, the Newfoundlander came through for the people of Ontario. It is the same old greedy attitude that is exhibited by Central Canada, and the Liberal powers that be in Central Canada, towards the natural resources of this Province. So we are indeed upset by that. It is something that we deplore. It is something that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) who has been declared invisible by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) who, by the way, sat in this House for two years before we knew that he had any debating skills at all and then he started to debate and we realized why he had not spoken for two years.

MR. TULK:

Why?

MR. STAGG:

I have not got to paint the whole picture have I? So that is one of the problems that we have, Mr. Speaker, that we are fighting a battle for existence in this Province and we are not really being assisted by people who control a significant portion of our resource, the fishery. They control the fish. What is the good of having fish plants if you have no fish? And as a corollary to that, of course, the same people who would control our fishery - we gave up our fishery, you know, under the Terms of Union in 1949; we decided to adhere to the provisions of the British North America Act, certain provisions of Section 91 and Section 92 of the British North America Act of 1867 whereby fisheries were under federal jurisdiction. Well, our leaders at that time decided that they would adhere to that and fisheries came under federal jurisdiction. Well, how have they dealt with it? They certainly dealt with a

MR. STAGG: government at the time that was willing to abdicate any and all responsibility with regard to the fishery, any and all responsibility. The credo of these years was, 'I hope my son does not grow up to be a fisherman. Do all you can so that he will not become a fisherman.' And we are just now, some thirty years later, trying to reverse that process which gained a tremendous amount of momentum between 1949 and, let us say, 1971, until this government took office. We have only been in office twelve years and it is a mighty task when the system has been put in place and the laws and the actions of people over the years have been the perpetuation of a certain system. It is a perpetuation of the system that I spoke about in the Throne Speech Debate a couple of days ago,

MR. STAGG: that in the history of North America, Newfoundland is Britain's oldest colony. We pride ourselves in being Britain's oldest colony but we do not pride ourselves, ladies and gentlemen, in being or becoming or threatening to become Canada's newest colony. We do not, and we will mightily protest it, and we will do everything we can to strive against that problem which comes up all the time. We see it most dramatically now in the offshore negotiations that are - well, there are no offshore negotiations at the present time. The federal government, bolstered by the -

MR. CALLAN: There never were any in good faith.

MR. STAGG: - bolstered by the decision of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland are relying on legal technicalities and the sheer weight of their government and their resources to attempt to put us under their thumb in true colonial fashion. And, of course, hon. gentleman opposite who, in their desire for power at the provincial level would do anything to discredit the government on this side, do not direct themselves at all towards the real problems of the Province, and I am afraid that the prophecy that I made a couple of years ago that their numbers were small and getting smaller is certainly becoming a reality.

Now I would like to direct myself to some extent towards the seal fishery, or the seal hunt as it is sometimes called. There is a recital in this obnoxious motion by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) which indicates that the seal hunt and the seal fishery - the failure of it or its problems are not in any way attributable to the Newfoundland Government. Now I will give a certain amount of credit where credit is due to the member for Fogo, and to the Leader of the

MR. STAGG: Opposition (Mr. Neary), of all the things I have seen them come up with over the past four years, and certainly there is no lack of material that the Leader of the Opposition sends out to the media, as a matter of fact, I think that the paper mills in the Province are indeed indebted to him, he sends out so much material to the media, but one of the things they did come up with, and one of the initiatives that they took that gains a certain amount of credibility in the press was their advocating of a genuine Newfoundland -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. STAGG: - a genuine Newfoundland sealing industry, that is the catching of the seals and the processing of the skins and that sort of thing. I agree with that.

MR. STAGG: And there was a certain amount of editorial comment in some of the papers that supported them in it. Certainly it is nothing new to us on this side of the House. We have been advocating that for years. But it is the sort of initiative that I would certainly encourage from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Again, as far as the seal hunt is concerned, we do run into the hypocrisy of the federal level of government or their Crown corporations. Now the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) dealt in detail today and dealt quite eloquently with the problem that we are presently encountering with regard to the Sea Shepherd. Now the Sea Shepherd is a trawler, converted trawler, that is being operated by the Greenpeace Organization, the Greenpeace Organization whose objectives, by the way, in some respects I agree with. They have certain stands on truly endangered species in the world and on nuclear disarmament that I do not disagree with. As a matter of fact, I encourage them in that regard. But they are grossly and -

MR. NEARY: Be careful now, be careful.

MR. STAGG: Be careful?

MR. NEARY: You might be called a traitor or something.

MR. STAGG: Yes, well, I have been called a lot of things in my lifetime. There are certain of the philosophies of Greenpeace that I agree with, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, they have chosen in objecting to the seal hunt, something that is not a legitimate, is not a genuine protest. They have chosen to feed on the emotions of people who know nothing about the seal hunt, know nothing about the realities of any kind of hunting or any kind of killing of animals both for skins or for food, playing on the emotions of individuals.

