

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
10:00 A.M. - 1:00 P.M.
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 1983

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, as the minister responsible for the 400th Anniversary celebrations, I want to report to this House now in sort of a concluding manner as a result of the celebrations period being officially concluded. I think that now that the major events of the Anniversary celebrations are over, it might be appropriate to examine some of the benefits that have been gained by our Province this year -

MR. NEARY: You are trying to justify the money you have spent.

MR. SIMMS: - contrary to the one critic that we have had in this Province during the entire year.

Province-wide, hundreds of individuals, organizations and communities embarked upon many projects investigating their own heritage and culture, and I think that this perhaps is the most valuable legacy of our 400th Anniversary - an awareness on a community as well as a provincial level, of the history and development of the past 400 years. Across the Province, historical pageants were performed, local histories compiled and written, and the federal/provincial funding enabled every resident of this Province to take advantage of this unique opportunity to research his or her own heritage and culture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: Cultural and artistic benefits, however, have not been the only legacy. One of the obvious impacts of the celebrations which my colleague, the Minister for Tourism has stated, has been on the tourism industry which, as my colleagues are no doubt aware, has improved significantly over the last year as a result of the 400th Anniversary stimulation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: There is no doubt that the promotional tours mounted by the Department of Development, as well as their advertising campaign attracted wide attention to our special celebrations. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have newspaper clippings here from every major newspaper across the country, promoting the 400th Anniversary celebrations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: As an example, Mr. Speaker, during the period April to August, automobile traffic alone to the Province increased 5.4 per cent over last year, giving rise to an increased expenditure by tourists of some \$20.3 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: That, Mr. Speaker, is a favourable return, in my opinion, considering the cost to my department to organize these celebrations was not \$1 million, as our most famous critic in the Province often states, usually without the facts, as normal, losing all his credibility.

MR. NEARY: How much was it then? How much?

MR. SIMMS: It cost this department \$400,000 including the cost of the Royal Visit. So I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this has been a tremendous return.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: The official opening of the celebrations in June by His Royal Highness The Prince of Wales gave a great deal of impetus to our festivities and provided a high level of international media coverage which has been sustained throughout the Summer.

MR. NEARY: They were coming anyway.

MR. SIMMS: They were not coming anyway, Mr. Speaker. As usual, the Leader of the Opposition is out of touch, out of whack and out of everything else!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SIMMS: Visitors from England, including members of the Gilbert family, the Lord Mayor of Plymouth and other officials from the county of Devon, provided another highlight in August, and it was gratifying that so many other distinguished visitors came to Newfoundland at that time.

His Excellency the Governor

General of Canada

MR. SIMMS:

also honoured the Province by a visit during which he attended the traditional music festival and the St. John's Regatta, as well as the opening of Mrs. Gilbert's exhibition of paintings in Corner Brook.

Many Newfoundland artists, Mr. Speaker, have benefited from the 400th Anniversary by way of grants enabling them to develop ideas and programmes which would not otherwise have been possible. Visual work by Newfoundland artists is currently on tour to the smaller communities around the Province, and the Newfoundland and Labrador Crafts Development Association is assembling a collection of crafts for future tours.

As far as the performing arts are concerned, funds were made available to the many artists in the Province to pursue their own specific interests. Many touring shows were made possible through federal/provincial funding and these tours covered such areas of the Province as Coastal Labrador, the Strait area, the Southern Shore, the South Coast and the Northern Peninsula. These tours, particularly those involving schools, are still ongoing. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that two of the major touring events, the Canadian Heritage Festival and the International Traditional Music Festival, were both an enormous success, and enabled many parts of the Province to enjoy unique performances. Other successful tours have been mounted by the Memorial University Honours Youth Band and the Newfoundland Symphony Youth Orchestra, which have not only provided many communities in the Province opportunities to enjoy these performances, but has also given these young musicians a chance to perform in public and to see for themselves other parts of Newfoundland and Labrador.

It is quite evident that the

MR. SIMMS: economic stimulation to the arts has been significant, and as well, most of the funding made available has remained in our Province.

When I look back on this year, Mr. Speaker, and the varied programme of events which has taken place, I can see that the celebrations have been the result of tremendous co-operation on the part of many people. My greatest admiration has been for the 400th Anniversary Celebrations Committee itself, some forty people from the general public, which showed such vision and ingenuity in devising a very unique programme of events. Projects such as the visit to Newfoundland of a flotilla of yachts from Ontario, the launching of the Sir Humphrey Gilbert postage stamp and the displays by the Canadian Forces precision flying and parachute teams have required much advance planning and painstaking attention to detail. I am sure that most people will agree, with one possible exception, that the celebrations have been an enormous success and I would like to take this opportunity of thanking my colleagues in this House of Assembly for their continued support and co-operation - colleagues on both sides of the House I might add, Mr. Speaker, with one significant exception as usual - the 400th Anniversary Committee for their hard work and vision, the RCMP and the Canadian Forces for their colourful additions to our celebrations, the federal Department of Secretary of State, who provided more funding than we did towards these celebrations incidentally, the federal Liberal Government, and, in particular, the general public whose enthusiasm and generous hospitality to our visitors have made this year such an outstanding success.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest we start planning for the 500th Anniversary of the discovery

MR. SIMMS: of Newfoundland by John Cabot, and perhaps we can dress up the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) in that particular one.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for giving me the opportunity to respond to this so-called Ministerial Statement.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the rules of this House as they apply to Ministerial Statements, there is no trouble to see who abuses the rules. Here you have a minister trying to justify fiddling while Newfoundland burns, while Newfoundland goes down the economic tube. Mr. Speaker, what a gigantic bluff. And, Mr. Speaker, we have some questions that we will be asking about the cost of these celebrations and we will have some questions to go on the Order Paper in connection with these celebrations. We hope, Mr. Speaker, to get the true cost, because the figure that the hon. gentleman just flung across the House is not the true cost of these celebrations.

MR. SIMMS: How do you know?

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Speaker, I know. And we want to get the cost of sending this monkey, the fellow they had dressed up in the monkey suit, back and forth across the Atlantic.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!
The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth on a point of order.

MR. SIMMS: To answer that question by the Leader of the Opposition, those funds were provided by

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder if that crowd up there are not as bad as that crowd across the House. The silly, foolish things that they do! The number one priority in this Province in the last year was throwing cocktail parties, unveiling commemorative stamps, and a little handbook. I went to some of these receptions, Mr. Speaker, out of curiosity more than anything else, and what I saw was a handful of prominent Tories at every reception, every cocktail party over and over again. Mr. Speaker, the ordinary people in this Province completely ignored -

MR. SIMMS: Boy, do not be so negative.

MR. NEARY: - completely ignored the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the question what did this do for the unemployed in this Province? What did it do about the high taxes? What did it do about the high cost of living? What did it do about hospital beds when you have people who need treatment cannot get into hospital? The number one priority is to go out and celebrate. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Royal couple would have come to Newfoundland anyway. They did not go to Nova Scotia because of the Sir Humphrey Gilbert celebrations in Newfoundland, or they did not go to Western Canada because of the Sir Humphrey Gilbert celebrations in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, what a gigantic bluff! What a gigantic bluff! And if the hon. gentleman wants to take over the leadership of that party, Mr. Speaker, he will have to come up with something a little more substantial than that, something a little more meaningful to the ordinary people of this Province than going on with these foolish, silly, celebrations -

MR. SIMMS: Sit down boy!

MR. NEARY: - the administration celebrating while the rest of the Province are suffering and struggling for survival. Mr. Speaker, I say shame, shame on the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). Mr. Speaker, the House opened this morning at 10:00 and according to how feisty it has gotten already I am glad it did not open at 7:00 this morning. But I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries - he is coming back into the House - on the resource-short plant programme. In 1977, as everybody will recall, the country of Canada under the Liberal Government established the 200 mile limit. And the objective, over a period of time, was to get as many foreign fishing boats outside the 200 mile limit, and indeed outside of Canadian waters altogether, outside of the Continental Shelf. Now, Mr. Speaker, that has not been accomplished so far because of traditional rights and trading rights and so on. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there is a danger under

MR. TULK: The RSP programme - the Resource Short Plant programme - that indeed we may be opening the door again to foreign vessels coming inside of that 200-mile zone to catch our fish? I am referring to an announcement that the minister made I believe the other day, both in the House and outside the House, that he is contemplating bringing back foreign bottoms, as he now calls it -

AN HON. MEMBER: What is that?

MR. TULK: They are boats, Mr. Speaker - to deliver fish to inshore plants. I would like to ask the minister this morning is that kind of move going to be a principle and a trademark of the Peckford administration?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the concept or the idea of having foreign vessels in our waters and catching fish by foreign fleets and taking it back to the respective foreign countries to be processed is a completely different concept from having foreign vessels catch fish and having it landed to be processed here in our own country and here in Newfoundland. It is a different concept all together. The only reason why, at the present time, we are proposing that foreign vessels or foreign bottoms be used to land the fish or catch the fish is because unfortunately at the present time the owners of the Canadian fleets are unable to determine or to provide the independent companies, who own these plants without trawlers, to give them a firm, determined cost of harvesting per pound. Because of that the independents just cannot say yes on a blanket approach to the companies like National Sea and Nickerson and Fishery Products and the Lakes, who are still there until the restructuring has been put in place, 'You go out and use your vessels, catch the fish, bring it in but we will determine at some later date what the cost is going to be per pound of that fish you catch for us'. And that is the

MR. MORGAN: whole problem at the present time. It is only as a temporary measure that we are saying to Mr. De Bane in Ottawa, 'Give the right to the independent companies to engage foreign vessels' - we know they are available and are available right now; in fact, today they are waiting, in ports like Halifax in particular, and they are waiting off our Coast to be engaged to catch part of that resource-short plant quota, which is there, not a pound caught to date this year of 10,000 tons total - 'to catch part of that 10,000 tons and have it landed to be processed in those plants without trawlers.' And we are saying that because, as I said earlier, the Canadian companies who own the Canadian fleet are unable to co-operate sufficiently even to the point of giving a cost per pound to the independent companies as to what it would cost to use their trawlers to land that fish.

I want to stress again that this government is very adamantly opposed to foreign vessels and foreign fleets taking fish from our waters to foreign countries to be processed when we have fish plants here crying out for raw material, crying out for fish to be processed, demanding it and pleading for it. We are always opposed to that and we are now. But at this present time, to break the stalemate and to get fish to our plants to supply jobs for Newfoundlanders at a time of the year when there is no fish for them, we are supporting and made a proposal to the federal minister last week as a temporary measure to give permission to the independents to engage foreign vessels to catch the fish at a certain price, supply the fish to the plants in Newfoundland, and have it processed this Fall and part of the Winter.

MR. TULK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Two points about the minister's answer; I would like to point out to him that oftentimes as, I am sure he is aware, temporary very quickly becomes permanent. The other thing is that I know full well the difference between coming and catching fish and bringing it back to another country to be processed, or processed and then taken back to another country by the same boat, as opposed to landing it. But I would like to ask him, Mr. Speaker, are there any plants in Newfoundland at the present time that are using foreign vessels to land fish in this Province right now? Are there any plants in this Province using foreign vessels?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, yes, there is at least one operation that has been using foreign vessels and getting fish from foreign vessels and that is in the St. Anthony plant. There have been foreign vessels supplying fish to that plant for the last number of months. It is the same kind of an operation, or arrangement, that was worked out for the St. Lawrence plant in previous years. In that case Portuguese vessels were engaged, they caught the fish and landed it to be processed in St. Lawrence. These permits, or licences, were later transferred by the federal government to the right to land the fish and process it in St. Anthony. And to my knowledge, I am pretty sure I am correct in that, that is the only location in the Province where foreign vessels have been given the right to catch fish to land and be processed, in other words sold to the local companies. And we, this government, Mr. Speaker, the Premier and his

MR. MORGAN: government, are very firm and adamant in the restructuring agreement that if we have got to use foreign vessels, we should never, never be totally dependent upon having to use foreign vessels to catch fish for our fish plants when we have a fleet - not a good fleet, there are many vessels need replacement. That is the reason why in the restructuring agreement it is clearly specified that this new, so-called super company, will have to use their trawlers, make them available to the independent companies, Canadian vessels owned by the Newfoundland company, to catch the resource-short plant quota fish and have it landed for processing in the plants of the independent private companies here in Newfoundland.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. TULK: The minister has said that as far as he knows there is only one place in Newfoundland, namely St. Anthony, I believe -

MR. NEARY: And St. Lawrence.

MR. TULK: No, the St. Lawrence licences were transferred to St. Anthony: Is that correct?

MR. MORGAN: Yes.

MR. TULK: - that legally have the right to land fish. I would like to ask him if there are any places where they are doing it perhaps illegally in this Province and do not have the right? I refer him to the Southern Shore, namely Bay Bulls, the O'Brien's. Is that possible?

Mr. Speaker, the minister also says that the difficulty now is the cost of Canadian bottoms, the cost of Canadian boats as opposed to foreign boats, to land fish for the resource-short plants, and we accept that, Mr. Speaker. And I think the proposal that he has made is that he would take 4,000 foreign, 4,000 Canadian and let - I do not know where the other two have gone - but he would

MR. TULK: use those two, 4,000 foreign, and 4,000 Canadian, for vessels to land at resource-short plants. I would like to ask him, Mr. Speaker, before coming to that decision, if he indeed consulted with the Fishermen's Union in the Province?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of practice over the last three years we are in a continuing process of consultation, negotiation and discussion with the Fishermen's Union. There is hardly a week passes but I am in

MR.MORGAN: discussion with Mr.Cashin, either by telephone or in meetings. We have a good liaison and a good working relationship. The Fishermen's Union is of the Opinion that there has got to be a firm, determined price for the Canadian vessels to supply to these plants where many of their workers, union members, are looking forward to employment. The union themselves last Summer engaged quite a number of foreign vessels, Mr.Speaker, which came to our waters to purchase fish directly from fishermen. But many of these foreign vessels and foreign fleets demanded from the Government of Canada at the same time that they be given some fish stocks in order to do that, because they knew that our situation was rather desperate in the glut situation, where there is a large catch in a short period of the year, during the cod trap season, and we had to depend on foreign vessels to be able to buy directly from fishermen. The situation as it now is with regards to illegal activity, I would say that any foreign vessel landing without permits from the federal government would be illegal. And the only operation I know of connected with Bay Bulls-you mentioned Bay Bulls Sea Products which recently had the misfortune of having its plant burnt - did have an operation that we call over-the-warf -

MR.NEARY: No, over-the-side.

