

VOL. 2

NO. 67

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.  
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1983

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

Before we begin today, it is a pleasure indeed for me to welcome some distinguished visitors to the galleries from Abitibi-Price Incorporated: Mr. Mickey Devine, Vice-President, Newsprint Manufacturing, Region III; Mr. John Carson, General Manager, Grand Falls Division; Fern H. Duquette, General Manager, Stephenville Division; Ron D. McKelvie, Woods Manager, Grand Falls Division; from Bowater (Nfld.) Limited: D. Wally Clark, President and General Manager; John Lee, Assistant General Manager; from the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association; Howard Hart, President; Gordon Minnes, Secretary; David A. Wilson, Director of Economic and Statistical Services, and Mrs. Elinor Blanchard, Manager, Government Affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have a brief statement but I think an important one, and before I start I should say that I had expected copies would be here by now, but they will be along very, very shortly.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today that government has agreed to provide a retail sales tax exemption for the purchase of kerosene oil used for domestic heating purposes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Government recognizes there has recently been a noticeable increase in the usage of kerosene for domestic purposes. For 1983 the estimated consumption in this Province is 750,000 litres.

This exemption is being introduced in order to make our exemption policy more equitable as it pertains to energy consumption for domestic heating purposes. The forms of energy used for domestic purposes which are currently exempt are furnace fuel, stove oil, wood and electricity.

This measure is consistent with policies in place in other provinces.

The exemption

DR. COLLINS: is estimated to cost the Province \$60,000 annually and will become effective on Friday, December 2, 1983.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, surely the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can do better than that. As my colleague said, that is pretty heavy stuff. Mr. Speaker, you would expect the hon. gentleman to come into this House and announce a reduction in the retail sales tax, The Board of Trade suggested it, we have suggested it, and the people in Newfoundland and Labrador want a reduction in the sales tax, yet the hon. gentleman comes in with this feeble, very pathetic statement today.

MR. SIMMS: Are you against it?

MR. NEARY: Any reduction in the retail sales tax we are in favour of it. Mr. Speaker, if they keep on the policy, the policy of this administration of wrecking the economy of this Province, we might need a cut in kerosene oil because we will all be using kerosene oil lamps before too long.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what I am supposed to do with this. Perhaps the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) can tell me what I am supposed to do with this. Do I sniff it or do I stuff it? Because if it is for turkeys,

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman the turkeys I would like to stuff are on that side of the House. I suppose the next thing, Mr. Speaker, is we will be getting some embalming fluid from the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young).

Mr. Speaker, I want to direct the Minister responsible for the offshore (Mr. Marshall). Could the hon. gentleman tell the House, now, today, in view of the severe storm that we had last night, if the administration are yet in a position to announce whether or not they are in favour of Winter drilling or are they still sitting on the fence on that matter?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the administration never sat on the fence last year, neither is it sitting on the fence this year. The fact of the matter is that we have been involved in extensive negotiations with officials of the industry, officials of the federal government, and the Petroleum Directorate with respect to Winter drilling, and there has been a great deal of discussion and ground covered with respect to it. There is going to be a meeting within the next week or ten days. After that meeting we will be in a position to make our position on Winter drilling known for the ensuing year.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we had our first major storm for the Winter last night, would the hon. minister tell the House if there were any incidents involving any of the rigs drilling on the Grand Banks last night in that severe storm:

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

MR. MARSHALL: I do not know whether one would call it an incident, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman seems to characterize things as he wishes to characterize them, but last night the SEDCO 710 decided to adopt a procedure which is known as 'hanging off', which was to disconnect from its drilling position, and at the period of time it appeared that one of the chains holding one of the anchors broke loose. There were still at least seven other anchors on the rig. That was the situation which occurred last night, there was a breaking of an anchor chain which was not considered to be a serious situation. The present situation is

MR. MARSHALL:                   that the rig will reconnect as soon as the weather conditions abate sufficiently.    At that time they will proceed to grappel for the anchor and when they grappel for the anchor then at that time the hon. gentleman will be glad to know that the Petroleum Directorate has made arrangements, when the anchor is resecured, to see what happened. Apparently what happened was a breakage in a link and we are taking steps to see that it is examined, and to see the reason for the breakage. But I want to

MR. MARSHALL: emphasize at the time the hon. gentleman wishes to style it as an incident, and I suppose you could call it an incident as such, he is in a habit of styling things with certain imperatives that are not in accord with the facts, that what happened with respect to the incident happened within normal limits and everything is proceeding accordingly.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman may not characterize it as a serious matter, but, safety being uppermost in our minds, the safety of the people who work offshore, we consider it to be a very serious matter indeed when an anchor chain of the magnitude of the chains that hold these anchors, Mr. Speaker, break, burst in forty foot waves. We consider that to be a very serious matter indeed. Now would the hon. gentleman inform the House in connection with SEDCO 710 if he is aware that when the rig was being brought from Japan to the Grand Banks that six out of the eight thrusters burned out, and are still burned out, and that means that there are only two thrusters on the rig that are working? Is the hon. gentleman aware of that?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the situation with respect to the rig, and arrangements are being made in the very near future, in the relative near future, to bring the rig in for the purpose of repairing those thrusters. I should say to the hon. gentleman, when he makes the statement, is he aware that when the rig was connected that this was the situation with respect to the rig? The hon. gentleman is only too aware that that is a rig that was commissioned by Petro-Canada and was put out in the Grand Banks at the period of time by his friends in Ottawa on a unilateral act. So it was going out there in



MR. MARSHALL: any event. So I would suggest that some of these questions that he addresses to the government he might well address to his friends in Ottawa at the same time to determine the situation.