MR. STAGG:

Well, what has the federal Crown corporation, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, done? Well, at other times, Mr. Speaker - what they are doing by giving publicity to Greenpeace, by actually putting a crew from Newfoundland - I understand, the CBC personnel from the Province of Newfoundland are on the Sea Shepherd plying the waters towards Newfoundland, the objective of which is to obstruct the sealing vessels as they leave St. John's Harbour and to ram them. That is their stated intention. That is an act of aggression, Mr. Speaker. And if your ships are being intercepted and being sunk by foreigners, which is what they are - they are a foreign power - well that is an act of aggression. And should we, or should the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, or should the federal government, the Minister of Communications or whoever, should this be allowed? Obviously

MR. F. STAGG:

it should not be allowed, because these people rely on publicity as their main source of funding. They get an awful lot of publicity. They get the kind of publicity that one gets on the television in Canada and the three major stations in the United States and all throughout Europe. They get it by manipulative tactics, by use of the media. Well, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is giving aid to the enemy. These people are the enemy in the same manner that the U-boats lurked off St. John's Harbour in the second World War and would sink any ship that came by. The Sea Shepherd, even though it might be a comical looking craft, going around with barbed wire around its decks to ward off the boarding parties, is no less an aggressor and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has a crew on board just in case something interesting would happen. So I say to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and Pierre Juneau and all of the rest of them, 'Get our people, these Newfoundlanders, off that boat and get them back to covering matters that are consistent with being good Canadians.' Things that are not subversive, things that are not involved with giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

I would like to advise the hon. member that his time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. STAGG: By leave, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: By leave? Agreed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. STAGG: I will finish up in a couple minutes. I thank gentlemen opposite for that.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
which in many ways does yeoman service in the world in

MR. F. STAGG: exposing things that are reprehensible; The Fifth Estate and some of these programmes do great work in that regard. Well, The Fifth Estate, I suggest, should investigate the CBC.

MR. S. NEARY: His time is up.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): By leave.

MR. NEARY: By leave? Well, who gave him leave?

MR. STAGG: Your colleagues gave me leave.

So, Mr. Speaker, for the reasons that I have enunciated, and for the reasons enunciated so eloquently by the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), and for the reasons that will be enunciated by my colleagues to follow me, I will not be voting for this motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ANDREWS: Thank you.

If there is indication that the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) wishes to speak in this debate, I will yield to him.

MR. W. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. ANDREWS: Go ahead.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to address a few points.

MR. G. TOBIN: Now, what is the problem?

MR. CALLAN: You were not in your seat. That was not my problem, that was yours.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a few minutes about this resolution put by my colleague the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) on the fisheries and the fisheries

MR. W. CALLAN: problems that we have in this Province. In listening to some of the previous speakers, Mr. Speaker, especially from the government side of the House, it is again painfully obvious that there is nothing under the sun in this Province that the government and the supporters who sit opposite, the supporters of the government, there is nothing that they do not blame on Ottawa.

MR. CALLAN: I do not know if the Premier and his colleagues think that they can win another election on this continual kicking at Ottawa, blaming all of the Province's woes on either things that happened ten, fifteen, twenty, thirty years ago and, of course, things that are happening in Ottawa at the present time with the Liberal government there. But it is an insult, I think, Mr. Speaker, to the intelligence of the Newfoundlanders because the Premier and his colleagues, I believe, are making one small miscalculation. It seems small now but when the next election rolls around, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Premier and his colleagues who sit on that side of the House - the Premier, by the way, is more to be pitied than blamed because it is painfully obvious to anybody in this Province now and all you have to do is listen to the Open Line programme that the Premier calls into, by the way, that the Premier was on a couple of days ago, the one that the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) said only welfare people phone into - the Premier

MR. NEARY: But what about Aubrey -

MR. CALLAN: - of course, is on welfare.

There is no question about that.

MR. NEARY: He gets his rent paid.

MR. CALLAN: He is on welfare.

MR. NEARY: What about Aubrey's open line brigade.

MR. CALLAN: We will talk about that at another time.

MR. TOBIN: Did you read 007 yet?

MR. NEARY: No, but I got a couple of letters from Burin today I can show the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: But, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is continually talking across the House, most of the time when he is not even in his own seat, continually disrupting and interrupting the proceedings of the House and, of course, the speakers who happen to be on their feet at the time.

MR. WARREN: He is only a junior. He does not know the difference. He does not have the brains.

MR. CALLAN: Now that, Mr. Speaker, is the point that I was about to make. Practice what you preach. Mr. Speaker, if this government were to take a look at their own affairs in this Province, if this government were to take a look at the way they handle their own affairs in this Province and looked after that matter first then we would understand them talking about Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for some silence.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. member when speaking does have the right to be heard in silence and there has been a continuous debate going on - one member to my left and one member to my right. I am sure the hon. member for Bellefleur (Mr. Callan) is finding it difficult to express his thoughts.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the couple of points that I was going to make - I believe, as I said, that the Premier, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the other members of his Cabinet and, of course, the people who sit in the back benches on the opposite side, are making, I believe, a tremendous mistake. They think that this continual kick against Ottawa will last and last and last and last.

MR. CALLAN: They think, for example, that last Spring they received a mandate to continue this political game that they are playing. Mr. Speaker, any Newfoundlander who looks around, who listens, reads the papers and who does any amount of thinking whatsoever can see that there is no government in this Province. What we have is a Premier in name only, but what we really have is a gentleman who is leading a political party. The Premier is not satisfied with playing politics during election time, in the twenty-one or so days leading up to an election and then after the election is over let us get on to governing. The Premier from the time he was elected in 1979 until, of course, the general election last Spring and even up until today, nearly a year later, the same game is being played, playing the political game rather than trying to govern this Province. Right now the Premier is trying to win some seats for the Tories federally. He is not too concerned about winning his own next election, because apparently the Premier is on record as saying that there will be no next election for him, that he is a two-term man like his predecessor, Frank Moores.