MR.MORGAN: Not over-the-side,over-the-side is different. Over-the-side is where fishermen sell directly to the vessel. Over-the-wharf would be where the company would buy the fish from the fishermen and have it taken immediately aboard a foreign vessel. That kind of operation at Bay Bulls last Summer, was approved by the federal government of Canada. In fact we had one at our own plant in Black

MR. MORGAN: Tickle, Labrador, where Nickerson was operating our plant for us. We had one there, the same type of operation, a foreign vessel at the wharf with freezing capacity on board, and they assisted in accomodating more market for fishermen because our plant could not accomodate all the fish being caught by the fishermen in the area. So these kind of operations are quite legal and proper. I know of no case in the Province where there are any foreign vessels catching fish and landing if for processing without the necessary licenses from the federal government.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: You did not answer the question about the unions.

MR. TULK: I thank the minister for that piece of information, Let me ask him one other question. He did not answer the question on whether indeed he had consulted with the union on this particular proposal that he has put to the federal government. But I think it is fair to say that one of the things that has been discovered is that the cost of Canadian vessels or Canadian bottoms to land this resource-short plant fish, if you want to call it that, is probably about 25 per cent higher than what it would be with foreign vessels. At least some people have made that statement. Could the minister explain to this House why that is the case? Is it labour costs? Is it the cost of fuel or just what is the reason behind the Canadian vessel cost being higher than for foreign vessels?

MR. NEARY: We have the catching capabilities.

MR. TULK: We have the capabilities, certainly.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of

Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, it is a good question and a very pertinent one to what is happening at the present time. The argument is that the foreign vessels could land fish at a cost maybe seven to eight cents per pound less for the same type of product than Canadian vessels could land it. And the argument has been it is because of the relatively cheaper labour on these vessels; the cost of labour for the vessels is less than what it would be aboard the Canadian vessels. I am not willing to totally accept that. That is the reason why, in the restructuring agreement, we pointed out that if it ever came to a point in the future where the independent companies disagreed with what the harvesting trawler companies were saying their cost was to harvest the fish, independent chartered accountants would be called in. They are saying they do not want to make a profit on harvesting fish for the independent private companies, they merely want to break even, have no losses either. Well, I cannot accept in a blanket way and totally the argument that the only reason foreign vessels can land fish at less cost is because of the labour cost. Efficiency of operations is a key thing to look at. If the companies themselves cannot land fish less than, say, thirty-two or thirty-three cents a pound, if that is their harvesting cost, I would say they are going to have a problem in becoming a viable operation. Because the independent plants claim they cannot pay that much for fish per pound and have it processed and then taken to the market for a profit at today's market prices. So if the independents cannot do it, if they have to pay that much for their fish, I just cannot

MR. MORGAN:

see how any of the trawler companies can make any money either. So I am not willing to accept that because there may be need for improvement in the efficiency of the harvesting sector of the industry. And that is the reason why, in the restructuring bill and agreement, it specified that whenever it comes to a point that the independent companies will disagree with what the harvesting companies are saying under cost for harvesting per pound, that we will then establish an independent board of chartered accountants and that independent board will scrutinize and clearly determine how much it really costs per pound for Canadian vessels to go out and catch fish and land it in this Province.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

I would like for the minister again to answer the question of whether indeed he has consulted with the union on this particular case and whether they have agreed that he should take the proposal that I understand from him he has taken to Ottawa to the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane), that indeed they have accepted that proposal.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to bring a new question, if I could, to the minister to bring back the idea of foreign ownership of fish plants and indeed our fishery resource in this Province. Under the restructuring

MR. TULK: agreement it has been said, I think by the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane), that we have created the second largest fish company in the world, which controls harvesting and it controls processing and it controls marketing. Basically it controls the whole kit and caboodle in Newfoundland. Is the minister now saying, when he talks about the divestiture efforts that are going to be made to pass this company back to private enterprise, that he would sell part or all of that super company that is now being created to foreign interest? Is he now saying that, Mr. Speaker?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, this government have never been opposed to foreign investment in any industry in the Province. In fact, we have always been of the opinion and complained about the role of the Foreign Investment Review Agency that its very strict regulations and guidelines is discouraging to any potential foreign or offshore investors in coming to invest within Canada, let alone in the Atlantic region and here in Newfoundland. We have been concerned about that and we are saying that these kinds of regulations have to be changed or FIRA itself completely wiped away. There has to be a total overall revamping of FIRA's regulations to attract and encourage offshore or foreign investment in our industries in Canada, and in particular, the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada and here in Newfoundland. We have never been opposed to foreign investment. At any time we welcome it and we encourage it.

As for control of our industry, we never did say we want total control to be in the hands of foreign investors. We would welcome foreign investment

MR. MORGAN: as long as it comes to a point where our local investors, either private or government - in the case of the super company it is going to be government - would have control. Control would rest within Canada, control would rest within Newfoundland if at all possible, but we would welcome foreign investment to be shareholders with us whether it would be West Germans, whether it would be the Russians, whether it would be the Portuguese, or U.S., or anyone else throughout the world who want to invest their dollars with us, we would welcome them because we think that private sector dollars are important to have in any industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister is obviously forgetting something, and I want to quote to him from his own speech on Tuesday. He said, and this is in Hansard, Mr. Speaker, "Once that company is established" - referring to the super company - "stability is brought back in the industry and we are once more getting this operation of harvesting and processing and marketing from the deep-sea side of our industry on a viable footing. Then we may be able to attract someone whether they be from West Germany, whether they be from Portugal, whether they be from the U.S., no matter where they are from, or our own Canadian investors, no matter where we find them we would like to see private sector dollars come into this new company."

Mr. Speaker, we all want to see private sector dollars come into the fishing industry, we believe in private investment on this side as well. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the minister that

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

MP. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I thought I answered that question in the last part of the last answer, that we want to have private sector dollars invested in the fishing industry and, whether it comes from offshore or foreign interest or from within Canada or within our own Province, we welcome it. And if the hon. gentleman is to clearly interpret what all the restructuring is about, he should read very carefully the corporate structure as outlined in the bill, which is the agreement itself, with regards to the two divisions of the new company, where there would be a shareholder company or division and there would be an operating division. And our position is that we want to have different divisions even beneath that. We want a common services division, including marketing, and we want to have different divisions of harvesting and processing operations. I mentioned this in my speech a few days ago. One division could be the company we now know as Fishery Products, one division could be the Lake Group and John Penny and Sons combined, and one further division could be the Nickerson operations in Newfoundland taking in North Atlantic Fisheries, Triton and possibly T.J. Hardy. Divesting ourselves of these individual divisions would still mean that we - in this case the two governments and the Bank of Nova Scotia - would have control. But the different divisions could be sold out to private sector dollars and the private sector dollars would be subject to the scrutiny of foreign investment through regulations. As I said earlier, these regulations are now under FIRA. FIRA should carefully review these regulations to attract these kinds of private sector dollars which we feel are not available today in Canada. We have got to go out and try to attract foreign dollars

MR. MORGAN:

to be invested, not to have control, not to take over our industries, not to take over our resources, but to work with us in developing our resources and be partners with us in joint ventures.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the minister. I am aware of the different divisions that are contained in the company, and I am also aware of who the major shareholder in that company is, and I am also aware of who controls the different shares in that company and it is, namely, the federal government and the Bank of Nova Scotia, particularly the federal government. The federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane), as a matter of fact, has control. If you look at the complete structure of that company and the complete shareholdings and so on, the federal minister has the major control of that new restructured company.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister to stand in this House and explain how, even if he sells a division or if he sells the whole of the company, if he sells the major part of that super company to the West Germans, I would like for him to stand in this House and tell us how the provincial government of this Province, the provincial Minister of Fisheries is then going to have control, not only over processing, but over harvesting and marketing of Newfoundland's fish as well?

MR. NEARY:

Good question.

MR. TULK:

Have we not indeed sold out? Once that takes place, that divestiture procedure has gone through, have we not then sold out that company to foreign interest, once again is not out fishery being controlled by foreign interests outside of

November 10, 1983

Tape No. 2933

MJ - 3

MR. TULK:

Canada altogether?

MR. NEARY:

It is against everything the
Premier have been preaching about for the last three or
four years.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am really surprised that the hon. gentleman today is going to take part in debate on the restructuring, and I am glad he is asking these questions because he obviously misunderstands what is happening in the restructuring agreement.

MR. TULK: You will see when we get to the debate.

MR. MORGAN: Because, forgetting who the shareholders are for the time being, look at who is going to be running the company and the management and the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors will consist of eleven members: Five will be from the federal level, three from the Newfoundland Government, two from the Bank of Nova Scotia and the others are going to come from the union, when they take part, and the CEO, who has to be jointly agreed upon. Whoever the CEO is going to be heading up this new company will also be on the Board of Directors, to make a total of eleven. At no time will the federal government have control to do as it wants on the Board of Directors and in running this company. We are not passing over control to the federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen are living with their heads in the sand, because up until now we had no say whatsoever on the harvesting of the deep-sea fishery, we had no say on the assignment of the vessels in catching the fish, we had no say on the allocation of quotas, we had absolutely no say over the deep-sea fishery in our Province except on the licencing of plants, onshore activity. That is all we had. Now we are going to have a major say in a company that is going to be controlling the catching, the harvesting, the licencing and the marketing of that fish.

MR. NEARY: Are you as gullible as you pretend to be?

MR. MORGAN: Maybe they have a new twist coming up today in debate on the restructuring bill. Now they are going to try to say that we passed over the fishing industry to the federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. MORGAN: They had it all, Mr. Speaker, they had all our fishing industry.

MR. NEARY: How gullible can you be!

MR. MORGAN: Here is our most important industry and we have been saying for some time, the Premier in particular, has been saying it during the constitutional debate, 'Look, our fishing industry is so important to our Province' -

MR. NEARY: You are going to give it away to the West Germans.

MR. MORGAN: - 'yet the federal government has been controlling it, the federal government has been controlling our main industry'. And now finally through an agreement with the federal government they are going to give us a say, a major say, and now the Opposition is trying to say that we are giving away what we had. We never had control of the fishing industry. We never did, Mr. Speaker.

To answer the question, Mr. Speaker, this restructuring agreement, I want to say again, through the company structure and the structure of the corporation itself and the Board of Directors, and the way the Board of Directors will be put in place, will give this government more say than ever before over the deep-sea sector of our fishing industry. And do not let anybody ever be getting on with the nonsense that we are giving away our fishery, we never had control over our fishery at any time since Confederation.

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

MR.HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr.Morgan), but not on the same matter. I notice that the minster said in his speech on Tuesday that the government had given a guaranteed loan to Bay St. George Seafoods Limited last year. That company now owes \$50,000 to fishermen in the Cape St. George area of the Province. I would like to ask the minister what he intends to do about this? The company has not declared bankruptcy but they have not paid the fishermen and there are some fishermen who are owed as much as \$2,000 or \$3,000. Is the minister in communication with the principals of this company and could he tell me what he is doing about it?

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR.MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, during the past year, in the past twelve months, we did indeed assist Bay St. George Seafoods. We assisted Aqua Fisheries, we assisted Atlantic Fisheries, we assisted Bay Bulls Sea Products, we assisted Belle Isle Seafoods, we assisted Blue Ocean Products, we assisted Clarenville Ocean Products, we assisted Greenspond Fish Processors, we assisted Great Harbour Deep Seafoods, we assisted Island Seafoods, we assisted Eric King Fisheries, we assisted Newfoundland Food Processors, we assisted North Atlantic Fisheries, we assisted Ocean Harvesters, we assisted Port. Enterprises, we assisted Smith Seafoods Limited, Triton Seafoods, White's Fisheries, Eastern Ocean Products, S.T. Jones Limited, Fogo Island Co-op, Great Harbour Deep Seafoods and a second time. All of these companies, Mr.Speaker, this government was very pleased to help, after very close

MR.MORGAN: scrutiny and assessment and analyses by three departments of government, Fisheries, Finance and Development, top level officials, we deal with these companies and if it looks like they can be viable operations, and indeed they did look like they are going to be viable operations or he would never have assisted them. They met the criteria we established, and we established some firm criteria, We then set some firm guidelines and some firm policies they must comply with if we give them assistance, and they have done that as well. Now as it pertain to the one company in the hon. gentleman's area, it seems that questions in the House of Assembly these days are mostly connected with the little parochial problems of the individual member's district more so than the Province-wide issues.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR.MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is fully aware that if we did not assist that company there would have been a plant closed this Summer in his district. And now he is complaining because the company is owing a few dollars to someone. Well, if the company is owing a few dollars to someone, and it is a matter between the government and the person who the money is owed to, we will interfere.

MR. MORGAN:

But it is a private matter between the company and the people they are dealing with, whether they be fishermen, or suppliers of services, suppliers of various types of supplies, etc., it is difficult for us to go interfere in private enterprise in that manner. Our loan guarantees have some very strict conditions set down to them, but it is not in dealing with day-to-day affairs of that company, and their dealings with fishermen. But if there is a problem, surely the fishermen can sit down with the company themselves and work out what the problems are without having to come to government to interfere in that matter. But I will say sincerely to the hon. gentleman, if the company that he referred to, which we have assisted financially, if the financial assistance in any way or form is tied into the problem he referred to, we will get involved and do our best to resolve it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am disappointed to hear the minister say that this is a parochial little problem. I mean, \$50,000 being owed to fishermen!

MR. NEARY: Foreign ownership is a parochial little problem too.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I happened to see that company's books and the guaranteed loan that the minister gave to that company was just enough to get them to operate for the next year. And they fell into a debt to the fishermen and to the plant workers to the tune of \$50,000. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister when he gave

MR. HODDER: them the loan last year - and I should point out that they have received two Rural Development loans as well - did the minister have anyone sit on the Board of Directors, or did the government check to see how this money was being spent? Because I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that if the Department of Fisheries had done their job when they gave that close to \$100,000 guaranteed loan to the company last year, and had looked at the books as they should have, they would have seen that the company needed much more than that. What they did, Mr. Speaker, was to put the company in position to operate one year and to get itself mired financially. The situation was able to be forecasted a year ago, before they got that government grant.