Now the fact of the matter is in the meantime, though, that Petro-Canada is reporting regularly to the Province and I am happy to say it is complying with all provincial regulations, as I am quite sure it is complying with all federal as well. I know that that it would be quite disappointing to the hon. member.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we on this side are horrified at the attitude and the arrogance of the hon. gentleman in dealing with these matters, Mr. Speaker. These are not statements that are made by this side of the House, these are questions that are put to the hon. gentleman and the hon. gentleman should treat them as questions and not statements. Mr. Speaker, we have a right and a responsibility to ask the hon. minister questions about these matters because safety is uppermost in our mind, it may not be in the mind of the hon. gentleman. Now would the hon. gentleman tell the House when this rig will be brought in for repairs and will the rig be brought in to Marystown or will it be sent somewhere else to have these repairs?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the hon. gentleman that we reply fully and completely to all his questions but we also reply to the little innuendoes that the hon. gentleman casts in connection with his questions from time to time. But the fact of the matter is we are aware of the situation with respect to the thrusters. We have been given assurances that it does not affect the SEDCO 710 in its operations, drilling out there at the present time, and that the rig will be brought to port as soon as possible for the purpose of repairing the thrusters. Now where it is going to be, I suppose I could say, if I wanted to to the hon. gentleman, I could say the control of where the SEDCO 710 goes, whether it goes to Halifax, or whether it goes to Quebec City, or whether it goes to Sydney, or whether it goes to Marystown, it being a rig that is under the control of Petro-Canada, despite the way that Petro-Canada may wish to act towards this Province, the strings are being pulled, as the hon. gentleman knows, elsewhere. So I suggest the hon. gentleman might address his question elsewhere

MR. MARSHALL: and ask where the people who are chartering the rigs intend to put the rig.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: I remind the hon. gentleman that I am not a Member of Parliament, I can only direct my questions to the people there opposite. And when it comes to innuendoes and snarky, nasty remarks, the hon. gentleman wrote the book, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is a master at squirting poison across this House, he is a master at it. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman this question in the interest of safety, protecting the lives of the people that work offshore and to protect the environment. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House if SEDCO 710, which is drilling, I believe, on the Grand Banks for the first time in the Winter months - it only came in earlier this year - if that rig is as seaworthy as the other rigs or does the rig roll more? Is there any foundation to the report that only a few days ago the rig rolled eight degrees in forty foot seas? Mr. Speaker, that would indicate to me that the people in authority should be very concerned about that particular rig, about leaving it out there in these severe Winter storms.

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

MR. MARSHALL: If I can say first, I will respond to the fact that the hon. gentleman can rest assured that if we have anything to do with it we will do our utmost to see that the SEDCO 710 will go to Marystown. If it goes anywhere else it will not be because of this government, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the other thing, I have risen in this House and have responded to questions by the hon. gentleman, the hon. gentleman wishes to ask questions of this nature: Is there any truth to the report that? Is there any truth with respect to this or that? He comes in and he repeats rumour before this House. Now we happen to be engaged in this Province, Mr. Speaker, in a new industry, which is the drilling offshore. We have gone

MR. MARSHALL: through a very traumatic disaster on the offshore in the Ocean Ranger disaster.

MR. NEARY: And you are very familiar with that.

MR. MARSHALL: And I submit, Mr. Speaker, it does not do any good to the future of this industry, the confidence of the public in its security and the integrity of the operation to have the hon. gentleman asking questions of that nature. Now if the hon. gentleman has anything

MR. MARSHALL:

specific to put to me I will respond as I have responded earlier in the Question Period. But I am not going to respond to his rumours, which rumours are based on questions that he wants to ask which in effect are going to have a bad effect on the security and integrity of offshore operations. If he wants to be responsible and ask me direct questions, I will respond to him, but in the meantime I am not responding to his rumours.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we get a response from the hon. gentleman, 'Does not do any good.' 'It has a bad effect.' Well, Mr. Speaker, we raised these matters before the Ocean Ranger disaster and the hon. gentleman pooh-poohed our questions and our correspondence with the hon. gentleman then and he is doing the same thing now, Mr. Speaker. We submit that our questions may have a good effect, that it may save lives, Mr. Speaker; that another disaster may be lurking on the Grand Banks and we are not trying to undermine the drilling operations -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I would like to remind the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that there may be other occasions when he can get into a speech and express his opinions on certain matters, but this is the Question Period and I would request that he direct a question to some hon. minister.

MR. NEARY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is enough on that particular topic today, because while safety is uppermost in our minds, it may not be in the hon. gentleman's. So I will change the topic for a moment if I could just catch the eye of the hon. gentleman who has

MR. NEARY:

The Financial Post in front of

him.

MR. SIMMS:

It is not the eye you want, it

is the ear, is it not?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Sir.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, could the hon. the Premier tell the House what the policy of his administration is on user-pay fees for doctors in this Province practicing under the medical care programme?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think everybody is familiar with our position on the whole question of user fees and the like in the health care system. We are presently now involved in a Royal Commission on health costs and nursing home costs in

PREMIER PECKFORD:

the Province, which is holding public hearings, I think, over the next few days in the Province. But our position is pretty clear.

MR. NEARY: What is your position?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am startled to find that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is asking, after the Minister of Health (Mr. House) on I do not know how many occasions has enunciated government policy on this, that the Leader of the Opposition in this House does not know what our position is on this. Mr. Speaker, I am astounded by it, I am absolutely flabbergasted that the hon. member does not know!

MR. NEARY: What is it?

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is terrible to think of someone in this House in this position today.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the problem is that they shift their position so often over there. I asked the hon. gentleman a specific question that required a very brief and simple answer: What is the administration's position on user fees? And let it be recorded that the hon. gentleman did not have the courage to answer the question, Mr. Speaker. Now, what is the administration's position? Tell the House and tell the parliamentary gallery, so that they can report it to the people of this Province, what is the administration's position on user fees by doctors?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear.



PREMIER PECKFORD: The Minister of Health (Mr. House) has made the position clear, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has made clear over and over again to the people of this Province our position on that.

MR. NEARY: What is it?