MR. WARREN: God bless Newfoundland.

MR. CALLAN: But where the Premier and his colleagues are making the mistake is in thinking that the same twenty-five per cent of the people that they conned last Spring - and they only conned twenty-five per cent, Mr. Speaker, You see some people get the foolish idea, and I think the Premier is one of the first to do this, to think -

MR. TOBIN: Are you speaking to the motion?

MR. CALLAN: Yes, I am. It has all to do with the motion because the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is more, if it is possible, he is more of a political animal than the Premier is. The Minister of Fisheries as Minister of Fisheries has not accomplished anything and as one of the former speakers -

MR. BARRETT: You should never be in politics.

MR. CALLAN: I am not in politics and did not intend to be in politics.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is retired.

MR. CALLAN: No, I am not retired, even though they said I was going to retire last Spring after I got elected, because I had to get elected once more to get my pension. That is what Bas and his cohorts were saying, trying to discredit me in last Spring's election. They said I was going to quit and go as a professor at the university. That was one story.

MR. TOBIN: I walked the line with the people in Burin, Sir.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I think that the member for Burin should be named.

MR. TOBIN: How many twenty dollars did you pass out?

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Burin should be named.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!
Again I remind hon. members that when a member is speaking he does have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. CALLAN: Actually, Mr. Speaker, what happened last Spring was that 25 per cent of the people of this Province gave the Premier some more rope. That is what they actually did. They gave him some more rope and, of course, the Premier, even though he does not realize it, is using that

March 8, 1983

Tape No. 174

IB-3

MR. CALLAN:

rope every day, every week

that goes by, he is using more and more of that rope to
hang himself.

MR. CALLAN: Now that in itself is not that serious because the Premier is on record as saying that he does not intend to run for another term anyway. But I think the Premier, who is more to be pitied than blamed, because he is on a big ego trip, the Premier does not realize that what he may eventually end up doing is not only hang himself by this continual kick that he is on, but he may hang a lot of his colleagues as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me explain why I am saying that only 25 per cent of the people in this Province were conned last Spring. It must be very obvious to everybody that in this Province what you have, and if you go back to 1949 you can see it, election after election after election, what you have in this Province, Mr. Speaker, is 35 per cent hard-core Tories, and 35 per cent hard-core Liberals, and about 5 per cent NDPers. Now last Spring those people who elect governments, the 25 per cent who are not hard core at all, what they did was they decided to go with the Premier once more. They decided to give him some more rope. But the Premier and his colleagues on that side every now and then, whenever the chance arises, they -

MR. DAWE: You should at least mention the Minister Fisheries or something a couple of times just to show we are on the resolution.

MR. CALLAN: I spoke to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) earlier in the day, Mr. Speaker, and I got no answers whatsoever, But I will be talking to the Minister of Transportation on the Late Show again tomorrow afternoon and we will see what comes out of that. I guess he will be just as evasive as he was this afternoon, and as he was in the last sitting of the House, last Fall, when I asked him some questions and he completely side-stepped and evaded the questions. He is almost, Mr. Speaker, he is almost as good at it as the Premier.

MR. TOBIN: Do you ever watch the Young and the Restless?

MR. CALLAN: Are you one of them?

MR. TOBIN: No, you are.

MR. CALLAN: No, you are. You are pretty restless. You cannot even stay in your own seat. And judging from your behaviour in this House, you are rather young as well. And I do not mean young as a member of the Legislature, I mean young, infantile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Infantile in your actions. Mr. Speaker, has called you to order on at least two occasions in the last ten minutes, but you still cannot shut it up.

MR. DAWE: He still has not made up for the four times you got called to order.

MR. CALLAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) knows full well that hundreds of thousands of dollars -

MR. DAWE: The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) should have spoken because he was probably more ready than the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: The Minister of Transportation knows full well that his department has spent hundreds of thousands of taxpayers' dollars - how we do not know - without any proper approval, without even a request from Treasury Board, says the Auditor General. There was not even

MR. CALLAN: a request from Treasury Board for this overspending, and no receipts.

The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is practically in the same mould as the Premier. The Minister of Transportation is one of the gentlemen, by the way, who, like the Premier and with the Premier, is taking that bit of rope that was given to him last Spring and inch by inch and day by day and week by week and month after month is gradually hanging himself.

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

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

MR. BAIRD: Mr. Speaker, I have not heard anything mentioned about fisheries at all this afternoon. I have heard about transportation, elections, and you name it. I think we are not into the subject that we should be talking about, the Private Members' Motion.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Now we have a new expert on the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: He is brand new. It is the first time, I believe, he has ever risen on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and he did not make a valid point of order.

MR. STAGG: He made a good point of order.

MR. NEARY: He did not make a valid point of order. And I would submit that he go back to the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) and get some more training before he stands in this House to show both sides of the House his knowledge of the rules of this hon. House.

MR. BAIRD: Relevancy, my boy!