MR. NEARY: You would not put the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) on the Board of Directors. He would cook the books.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The time for Question Period has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. minister have leave to answer the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. NEARY: We want to get this information.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, when the Premier and his government makes assistance to fish companies in the Province, we just do not casually hand out thousands and thousands of dollars to these companies.

MR. WARREN: You do! You do when there are by-elections.

MR. MORGAN: Do not ever try to leave the impression that we are irresponsible in handling the taxpayers' dollars. We have three very competent officials from three different departments, Fisheries, Finance and Development, who are on a monitoring committee on a weekly basis. They monitor every one of those companies that are outstanding with loan guarantees from government. We are always on top of what the companies are doing, what they are doing wrong, whether it be insufficient or poor management, or not doing things properly to make money; we are in a continuing monitoring process from my colleague, the Minister of Development's department and my own, Fisheries, and Finance. I take strong exception, Mr. Speaker, to the same member who, last year when his plant was closed in Piccaddily, put untold pressure on the Newfoundland Government, myself in particular, to get assistance for that company to get the plant opened. He did not care

MR. MORGAN: form the assistance took,
he did not care in what form the money was given, merely
to get the money out and get the plant open.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Leader of the
Opposition, on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: My hon. colleague
on this side of the House gave leave to get information
but the hon. gentleman is starting to get political now
and almost as silly and foolish as his leader, so we
withdraw the leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave has been withdrawn.
Before we proceed, I would
like to welcome to the gallery a former member of the
Legislature representing the district of St. George's in
the person of Mr. Alec Dunphy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

NOTICE OF MOTION

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of
Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice
that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill,
"An Act To Amend The Alcohol And Drug Dependency
Commission".

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that
I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled,
"An Act To Amend The Environmental Assessment Act".

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

- MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker.
- MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.
- MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond further to the question from the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) on a tender notice for water and sewer in Hopedale. I would like to advise him that there was no tender for a project or a phase of water and sewer, it was just a pre-tender notice or more or less an invitation for contractors who might be interested in the water and sewer project that is proposed for Hopedale to go up there to assess the area before a tender call would be made.
- I have since had a telegram from the Council in Hopedale, asking us not to proceed with a phase of water and sewer just yet.
- MR. WARREN: For what reason?
- MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.
- MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, on a point of order.
- SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!
- MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
- MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members know, there are a large number of written questions on the Order Paper that have not been answered, they have been there now for five or six months and there do not seem to be any answers forthcoming. I would like to ask the Premier, the gentleman who went around this Province talking about open and honest government, what time we can expect to get answers to the written questions that have been on the Order Paper now for five, six and seven months?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

That is not a valid point of order. I am sure that same question could have been asked during the Question Period.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: The day before yesterday, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) undertook to table information that he was reading from a document and that information has not yet been tabled, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Under the rules of the House, I understand that it is mandatory, you have no choice. Mr. Speaker, the document is traditionally tabled when it is read, it is laid on the table immediately.

MR. DAWE: He did not read it.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman did read from it and the document has not yet been tabled. The hon. gentleman read from it again today.

MR. SIMMS: Extracts.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if you quote from a document, read from a document, my understanding is that under the rules of the House it is compulsory for you to table that document.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to know at what time the document that the hon. gentleman told the House he was going to table will be tabled? It should have been tabled that day.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To that point of order, the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman apparently must have been lost yesterday afternoon, or he was not in the House of Assembly, because just before the closing of the House yesterday I stood on a point of order and asked the House of Assembly to give me leave - because the rules say you have to table something in the House at a certain time - to table a document. That document was tabled yesterday afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition-

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I went to the table about twenty minutes ago and I asked the Clerk if the document had been tabled. The Clerk told me, 'No, the document had not been tabled'. The Clerk gave me a copy of a document that was tabled which was not the document the hon. gentleman was reading from. It was a statement circulated to the press the day before yesterday from the Premier's office and not the document the hon. gentleman was quoting from. So the document, Mr. Speaker, has not been tabled according to the Clerk and the people at the Table of the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask again, when will the document be tabled?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKDORD: Mr. Speaker, there are rules governing this House and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) cannot be allowed to get up and abuse those rules. There is no point of order. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition had a question, we just finished Question Period. There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair has to rule that indeed that kind of a question could have been asked of the minister during the Oral Question Period. If the hon. minister did undertake to table a document, as far as I know there is no time limit set to do that kind of thing. Certainly the hon. Leader of the Opposition has not raised a valid point of order.

Before I recognize the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), I would like to welcome

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): to the galleries the Democracy class from St. Boniface High School with their teacher, Mr. Edward Slade, the Vice-Principal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I was here in the House yesterday when the minister tabled the document. He tabled it saying that it was a document which he had referred to in his speech and referred to the fact that the Opposition has asked for the particular document. Mr. Speaker, it is a rule that if a member quotes from a document - as he did this morning in Question Period when I asked him a question; as he did on Tuesday when he was speaking to the bill on restructuring - that he tabled that document. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member stood yesterday in his place and said he tabled that document.

MR. WARREN: Which is a lie. Which is a lie.

MR. HODDER: He referred to the document as the one which the Opposition has asked for, and that is the only one we have asked the minister for this session, Mr. Speaker. So I suggest that this should be a point of privilege, because there has been an attempt to pull the wool over the eyes of

MR. HODDER: hon. members here and to mislead this House of Assembly, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the minister must clarify it.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Justice to that point of order.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There is a point of order already.
The hon. minister of Fisheries

(Mr. Morgan) has said that he has tabled a document, the document that he undertook to table. Now the Opposition are saying that he did not table the document, the Minister of Fisheries has said he did table the document. I mean, one can keep going back and forth on that all day without making a great deal of progress. It would appear to me that when the hon. minister says that he has done what he has undertaken to do, the House takes his word for it. Now there is a question of fact which the Chair can determine between now and when we next sit with respect to what was tabled. I think the matter is much better left rather than allegations back and forth of something being tabled and what has been tabled not the same document as one thought somebody undertook that he might table and getting into all kinds of contortions. So I suggest we leave the matter and Mr. Speaker will have an opportunity to look into it.

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

The Chair has heard what it feels to be enough argument to this point of order. It appears to be a difference of opinion between two hon. members. However, the Chair will undertake to look at the document and make a ruling on it at the next sitting.

MR. NEARY: On point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition on a point of privilege.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we feel very strongly that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) attempted to mislead this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Speaker, that is correct, because let me quote from Hansard what the hon. gentleman said on November 8, 1983 when Mr. Roberts, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, said, 'Would you table that list?' He, Mr. Morgan, said, 'Yes, Mr. Speaker, not in the form it is now, but I will table the list of the companies that we have assisted in the Province over the past year and a half.' And Mr. Roberts said, 'And how much you have put in' And Mr. Morgan, 'And how much we put in.' Now, Mr. Speaker, this document we have here is one that was brought to the Press Gallery by Mr. Petten, the Premier's advisor or whatever he is, the day before yesterday, that was given to me from the Press Gallery, not the one the hon. gentleman was quoting from in the House. This does not give you a list of companies that the hon. gentleman talked about or the amounts that were spent. Mr. Speaker, this is an attempt to mislead this House and I think it is a breach of the privileges of this House, I mean, what else could you call it, Mr. Speaker, but an attempt to mislead the House? Mr. Speaker, apart from that let me also say this, that it has been traditional in this House for hon. members when they quote from a document - and I have had many an experience in it, Mr. Speaker - when they quote from a document the document has to be put on the table immediately. You cannot take it outside the House and change it and doctor it to suit yourself and edit it. It has to be tabled then, Mr. Speaker, otherwise it is not valid evidence to put on the table of

MR. NEARY: this House. And so, therefore, it is not a question of time, Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of if the minister has time he can do it in a day or two or three days; documents, if they are going to be tabled, have to be tabled immediately in this House. That has been the custom, the tradition and that is the rule of this House, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that our privileges in this House have been breached, Mr. Speaker, I think I have made a valid case, a bona fide case, a prima facie case, to have the hon. gentleman taken to task, Mr. Speaker, by the Chair and disciplined.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow this to go on, This is not a circus or a bear pit, this is not a tavern we are in, this is the highest court in the land, and when the minister says he is going to table a document, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour should insist that it be tabled immediately, in our opinion.

MR. NEARY: My hon. friend has the quotation, page 115 of Beauchesne, Documents Cited, 327 (1) "A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a dispatch or other state paper not before the House, unless he be prepared to lay it upon the Table. This restraint is similar to the rule of evidence in courts of law, which prevent counsel from citing documents which have not been produced in evidence. The principle is so reasonable that it has not been contested; and when the objection has been made in time, it has been generalised acquiesced in."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the hon. gentleman has violated the rules of this House. The hon. gentleman undertook to table a document. It should have been tabled immediately. And then, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was not here, but I understand, and I have Hansard in front of me, the minister said, "Mr. Speaker, just for a second, with permission from the House I would table the document asked for by the Opposition earlier." We did not ask for this document, Mr. Speaker. This was the one that was volunteered to the media outside of the House the day before yesterday by the Premier and his flunkies down on the eighth floor. And, Mr. Speaker, you agreed to allow the hon. gentleman. "Is this House ready for the question? All those in favour of the amendment, "aye", contrary "nay", I declare the - Well, the amendment.

Anyway, we got on to the amendment. But we gave the hon. gentleman permission to table the document, which he did not do. Instead he tried to mislead the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: That is right, purposely.

MR. NEARY: Purposely tried to mislead this House. I think it is outrageous and scandalous and the hon. gentleman should not be allowed to get away with it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: Withdraw it, boy.

MR. NEARY: And the Table confirmed it for me this morning when I went to the Clerk and to the table and asked for that document. Then the hon. gentleman got up and said, 'I tabled it yesterday.' and then there were sneers and laughs and jeers.

MR. TULK: That is all they know.

MR. NEARY: That is all they know over there, Mr. Speaker. The arrogance! That is one thing the people of this Province were worried about, how arrogant this administration would become -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - with the big mandate they were given.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: We are on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: We are on a point of privilege at the present time.

MR. MORGAN: House privilege is different, see.

MR. HODDER: Personal privilege is no good when it is House privilege.

MR. NEARY: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I am finished with my point of privilege, but I would like for Your Honour to treat this matter as urgent and take it under very, very serious consideration, because it violates the basic principles of the operation of this House, Mr. Speaker, and I think the hon. gentleman should be serverely disciplined for what he did.

MR. NEARY: The hon. Minister of Fisheries, to that point of privilege.

MR. MORGAN: I rise on a point of personal privilege and not just House privilege.

MR. HODDER: What is the difference? You cannot do it.

MR. MORGAN: There is a big difference. Mr. Speaker, because I have now been charged with purposely, the word was 'purposely', the same thing as intentionally misleading this House.

MR. WARREN: Exactly.

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a very serious accusation. I am going to defend it now and point out, in fact, that he has to withdraw that statement.

MR. NEARY: We are on a point of privilege.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition, has to withdraw that statement and here is why, Mr. Speaker: Hansard will prove, Mr. Speaker, that during my debate, and I only used the bill

MR. MORGAN: itself and some notations to the bill, I had no prepared document, no prepared notes, that is all I had in my debate, for an hour and a half, on the restructuring.

MR. WARREN: Another lie. Another lie.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, may I have silence? May I have order?

Mr. Speaker, I promised twice during the debate to table information as asked for. Once I referred to differences between the agreement signed in May and the agreement signed in September, and I held out the document and said, "I will now table this document." Hansard will show this. "I will now table this document."

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: The document was not tabled. It was a very, very inadvertent mistake. So it was tabled yesterday, the document showing the differences. During the debate the hon. member from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) asked me questions about some of the companies I was mentioning which got assistance during the past year, the independent companies. I was listing off the companies, some from memory, some from the notes on my desk, but there was no prepared document.

MR. NEARY: There was.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member in the Opposition, not the Opposition Leader, but the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle asked the question would I endeavour to supply the House with the information and table it in the House and I said, "Yes, I will gladly do that. I will get all the information, all the companies we have assisted". Then his second question to me was, "And the total amount?" I said, "And the total amount, we will table it in the House." But that was only the day before yesterday,

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker. I have had my officials working on getting all the information on all the companies on the list, how much money, when it was approved by the Cabinet, when it was given to the companies in loan guarantees. It takes more than one day to deal with all that information. I will endeavour to table the information, Mr. Speaker, and it will be tabled in the House. We have no secrets to hide. We are proud of all the companies we assisted. We are proud of all the help we supplied to the companies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: And that is what the hon.

member of the Opposition wanted; he wanted to know which companies we assisted, the list of them, and how much we paid out in loan guarantees. We are quite proud of our performance in that regard and we will gladly table it. So there was no, Mr. Speaker, there was no intentional misleading of this House of Assembly and there was no purposely misleading this House of Assembly by me as minister of the Crown or member of the House. And that statement, Mr. Speaker, must be withdrawn, because it is a very serious accusation against a member of the House.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, that was a great attempt to talk, hoping that everybody would forget the point. The point, Mr. Speaker, was that in Hansard of November 8, Mr. Roberts, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle said, "Would you table that list?" That was the list that the minister was reading from. The Minister of Fisheries said, "Yes, Mr. Speaker, not in the form it is now, but I will table the list of companies we have assisted in the Province over the

MR. HODDER: past year and a half."

MR. MORGAN: I was reading my note.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, he was reading from a list as he did this morning and Beauchesne is -

MR. NEARY: He says so himself, "I want to indicated that - "

MR. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, he said, "By the way, I am reading this list off because I want to indicate that these are the independent companies that we, this Newfoundland Government have assisted to keep them independent, to maintain their independence."

Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne is very clear that if the minister is reading, the minister is not at liberty to go and bring in another list. If he quotes

MR.HODDER: from any paper or state document or list or letter or anything else, Mr. Speaker. As a minister of the Crown if that is not before the House for debate, then he has to table that particular list or piece of information. Mr. Speaker, the minister undertook to do that, he undertook to table a list of companies to which the government had given grants or guaranteed loans. He did not do that. He instead tabled something which has to do with an agreement which was not the matter he was speaking of at the time, Highlights of the Improvements of the Federal/Provincial Restructuring Agreement. I believe, Mr. Speaker, we already had that particular piece of information -

MR.NEARY: That is right, we did. We got it outside the House.

MR.HODDER: - and when he did table it he said that he was tabling the list that was asked for by the Opposition.

MR.TOBIN: You are wasting the time of the House. Sit down.

MR.WARREN: It is not wasting time. He misled the House.