PREMIER PECKFORD: We do want to say that the whole question of health care costs are under a lot of strain these days because the federal government reduced its commitment to establish programme funding and it is going to cost us - I forget what the number was now - I think over \$100 million over five years.

MR. HOUSE: \$30 million a year.

PREMIER PECKFORD: \$30 million a year, We are getting \$30 million less from that great federal Liberal Government that the hon. gentleman supports over there; \$30 million less for EPF funding. As the Minister of Health has said on many, many occasions, we agree with a health care system which is open to everybody, where there are not any fees being charged. At the present moment there are some fees being charged in the hospitals. For hospital rooms and so on in this Province, a modest fee is being charged. We are, from a policy point of view, against any further attack upon the system, but we do point out, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Finance has on a number of occasions and the Minister of Health has, that with this reduction of \$30 million a year that the federal government has taken away, is subtracting from what we could

PREMIER PECKFORD:

normally expect to receive under EPF, that it is putting very strong strains on the system. And it was for that reason, because of the EPF reductions, because of the escalating costs of the health care system, a lot higher than the rate of inflation, for example, the rate of inflation right now is around 5.8 or 5.9, let us say 6 or 6.5 in Newfoundland, but I think health care costs are still going up around 11 per cent or 12 per cent. So the rate of increase in the health care system is still going up double that of inflation. So what we have decided to do, Mr. Speaker, as a government, to look at the whole health care system, is to establish a royal commission to give all members of the community an opportunity to make proposals and to comment upon the high cost of the health care system. We are not at all inclined as a government or as an administration to move into additional fees upon the consumer in this Province, but we must find a way to be able to keep the costs in line with our ability to pay as a government and that is the approach we have taken.

We have instituted a number, as I say, of modest fees into the hospital system, for hospital rooms, but we have not gone any further because from a policy point of view this administration does not favour any movement further that way. But by the same token we have got to somehow figure out how we can arrange the health care system in a way which does not see these costs go up. Right now the hospital costs, for example, the operating cost of a new hospital will equal its capital cost in about eighteen or twenty months. The new hospital in the hon. member's district of LaPoile (Mr. Neary), which was the first new hospital that we built, is going to cost - what is the capital cost of the Port aux Basques hospital, \$20 million?

MR. HOUSE:

\$11 million or \$12 million.

November 29, 1983

Tape 3495

PK - 2

PREMIER PECKFORD: \$11 million or \$12 million, say \$12 million. Well, eighteen months after that hospital opens it will equal its capital cost, and every eighteen months or nineteen months thereafter it will equal its capital cost, a tremendous cost.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And the new technology that is being introduced into the health care system, because it is new, has a higher cost attached to it on the front end than other new technologies have. But we are, Mr. Speaker, as a government, wishing to address ourselves to this, this is why we have the Royal Commission established. We have looked at what they have done in other provinces, They have moved into user fees in Ontario, I guess they have; in Albert, I think they are about to. Those are two provinces I know of off the top of my head. And as a poorer Province, less wealthy, if you will, than these other provinces who have introduced it, we have still resisted. I guess it is an easy temptation because from a policy point of view we do not believe it is the appropriate way to proceed with the provision of health care services to the public. But at the same time as we take that policy position, we are cognizant of the fact that costs are going up almost geometrically and it is very difficult for a Province like ours to continue to finance the system. But we are trying and we are going to be sensitive to the recommendations that are brought in by the Royal Commission. At this point in time that is where we stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: One of the great flaws in the hon. gentleman's character is that he flings out figures on the floor of this House irresponsibly. The hon. gentleman told us that the established programme funding is going down when in actual fact it is going up year by year and so are the equalization payments to this Province, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that there is more money coming from Ottawa.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon.

President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman

is involved in supplementary questions at the present time, but

he is making a speech. He asks questions, and the fact of

the matter is communicated by this side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would remind the hon.

Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), when asking a

supplementary question there should not be any need for

any preamble whatsoever in that realm to enter the realm

of debate.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the stuff I have

on my desk here, I think, is getting to me.

MR. ANDREWS:

The Leader of the Opposition

is a walking preamble.

MR. NEARY:

Is the hon. gentleman now

telling us that the Province is being governed by press

releases and royal commissions? The hon. gentleman just

told us - we heard it yesterday, we heard it again today -

that the administration have no policy. And will the hon.

gentleman tell the House if these user fees that we are

talking about in hospitals and imposed by doctors, direct

charges to the patient, if they continue, could they bring

reprisals and deterrent penalties from the federal government?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is a foolish

question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

It is kind of foolish

all right.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The federal policy on

health costs, I mean, is well known to the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Health and Welfare and what she has been saying in recent weeks, in recent months. Just let me remind the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), we do not govern, Mr. Speaker, by commission and the like -

MR. NEARY:

You just do not govern

period.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- but, Mr. Speaker, we

intend to continue to appoint royal commissions and select committees of this House to get the widest possible representation from the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

This is a democracy and

we are going to ensure that everybody is involved. We have a select committee on food prices that has been travelling and having public hearings around the Province. Is the Leader of the Opposition against that? We have a Select Committee on Election Expenses that is going to report today, as I understand it. And the Leader of the Opposition and his party have members on that that have gone around the Province and held public hearings. We have a Select Committee on the Companies Act, on the Chartered Accountants Act, the CGA, and so on, to go around and get as much input from the people as we can. The Leader of the Opposition just does not speak for all of Newfoundland and we have to do is consult the Leader of the

PREMIER PECKFORD: Opposition, Mr. Speaker, thank God. We will consult all the lobby groups, all the interest groups around the Province and then, based upon recommendations that come in from those commissions, formulate public policy that then will be announced in this House. That is the way we operate, Mr. Speaker, and we continue to do so. And no opposition from the Leader of the Opposition will deter us from continuing to appoint commissions to get the widest possible representation. I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition does not want this government to continue to create royal commissions and select committees and get the widest possible input from the people of this Province. We will continue to do it even though the Leader of the Opposition is against it.