MR. STAGG: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, the hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: I cannot for the life of me understand why the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is not addressing himself to the resolution. His district is a fishing district, it has a considerable number of communities whose lifeblood is the fishing industry, so, Mr. Speaker, I think for the sake of the hon. member, so that his constituents know that he is in here dealing with the fishing industry, that he should be told to be relevant.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I have only been sitting in the Chair for two minutes of the hon. member's speech but in that time I have not heard too much related to the fishery. I would remind the hon. member that we are speaking on a resolution shown on the Order Paper as Number 15.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, that is correct, Mr.

Speaker, the district of Bellevue is a fairly heavy fishing district, a lot more, for example, than happens in the district of Stephenville. What did the government side of the House decide to put up that gentleman. I thought that the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) would also be speaking on this resolution. But, Mr.

MR. CALLAN:

Speaker, the district of Bellevue is one of the districts around this Province that has suffered and suffered badly over the past several years because of what we see contained in this resolution, because of a lack of action by this government and particularly by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. CALLAN: The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), Mr. Speaker - in my district and, I would think, in a lot of fishing districts, the Minister of Fisheries is a laughing stock. The Minister of Fisheries is not very highly thought of because, Mr. Speaker, just name some of the things that the Minister of Fisheries has done since he took over that portfolio - what? - three years ago. It seems like thirty but it is probably about three years ago.

MR. SIMMS: When was the hon. member elected the first time?

MR. CALLAN: 1975.

MR. SIMMS: Was he Minister of Fisheries then?

MR. CALLAN: No Sir, Walter Carter was, the one who would not stay here with the Premier (Mr. Peckford), the man who was too smart to stay in the Cabinet with the present Premier. He decided to go and run down in Roger Simmons district.

MR. TOBIN: Simmons is gone. Simmons is finished.

MR. CALLAN: Yes and so is the member for Burin (Mr. Tobin), the coattail member.

Mr. Speaker, the latest example that we see of the ineptitude of the Minister of Fisheries is the way he has been handling the seal fishery, the loss of it. How has he been handling it Mr. Speaker? Through the press. He comes out one day and condemns Carino for not paying high enough prices, says he talked to another company in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick that is paying higher prices. These are the kinds of things that the Minister of Fisheries does. These are indications of the way that he negotiates, like the Premier. Another gentleman who is in the same mould

March 8, 1983

Tape No. 177

IB-2

MR. CALLAN: as the Premier (Mr. Peckford) along with the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) who I just referred to. Evasive answers to questions here in the Legislature and, of course, blasting somebody else in the press, usually an enemy far removed like Ottawa or the

March 9, 1983

Tape No. 178

IB-1

MR. CALLAN: European countries or
Pierre De Bane, anybody -

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

MR. CALLAN: - but do his own duty
to the portfolio that he should be representing.
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
That was a very, very enlightening speech on the state
of the fishing industry in Newfoundland, no doubt.
I am very, very impressed. Considering the state of
the industry which is not denied by this government or
by the federal government or I do not think anybody
involved in the industry I think it is absolutely
disgusting to spend twenty minutes listening to such
tripe as that, not on the issue at all at hand here.

Mr. Speaker, there is no
doubt that the fishing industry -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I would like
to be heard in silence in this hon. House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, there is no
doubt that the fishing industry is in a bad economic
condition. Fish plants are closed, fish plants have
been closed, fish companies are losing money, fishermen
are losing money. This year does not look any
more optimistic although I am told there should be
some improvement in market conditions. The conference
Board of Canada feels that this may be the case and

MR. ANDREWS: I certainly hope that their predictions are correct. But the basis of this motion, Mr. Speaker, is to in effect condemn the activities of this provincial government and in particular the provincial Department of Fisheries over recent months not to condemn the Department of Transportation.

MR. NEARY: They have been waiting for him down in Ramea.

MR. ANDREWS: Yes they certainly are, and they are waiting for you.

MR. NEARY: I was down there.

MR. ANDREWS: Yes I know and you brought all the good news that you brought when you were down there.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to review -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS: - some of the facts and the facts of the state of the fishing industry in Newfoundland today and what has happened over the past several months. To say that the provincial government has ignored its responsibility in the fishing industry is not to tell the truth, Mr. Speaker. This government has helped over eighteen fish companies in the past eighteen months to the tune of over \$25 million for thirty fish plants. And, Mr. Speaker, if that is not assistance I do not know what is. And that does not include the \$5 million equity position taken in the Lake Group of companies nor, Mr. Speaker, the \$3 million loan that was given to the community of Ramea by this government. And not

March 9, 1983

Tape No. 178

IB-3

MR. ANDREWS: one cent, Mr. Speaker,
did come from Ottawa to help to assist the fishing
industry in Newfoundland. The provincial government
of this Province