MR.HODDER: Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is not a deliberate attempt to deceive this House of Assembly and to deceive members on this side of the House, I do not know what is.

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): I will hear one other argument. The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It appears to me that in the point of privilege now before the House there are three aspects. There really cannot be three points of privilege, because the Chair

MR. OTTENHEIMER: can only hear one point of privilege at a time, so there are three aspects. One deals with the matter of whether the undertaking to table was fulfilled or not. The hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) says he tabled the document; the Opposition say that it was not tabled or what was tabled was not what was supposed to be tabled. Earlier, before the point of privilege came up, when the Chair ruled there was no point of order, the Chair undertook to look into that question of fact and inform the House on it. So I think that is a matter, before the point of privilege came up at all, which had been resolved and Mr. Speaker undertook to look into it and inform the House. Briefly on the second aspect of it, and that is the rules with respect to tabling of material, certainly what the Opposition House Leader read at the bottom of page 115 in Beauchesne, Subsection 327 , I certainly do not argue with that. I would point out that on page 116 there are also items 3,4, and 5, and I will just read them to draw the Chair's attention to them, because I do not know which category the document which has been tabled, or which allegedly was quoted from comes under. I do not know. But with respect to tabling there are also three other rules briefly cited there:

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Subparagraph (3) "A public document referred to but not cited or quoted by a Minister need not be tabled." (4) "Only the document cited need be tabled by a minister. A complete file need not be tabled because one document in it has been cited." Paragraph (5) "To be cited, a document must be quoted or specifically used to influence debate. The admission that a document exists or the reading of the salutation or address of a letter does not constitute citing." I just pass that on for the House's information so that when the Chair reviews that they will be aware of those citations as well.

So, as I said, I believe there are three aspects of the privilege before the House, which I would not expect, obviously, Mr. Speaker to rule on now: one, whether something has been tabled and what the nature of the document that has been tabled is, and whether it is the appropriate document to be tabled. So I suppose there is that. And then there is the other aspect of it and that is the allegation that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has purposely misled the House; and the further allegation, that the hon. the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Hodder) just finished a couple of minutes ago, that the Minister of Fisheries has 'deliberately attempted to deceive the House of Assembly' - I have taken that down in quotes. So I would suggest to Your Honour that, when there is an opportunity, there will be a ruling necessary certainly on the question of citation and of tabling, and also whether it is permissible under the circumstances for the hon. gentleman opposite to allege that the Minister of Fisheries 'deliberately attempted to deceive the House of Assembly.' We look forward to Your Honour's ruling when it is convenient for Your Honour to so do.

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

The Chair indicated that he would hear one more argument from the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and feels that he has heard enough arguments on this matter. It is certainly a very serious matter and the Chair will certainly take it under advisement and make a ruling as soon as possible.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Order 35.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 35 is the bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Entered Into Between The Government Of The Province And The Government Of Canada Respecting The Restructuring Of The Newfoundland Fishery." The hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) adjourned the debate last day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, in the beginning of this debate, I want to establish two or three points, one of them which will require the consensus of people on the other side, the first one being that I might or might not take - I will try to say what I have to say - if it takes an hour then sobeit, if it takes forty-five minutes, sobeit, if it takes an hour and a half, I would ask that the other side grant the same privilege as I granted to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) the other evening, that is, give me leave of the House.

As I said yesterday,

Mr. Speaker, recognizing the importance of the bill, when the minister stood in this House and said, 'And I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that it is the most important bill to come before the House this session', if the garbage that has been put on the table is any indication so far, then

MR. TULK:

I suspect that this is indeed, as the minister said, an historic day in this Legislature. I would even go further than that, Mr. Speaker, and say to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) that indeed it is an historic day in Canada itself.

MR. TULK:

It is historic, Mr.

Speaker, for a number of reasons, but primarily I suggest it is historic because it shows what can really happen in a Province and what can really take place when people in governments really and finally do decide that there is way out of a problem by negotiation. It shows, Mr. Speaker, what can happen in particular in regard to matters of principle, and that is what this bill is. Make no mistake about that, Mr. Speaker, the problems in the fishing industry have not been solved, and I think the minister indicated that as well the other day, the problems in the fishing industry in this Province have not been solved by the signing of this agreement and the passage of this bill both here and in Ottawa. It is an agreement in principle which says that the two governments will work together, under various corporate structures and so on, to work out the problems of the fishing industry. The real issues of the fishing industry have yet, I suspect and I suggest to Your Honour, to be dealt with. The real issues will come later. I think the minister has experienced one of them already, and that is the RSP programme which is part of the restructuring programme at this point. The minister has been dealing in the real world with that problem, the problem of Canadian bottoms, as he is now calling it, Canadian boats, charging approximately thirty to thirty-one cents a pound for landed fish when the inshore plants in this Province are used to getting it for about twenty or twenty-two cents and they need to get it at that price in order to survive. So the real problems of the fishing industry are yet to be dealt with, but it is an important matter of principle that has been agreed upon by the two governments that will pass in this Legislature, I am sure, and I would hope that it would pass

MR. TULK:

in Ottawa very quickly.

The other one that we raised this morning, Mr. Speaker, is the question of foreign ownership, the possibility of foreign ownership of the resources of Newfoundland and of the fishing industry; the processing, the harvesting and the marketing sector may indeed creep in through the back door. That may very well happen. But it is an important matter. So I would trust, Mr. Speaker, that if leave is needed for the few questions that I have to raise in this debate - if it is needed; as I say it may or may not be - then I would trust that leave will be granted to do that in the same way as we granted it the other day to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and allowed him to go on to make his case on this important agreement on the principles of the fishing industry. Mr. Speaker, I said at the beginning of this debate that this is an historic day in Newfoundland's Legislature, of that I have no doubt and it is an historic day in Canada. I want to make one other point before I really get into the process that has gone on and what has really happened with this bill and that is, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House are not going to delay any more than is absolutely necessary the passage of this important bill on the principles of establishing a new fishing company for the Newfoundland fishery.

Mr. Speaker, it is beautiful to have the shoe on the other foot. The minister and the Premier have constantly looked across this House asking us to get 'our Liberal buddies' - I think that was the key phrase - in Ottawa to do certain things for Newfoundland. We at times have tried to get that done and we have not always been successful but on some occasions we have. I would hope that the minister can now get his Tory buddies in Ottawa, his Tory friends in Ottawa - he has been on the radio for the last couple of days -

November 10, 1983

Tape No. 2944

MJ - 3

MR. MORGAN:

They better.

MR. TULK:

What are you going to do with them if they do not, 'Jim'? - he has been on the radio for the last couple of days saying that the Torys and the NDP, but particularly

MR. TULK:

the Tories should make sure that this bill passes very quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that we in this House, perhaps as early as Monday - I think there are a number of people on this side who have certain points they want to make - but I think this bill can be passed as early as Monday or Tuesday, as far as this side of the House is concerned, with very little problem. So in this case, Mr. Speaker, we in this Legislature may indeed end up, thanks to the Tories in Ottawa, being ahead of the federal bill itself being passed. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that we will.

I want to commend Mr. Pierre De Bane, the federal Minister of Fisheries. I can say one thing for that gentleman; I may not always agree with him, as a matter of fact I do not always agree with him - there were a number of occasions when I disagreed with him privately and publicly - but I want to laud and praise him for his efforts in getting this piece of legislation put together as well as getting the agreement signed. He has done a magnificent job and worked very hard at it and I want to praise him for that.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to support the bill. As well as allowing passage of it - we cannot stop passage once we stop speaking anyway - we are also going to support the bill. We are going to do that, Mr. Speaker, for several reasons, the primary reason being is that the people of the Burin Peninsula and the South Coast of this Province have suffered enough. God knows they have suffered enough in the last year or year and a half with the closure of the deep-sea plants. It was fast reaching a point on the Burin Peninsula, and indeed in all of Southern Newfoundland as I am sure my friend from Fortune -

MR. TULK:

- Hermitage (Mr. Stewart)

will agree, and the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), and the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) will agree that it was fast reaching a point on that coast where people were rapidly running out of unemployment insurance benefits and were being forced to go to the department run by the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey). And that is not, Mr. Speaker, what the people of the South Coast of this Province are used to and it is not what they want. It was probably the first time in their lives. Mr. Speaker, I can remember sitting in this House after 1979 when the member for Burin - Placentia West was on this side of the House and he was a very happy man compared to what I was, being from the Northeast Coast of this Province, representing a district on the Northeast Coast of this Province because he could look at me and say, 'I practically have no unemployment in my district'. Mr. Speaker, for those people who have been reduced to what they have been reduced to in the past year, and for anybody in this Legislature or indeed in the Legislature of Canada to suggest that they are going to hold up a bill that in some way may keep them in that same position, is intolerable. We are going to support the bill and as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can stand here today and say that this bill fits totally within the policy of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. TULK:

I do not believe

I can do that, I know I cannot do that because our policy has been that all the fish plants on the South Coast, all the fish plants have to be kept open, all the fish plants on the South Coast have to be kept open. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we made that statement we were not saying that all of the fish plants on the South Coast have to be kept open for the next little while or it has to be let to some corporate management, some chief executive officer of some super company to decide. We meant the phrase for exactly what it said, that all of the fish plants have to be kept open.

MR. NEARY:

Period.

MR. TULK:

Period.

And, Mr. Speaker,

as I look at this bill, as I go down through it, I am not sure-and I do not believe anybody else in this House is sure, I do not believe that anybody in Newfoundland is sure-that indeed all of the fish plants are going to be kept open, period. I do not believe that is possible to get that out of the bill. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to sound like an alarmist, and I do not want to sound like I am in some way hindering the future of the Grand Bank plant or indeed the Burin plant, But if you talk to the people of Grand Bank, as I did last weekend, the feeling is 'we will try,' and I have no doubt that the people of Grand Bank will try to see that their fish plant is competitive, is efficient, and effective in every way possible, but there is also a feeling on the Grand Bank by a number of people that what you are seeing in a state of execution at the closure of the Grand Bank plant. I hope that is not the case and I trust that it is not.

Mr. Speaker, there are other reasons why we have to support this bill, because, as I said in Question Period today, and as I said earlier on this

MR. TULK: morning, this bill will not solve the real issue, but it is an important bill in that it is an agreement in principle and an agreement of principle of how the two governments will solve the fishery problems in this Province. And we have no problems with that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to come back for a minute, if I can, and stay on it for a little while, as to why we say all of the fish plants in this Province have to be kept open and why we said that earlier in this game. There are a number of reasons for that. But the primary reason, I think it can all be put under the one caption, and it has been put under the one caption for some time is social reasons. Because, Mr. Speaker, to close down fish plants in this Province, to allow a super company, to allow a bureaucracy to close down the fish plants in this Province means, as I think it was first said by the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) - for once he said something right; I think in that case he did - is that it would be centralization through the back door. What you would be doing essentially is tearing Newfoundland apart. And we on this side, Mr. Speaker, are not prepared to see Newfoundland society ripped apart by some bureaucrat or some chief executive officer of some super corporation.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that we said earlier in this game - early in this process, it is not a game; a game does not carry the right connotation - this process that went on, is that we agreed earlier that there was an overcapacity in the fishing industry in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, the people who were then being affected in Grand Bank, and indeed are being affected all around Newfoundland by the overcapacity in processing for the stocks that we have, it is not their fault that they find themselves in the situation that they are in.

MR. TULK: It is the fault of both the provincial Minister of Fisheries of the day and the federal Minister of Fisheries of the day - and I am not talking about today, I am talking about in 1977. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you get the tapes of television shows and the tapes of radio broadcasts, you will find the the federal Minister of Fisheries of that day and the provincial Minister of Fisheries of that day, Romeo LeBlanc and Walter Carter respectively, and they were both encouraging people to get into the fishing industry, buy boats, and they were encouraging private investors to expand plants, to build plants. And, of course, this Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), we have here has to share some of the blame for what has gone on because, quite simply, he has passed out processing licenses all over this Province, particularly when it suited his political purposes.

MR. NEARY: Like dealing cards at election time.

MR. TULK: Like dealing cards at election time, A certain by-election in Bellevue will attest to that. So, Mr. Speaker, it has not been the fault of the people of the South Coast, or indeed of the people of Newfoundland that their fish plants were closed. So, Mr. Speaker, we said earlier, and I will repeat it again, that all fish plants have to be kept open. And that is, and I hope it will remain the Liberal party's policy.

MR. NEARY: As long as you and I are around it will.

MR. TULK: As long certainly as I am spokesman for fisheries in Newfoundland and Labrador. And I will not be if it is not.

MR. NEARY: As long as I am the leader it will be the policy.

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, we have set the fact very well that there may indeed be a social cost involved. If anybody thinks in this House today, if anybody believe, that both levels of government will never again have to put money into the deep-sea fishery, or indeed into the inshore fishery, if people in this House believes that, then I say to you that they have rocks in their heads. There will be times, because of the social nature of both the deep-sea and inshore fishery, when governments will again have to come to the assistance of the fishing industry. And, Mr. Speaker, let there be no doubt, again let me make one other point clear, let there be no doubt that on this side of the House we believe that as far as it is humanly possible we should make the fishery economically viable-in as far as it is humanly possible we should do that. But it is clearly the case that you cannot accomplish that overnight and neither can you do it at the expense of different communities and the way of life that we have in Newfoundland.