MR. SIMMS: He is against everything.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, another indication of one-man rule in this Province. Whatever the hon. gentleman says now, that is the law. Well, I say bully for the hon. gentleman.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman in his reply again showed his ignorance of how the system works.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you would expect the elected representatives of the people to set policy. Now let me ask the hon. gentleman, resulting from the answer he gave me to my last question, if he knows the difference between a select committee of this House comprising of elected representatives of the people, if he knows the difference between that kind of a committee and a commission?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not know the difference, obviously.

MR. NEARY: I did not think you did.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, I do not know the difference. and I would be very glad if sometime the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) can give an appointment so that I can go and visit him so that he can clarify the matter for me, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) a question, but since the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) is anxious to get going, let me ask the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms), I am sure he is familiar with the problem that exists between those people who snare rabbits, like the Premier - the best one in Newfoundland, he says - and those people who hunt rabbits with dogs. Now, this is a major problem, Mr. Speaker, especially on the Avalon Peninsula, and I am sure that the minister has heard about instances of dog poisoning and so on. What does the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth intend to do about this problem?



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

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth intends to consider the matter, as he has been doing in recent weeks and months, and has received a number of representations from people who are as concerned about the issue as I am and in due course we will make a decision, hopefully that will alleviate some of the concerns of the people that they have expressed publically in the past.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) the question I intended to ask him. In the most recent report of the Minister of Finance, the one he read last week about the deficit situation of the Province, on Page 5 the minister says, 'As a preliminary guideline for next year's budget, government has already decided not to implement any major new programmes.' Could the minister elaborate on that? What sorts of programmes is he talking about? For example, will there not be any new paving projects next year, new water and sewer projects? What exactly is it the minister has decided not to do next year?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, that particular comment was meant to indicate to the House that we have sent instructions to the various departments who are now getting their estimates together for the new budget, indicating to them that we would not be entertaining the same level of new initiative that has been the usual situation in the past. Now there are ongoing programmes that will have to be serviced, obviously, and the hon. member opposite mentioned paving. Well, paving has been going on ever since it was invented, I imagine, and we do not regard that as a new programme. We will expect that necessary paving will take place in the future. But we have indicated to departments that because of the straitened finances of the Province that we would ask them not to engage in expanding their series of operation except where it is absolutely necessary for public safety and public health and these type of things.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary ,  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for  
Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there are questions from the backbenches on the government side. There are a lot of people voicing opinions over there , Mr. Speaker. A supplementary , Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) saying in this statement 'departments have been instructed not to seek such funding in their draft estimate requests; by that statement does the minister mean that there will not be , for example, as much money allocated in next year's budget for capital works programmes, such as water

MR. CALLAN: and sewer and pavement?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is endeavouring to read into that certain things that will only come out as a result of the consideration of the budget which will be brought down early in the New Year and I would suggest that that is the time for him to get into such specifics as he is attempting to do now. I think he should just take the statement in the way it is written and in the way I have explained it. We have made sure that the departments understand, they do, I am sure, but nevertheless we want to make it crystal clear to them, that the departments understand that the financial circumstances of the Province will not be able to take care of new programmes to the same extent it has been in more fortunate times in the past.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know the Question Period has almost expired, but I have a quickie for the Minister of Fines, Wildlife (Mr. Simms). I wonder if the hon. gentleman could tell the House, could elaborate on a statement that he made, I think it was back on June 29, when the hon. gentleman made a statement that there may be 1,100 moose-car mishaps in the Province this year. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House if his department or the administration have taken any measures -

MR. ANDREWS: How many have they got left to go?

MR. NEARY: Could you ask hon. gentlemen to restrain themselves, Mr. Speaker?

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

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman or the administration is taking any extraordinary steps to cut down on the number of moose-car mishaps in this Province?

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

MR. SIMMS: Well, Mr. Speaker, yes, I can tell the hon. member that we have indeed had consultations with the Department of Transportation. Unfortunately, putting up signs at various locations around the Province is not really the answer because we are not convinced that moose will follow the directions of those signs, so we had to look at it from a broader perspective because it is a serious problem, there is no question about that. What we have attempted to do, in consultation with the Department of Transportation, is improve on an education programme which we recently begun, and placing that information in education pamphlets on the ferries and at other transportation depots around the Province. Unfortunately,

MR. SIMMS: we live in a Province where these occurrences do take place, and the only way we can really overcome the seriousness of the situation I think is educate the public to be more careful and cautious as they drive around the Province. But we did in fact put up more signs. The Department of Transportation, my colleague the minister tells me they have established a number of more signs, but unfortunately that really is not the only answer.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present the report of the Standing Committee on Elections, Controverted Elections and Election Financing, to give it its full title. What we are tabling today is our report and a suggested possible draft bill upon which, obviously, there will have to be much more work done by the government and by this House of Assembly.

MR. CARTER: Rather than read the report itself in its entirety, I will make a few comments or I will highlight what I feel are the outstanding points.

First of all, I would like to thank the members of the Committee -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

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

MR. NEARY: For the sake of clarification more than anything else, Mr. Speaker, 'Presenting Reports', does that mean that you just present a report and lay it on the table of the House or is a member allowed to enter into debate? And if so, Mr. Speaker, will members on this side be allowed to comment on statements made by the hon. gentleman?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council, to that point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The point of order is that one is not supposed to ask hypothetical questions of the Speaker. The situation is, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is rising to object to the hon. gentleman presenting the report making a comment -

MR. NEARY: No, no, I am not, if he would present his report.