MR. ANDREWS: is exposed to the tune of some \$60 million to the fish plants and the processing sector in this Province, \$60 million. The whole federal government, the great nation of Ottawa is exposed to the tune of approximately \$13 million. Who is doing what for who, Mr. Speaker? This motion is not based on any facts whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, the concern of the federal government is expressed in these figures. The actions of the federal government are expressed in these figures. The fishery is controlled Mr. Speaker, by the federal government. It is okay to say that the Government of Newfoundland has control over fish plants. That in effect, in theory is true. All the provincial government in fact has control over fish companies and the fish processing sector is whether or not they will get a permit to operate. Even the quality of fish that is exported from this Province and from this country is a federal matter from federal inspection services of the Canadian Fisheries and Oceans Department, Mr. Speaker. That is a federal responsibility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS: The quality of our fish that goes into the United States is a federal responsibility, Mr. Speaker. The controls are there. The mechanism is there in place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: And if it has not been enforced it is not the provincial responsibility. There is a job to be done and the handle is being taken now by the provincial government in an attempt to upgrade the fish that is landed at the plants and to upgrade the quality

MR. ANDREWS: of fish that comes out of the fish plants. And I will say I am very happy to know and to recognize that the co-operation of the federal officials and the federal government is doing a great deal in this regard. And the seminars that are being held by the provincial Department of Fisheries and in particular the work that is going on in improving the quality of landed fish in Newfoundland coming out of the inshore boats, There has been some tremendous work done in that regard.

MR. NEARY: Ramea, Burin, ingnore, forgotten.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) brings up the issue of the deep sea plants, and I am very concerned about one in my own district, the community of Ramea. Burin of course has been in the news in the past few months but there are others and there may be others still. Hopefully not. Mr. Speaker, the onshore processing sector, the authority to issue a licence is in the provincial jurisdiction no doubt. But to issue a licence, Mr. Speaker, where a situation exists where there is no fish, there is no harvesting capability

MR. ANDREWS: and we have poor markets, that gives you absolutely control over nothing. What is wrong with the fishing industry right now, today, Mr. Speaker, is that this is a very cyclical thing that goes back in our history for 400 years plus. The state of the fishing industry in Newfoundland has been affected constantly by international wars, European wars mainly, the international economic situation and this present situation in the fishery is no different. One of the main factors, the marketing end of the problem, is brought about by the economic situation in the world. And that goes right back to all the Western societies that we can think of and the difficulties that they are having. I guess you could trace this present one right back to the decision of OPEC in the mid-seventies to double and triple and quadruple the price of oil. Since that time the economic activity in the United States has declined because what we are selling in the United States, Mr. Speaker, is not a cheap product. It is not cheap food. It is a very high priced food when you consider that you can buy in the United States of America meat products such as chicken and pork for \$1.00 or \$1.25 a pound and our frozen fish goes on the market for \$2.50, \$2.25-\$2.50 and that is some of the lowest packages such as cod fish in one pound packages. We are selling a very high protein product but a very expensive product and in hard economic times people are going to be reluctant to buy it and they are going to buy their own.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about the Ottawa involvement and one of the things that has happened since 1949 when we sold away our right to control our own fishery which we did up to that point in time, I believe, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of good

MR. ANDREWS: intentions by the people in Ottawa, from the politicians down in many cases. But I would like right here now to criticize the federal Department of Fisheries in their staffing, in the manner in which they appoint their staff. No disrespect to gentlemen like Dr. Arthur May and the late Len Cowley. Dr. May, as we know, now is the Deputy Minister of Fisheries for all of Canada. But Dr. May and Mr. Cowley did work themselves up to the highest echelon of the federal bureaucracy and are trained as biologists. Most of the people underneath them are trained as biologists and the people who went before them were trained as marine biologists, darn good profession, no doubt. I think what is lacking in the federal Department of Fisheries is some sort of balance.

I do not know of any ex-businessman or good ex-business accountant or lawyer who works with the federal Department of Fisheries. Mr. Speaker, there is a lack of input by the business mind, people who can talk to fish plant managers and company owners about the problems, Mr. Speaker, to recognize and listen to their concerns and also listen to the economic.

MR. ANDREWS: concerns of the fishermen, the inshore fishermen and the deep-sea fishermen. This is probably one of the factors that has brought us to where we happen to be right now in the fishing industry, because of a lack of the concern of the economic factor of the fishermen. One of the things that has happened is the tremendous expansion in fish plants in Newfoundland. I was certainly opposed to it all along, long before I became involved in politics. This was a lack of good business planning on the part of the federal Department of Fisheries. The Department of Fisheries encouraged fish companies to build as many fish plants as they could because there was DREE money available. The fish plants were built all right, Mr. Speaker, massive fish plants on the North East coast of Newfoundland. But where are they now? There was no fish for them. There was not a balance between the economics and the biology of the situation at the time. And I do not believe this can be blamed at all, Mr. Speaker, on the provincial government.

There is a lack of understanding, Mr. Speaker, in Ottawa as to what Newfoundland and the Newfoundland fishery is all about. I remember some six or seven years ago before I entered politics being at a fisheries convention in Ottawa, an exposition, and I sat down and had lunch around the table with some people from the federal Department of Fisheries in Ottawa, very pleasant people, very high ranking civil servants. I was working with the CBC at the time.

MR. STAGG: Oh! You have changed.
You have changed.

MR. ANDREWS: Well we all have skeletons in our past. The conversation was about the type of

MR. ANDREWS: fishing vessel that should be used in the Newfoundland inshore fishery, the longliner we call it. And this gentleman was expounded on his theory because he was a naval architect and I was very pleased to meet a naval architect, you do not meet too many of them. He showed me some sketches and some diagrams and some work he had done and was doing on a vessel for Newfoundland which he said would be the perfect fishing vessel. And I disagreed with him. I said, "No, that is not going to work. It is not going to work on the Northeast coast for sure where I am very familiar with." "Oh yes it will". We ended up in a fine little argument, Mr. Speaker.