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is precisely, in my opinion, why one Michael Kirby and his task force were so unsuccessful. They were unsuccessful, Mr. Speaker, in their ventures. And I am glad they were unsuccessful in their ventures. And that is precisely why we from the very beginning expressed some grave doubts about the Kirby Report. Because you see, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kirby's overriding mandate was to make the fishery economically sound, 'economically viable' was the word. It was supposed to be the report to end all reports. Mr. Speaker, God knows that in this Province we have had enough reports on the fishery. It has been reported to death and studied to death. Kirby's was supposed to be the report to end all reports and he failed. He failed because his mandate was so heavily weighed on the economic side rather than on the social side. The report failed to recognize one particular point, and this is an important point and it should be kept in mind by all those people who are going to reform the fishing industry, and that is, and I am going to repeat it again, the fishing industry in Newfoundland has a social factor involved in it, the fish industry has a social component involved in it. Now, Mr. Speaker, there will always be politicians involved, because politicians exist, that is the very reason why politicians exist, to take care of the Province's society, not to take care of the Province's big bureaucracies. We have to take into account economic realities but we have to take into account social factors as well. And I ask the question again; How could any member of this Legislature, through cold-blooded economics, destroy one single Newfoundland outport or community? The answer for the Liberal Party was obviously

MR. TULK: no, and it remains no. That is why it was easy, very easy, for us to stand in this House months before the present government did, and you did not have to think it through very much, it was very easy for us to stand in this House and say, "Every plant in this Province remains open." Mr. Speaker, that was, I suppose, last November or December. The government, I am going to be very kind to them, the government borrowed that policy - I use the word "borrowed" with some great care - and on March 23 we finally heard, through a document which I do not believe I have here now, a document presented by the Premier making it their policy. And we are proud that they did. They added something else that we had also put in our submission to the Kirby Task Force and that was co-ordinated marketing approach and a co-ordinated fleet deployment, the use of the fleet to see that our plants were given a supply of fish. As I said, that was all part of our proposal to the Kirby Task Force in July of '82 and theirs was March '83. We were proud, as I said, of the fact that they had accepted it. Mr. Speaker, that was why, and I want to review this history briefly, that was why we had no problem in sending a Telex to the Prime Minister of this country asking him to take Michael Kirby and at least put his report, if you want to you can do it with Kirby, at least put his report on the shelf and let the Federal Minister of Fisheries completely handle the issue.

MR. NEARY: How wise we were.

MR. TULK: How wise we were, but we did it. We did it because we believe, as I said, that the fishery is a political issue, that politicians

MR. TULK: should be involved with it. It is a social issue and, therefore, politicians have to be involved in it. That was why, Mr. Speaker, at the People's Conference when somebody said to us, 'You have a federal Liberal Government in Ottawa and you are a Liberal Opposition in Newfoundland, what are you going to do about a proposal, a motion with the first clause in that motion saying that all plants have to be opened?' that was why we had no problem in standing and saying, 'Yes, indeed we support that, because that has been our position from the beginning.' No problem at all. As a matter of fact, that petition, that proposal was also supported at that time by the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

What was the date of that? Was that about March 28, late March? It was late March that the Minister of Fisheries and the Liberal Opposition and everyone at the meeting supported that proposal.

MR. HOUSE: And members of parliament.

MR. TULK: Yes, the members of Parliament. There is a recognition on this side of the House that the fishery weaves right through our whole political life, our whole life in Newfoundland, our whole social culture and so on. Mr. Speaker, I have to say as I said earlier, that we on this side of the House - because I am sure the Minister of Fisheries is still somewhat concerned about Grand Bank, because I think it is fair to say that Grand Bank is assured at this time that it has eighteen months rather than perhaps the twelve months that it might have had if the original proposal of March 16th had gone ahead and given that super company time to evaluate whether indeed it was a viable fish plant or not.

Burin is not at this time a primary processing operation, it is a cooked food operation which is secondary processing. As I said, we can accept that

MR.TULK: that is the case for two primary reasons: That we have a statement of principle here which both governments have agreed to, and we will pass this legislation - the real issue will still have to be dealt with and we will watch closely to see that the minister lives up to living in the real world in dealing with those real issues as they come forward. The other reason that we can accept this agreement is that Mr. Kirby, a person who I have come to somehow personally like, although that was not the feeling the first time I met him, as you will recall -

MR.NEARY: Who was with him?

MR.TULK: -Peter John Nickerson.

And they both have failed , in my opinion, and I hold no personal animosity toward either one of those gentlemen, but they have personally failed to make the Newfoundland fishery totally economically oriented, and that is good.

MR. TULK:

If anything, Mr.

Speaker - and I want to get into this with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan); we started to get into it this morning - if anything the political influence, and I am not saying it is a bad thing, the political influence on the new super company being created under the restructuring programme is perhaps much greater - I say it is much greater - than the government's former influence ever was over private companies in this Province. The Minister of Fisheries may think differently, he may profess differently publicly, but if he sits down and examines the corporate structure, who has shares - and, as I said this morning, he who pays the fiddler calls the tune - he will see that politicians now have more influence in the deep-sea fishery in this Province than ever before.

Unfortunately for the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), if he looks at that same corporate structure he can come to no other logical conclusion than the person in this country regardless of who he is, who really has the most control over that deep-sea super company, that restructured company, which will take in some inshore plants, is really the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane), That is the person who has the most control. There is absolutely no other way for him to figure it out. And the honest truth is, as we reminded the minister last year in this House, that he did have control over the processing sector in the province. That was there in the constitution. But under this new super company, I suggest to him that really if you sit down and take the federal government - there are eleven members, Mr. Speaker, on the Board, five appointed by the federal government, three appointed by the Provincial Government, two by the Bank of Nova Scotia, one by the union; and the CEO is a joint appointment.

NEARY:

The union has not said whether they will accept.

MR. TULK: Let us suppose they do accept, let us suppose that the Bank of Nova Scotia which has two votes on that Board, and whoever the Federal Minister of Fisheries is in two years time - it could be Jim McGrath wanting freezer trawlers -

MR. TOBIN: It will certainly be a Tory.

MR. TULK: Right, it could be Jim McGrath wanting freezer trawlers, factory trawlers off this coast. It could be Jim McGrath, the Minister of Fisheries in two years time, the Federal Minister of Fisheries. The five appointments on the Board are federal. Now, if anybody believes, if anybody is stupid enough to believe that those five appointments are not going to carry out the wishes of whoever the federal minister is, he has got rocks in his head. He has rocks in his head, Mr. Speaker, if he believes that.

The Bank of Nova Scotia well - and this is what it is, it is nothing else, it is a profit-making organization - they are not concerned about social reasons in this Province. Neither should they be, it is not their job. Their job is to make a profit for their shareholders. So you have the federal Minister of Fisheries with five appointments on that Board and the Bank of Nova Scotia with two, Now, Mr. Speaker, that is seven out of eleven. That is control.

MR. TULK: The provincial minister can sit in his seat all he likes, and the Premier can talk all he likes about the fact that he now has a consultation process in place in the new agreement. Mr. Speaker, we know what consultation is. Consultation, basically, is going and asking, 'What do you think about what I am doing?' That is basically what it is. So the influence of politics is greater, and it should be, but it has been lost by this provincial government. The Premier and the minister will say, 'Well, we can veto any decision' -

MR. NEARY: That is not veto power.

MR. TULK: - 'of that company, that is in the agreement.' So the federal minister makes the decision that he is going to close - let us not use Grand Bank. Let us say he is going to close - where?

MR. NEARY: Timbuktu.

MR. TULK: Triton. He is going to close the Triton plant which is not yet under the restructuring agreement, although the Premier has claimed that it is. He is going to close Triton and the Premier warns him and says, 'No, that is in my district. I am going to veto that.' Alright, what is the decision going to be now? The Premier's decision is that he is going to veto. So you get the merry-go-round of the federal government then saying to the Premier, 'Well, we are going to veto your decision.' Now, Mr. Speaker, what is that? That is a merry-go-round where you are at a stalemate and nothing is being accomplished. So what is the point of your veto? You are in the same situation that we have been in for the last year and a half where nobody will sit down and talk to each other. That is where you are.

MR. NEARY: Then they will eventually say, 'Well, if you want to operate it, take it and pay the cost.'

MR. TULK: Yes. A fish plant closes in the Province - Triton is closed, you might say - and the

MR. TULK: Premier, being Premier of this Province and being a good district member, which I am sure he is, says, 'Triton has to be re-opened'. The CEO, - is it? Chief Executive Officer. The CEO, as the Provincial Minister has been calling the boss of that super company - says, 'Well, all right, boy. If you want to open that company it is going to cost us \$3 million in the next year because of our losses' only are they talking about loss of operations, they are talking about loss of income. That could mean income after taxes - 'you are going to pay the cost of that.' Some power, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Premier have some power. If the Minister of Fisheries wants to pass out \$3 million to a shoe company in Harbour Grace to run a fish plant, if he wants to pass out \$3 million to them, and if he wants to cover their operating costs and their loss of income and so on, they would be some foolish not to take it. They would be some foolish, some silly. So, Mr. Speaker, what has the minister really gained? What has the Premier really gained?

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the government that stood in this House repeatedly since 1979, and even earlier than 1979 but certainly I can remember since 1979, and have said over everything that you have to have total control in order to be able to run something. If you are going to run something you have to have total control. And they now find themselves - the Premier can say what he likes, he wanted total control of the Northern cod stock.

MR. NEARY: Bowater is total control.

MR. TULK: We will get to Bowater later, I guess.

The Premier said, 'I want control of licencing' - he said it - 'I want control of quotas, I want provincial quotas'. And that basically is control of his own quotas. He now finds himself

MR. TULK: sitting on a board where he has 25 per cent ownership of a company, he has three board members out of eleven, and we have got a super company with other people running it and in control of the one single thing that this government had total control of in the fishing industry, namely the processing sector. Gone!

MR. WINDSOR: We still have licencing.

MR. TULK: You still got licencing. Oh!

MR. MORGAN: We always did. Do not be so foolish!

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, he has control of processing - He always had control of processing! How many times have we heard that minister stand in this House and say we can do nothing because we do not have control of the fishery, we do not have control of anything.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in this House, for this government, I think recognized what was happening when, on September 9, he wrote to the Toronto Globe and Mail. He recognized, being the good Tory that he is, he recognized that indeed we were becoming part of the Canadian nation and perhaps we were losing some of our jurisdiction, and he wrote to the Toronto Globe and Mail on September 9 and said, 'The De Bane initiative was a naked intrusion into an area of provincial constitutional jurisdiction which is intolerable to any province.' Now, Mr. Speaker, the Finance Minister was being perfectly consistent with his Premier's policy. 'Stay out of our jurisdiction', namely processing. He goes on then to say, 'A super company fishing industry in which a distant federal government will have overwhelming ownership' - listen! - 'bears the seed of its own distruction and that of the welfare of many families and communities dependent on it.' Now, Mr. Speaker, what he was saying is exactly what has happened; the federal government has a majority share in

MR. TULK: that company along with the Bank of Nova Scotia and along with the unions and so on. They have majority control, there is absolutely no doubt about that.

I do not agree necessarily, Mr. Speaker, with the last part of the Finance Minister's (Dr. Collins) statement to the Toronto Globe and Mail, in his letter I think to the Editor. I do not necessarily agree with him because what he is saying is that nobody else only this provincial government can do anything or really wants to do anything for the people in Newfoundland. I do not agree with his statement.

Again, I want to come back to Mr. De Bane's efforts to get this problem solved. Mr. Speaker, if you look at -

DR. COLLINS: If you see it that way (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Your stomach must roll over when you hear it.

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible) a copy.

MR. TULK: Well, I will send you a copy. Unlike the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), I will send you a copy of your own letter.

MR. MORGAN: Table it for him.

MR. TULK: Sure, I will table it for him. I will send him a copy of his own letter to the Toronto Globe and Mail on September 9th in which he said, "It was totally unacceptable to this Province and to this government that we would have a super fish company in which a distant federal government', will have overwhelming ownership.' 'Totally unacceptable.' And today he is faced with the prospect, when we pass this bill, of letting that happen where he

MR. TULK: no longer has any ownership in that company except three members on the board.

MR. NEARY: And they have to sit there like big mopos.

DR. COLLINS: That is the crucial point of this whole debate.

MR. NEARY: A big mope.

MR. TULK: Exactly. And we have hit dead on it. You have absolutely no control at all in that company.

DR. COLLINS: You do not have any concept of control, that is the problem.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to Mr. De Bane and his actions. I want to praise him as a man of principle. As I said, I may not always agree with him, but I want to praise him, as the provincial minister has done, as a man of principle and compassion. It would have been very easy for the Federal Minister of Fisheries (De Bane) to walk away from this problem. It would have been very easy for him. He could have walked up to the provincial minister and said, "The fish plant closed? Your problem. I may have some money to give you but it is your problem to decide what you are going to do with it." He could have done that. And perhaps politically for him that may have been the course of action for him to take, walk down and say, as he keeps referring to the Minister of Fisheries for Newfoundland, "'Jim', I have \$75 million. I will give you that, now you go ahead and solve the problems in the processing sector of the fishing industry for which you are responsible." That might have been the politically wise thing for him to do.

MR. NEARY: He would have done some travelling around the world then if he had to get his hands on that money.

MR. TULK: He would never have come back.

MR. NEARY: He would never see him again.

MR. TULK: He would have never come back,

Mr. Speaker, he would be travelling for the next twenty years, the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

But De Bane did not do that.

MR. NEARY: He would have got as far away from Newfoundland and its problems as he could.

MR. TULK: It is worthy of praise the man did not do it and he should be praised for it. As he said on July 4 of this year, to do that, to have walked away from it would have been immoral. I think his words were immoral and callous to have done that.

His efforts are magnificent.

Mr. Speaker, that aside, Mr. De Bane aside, the control of the fishing industry in this Province after this agreement was signed rests in the hands of the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) and the Bank of Nova Scotia if they decide to get together. The truth is the provincial minister has very little control, unless he is willing to pay through the nose for it. But then again, who would not?

The Premier in this Province stands for control, he stands for ownership. The Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) was right, and I want to re-emphasize it, he was right when he said he was following the line that the Premier has held out for years. And we do not need to go any further, Mr. Speaker, than the offshore to illustrate that. In 1979 I can remember quite clearly sitting in the House as a young member and hearing the Premier dance around his seat, fall over the desk almost -

MR. NEARY: Almost cut his wrists off for Newfoundland to own the offshore.

MR. TULK: 'We have got to have ownership because ownership means control' and in this company he has lost it, he is giving it up.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other questions that one has to ask. A lot of people in this Province have been led to believe, as I said before, that we are now going to have a panacea in the fishing industry. It is going to be beautiful,

MR.TULK: it is going to be a beautiful world. I think the minister knows the difference because, you see, Mr. Speaker, what has happened is that we have set in motion- I am a firm believer in what I believe is called Newton's Law, I am not sure, but for every action there is a reaction -

MR.CALLAN: Equal and opposite reaction.

MR.TULK: - an equal and opposite reaction. Mr. Speaker, what we have done today and what we will do on Tuesday or whenever the Tories decide in Ottawa they are going to let the bill pass - we hope that the provincial member (Mr. Morgan) can do something with his Tory buddies up in Ottawa and get the motion off the Order Paper - is set up a super fish company and an outfit called the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation which will take care of certain segments of the Newfoundland fishery. They will try to take care of that and I have no doubt that they will try to do a good job. But there is a very vital question that arises, there is a vital reaction that comes about somewhat as a result of that action that we have taken for the past year and a half, and we have to ask ourself this question now, since we have taken that action and since we have been so busy with that action, what has happened to another very important and vital segment of the Newfoundland fishing industry?