MR. MARSHALL: I would submit to Your Honour if the hon. gentleman is rising on a point of order and objecting to it that the normal procedure in presenting reports is that there are a certain few words of explanation allowed in order to explain the content of a report.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And I am sure that is all the hon. gentleman is doing. It is not a time for debate or questions back and forth across the floor, it is a time for tabling a report, and when one tables a report, Mr. Speaker, a member or a minister is entitled to give a few words of explanation as to its content.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me say first of all that I am not objecting to the hon. gentleman tabling his report, as a matter of fact, I welcome the report, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this will be a departure -

MR. BAIRD: Well, sit down then.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should go and try to look after his constituents in Corner Brook.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this would be a departure from the norm in this House. If a member tabling a report is allowed to comment on the report, to enter into debate then, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House feel that we should be able to comment and answer the hon. gentleman. That has been the procedure up to now - unless the hon. gentleman is taking the House on his back. The other day we saw a civil servant walk into the House. They think they own the House, Mr. Speaker.

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is recognized on a point of order and is certainly not addressing his comments now to the point

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): that was originally raised by him with regard to the hon. member presenting a report.

MR. NEARY: Tabling a report.

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

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: I would just make a few comments to the point of order. The hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is Chairman of a Select Committee of this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - and, as Chairman, he is now tabling the report which has been completed by that Committee. That Committee represents members from this side of the House and the opposite side of the House and, as I understand it, it is a majority report. It is a report which has the endorsement of all members of the Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: So what the hon. the member for St. John's North is doing is presenting a majority report on behalf of all members of the Committee, all of whom are members from that side and members from this side who agree with him. And in tabling the report he is highlighting a number of the significant issues which all members of the Committee agree with. So obviously, what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) says is comment or debate is not, it is the comments and recommendations of all members of the Committee from the opposite side of the House and this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. So the Leader of the Opposition's point about debate and comment is irrelevant because it represents the comment



PREMIER PECKFORD: and recommendations of all  
members of the Committee, that side of the House and  
this side of the House.

MR. NEARY: Just one quick comment on that,  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: One quick comment on what the Premier had to say, lecturing us again like a school teacher, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that the Public Accounts Committee that represents members on either side of this House has to table its report and are not permitted to comment on it, and I would submit that the same thing applies to this committee, Mr. Speaker. Tabling reports, presenting reports, means you present the report without comment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! To that point of order raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), since I have occupied this Chair hon. gentlemen giving and tabling reports, as it is called, have always been allowed the courtesy of a few comments in tabling a report. With regard to the other point raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition as to whether or not anybody on his side, so to speak, would be allowed to express any comments, I would assume that that can only be done by unanimous consent of the House.

The hon. member for St.

John's North.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. House Leader indicate if we have unanimous consent so my colleague who is on the committee -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No. No way.

MR. NEARY: Oh, they just want to have it all to themselves. My colleague is a member of the committee, he should be allowed a few comments too. Unless they are trying to muzzle the House.

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

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: This is highly irregular. I mean, as a number of members have already pointed out, and I have myself, the Chairman of the Committee is acting on behalf of all members of the committee. And if one is going to allow the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), who I think is the one to whom the hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring, then all the rest of the members of the committee legitimately - are they legitimate members of the committee? The chairman and the other members from this side are just as legitimately members of the committee as is the member for Bellevue. So will we have all five - is it? - members of the committee now get up and make comments on the report, or is there supposed to be a chairman who is supposed to report on behalf of all the rest of the members of the committee, Mr. Speaker? This is highly irregular.

MR. NEARY: Just a quick response to that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAIRD: (Inaudible).

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before the House met this afternoon the Chairman of that Committee indicated to my colleague that he would recommend that my colleague be allowed a few brief remarks on this report also. But now the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and the administration there opposite are refusing to allow that request, Mr. Speaker. So I would submit that the hon.

MR. NEARY: gentleman get on with his business of tabling the report unless my colleague is also allowed to comment.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Again to that point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), I think, rose on a point of order and posed a question to the hon. President of the Council as to whether or not he would permit somebody from the Opposition side to respond. If I remember correctly the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) did not say that they would not permit the hon. member to my right to speak in reply to the tabling of that report. He did not indicate that he would not be allowed to speak. And if the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) wishes to speak, then the Chair will certainly be prepared to put the question to the House for unanimous consent.

The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I thank all hon. members for their comments and their input into this report. I did not think it would be such a stormy one because it is after all unanimous, completely unanimous. And what I was about to do was to thank the former members of this committee because this committee has been constituted now for something over two years. It evaporated at the call of the last election as all committees do, and was reconstituted after the election. So I would like to thank, first of all, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), and the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), and the now erstwhile member for Terra Nova, Mr. Lush. I would like to thank all those gentlemen because they did put a lot of input into the report.

MR. CARTER: We had relativeley few public hearings and not a great deal of public interest, but a tremendous amount of private interest and a great deal of lengthy searching debate, and quite a few lengthy telephone conversations and a lot of input from a lot of people. So the report represents at least two years of work not necessarily continuously sustained but intermittent work, and I think it will bear of scrutiny. We have twenty-nine recommendations. Although I have provided an argument to go along with each recommendation, I will just comment very briefly on some of them because perhaps a further comment is useful. The recommendations are not necessarily presented in the order of their importance, but they are presented in the order of the Election Act itself. We were all very heartened and helped greatly by various officials who have had a great deal to do with the Election Act, and not least of all the late Harvey Cole who sat down with me and went over clause by clause each part of the old Election Act pointing out the clauses that had been helpful to him and the clauses that he felt had been a hinderance. So the order of the recommendations has no bearing whatsoever upon their importance, rather it is the order in which they occurred in going through the Election Act. I might say in beginning my remarks that perhaps we should look very carefully at the old act before we discard it. I think we have done quite well. The old act has served us very well, looking at this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: So perhaps we should think very carefully before we adopt this report.