I said to him, "Boy, when was the last time you were down to Newfoundland and showed this plan to some Newfoundland fishermen?". He said, "I have never been to Newfoundland", Mr. Speaker. He told me he had never been to Newfoundland. Not only that but that man had never been into Atlantic Canada or on a fishing boat but he had a high ranking position with the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans in Ottawa designing fishing vessels. Now I do not say and I am sure that most of the officials and bureaucrats in Ottawa are not in that bad a situation when it comes to knowing how to do their job. But I believe that there are a lot of them there who know nothing, absolutely nothing, about the fishery in Newfoundland, and not only the fishery I would to as far as to say many other industries as well, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKEY: He was designing boats for trout fishing.

MR. ANDREWS: Trout fishing, yes, on Lake Superior.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) talked about processing and such things as over-the-side sales and so on. One of the things that our fisheries policy does not want is nationalization of the fishing industry. So if the hon. member will consider the fact that much of the processing of fish along the Coast of Labrador over the past several years since the early 1970's has been controlled by the Canadian Salfish Corporation and in recent years

MR. ANDREWS: by the union, the Newfoundland Fishermen Food and Allied Worker's Union through the Canadian Saltfish Corporation and in many cases - I guess they cannot take the heat, Mr. Speaker, they all had to leave - and in many cases the union has co-operated I understand, with the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, and the lack of processing and the lack of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians involved in these over-the-side sales, Mr. Speaker, is not a result of practices of Newfoundland companies rather than by the attitude of Ottawa and in this case I must criticize the Newfoundland Fishermen Food and Allied Worker's Union.

MR. SIMMS: You should let somebody in the Opposition have his say now.

MR. ANDREWS: Oh, here we go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: The member from that great fishing district.

Mr. Speaker, this motion goes on, "WHEREAS, WHEREAS, AND WEEREAS, AND WHEREAS". I think probably the greatest 'WHEREAS' is that there is no fisheries policy in Newfoundland and so on. But I would like to refer the hon. House to this document here which was prepared by the provincial Department of Fisheries and, I guess, by the government because it is the government's position on the fisheries. It is the latest of many documents prepared by this government on its position since 1979, its position and its philosophy on the fisheries. And this was prepared in June of 1982 really as a condensation of all the thoughts and ideas that we, as a government, have on the fishery for the Kirby Task Force on the fishery. I am glad to note that Mr. Kirby has said that he has accepted many of the recommendations and most of his thoughts on his changes

MR. ANDREWS: in the fishery have come from the input of the Government of Newfoundland. And, Mr. Speaker, if we praise the Kirby Task Force Report which I do in many cases - I will pick some bones with it - this is where it came from. So it is not proper for this resolution to criticize the government for not having a policy because it is this paper here that has developed the Canadian fishing policy as seen by Mr. Kirby, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: I do not have time to go into it but, Mr. Speaker, it is a very, very interesting document, this one here and it summarizes I do believe the Kirby Task Force.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution also very briefly talks about sealing. Now I have a very weak spot in my heart for the sealing industry. One of my best friends in the world happens to be one of the best sealing skippers, I guess, who ever walked the decks in the history of Newfoundland. I have been out to the seal hunt twice. In 1967 I spent a month out there. I got stuck out there working. And in 1979 I took three weeks of my vacation and went out and spend a trip out there. I visited Norway and I visited the Rieber processing plant in Bergen, Norway where, Mr. Speaker, they process seal skins from the Soviet Union, from the Bering Sea and the Barents Sea, from the United States, from the Aleutian Islands, from the Pribilofs, I think it is pronounced, where the Americans have their own seal harvest and from South Africa and other places. And, of course, we know they buy seal skins from Canada through their subsidiary company, the Carino Company here.

March 9, 1983

Tape No. 182

IB-3

MR. ANDREWS: I am a little bit concerned about the situation as it exists today. The Rieber Company has created a monopoly for itself in the purchase of seal skins in Newfoundland. They have done that by

MR. ANDREWS: in many ways I think they went about it in a very good way because they have kept prices high by encouraging fishermen and sealing ships to bring in a good high quality product. But on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, a monopoly situation is no good for anybody. And the fact that the Rieber Company can in the Spring of 1983 say that they will not buy any whitecoats this year and they will only buy 40,000 to 60,000 older seals, puts the industry in a very, very tight strait jacket and I think that both the federal and the provincial governments as I know are working towards the resolution of this problem, there probably will be a year go by now whereby the sealers will not be able to sell as many seals as they would like to be able to. But I believe the thing can be resolved.

There was created by the Rieber Company a great mystery about international marketing and about international processing and designs and fashions and so on, Mr. Speaker, I think a myth that we did not bother to fight or to investigate but we are forced to now and we find that it is really only a shadow. I believe that with a little bit of work we can burst through to new markets at least anyway and regain some of the business that we have had for so many years in Newfoundland.