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.TULK: And I am referring, of course, to the inshore fishery. Mr. Speaker,

MR. TULK: it is absolutely not good enough for either governments or politicians in Newfoundland and in Canada to sit back and take care of one segment of the industry without taking care of the other. The fishery in this Province is a total concept. There are perhaps more communities, smaller perhaps, but there are more communities and perhaps more people dependent on the inshore fishery than there are on the offshore fishery. Mr. Speaker, that is a fact beyond dispute, And it is a fact beyond dispute that the inshore fishery in this Province is in trouble and I suspect it is a result of everybody in Newfoundland saying, 'We have to solve the deep-sea problem' and attention being focused almost solely on that one problem, It is a reaction to the signing of this agreement. We have seen it this morning and we have seen it in the last two or three days. One of the things in that package, in the offshore agreement and the restructuring of the deep-sea fishery, was indeed that we were going to use the resource-short plant concept. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have seen in the last couple of days what that is. And what that says, what that resource-short plant concept says is that those plants who depend on the inshore fishery to operate during a short period of the year, during the Summer season basically, will be allocated offshore fish in the off season, in the slow season of the year, so that they can become economically viable.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, if we look at this bill in Section 8, what do we see about the resource-short plant allocation? What do we see in that Section 8 about the resource-short plant?

It says, 'Whenever part of the Company's trawler fleet is not fully utilized and is otherwise available such trawlers will be utilized for the harvesting and supply of fish at an agreed upon price, which shall be equivalent to the Company's harvesting costs' -

MR. NEARY: Mumbo jumbo!

MR. TULK: Listen. The provincial minister should listen very closely to the next phrase - 'as determined' - by whom? - 'the management of the Company' - not even the company, not even the board of directors, not even the minister.

MR. MORGAN: Go on from there now. Go on from there.

MR. TULK: I am going on to the next part -
Yes, indeed I will. 'to independently owned plants under the Resource Short Plan Program. If the owner of an independent plant disputes those costs, the Company shall ask an independent firm of chartered accountants to review management's determination of the cost and make a report to the Company's Board of Directors.'

MR. MORGAN: 'This report shall be made available to the Governments on a confidential basis. No more than one report may be required each year.' It is available to the government. He says it is available to the government. But let me ask him this question: Even though he gets the information, even though he is told that that fish only costs twenty-four cents a pound

MR. NEARY: His hands are tied behind his back.

MR. TULK: Who is going to make the

MR. TULK: final decision as to whether or not the boats will sail?

MR. NEARY: Management again.

MR. TULK: Management again. You are back to management again and you have no control, or the board of directors, and he has no control of either one, absolutely none.

MR. MORGAN: Once the cost has been interpreted, whether they are going to take it or not then.

MR. TULK: Then they decide whether they take it or not. If they take it at a higher price, they end up in the same position as if they do not take it at all. And the same position is what? Bankruptcy, probably. You cannot make a profit. If they pay more than than twenty-two to twenty-four cents a pound, they cannot make a profit, they cannot even break even.

MR. MORGAN: Who brought in the resource-short plant concepts? This government did.

MR. TULK: Never mind who brought in the resource-short plant concept, let us talk about it under restructuring. Never mind who brought it in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: That we will leave for another day. But the truth is that under the -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. TULK: I am going to ask the minister to be quiet in the same way as I sat here the other evening and was quiet when he was speaking and listened very attentively to what he had to say.

Under the present structure that has been set up, the independents face either

MR. TULK: one of two choices, as the minister has said. They can either take the fish once they learn what the price is; if it is too high they can say, 'No, we do not want it; or they can do without it. That is what he is saying. They can do one or the other. The end result is the same because those fish plants are not economically viable unless they have a supply of fish year round. That is the idea of the resource-short plant concept. And if they take fish that is too highly priced, they cannot make a buck on it anyway. Perhaps that is the very thing that has been happening to some of the deep-sea plants, the delivery of fish by Canadian trawlers has been costing too much money. That could very well be the one major thing that has caused us serious problems in the deep-sea companies. That could very well be it.

We have reached a place as a result of the restructuring - the minister will agree this is correct - we have reached a place where the independents are now asking to be incorporated in the restructuring not to -

MR. MORGAN: If I could, I would like to clarify that for you.

MR. TULK: Go ahead.

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

MR. MORGAN: Just for clarification on the independents, some statements were made last weekend by the independent companies and the head of the independent companies in Newfoundland that they were on the verge, was the term used, of asking Mr. De Bane to take them over and put them in restructuring because they want him to buy out the assets. Well, I was in communication with the independents and had a telex back from them that they have not done that and there is no indication they are going to do that, but they are worried about this resource-short plant programme, they are worried about any

MR. MORGAN: unfair competition to be established by the super company, but they have not asked Mr. De Bane, the federal government or us to take them over and put them in restructuring.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Let me just suggest to the minister that if they have not asked I am pretty well sure that, unless something is worked out with that resource-short plant concept, they will.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few more points that I want to make and I do not believe I can make them in the next few minutes. Do I have leave of the House?

MR. MORGAN: Leave? Sure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I want to look at one other thing in this agreement. I want to look at many other things but one other thing in particular, and that is how well the structure of this company affects the marketing of the smaller companies, of the independents. And not only the independents, I suppose you can call them all independents, but even places like my own fish plants, Beothuck Fish and Fogo Island Co-op. You have to ask yourself the question, again in the real world that we are going to be in when we start to work with this new super company, will they indeed be pushed out by the larger corporation, the larger super company?

MR. MORGAN: It will be a sad day if they are.

MR. TULK: Yes, it will be a sad day if they are. Because I think the minister will agree with me that I have - I will call it a company, that is what they are a company - a co-operative in my district which produces some of, if not the best then certainly some of the best fish in Newfoundland.

MR. MORGAN: Top quality stuff.

MR. TULK: Yes, top quality stuff.

MR. TULK: If that quality or if that company, that co-operative is hurt in any way by this large corporation, then it will indeed be a sad day.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one other point in regards to quality, and that is we have heard in this Province for years, and we have been led to believe that it is the fishermen in this Province who are primarily responsible for the state of quality of our Newfoundland fish. Mr. Speaker, there is an awful lot of doubt as to whether that is true or not. A large part of the quality problem. I firmly believe, and I am sure that some people on the other side will agree again, is a result of the way fish has been handled in fish plants.

We have to ask ourselves a question and that is will that large company - I am a firm believer in small is beautiful - produce quality as well as the smaller companies are doing now or as well as they are capable of doing? And the answer, Mr. Speaker, is probably no. Because one of the things that was in the Kirby Report, as the minister knows, is that Grand Bank would close and they would merge with Fortune and that they would put on two shifts, three shifts if necessary but certainly two. And what we are finding, I think I am correct and the minister will correct me if I am wrong, but I think what they have found that if you put two shifts in in Fortune, then the bacteria count is up and quality will suffer. I think that is correct. So we may indeed find that the super company produces a quality of fish that is not near as good as the quality of fish that can be produced by smaller companies.

We then have to ask ourselves the question will the smaller companies that are still left outside of that super company suffer lower prices? And the answer in that case is probably yes, because the feeling

MR. TULK: that will be around
about Newfoundland fish is that it is of a poorer quality.
we have been
assured by the minister, (Mr. Morgan) and I think he was
sincere in trying to assure us, that the smaller companies
can use the resources of the large company for marketing.

MR. MORGAN: If they want to.

MR. TULK: If they want to they
may use them.

But what does the agreement
say? What does the agreement that the minister has signed and
what is the bill that we are going to pass in this House really
say? It says this, Mr. Speaker, that the first priority of
the super company in marketing. In other words,
what they will try to do first is to sell their own fish. That
is pretty reasonable, for a company to sell their own fish first.
Who gets second priority? Whose fish is placed second to be
sold? If an independent like Boyd Way and Beothuck Fish wants
to use ~~the~~, I do not believe he will because I believe he will
do a better job himself.

MR. MORGAN: He will not need them.

MR. TULK: I do not think so, but who
knows? He may. But if he did want to use that large company to
do his marketing, and he says, 'Look, I want to use you.' What
are they going to say to him? Under the agreement they can look
at him and say, yes, but you are second to us.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, let us look at what happens in times of poor markets, and that is not uncommon in Newfoundland in the Newfoundland fishery. Who gets the first kick at the cat? is what I am asking. The large company gets the first kick at the cat. Who has the most potential to develop new market strategies? It is obviously the super company.

MR. MORGAN: That is the same as it is now.

MR. TULK: But what I am saying to you now is that you got -

MR. MORGAN: Fishery Products, for example, now (inaudible).

MR. TULK: But what I am saying to you now is that you have created a larger monster than was here before.

Mr. Speaker, some people will say, 'But they have got that Newfoundland Marketing Planning and Co-ordination Council.' The weakness of the bill is that that is established by the super company. Mr. Speaker, if you are going to make a decision on something, you are only as good as the number of votes you have around a table if you want to get your decision through. Let us ask ourselves a question: How many independent processors will sit on that Planning and Co-ordination Council? It is not specified. I do not know if the minister is aware of it or not, but it is not specified in the agreement. It could be one, it could be a dozen. Perhaps the minister, when he clues up, will tell us how many is going to be sitting there. We do know, Mr. Speaker, how many are going to be sitting on that Marketing Council from the other sectors. If you look at page 9, you will see that the number of representatives from the independents are not specified. We have three representatives from the board of directors of the company, including at least one provincial nominee - we are in a minority

MR. TULK: position again - one representative from the union, and two representatives from the management of the company. How much influence will the independent processors have on that whole situation anyway? So I have to ask the minister, in spite of his reassurances that the independents are going to be taken care of both in the resource-short plant programme - and I do not believe the minister is trying to pull anything off, but I have asked him the question and he has not yet been answered by anybody - in spite of his reassurances that the independents in this Province, the small companies in this Province are going to be taken care of through this super company both in marketing and in the resource-short plant sectors, In spite of all of that, Mr. Speaker, there is some indication,

MR. TULK: a great deal of indication in the corporate structure of that company and the corporate structure of all the boards, that that is not going to happen. That is not going to happen. There are a number of questions that have to be answered, Mr. Speaker, about this whole restructuring deal.

Mr. Speaker, I have said in this House before and I repeat it, and it is a criticism of the government; this government has done absolutely nothing for the inshore fishery. The Kirby Report did, in my opinion, practically nothing except tell fishermen that, "We are going to take your ten best UIC contributions to determine your benefits from unemployment insurance." Now, Mr. Speaker, is it ever possible that we have reached the state in this Province that we believe that that is all that our inshore fishermen want, better unemployment? Mr. Speaker, it is not the case. It is not the case. That is not true. The government in this Province has the same kind of record that my friend from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) told the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) the other day with regard to the inshore fishermen, that is it is a perfect record! It has done practically nothing. We have been bringing this issue to the House for years on this side of the House, we have pointed out that costs have increased and prices have decreased substantially. Fishermen's incomes in this Province are practically the same today in real terms, or perhaps even lower than they were in 1977.

MR. MORGAN: Kirby recommended taking away all subsidies.

MR. TULK: Kirby recommended taking away all subsidies, He said, "Give them more unemployment insurance." That is not good enough. Yet in 1977 those same people were

MR. TULK: encouraged by both governments to get in the fishery. They made everybody believe that they were going to be rich if they got into the Newfoundland fishery, and consequently many fishermen- as the minister is now becoming more and more aware every day - many fishermen got in over their heads in the purchase of longliners and so on. It was done on speculation, speculation that we were going to have barrels of fish as soon as we drew a line on the map rather than waiting for it to improve.

The greatest speculative move almost in this Province, with the exception of the offshore, was when the 200 mile limit was signed. The price of gear and equipment went through the ceiling. And the price of fish has stayed virtually the same, two or two and a half cents increase per pound since 1977. The consequence of that, Mr. Speaker, is that the fishermen now find themselves with a lower profit and they are just not making it. And the result was that in 1980, and I have to review this again, Mr. Speaker, we saw a desperation move on the part of our inshore fishermen in this Province when they went on strike. Absolutely no doubt that it was a desperation move. The provincial government deserved it. The provincial government in this Province deserved it. They called for a cooling off period in July, in the middle of the inshore fishery,

MR. TULK: That was their wisdom, to say, 'Now do not go fishing today. Go ashore and cool off.' And then, of course, finally when the inshore fishermen put enough pressure on the government, we got that famous - or perhaps infamous is the correct word - Royal Commission. Now I am saying nothing personal about the commissioners at all, but really that commission, in my opinion, was about a strike-breaking tactic and it now sits on the shelf gathering dust. That is where it sits, on the shelf gathering dust, just another study. Still our inshore fishermen's income is less than it was in 1977. Mr. Speaker, this government did do something for inshore fishermen some two or three years ago. They specified that anybody building a boat or buying equipment over \$50,000 which had been formally done through the Fisheries Loan Board in this Province, would now be done through the chartered banks. Mr. Speaker, we objected on this side of the House to that at the time, I still object to it. They drove those fishermen to chartered banks-

MR. MORGAN: Administered by the banks but approved by our board.

MR. TULK: Approved by your board.

MR. MORGAN: It is not approved by the banks, that is all, it is not approved by the banks.

MR. TULK: I am not talking about the approval, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the demand for payments. That is done by the bank.

MR. MORGAN: They cannot take a boat unless they come to us.