The first point, Mr. Speaker, is that a permanent -

MR. NEARY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the  
Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, this has nothing to do with the content of the report, Mr. Speaker, or tabling the report or whether he should table it or whether he should not, it has to do with the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, and Your Honour and the members are aware that what the hon. gentleman is doing is completely out of order. They are taking the place on their backs over there, they are doing what they like, they are trying to change the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, and in the process muzzle the Opposition. Your Honour, knows that this is completely out of order, unheard of.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Look, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) realizes it but, I mean, I consider this report and this piece of legislation on elections and election financing to be the most important piece of legislation to come before a Legislature of Newfoundland since about 1832, Mr. Speaker. This is a very significant reform and we have had the select committee and, all the Chairman is trying to do is highlight some of the important parts of the report -

MR. NEARY:

Okay, let us debate it. This is out of order, We do that during debate.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- for the House and then move on. The Leader of the Opposition, I do not know if he recognizes the importance of this whole thing. And surely we are willing to allow the Chairman of the committee, who is speaking unanimously for all members of the committee, a chance to say a few words and highlight a few of the points.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I mean, it seems to me to be awfully uncivilized not to allow the chairman of a select committee to say a few brief comments upon the most significant piece of legislation dealing with elections since 1832.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it has nothing to do with the importance or the content of the report. It has nothing to do with that. We have to follow the rules of the House. And if the hon. gentleman says it is the most important thing we have had since the 1800s, well, then, let us debate it. Bring it on and let us have a debate on it, if the hon. gentleman places so much priority on it. Mr. Speaker, but the trouble is what the hon. gentleman is doing now we cannot respond to it and that is wrong, Mr. Speaker. It is completely out of order and against the rules of this House.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. John's North to that point of order.

MR. CARTER: I hardly think it is outside the spirit of the report for me to thank the members present and past who contributed so much to the report, or to thank all the

MR. CARTER:

public officials and private individuals who have contributed to this report. I do not understand what kind of a game the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is playing. It is most uncivil and indecent of him.

MR. NEARY:

Oh sure, do what you like. Take the House on your backs.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

To that point of order I again must repeat that it has been the practice of this House to permit hon. members when presenting reports to make a few brief comments. I would ask, however, of the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) that he not be too long in making his comments. As to whether or not an hon. member to my right is permitted to speak I suppose we shall have to wait and find out two things, number one, if he has a desire to speak and, number two, if the House will be prepared to grant him unanimous consent.

I recognize the

hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker,

having made my few introductory remarks, I am now into the body of the report itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER:

So I do not see how

I can be out of order. The first point, Mr. Speaker, again not in order of importance but in the order in which it occurred in the old act -

MR. NEARY:

A complete abuse of the rules.

MR. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the

interruption because it is helping me to gather my thoughts, but, still, I wonder how the rest of the members



MR. CARTER: of the House are reacting to it? A permanent list of voters, we feel, is both technically possible and administratively desirable. It is now technically possible because of the introduction, I suppose, within the last five years of a word processor that allows all that information to be kept on tape, fed into a computer, which is what a word processor is, and additional information to be put in and put in alphabetical order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, there are some problems, of course -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am quite seriously trying to go through this report piece by piece. I request the protection of the Chair if only for the sake of order and not for the sake of my protection. Because this is an absurd exercise otherwise, but it is intended to be a serious exercise.

MR. NEARY: I hope the Public Accounts Committee will be allowed the same privileges.

MR. CARTER: Even the Avalon Telephone Company will point out that its telephone directory is out of date by the time it is printed. And what we are suggesting is that there will be always an up-to-date voters list so that a person may be able to get on the list if they have any reason to believe they are not included.

MR. NEARY: I cannot blame His Honour for shaking his head. A complete abuse of the rules of this House.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

I would remind hon. members that there is another procedure rule in this House, that when a member is speaking he does have the

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): right to be heard  
in silence. I would ask all hon. members to adhere to that.

MR.CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR.SPEAKER: Order, please! The  
hon. member of the Opposition (Mr.Neary) on a point of  
order.

MR.NEARY: Your Honour is absolutely  
correct when he says that a member has the right to be heard  
in silence, but there are other rules, Mr. Speaker, that  
are not being observed at this moment in this House. And  
I can only appeal to the Chair to enforce the rules of  
the House. The hon. gentleman is completely out of order  
and it has nothing to do, as

MR. NEARY:

I say, with the report; put the report on the table, we will debate it in due course. The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is presenting argument and debate at this moment and I would submit to the Chair for the third time that the hon. gentleman is completely out of order and ignoring the warnings from the Chair that he be brief in his comments.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

For the third time I have to say that it has always been the custom of this House that when an hon. member is presenting a report he is allowed the courtesy of a few comments. And it is correct I have mentioned this to the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), and I would ask him to keep his comments brief, and I would ask him if he could confine his comments to five more minutes.

The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your indulgence. However, I would say that this is quite a complex report and requires a fairly detailed comment, but I will do my very best.

MR. NEARY: We will debate it in due course.

MR. CARTER: As will be seen later on in the report, the number of people on the voters' list is directly tied to election financing. The second recommendation is that permanent returning officers be appointed and we feel that this will mean that the people who are returning officers will be completely familiar with the act. In our opinion, three weeks is far too short a time for a person to be appointed as a returning officer, become familiar with the act and also administer it in addition to the many other hundreds of things that a returning officer has to do. It is a fact, of course, that many returning officers come back time and time again to each district, but this will

MR. CARTER:

regularize that procedure.

Moving right along, there is also a recommendation for a proxy vote. That is to say that a person is who is unable to vote at an advance poll, or on polling day, or at a special poll, who is unavoidably absent or who is unable because of sickness or incapacity to cast his ballot may, under certain carefully restricted conditions, appoint a proxy who would be able to vote for him.

Another change, an innovation, is that we are recommending that the ballot include the name and address and the party affiliation, if any, of the candidate. This is a sharp break with our local tradition, although not a break with tradition across Canada and the United States. It varies from place to place but we feel that since a person often votes for a party rather than a particular candidate that this would aid rather than hinder a democratic choice.