One final note, Mr. Speaker. I was so worked up a while back about this business of the Sea Shepherd that I was going to make a public announcement myself but I did not think it was fitting for me to do it. I thought it should come from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) anyway. But I will say here and now that I would demand that the Government of Canada arrest that vessel immediately as she comes within territorial waters, Mr. Speaker. That vessel has threatened

MR. ANDREWS: the lives of Newfoundlanders. She has threatened violence. That in itself is assault. That in itself is a crime. The vessel must be arrested and those people must be imprisoned. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will also in closing -

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the law?

MR. ANDREWS: That is the little I know about the law, Mr. Speaker, that assault, even the threat of assault is a crime. Those men have committed the crime.

Mr. Speaker, after what I have said I find no reason to support this motion. It is full of loopholes. I can understand the concerns of the mover of the motion but the motion is full of loopholes and I find it difficult to support. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I was not going to speak to this resolution but seeing there is no one in the Opposition prepared to support their colleague's resolution, I thought I would have a few words.

MR. NEARY: You have not looked at the numbers lately in the House.

MR. HICKEY: What is that?

MR. NEARY: You have not looked at the numbers lately.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, I see.

MR. NEARY: It is forty-four to eight.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting things about this resolution that my friend from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) finds that there is an invisible Department of

MR. HICKEY: Fisheries with an invisible minister. I find that astounding because I do not know of any minister in this government who is more visible than the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). If he is not in Ottawa making a case for the people of this Province and especially the fishermen he is in Europe making a case with the Europeans with regard to the seal hunt.

MR. HICKEY: If he is not in any of those places, he is in every nook and crannie and village in this Province, sitting down with the fishermen, talking to the fishermen, listening to them, trying to do the best he can for them. Mr. Speaker, he does not need me to defend him, nor does he need me to defend his performance, as Minister of Fisheries. It is astounding to find that there is any mention of his being invisible. Possibly, one can conclude that this whole resolution is indeed a joke, because that aspect of it, certainly is one.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that it has already been pointed out that this Province with limited funds, last year, went in excess of \$25 million - \$24 million, something in that order to keep fish plants going through loans, loan guarantees, grants, what have you. Whilst the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, has jurisdiction, whilst they make their case by saying that we control what is onshore, such as the fish plants, that in almost like saying someone controls the barn after the horse has got away.

It is precious little good Mr. Speaker, to control fish plants when you have a Federal Government that is so insensitive to the needs of Atlantic Canada, especially this province, when it gives away a good chunk of our resources. To whom, Mr. Speaker? To the Europeans. To the very people who killed or all but killed and continue to try to kill our seal hunt, our sealing industry. The very people who come to our waters and take our fish with the blessing of the federal government, are the very people who have done everything under the sun to squash forever the seal hunt. That has to be the greatest

MR. HICKEY: slap to Newfoundlanders, even those like myself, who have never been on the ice but who know enough about the history of this Province, who knows enough about the importance of the sealing industry to the people of this Province, an industry that helps put bread on the table for a large number of families

It would be far better Mr. Speaker for the hon. gentleman from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) instead of introducing this kind of resolution, to do some lobbying with his Liberal friends in Ottawa, to wake up, wake up to reality and to be decisive and a bit courageous for a change and tell the Europeans where to go. Tell them to just get off our backs with their high faluting, sophisticated opinions and ideas about seal pups and fur coats.

MR. HICKEY: But Mr. Speaker, we do not find that, we find people mealy-mouthing their position on this industry. You will hear them say, they are in favour of the sealing industry on the one hand, yet, on the other hand you will hear them say something else. You will hear them criticize this administration for whatever it tries to do to save that hunt. Indeed, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Premier of the Province were no sooner left this province to go to Europe in company with some Federal Ministers, when there was a great outcry that the Premier should be back in the Province, the Minister of Fisheries should be back in the Province.

MR. YOUNG: Who is saying that?

MR. HICKEY: The opposition says that! That is written, that is in print, there is proof positive of that. That is not hearsay! That is fact! Mr. Speaker it is like the satellite station you know.

What is their position on the seal hunt - are they for or are they against? Do they give a damn!

MR. SIMMS: Yes, they are for and against.

MR. HICKEY: They are for and against, I thought that was it. I wanted to be kind to them, I did not want to say that.

MR. SIMMS: The answer to that is yes and no.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, one hears references of arrogance about this government from time to time and for the life of me as long as I have been in the House, some eighteen years now, I have not seen a government that tried so hard to put information on the table. I have not seen a government that is anymore sensitive or could be anymore sensitive to the needs of people. We are not able to solve all of the problems, of course not. We do not have the money to even begin to solve all the problems. In this industry,

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the fishery, we do not even have jurisdiction. We can do all we like, we can make every single dollar that is available from the Provincial treasury to the fishing industry and it will not be worth two plugged nickels as long as Ottawa controls every single fish that is out there. We can turn all the plants into shopping centres if we like or supermarkets, because there will not be any fish there.