MR. TULK: You have a choice, though, have you not? What is your choice once they make the demand? You have to garnishee wages, that is your choice. They have drove fishermen to the chartered banks and effectively scuttled, in my opinion, the effectiveness of the Fisheries Loan Board for loans over the amount specified, \$50,000. And many inshore fishermen now find themselves in this position: If you go along the Northeast Coast of the Province this year, Mr. Speaker, you can find boat, after boat, after boat, with those red and black signs in their window, 'For Sale' marked on them. That is because many fishermen along the Northeast Coast, if they do not sell those boats, given the state of the price of fish, and given the state of the supply of fish this year, the amount that was caught, many of them are not only in danger of losing their boats but are in dange of losing their houses, cars, attachment of wages and so on. The banks, by this government, have been given control of them. Those concerns are all concerns, Mr. Speaker, of restructuring and the kinds of things that have gone on as a result of restructuring and as a result of paying attention, perhaps so much, to the deep-sea plant problem, and we had to do it, make no mistake about that, but they are there, and they are not being answered. Mr. Speaker, I may have to get into this some other time, but more than that, the process that has happened in this Province in the past year and a half illustrates quite clearly for anybody who want to look the inability of this present government to solve the economic and social problems of this Province through negotiations.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to stand in this House - I am not going to do it, as I have said so many times - and say that the Premier and everybody on that side, his colleagues, are not good Newfoundlanders. I am not going to stand over here and say that they put politics before Newfoundland. I will not say that the Premier is a traitor, not at all. I will say that he has to be king, but not a traitor. However, Mr. Speaker, I am going to stand on this side of the House and say that the Premier and his colleagues either do not know what they want or do not know how to get what they want, or perhaps both. I suspect it is probably both. As I said last year, the Liberal Party of this Province quite clearly stated where we were on the deep-sea problem: We said quite clearly that all fish plants had to be opened. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, there is no doubt in that statement - that was last November - there is absolutely no room for doubt in that statement. All fish plants include every fish plant in the Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, you can understand then that I want to do this to illustrate how the Premier has flicked around and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has flicked around with this whole restructuring concept. It has been here, there or everywhere. You can understand our concern when last January - January, 1983 - the Premier of this Province in Ottawa started talking about the negative fallouts and made the statement on national television that indeed some deep-sea fish plant may have to close.

MR. TOBIN: When did he say that?

MR. TULK: Last January. Some deep-sea plants may have to close. That was the Premier's statement - not may, will have to close. That is why we became concerned.

MR. TULK: Were the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in this Province saying that some plants on the South Coast - the Premier said it - would close? He said that there would be negative fallout and some plants would close. That is why we wired the Prime Minister, why we wired Kirby and why we wired the federal minister advising them that, as far as we were concerned, you did not close any plants. We asked the Prime Minister at that point to take advice of the federal minister rather than Mr. Kirby and rather than the Premier of this Province. We were concerned at that point last January that the Premier had abdicated his responsibilities. We came into this House and pressed the provincial Minister of Fisheries for his position. I can remember day after day asking, 'Is it your position and the position of your government that all plants in this Province are to remain open?'.

MR. TULK: There was no answer coming from the minister. He would get up and say something but he never did say whether that was his position. That was in January and February, 1983. And the minister kept reassuring us on this side of the House that negotiations were ongoing and that they were very delicate and that we should not ask those type of questions because we were going to upset the negotiations. Now, Mr. Speaker, in that I think should be a warning for the people who are concerned with the Bowater issue in Corner Brook. Keep quiet because there are delicate negotiations ongoing. Do not say anything because they are delicate negotiations ongoing, and if you say anything you may mess that up. The people in Corner Brook should listen very closely to what they had to say.

But we took his word. Like most people in this Province we took his word.

MR. BAIRD: What are you saying about the people of Corner Brook?

MR. TULK: Finally on March 26 of last year, the Premier presented his submission to the federal government and at that point he said yes, all plants have to be open - six months later than the Liberal Party of this Province said it. There it was as far as we were concerned. We had our answer. Everybody had their answer. The government were going to stand tall, be counted, and be strong for the plants to be reopened in the Province. As far as we were concerned, until July 4 of this year that was the position of the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Premier.

But what did we learn on July 4 of this year? We learned that on May 17, 1983 the Provincial Minister of Fisheries had signed an agreement with

MR. TULK: the federal minister saying and agreeing to the closing of Grand Bank, Burin and St. Lawrence. He agreed to close on May 17.

MR. MORGAN: No, no.

MR. TULK: On May 18 we also learned that the Provincial Minister (Mr. Morgan), I suppose he must have talked on the night of May 17, or sometime during May 17 after he had signed the original agreement, to his Premier, I would assume he did, he had now agreed that the management of the new company would decide upon the future of Grand Bank and Burin. Pending that decision, he said Grand Bank will continue to operate and Burin and St. Lawrence will be closed. Now that is the same minister and the same government.

MR. MORGAN: Not St. Lawrence.

St. Lawrence would be an inshore plant.

MR. TULK: St. Lawrence would be an inshore plant, but until that time it would remain closed until the new management was put together. But in any case what we had seen, Mr. Speaker, was in January the Premier of this Province in Ottawa on national television saying some deep-sea plants will have to close. In March they are saying no, they all have to be open. In May we find the Provincial Minister saying yes, close down Grand Bank, close down Burin, and keep St. Lawrence open, he says, as an inshore plant. Now, Mr. Speaker, that

MR. TULK: shoots down the arguments of this government. Their own actions and their own expressions shoot down the argument of this government that they have always believed that the deep-sea plants should all be kept opened.

MR. MORGAN: How long are you going to be? I have to step out but I will be back.

MR. TULK: Take your time.
Mr. Speaker, that is quite a change of heart on the part of the provincial minister from March 26. We have now seen quite a change from March 26 at the People's Conference where that minister stood up and said all plants opened, yet on May 17 he was willing to sign an agreement to close down certain plants. What a switch!

Mr. Speaker, it also illustrates one other thing, that when the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) went to Ottawa to negotiate with the federal minister, he either did not know what his Premier wanted or he did not know how to get it - otherwise the Premier sold him down the drain, one thing or the other, because he did sign. And you would normally think that a Premier would inform his minister what the final objective was that he wanted, you would normally think that would have been the case. And you would have thought that without coming back to his Premier that minister would have signed no agreement.

MR. MORGAN: See, now we have really made improvements from May to September.

MR. TULK: No, no. We will get to that. We will deal with that. The minister cannot laugh his way of the fact that either the Premier of this Province thought he was incompetent or sold him down the drain. He cannot but his way out of that.

MR. MORGAN: May was the foundation of what we have now.

MR. TULK: Presumably, as I was saying, when he went to Ottawa to negotiate with the federal minister one would think that the Premier of this Province has sat down and said, 'Jim, here is where I want to go. Do not sign any agreements before you get that. Do not sign any.' And if the minister did that, if the minister signed an agreement on May 17, and then came back on May 18 and wanted to sign another one, you would certainly think that somewhere in between he had talked to the Premier of this Province and that that in essence was what the Premier wanted at that point, that was the second chance that they had. But no, the Premier has to grandstand, or he does not know - I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, what it is. Either the Premier does not know or he has to grandstand all of the time, or he has paranoia. The one think that we learn--

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

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

MR. MORGAN: When I spoke in this debate I did my very utmost to keep the debate from being partisan. In fact, I stressed it not to be a partisan debate. It is too important a debate to be partisan. It is so important to so many Newfoundlanders and to our economy that I asked and pleaded for it not to be a partisan debate. We have given the hon. gentleman leave to continue on beyond his limited time, the same as they gave me. I did not make it a partisan debate and I plead with him now not to become partisan. Keep the debate nonpartisan, let us keep it on a good level. It is a positive issue, so let us keep it that way.

MR. MORGAN:

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

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

MR. TULK: I have to tell the minister, in that point of order, that I am not trying to be partisan, but I am trying to lay out something that is clearly the case, the truth.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I rule it is merely a difference of opinion between two hon. members. The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: I will conclude that part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by saying that, in the one case, if the minister had done something that the Premier did not want done, then he should have demanded the minister's resignation; in the other case, if the minister had been sold down the drain he should have submitted it, because it was obvious that his competence was being questioned.

But on July 4 we had the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) make his unilateral announcement on restructuring, which was not, Mr. Chairman, perhaps a good thing but perhaps was the one thing that got the Province eventually moving again. On September 26, 1983, almost three months later, we had the agreement signed which was hailed as the most important signing since Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, that may very well be the point, that may very well be, but only the minister's actions in the real world will show it. That may very well be the case that that is the most important agreement since Confederation. But you have to ask the question, Why did we have to have a three to five month

MR. TULK: delay? And we have to ask the question, Did we get all the fish plants operating as before the closures? In other words, did we stick to our guns, did we really get what we went after? The answer is no, we did not.

St. Lawrence is now an inshore plant -

DR. COLLINS: We are negotiating. We are tremendous negotiators.

MR. TULK:

I am not arguing that you have to negotiate, and I am not arguing that perhaps the agreement is the best one that you could get. I am not arguing that at all. It is perhaps the best one you could get. St. Lawrence is now, though, an inshore plant with the possibility of getting a resource-short plant allocation. And the strange thing about that, Mr. Speaker, is that you really did not need a restructuring agreement in order for the Province to do that anyway. The Province could have made St. Lawrence an inshore plant anyway. Because presumably an inshore plant gets its stocks from inshore fish and there is not a set quota on inshore fish, at least it has never been enforced.

MR. TULK:

There may be some guidelines, but certainly not a quota.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Province could have made St. Lawrence an inshore plant in any case and it certainly could have allocated some of the fish from the resource-short plant programme.

Burin is a secondary processing plant and there is no primary production, and Grand Bank is open for eighteen months, that is all we are sure of. So we have not reached our objective. The minister admitted that yesterday. And, Mr. Chairman, the super company can still close inshore plants in this Province, can, after eighteen months, decide that not only will they close Grand Bank, Fortune and St. Lawrence, but they can close Triton as well, they can close Harbour Breton as well; that is a possibility.

So, Mr. Speaker, in summary let me say that, after a three to five month delay in negotiations, we have perhaps not got a better deal than we could have got three months ago, in July. And you can go through statements - and I will do it later on, not in this debate but in other debates - you can go through the statements of the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) and find out that many of the things that the Premier put in that press statement that he sent out the other evening, trying to upstage the Minister of Fisheries were either there in May or there in July.

The Premier has been very careful to say that they were not in some of the May agreements. Well, they may not have been there then but they were certainly there in July, and yet he refused to get back to the bargaining table until September.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, we are going to support the bill because we believe

MR. TULK: it is important to the people of the South Coast and we believe it is important to the Newfoundland fishery, and we are going to support it in spite of the fact that we do have certain reservations.

Thank you.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak today on a bill of consequence, the historic bill which is before the House. I do so with a genuine hope that the bill which is before us is only the start of the federal government recognizing the role they must play in developing our natural resources to the fullest potential possible.

Since my election to this hon. House, I have been learning more and more each day as it relates to the fisheries. It has been a very trying time, yet it is rewarding to me to know that the people who elected me appreciate my support and the manner in which I have represented them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: I have spoken in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, on several occasions regarding the fisheries, times when it was frustrating, with everyone in Burin unemployed and not sure of their future.

I remember well, as a young boy growing up in Trepassey, that I learned of Burin and at that very early age I also learned that the survival of this town depended on the people of Burin and surrounding areas. It was these seafaring fishermen, these experienced trawlermen who landed their catch at

MR. TOBIN: Trepassy, Catalina and other places and did so, Mr. Speaker, because it was obviously surplus to their needs but certainly rewarding to our communities.

MR. TOBIN:

Today, Mr. Speaker, there are no trawlers landing at Burin. I am not sure if one can call it evolution or revolution, but one thing I can say Burin has once again started a new era in fishing.

I remember the frustrations last year when Mike Kirby wanted to doom Burin forever. I remember when the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) announced his unilateral plan for the fisheries. To my disappointment Mike Kirby's wishes were acknowledged. Today, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go over all of these steps, again make all of the accusations, recite all of the injustices, but I do feel obligated on behalf of the people whom I represent to express our gratitude to the Premier of this Province for the support he afforded Burin. When others wanted Burin closed he refused, when it was tried without him, he objected, and as a result of his persistence and his ability to negotiate as of eight o'clock on Tuesday morning past Burin started secondary processing once again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

I must point out, Mr.

Speaker, however, that the amount of work depends on the markets, Therefore, it is essential in my opinion that a division of marketing for secondary processing be established in this new company. And I too believe then much can be accomplished. Just recently I had the opportunity to visit the operation at Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, along with my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), the Mayor of Burin, the President of the Fishermen's Union for Burin, and I think it is fair to say that each and every one of us was absolutely astounded by the operation that is in place there. The whole plant, Mr. Speaker, the total

MR. TOBIN: I understand the minister has passed on to his Restructuring Committee. I sincerely hope that my recommendations are listened to because I believe them to be sound and sensible and would do much to enhance future employment in Burin.

As well, Mr. Speaker, the Burin Peninsula Development Fund will be of tremendous benefit to the entire Burin Peninsula and I believe that both levels of government are to be commended for their foresight in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, the restructuring again indicates some very positive results for my district. The future of the Marystown Shipyard is indeed very promising. We all recognize the need for new trawlers under a replacement programme and I would say that if the fisheries is to be successful trawlers are certainly needed.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I must pay gratitude to this government, to the Premier and his government, for having the foresight to put a clause in this agreement that included the Marystown Shipyard in any restructuring plans. It is certainly welcomed news by me and I can assure you welcomed by my constituents. I sincerely hope that a start on these trawlers can be rather soon, started immediately, because right now, Mr. Speaker, the work force of the Marystown Shipyard is fastly declining due to the lack of new construction. However, I feel obligated that I must make it quite clear that this government in the past have left no stone unturned in supporting the Marystown Shipyard. Right now, Mr. Speaker, at the yard there is a supply vessel which has approximately cost, I understand, \$14 million which is still unsold which was financed on behalf of the yard through this government. I want to say, though, and I think that I must say for the record

MR. TOBIN: that I was somewhat disgusted, and it was in itself disgusting, to listen to a story carried a few weeks ago which said that the federal government has announced a ship-building programme for the country from Halifax to British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, we were disappointed in Marystown to know that our yard was one of the very few in this Country that has been excluded so far from any new construction by the federal government. And I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the last new construction job afforded the Marystown Shipyard for the federal government was done so under the federal Conservative Government when Jim McGrath was Minister of Fisheries. At that time a boat called the Cygnus was built at Marystown. That is the last new construction work we have had from the federal government.

However, Mr. Speaker, let me say today that I am convinced that if all parties involved in this new company, if all the major players in this new company would agree to purchase a trawler or two upon completion, then I honestly believe that this government would grant the Marystown Shipyard the necessary approval to start construction immediately. I know, Mr. Speaker, and others know that the long-term future of this yard is great, but in the immediate, right now, we need something and I am sure that that could be resolved.

MR. TOBIN: I must say that I have had several meetings with the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), a man who has committed himself to the Marystown Shipyard in the past, a man who is committed to the Marystown Shipyard in the present, and I know will be committed to the Marystown Shipyard in the future.