MR. NEARY:

(Inaudible)

MR. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, this is very hard to put up with. It was amusing for a while, it was funny, but it has ceased to be funny and I would appreciate it, Mr. Speaker, if I could have the protection of the Chair from the hon. gentleman.

MR. CARTER: Those who may vote; We are suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that those qualified to vote be Canadian citizens, a citizen of the Commonwealth, or a citizen of the Republic of Ireland on the basis that these are, Canadians, British Commonwealth, and those from Ireland, are the three people, the three founding races, if you like, of Newfoundland. And the suggestion is that it is the permanence of residence rather than the source of residence that would be the decisive factor. We do suggest also that landed immigrant status be considered, that is in line with the permanence of residence.

Students residing outside their permanent residences going to college or trade schools or places of learning who are entitled to vote, we suggest that they be given the right to opt either to vote in the place that they are now residing or in the place in which they ordinarily reside. This will avoid a lot of confusion and, I think, facilitate a democratic choice.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to page 263 of Beauchesne, paragraph 857 and I will read it for the benefit of members of the House: "The Chairman of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders presents the Committee's Report to the House and moves its concurrence at the earliest opportunity." Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask Your Honour to enforce the rules of the House.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's North to that point of order.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker,  
although I do not have Beauchesne in front of me, I notice from what the member read, and I can only go by what the member read, that that is a Standing Committee. This is the report of a Select Committee.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: As the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) pointed out, it relates to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders." You know, in case the hon. gentleman does not understand it, it is not a miscellaneous bill, this is a Select Committee of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the situation with respect to this is that Your Honour has made a ruling with respect to this matter, Notwithstanding Your Honour's ruling from time to time, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has not accepted it and got up and repeated the point of order over and over again because Your Honour's ruling was not to his satisfaction. There is one even more important ruling in Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wishes to read it, and I recommend it to him. It is on page 38, paragraph 117, and it has to do with respect to Your Honour as Speaker, as Presiding Officer of the House. "No member may question the Speaker." Once the Speaker gives his ruling that is a ruling. Whether the hon. gentleman likes it or not or any hon. gentleman likes it or not, it is the only way that this House can function. Now Your Honour has made a ruling with respect to this matter and that ruling is obviously to be followed by all members not the least of which and most especially is the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order I have to rule that the hon. Leader of the Opposition did not raise a valid

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): point of order.

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One would wonder what the hon.

gentleman is trying to prove.

MR. BAIRD: Bring in the House Leader , boy.

MR. CARTER: At the request of various officials, Mr. Speaker, we are recommending that the day of an election be fixed. Not necessarily the date as they do in the United States, fix a date every four years, but we are suggesting that the day of the week be fixed. This would greatly facilitate the logistics of the running of an election, and we are suggesting, quite an arbitrary suggestion, we are suggesting that Tuesday be the day of the week unless the previous day is a holiday. The officials have pointed out to us that it is very useful if the day prior to an election is a working day so that various supplies and various last minute arrangements can be made. And therefore we are suggesting that the day of the week be a Tuesday, and that the election be on the fourth Tuesday after the writ is issued. This would mean that the period for an election could vary anywhere from twenty-two to twenty-eight days. Tuesday is a perfectly arbitrary day. It could be Wednesday or Thursday, as long as the previous day is a working day. That is the meat of that particular

MR. CARTER:

recommendation. A very important recommendation, that the candidate or his agent have access to the list of the names of those who have voted. We feel, Mr. Speaker, that the candidate can have access to that list through an agent who is hired to sit down at the desk when the voter comes in. But the deputy returning officer is able to refuse the candidate the right to see that list of those who have voted and we feel this is unfair. If he is given one right he should be given the other. So we are suggesting that somehow or other, and we leave it to the government to work out the details of that, that the candidate have access to the official list of those who have voted.

I am skipping some of the recommendations because in each case we have put in an argument for the recommendation that we have made and we have also suggested a way that it can be done by bringing in some suggested draft legislation.

Number thirteen, we feel, is worthy of mention, that because the boundaries in an urban area are certainly not natural boundaries - usually the boundaries go up the center lines of streets - that the utility poles be made available for the display of election materials. That may seem like a simple request but it is not our right at the moment and we have always done it with the indulgence of the utility companies. Now we are suggesting that this right be firmly entrenched, and since their rights are already abridged by the use of traffic signs, we do not feel that this is a basic departure and we feel it would help to outline the urban districts at the time of an election.



MR. CARTER: The latter part of the report is concerned with the financing of elections and we are suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that recognized political parties be authorized to issue tax credit receipts for the provincial share of the income tax of an individual or corporation. This would mean that a person donating money to a party would have the same advantage that they do now have if they donate to a federal party, except that they would only be able to get a tax credit for the provincial share - the only power we have over the income tax is over the provincial share of the income tax - and that the maximum contribution that may be made to a political party or candidate be \$5,000 a year in an election

MR. CARTER:

year and \$1,000 in a non-election year. These are upper limits, Mr. Speaker. We do not expect that many contributions will be of this size, but we have to put some limit there. And, of course, the theme of our entire report is one of accountability rather than one of prohibition.