While the hon. gentlemen in the opposition sat on their hands and watch the seal hunt go down to its lowest level they equally sit on their hands and they do not say 'boo' to their Federal friends in Ottawa while they destroy the fishery. They are silent and that says something Mr. Speaker, that raises a number of questions - Where is their loyalty? Do they have any loyalty to this Province and its people! Do they have any loyalty to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians or is their first loyalty to the political cause, the Liberal party, the Liberal clique in Ottawa who do not know where we are until they want something. Who do not know that we exist until they want our resources, like the offshore. Who do not know where the fishery is until they want to give away yet, another slice to improve the balance of trade deficit, to trade it off because there is a problem in the auto industry in central Canada. Why, Mr. Speaker - because they are central Canadians, that is why. They do not know

MR. HICKEY: where we are, only when they want to use us. They do not want to have anything to do with us, they just want to use our assets, our resources. Talk about arrogance, Mr. Speaker, Let me give you an example of arrogance - I have in my hand a document of some five pages by the hon. I suppose I have to use that word, Jean Chretien, not an Outer Cove name. What does he say Mr. Speaker, he goes to great length to write all the mayors, I suppose he wrote them all. I am sure I am not so honoured for him, to write just the ones in my constituency, like the mayor of Pouch Cove, of Flatrock. Five pages Mr. Speaker of trash, of garbage

MR. TOBIN: I wish he would put something in writing to us.

MR. HICKEY: Yes, exactly, of mealy-mouthing why the negotiations broke down. Mealy-mouthing, and yet the very thread that could have kept negotiations going, the simple, reasonable request by my colleague, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and the Premier of the Province to put in writing what they had agreed he would not do but he could find time to write five pages of garbage, of twisted words and mealy-mouth that. How desperate Mr. Speaker, how political, how cynical, how insincere to deliver -

MR. PECKFORD: Why would he think that the mayors of this Province are suddenly going to rush to defend him?

MR. HICKEY: Yes, that they are going to buy it. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman talks about arrogance. This same gentleman, wherever he went to school, apparently did not learn enough manners to respond to a telex sent by a Minister and by the government of this Province, to

MR. HICKEY: humbly beg him to give a state of execution to the closure of the satellite station for safety reasons. He could not even find the time to respond to it - to say Yes, I will; No, I will not or go to hell. But, then again Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but say that this is a gentleman who is so used to talking out of both sides of his mouth, now he can only talk out of one side. He is so used to sitting on the fence and playing both ends against the middle and he is no longer able to speak straight.

The same gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that sits with his colleagues, that spells the doom of the Newfoundland fishery, is the same gentleman -

MR. PECKFORD: How about the Rural Development Association that they are saying they are not going to fund anymore?

MR. HICKEY: Yes, more great federal news to hit this Province, and the list is endless. Mr. Speaker, the day is coming and it is not far off, and it has been said here many,

MR. HICKEY: many times by almost every single member of this House who stood in their place to speak to an issue, the members of the Opposition have been asked where they stand and the day is coming, Mr. Speaker, and it is not too far off when the hon. gentlemen opposite are going to be squeezed so much that it is going to be no longer possible for them to sit on the fence and that, Mr. Speaker, They will have to get off the fence, that is provided they are not injured from having sat on it for so long.

Mr. Speaker, if it was not so sad it would be laughable, but there is nothing laughable about it because it is sad, it is critical, it is the basic industry of this Province. It is an industry that this government places the highest priority on, far higher than oil and gas or anything else in this province, because it is the life's blood of the people of this province and especially rural Newfoundland. Rural Newfoundland will not survive, Mr. Speaker, until and unless the fishery is fully exploited and developed and protected. But we are expected to bail out everybody in relation to fish plants while at the same time as I said earlier, the Federal government gives away chunk, after chunk, after chunk. For what! To improve the lot for us. No, Mr. Speaker, to improve the lot for central Canada and they have a problem as I said in the auto industry or some other industry there is another few thousand metric tons given away, And the saddest part of all, as I said, is when those very same people all but destroy the sealing industry, they even fail then.

They do not even rise to the occasion then, Mr. Speaker, they do not even have enough courage then to stand up and do something about it.

MR. WARREN: Separtists!

MR. HICKEY: A funny thing, Mr. Speaker, the only time I hear the word

MR. HICKEY: separatism mentioned or spoken of is from members of the Opposition. I have not heard anyone on this side mention the word separatism.

MR. WARREN: Because you practise it, that is why.

MR. HICKEY: Is that right?

MR. TOBIN: We are all good Canadians.

MR. HICKEY: I will tell the hon. gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), and he represents the historic district in this Province, but he obviously is that high, he is that far elevated, because of the district he represents, I suppose, that he has not come back to reality long enough to even hear what we say over here or far less to understand it.

MR. WARREN: You are a separatist.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I will tell the hon. gentleman one thing that if he wants to call me a separatist, because I care about Newfoundlanders first. If the hon. gentleman wants to brand me a separatist because I happen to think of Newfoundland first, if the hon. gentleman wants to call me a separatist because I am not going to stand and jump and dance to the tune of Mr. Chretien, Mr. Lalonde, Mr. De Bane, Mr. LeBlanc, Mr. somebody else, all of whom are French Canadains.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Trudeau.

MR. HICKEY: Yes.

MR. STAGG: They are all good friends of Mr. Warren.

MR. HICKEY: And I am not going to get up and dance to the tune, whom we are subsidizing already, to the tune of about \$650 million a year through the Upper Churchill Falls agreement.

Mr. Speaker, it is too bad it is six o'clock because I am just getting warm. I adjourn the debate until next week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Let it be noted that the hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) has adjourned the debate.

It being Private Member's Day, I do now leave the Chair until three of the clock tomorrow, Thursday.