MR. HODDER: Speak up. We cannot hear you.

MR. WARREN: Open up. Take your foot out of your mouth.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, if I had a mouth like the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) I would never open it.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, I had a vision of Burin being turned into a primary processing operation under restructuring and I continue to pray and hope that some day maybe it will again be both primary and secondary. However, Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that the plant will now operate as an expanded secondary processing operation and it marks the first time that a serious attempt will be made to provide for a meaningful level of secondary processing of fish in the Province of Newfoundland.

As well I acknowledge Burin will become a major refit centre for all of Newfoundland's trawler fleet, with the exception of the ones owned by National Sea. The fish plant at Burin will receive capital funding for

MR. TOBIN: expansion and upgrading for a new operation.

MR. WARREN: How many people will be employed?

MR. TOBIN: A multi-million dollar Burin Peninsula Development Fund will be established to diversify the economic base and provide for new employment opportunities?

MR. WARREN: How many people will be employed.

MR. TOBIN: As well, Mr. Speaker, the fish plant at Marystown will be working to full capacity twenty-four hours a day, and the Marystown Shipyard no doubt will have a full new construction book for years.

Mr. Speaker, from what I have just said one could probably conclude that we indeed have a promising future and I say we have. But I believe that the desire must be there to explore every new avenue for job creation to ensure that the Burin Peninsula -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. TOBIN: - returns to the level of prosperity that it has in the past.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, probably the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and his Party would like to go back to Marystown again for another meeting, see if he can get a car load this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, for some reason every time I speak in this House I touch some sort of a sensitive nerve with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary).

MR. NEARY: That is only wishful thinking.

MR. TOBIN: But I want to tell the Leader of

MR. TOBIN:

the Opposition, Mr. Speaker,

I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition and confirm what was confirmed to him the weekend when he travelled to the Burin Peninsula, that is that the people of Burin-Placentia West, and the people of the Grand Bank district are pleased with the representation that they are getting from both myself and my colleague from Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: That is why, Mr. Speaker, time has changed on the Burin Peninsula and now the Liberals can hold their executive meetings in a telephone booth, Mr. Speaker, and hold their banquets in the kitchen of any ordinary house.

MR. WARREN: How many more people are going to be laid off?

MR. DINN: How many people did they have a few weeks ago?

MR. TOBIN: Twenty one. I am speaking to a issue today that is before this House and, as I said in the beginning, it is an issue of consequence, an issue that is going -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: There were more than that there. I was there.

MR. TOBIN: You were not there.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, regardless of the Opposition, if they want to interrupt or if they want to continue to interrupt, the Burin Peninsula will prosper, the Burin Peninsula will once again bloom despite the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and his party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that desire must exist to explore every new avenue for job creation on the Burin Peninsula.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is a disgrace to this House, a man who boasts outside about the years of experience he has, the man who was prepared to go on the radio station in Marystown and was shot to pieces by the local media afterwards, to say how I conducted myself in the House. There is a prime example, Mr. Speaker, sitting over there to explain the feelings people have toward politicians. Because you are not

MR. TOBIN: only a disgrace to this House, you are a disgrace to this Province and the best thing that can happen to you is to run in Burin-Placentia West in the next elections and you will never stick your nose through the door again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Mr Speaker, in concluding my remarks, I must notify the people on the Burin Peninsula that when I tried to speak in this House to represent them I was harassed once again by the Opposition. Simply stated, Mr. Speaker,

MR. TOBIN: they want nothing better than to see the Burin Peninsula doomed forever, which it was a number of years ago, and which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) tried to achieve further when he was Minister of Social Services. The Leader of the Opposition better play his cards close to the table. I was around for a while, I worked in Social Services for a while.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, all I want to say is that we must all work together to ensure the future of the Burin Peninsula.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. TOBIN: I believe, Mr. Speaker, where there is division there is sadness. The people of the Burin Peninsula have been deeply troubled over the past number of months and I have shared their moments of frustration with them, I guess. But now, Mr. Speaker, we must and we will respond with courage and respect and the implementation of this bill, I believe, will be achieved with an attitude of sensitivity to all people. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Another fellow you need a hymn book for.

MR. HEARN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At least I will be able to read the words in the hymn book.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: I certainly have to stand to support the bill, especially seeing that in my riding, in the town of Trepassey, we have one of the deep-sea plants supplied by trawlers and a plant that for a number of years was touch, and go and now with the new restructured company we can

MR. HEARN:

look forward to some security and permanency in the area.

Looking at the bill as we go through it, the objectives, as put together by both governments is an excellent agreement -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. HEARN:

- an agreement which, I am sure, both governments worked very, very hard to achieve, an agreement which will give stability and permanency to the fishing industry in Newfoundland. The objectives of this new company are, first of all, to find a lasting solution to the rebuilding of the deep-sea fishery which recognizes the fundamental role which the fishing industry plays in Newfoundland and Labrador, a fact that has been stressed over and over by people in this House, especially on this side of the House, that the only way to solve the problem of the deep-sea fishery is to find a lasting solution. We have argued this past number of years about the controls that both governments have. Now we have finally gotten together to do something to put together the controls that we have so that we can develop and proceed in developing a unified, solidified company that will take care of our problems as it relates to the deep-sea fishing sector.

We have a new company created whose primary objective is to strengthen the Newfoundland fishery, a company whose aim is to be viable, efficient and modernized. This is a challenge to all the factions involved in the fishing industry.

MR. HEARN:

We have to ensure maximum employment, stability and productivity. Maximum utilization of our facilities and our resources, Mr. Speaker, will achieve that aim.

In many areas of the Province now - and I can speak specifically of my own - we have a much greater concentration by all factions involved on the fishing industry. They are getting together, looking at their own areas, stating, 'Let us all work for a common aim.' You have the fish plant workers, union representatives, the fishermen, even the fish buyers, taking what we have locally, developing it locally so that we can achieve highest employment in the various areas.

This past year in our own district, we increased employment in our fish plant sector by something like 22 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

Last Summer I remember receiving from a certain area in the district a tremendous amount of phone calls simply because plants were shut down due to poor planning overall. This year, by the various factions getting together, with the help of our provincial Department of Fisheries, that problem is no longer with us and we are back to full employment in the areas concerned.

Getting back to the bill involved, one of the aims is to provide new opportunities for independent processors to have effective access to international markets. The resource-short plant programme, which is going to help also a number of these independent processors, will be of tremendous benefit to them. One of the things we would look at, though, and one of the great concerns that they have is in relation to cash flow. This past number of years, our provincial department has

MR. HEARN: In relation to plant closures, mergers, mechanization of trawlers etc., here we certainly have veto power and where over 100 people are affected, or one half of the work force, then approvals of both governments are needed in order to make any necessary changes. Over the years we have had protest lines set up because of equipment moving from one plant to the other, one plant being cut back, even within the same company, to help another company. Now this will be taken care of under the new set-up.

One of the most important things in the new agreement and under the new bill is the fishing industry structural study. The federal and provincial governments, once again jointly co-operating, will examine various organizational alternatives for the harvesting and processing and marketing sectors of the Newfoundland fishing industry. Here we are not just saying, 'We will throw something together to get the pressure off.' We are planning for the long term viability of the industry and, as both sides have always admitted, that is the only way to proceed. We have in the marketing sector developed a mechanism which will lead to our own fishery, the Newfoundland fishery, being very competitive in the marketplace, but here is where everyone involved must play a part, from the fishermen out in the small punt with his jigger through to the trawlers, through to the people who work on the fish plant, with co-operation from the union, and of course the people who process and market our fish, to the fellow in fact who sells it over the counter. If everybody suddenly starts to realize that this is our bread and butter, that it is not only fish, as has been the attitude, then perhaps we will be competitive in the marketplace. Fish is food and, when we all realize that and want to put forward a quality product at a competitive price, the fishery in Newfoundland will

MR. HEARN: be on solid ground for years to come.

I have already mentioned the resource-short plants. Certainly in many areas of the Island where we have well working plants, but because the inshore fishing season is so short these plants are not really viable, if resource can be provided from the offshore to these plants at a reasonable price, where they can be economically viable, then we have employment opportunities prolonged in several areas of the Province.

The social compact between the governments, the union, the workers themselves, is a tremendous idea because now we are not just working for a company. The idea over the years is, 'Look, we will get away with what we can get away with, the merchant is making the money and we are picking up the crumbs.' Now we will be working for ourselves, and when one works for oneself we have a little more energy and a little more pride in what we do and consequently the whole processing operation should be a lot more viable and economic.

There are two ways of increasing job potential in the industry: One is as suggested here, the harvesting of underutilized species. Many times we heard the Premier remark that in the Province we have many species which are underutilized. Markets certainly can be found for them with an increased marketed endeavour, as I am sure we will now see, and, once we start processing these underutilized species, then we have one more step and that is to increase our secondary processing. Here is where tremendous emphasis will be put on Burin and I can probably foresee that the Burin

MR. HEARN: plant in a few short years will be back to the level of employment that it had during the past few. We have a long way to go in secondary processing. Why should we have our raw resource sent out of the Province to be put in a nice little package so it can be sent back to us so we can buy it? And certainly the labour-intensive section of the industry is in processing and we have to increase that section here in the Province.

MR. SIMMS: It does not make sense.

MR. HEARN: It certainly does not.

In relation to plant utilization, certainly in my own plant in Trepassey - one of the ones we did not hear mentioned during the whole discussions on restructuring, simply because Trepassey is, I was going to say one of the most viable plants on the Island, but it is the most viable plant on the Island - studies have shown because of its geographical location we can easily fish the Grand Banks, we can fish Northern cod Winter and Summer, it is an ice free port. Last year when the Fisheries Products plant at Catalina could not be used because of ice problems, the trawlers landed in Trepassey, and the fish was trucked to Catalina. Now that showed the geographical advantage of Trepassey, Its proximity to the Grand Banks in comparison even to the South Coast ports economically is a tremendous advantage. It costs a company \$4,000 in fuel to send an empty trawler from Trepassey, for instance, to Harbour Breton and back, an empty trawler. When we look at the economic side of it, plus turnaround time, which is certainly involved in the economic side, we can see the tremendous importance of the plant in Trepassey.

MR. NEARY: What about your wharf?

MR. HEARN: Right now the contractor is back working on the wharf. A very unfortunate thing happened there and I think we should clarify it. During the Summer the company, with union agreement, decided to shut down the plant to repair the wharf, which needed repairs, and the cold storage. Agreement was given because many of the people could take their holidays at that time, be back working during the Fall, make money before Christmas, etc. Unfortunately, after the contractor moved in, the receivers also moved in. He was left up in the air, uncertain of the money he was owed, etc., and he walked off the job - you could not blame him. Eventually things were settled, with our intervention and help also. The contractor is now back on the job. The wharf will be completed, the cold storage will be completed, and these are the only two major components of the plant in Trepassey that were not up to scale. We now have what is described as a completely modernized plant and consequently the future for the Trepassey area is tremendous. Not only that; I have been told that, provided we do have an increase in cod stocks, as we have been assured we will, and we can count on increased landings in the area, the employment at Trepassey plant will reach the 700-plus level, which will easily take care of all that side of my district. We have already, with the help of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), taken care of the Cape Shore side, and our future plans for that area will take care of that. Our meetings now in the Central area hopefully will overcome the problems we have there.

MR. SIMMS: All because of the work of a certain member.

MR. HEARN: That is certainly recognized, as you know from your visits to the area.

Turning to other plants, Burin, now being

MR. HEARN: used as a secondary processing operation, has perhaps more potential than any other plant on the Island. The people of Grand Bank, I am quite sure, will rise to the challenge of showing their worth in the next eighteen months. That plant, hopefully, will continue to be the mainstay of the South Coast as it has been for many many years.

Probably the biggest disappointment in the whole restructuring agreement was the lessening of the position of the plant in Fermeuse which has been relegated to an inshore plant. Fermeuse fish plant over the years has been a very viable operation. It is on the brink of the Grand Banks, an ice-free port, but unfortunately the facility itself was left to deteriorate. Fermeuse has been in poor positions before, and I think once again that they will respond to the challenge and hopefully, as the new company continues to progress, Mr. Speaker, when they look at revving up the industry then Fermeuse once again -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. HEARN: - will achieve the position it always had as a full-time year-round operation. Way back in the days of Northeast Fisheries, when perhaps Fermeuse operated better than it ever has since, it was taken over by the Bird's Eye operation, if you remember, which became a flop, and the uncertainty of Fermeuse at that time was a worry to everybody. At that time, certainly, we had to give credit to the then Liberal government, which moved in, took over the operation and eventually transferred it to Bonavista Cold Storage. I remember, with Christmas approaching one year, the people in the area were in the same position they are in now, a position of uncertainty. But at that time the

MR. HEARN: government moved in and bought the trawlers, the houses, the fish plants, etc., and moved them to Bonavista. A local poet in describing conditions in the area wrote a little poem, and I remember the last line when talking about the confrontation between Fermeuse and the industry generally. He said, 'But Joey was there, like a tiger he fought/ And houses and trawlers and fish plants he bought. / He gave them back Christmas by that one great buy, / 'Twas the first time that Santa Claus wore a bow tie.'

So even though now they are in a similar position, as I said, the people of that area will respond to the challenge of making sure that their plant once again becomes a viable operation. Trawler replacement is extremely important in the success of the new company. Many of the companies involved, especially in the Newfoundland section of the restructured fishery, the trawlers are certainly not up to scratch. Fishery Products perhaps have the best fleet going, and many of the trawlers there, as a lot of us know, are certainly not the type of boats we would like to see in the restructured company. Consequently the newly restructured company has agreed to look at trawler replacement and, undoubtedly, as the years move ahead, we will see better boats in the operation and, of course, increased employment in my colleague's district at Marystown.

MR. HEARN: Mr. Speaker, I certainly, members on both sides, heartily support the bill. I congratulate our own government in working so hard, the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and their various colleagues who worked with them, to obtain an agreement which secures the future of the industry in Newfoundland, which guarantees the permanency, as I said, and stability of the industry. And I hereby heartily support Bill No. 88. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are so close to one o'clock, would it be in order if I moved the adjournment of the debate so I can lead off on Monday in this great debate that is taking place?

MR. SPEAKER: It is noted that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has adjourned the debate.

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn until Monday at 3:00 P.M.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until Monday, November 14, at 3:00 P.M.