MR. NEARY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

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

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, apart from the hon. gentleman ignoring the direction of the Chair I wish to draw Your Honour's attention to page 204, paragraph 648, Presentation Of The Report To The House, in Beauchesne, "When the Speaker has called for Reports from Committees, during the progress of routine business, the Chairman, or in his absence, a member of the committee, will rise in his place and say he has the honour to present the ..... Report of the Committee. He hands the report to the Page, who delivers it to the Table." Now, Mr. Speaker this is the fourth time that I have raised this matter of the rules of this House being ignored. The administration and members of it think they can take the House on their backs, they can ignore the rules of the House and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a ruling of whether or not this whole proceeding is in order.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council to that point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

The Speaker has already given a ruling with respect to that. The rules of Beauchesne - so the hon. gentleman can understand, if he refers to Standing Order No. 1 he will see the rules of the Standing Orders apply and where they do not apply other rules do. Now, the rules of this House and the custom of this House, Mr. Speaker, have

MR. MARSHALL: precedence over any other rules and customs of any other legislative jurisdiction or any other parliament, and the custom and the practice in this House, as Your Honour has enunciated, has been the fact that the hon. member presenting a report can make some words of explanation on it. Because of the importance of this report the hon. gentleman's explanation is a little bit longer than perhaps is normal, but then, again, it is a very important report. Now, Mr. Speaker, I draw to Your Honour's attention as well, you know, that these are the rules and this is a ruling and we are going to have complete disorder and disruption in this House if an hon. member not accepting Your Honour's ruling is, at every available opportunity, going to get up and again present to Your Honour the same point of order that Your Honour has already ruled on. If that persists, Mr. Speaker, and I know this will get all sorts of statements from the hon. gentleman about the majority of the House, but there is a matter of order in this House and there is a matter that all members of this House on whatever side have to protect, and if the hon. gentleman persists in flaunting Your Honour's ruling there is only one procedure that can be taken, and I think the hon. gentleman well knows it because he has been subjected to it from time to time in his career.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition to that point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, at least I did not have a member come across and punch me in the face in this House, not yet anyway. It happened to the hon. gentleman a few years ago, when he insulted a member's mother in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say this has nothing to do with custom or tradition, the rules of the

MR. NEARY: House have to be followed; the rules apply to both sides of this hon. House, the rules are not being followed. And it is not the custom and tradition in this House as the hon. gentleman just told us - he is falling back on that argument now - it is not the custom or tradition to allow long-winded statements. The hon. gentleman is now almost a half an hour, over twenty minutes, Mr. Speaker, and he is allowed to plough on, and this is a blatant, inexcusable violation of the rules of this House, if I may.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: By my rough calculation I would have been long since finished, long, long, since finished. - I am not noted for speaking at length, ever, and I would have been long since finished if it had not been for the interruptions of the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order, it has been a custom in this House of Assembly, as I said before, for the Chair to permit members when presenting reports to have a few comments and then table the report. While the substance of the report and the importance of it to this House may be of great importance, perhaps that is not quite the point that the Chair should consider. The Chair has, I think, been fairly lenient with the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) even though he has been sort of constantly interrupted by points of order and indeed has not had the opportunity to speak for a very long time on the report. However, there may come a point when the Chair has to make a ruling as to how long an hon. member can continue in presenting a report. The Chair did ask the hon. the member for St. John's

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): North if he would try to limit his comments to five minutes and that was about fifteen minutes ago. I would ask the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) if he would conclude his remarks in another minute or so.

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I will undertake if there are no further interruptions to conclude my remarks within a couple of minutes. I will give that solemn undertaking. But, Mr. Speaker, the interruptions have certainly been of great length.

The meat of the entire report, the nub of it, shall we say, is that government will be asked in future to help finance the running of an election, and the formula that we suggest is two dollars times the number of voters distributed to the registered parties on the basis of their standing either in the last election, or of the average of their popular vote in the last two elections, or of the average of their popular vote in the last three elections, or of their standing in the subsequent election. Now, it would obviously be unfair to divide the public money between the two major parties in this House on the basis of the last election, because it would give the lion's share to one party and, therefore, we are bending over backwards to be fair. So that is the main point of the financing part of this report.

The limit of the expenditures of a candidate be \$25,000 exclusive of travelling costs: Now, that seems very, very high, but I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is to provide for, say, the possibility of a by-election, where both parties expend all their efforts in one district.

There is a lot left over, there is a lot for the government still to do when they go over this report. We suggest that there should be an Electoral Commission that would review the performance of the parties and of this act after an election. And our last but not our least suggestion is that within five years of the introduction of a new act that there be a further Select Committee

MR. CARTER: appointed to review to see that what we have suggested has worked out. We are confident that it will.

I would like to thank all hon. members who have had some part to play in this. And I hereby table the report and the suggested draft act of this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

I assume that the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is standing to say a few words. I have to ask for unanimous consent of the House for the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I want to point out it is not within the rules of the House, not in accordance with normal precedence, but this is of such importance that he certainly has unanimous consent from this side, I do know know whether the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) will consent to it or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, whether one or two wrongs make a right or not is not important but, anyway, they have given me leave.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks shall be few, I would like to say, as the Chairman has already said, that it has been a pleasure working on this Committee. I





MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps

I can insert a little bit of comedy into this as well. Two members of the committee, myself and the Chairman, were in Ontario looking at other legislatures and so on in our efforts to come up with some draft legislation to improve the electoral system during election times, and I think it was when we were leaving the office of the Attorney General in Ontario, Mr. Roy McMurtry, when the discussion go around to the number of members in the Ontario Legislature as compared with the number of members in our Legislature - in Ontario there are 125 - and the chairman of this committee told Mr. McMurtry that in Newfoundland we have 52 members, the same number as you have in a deck of cards, but, he said, we have no jokers. Now, Mr. Speaker, I beg to disagree with that, I think in our deck of cards in this Legislature, the 52 members, that a number of the kings and queens have been taken out and a lot of jokers inserted in place of them.

Mr. Speaker, the Chairman -

MR. SIMMS:

You had better watch what

you say.

MR. CALLAN:

Most of the jokers, Mr. Speaker,

are on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, the Chairman

referred to Recommendation Number 13, that provision be made for the use of Light and Power poles. I might say that I found that an excellent idea. I have always managed to get permission from Newfoundland Light and Power to use their poles during elections, and perhaps that partly accounts for my success

MR. CALLAN: in being able to defeat the Premier on at least two occasions, in a by-election and in the last election, more than anybody else has done in this Legislature. Because, Mr. Speaker, what I used to do was hire somebody who had experience in that field and with his spurs on he would climb the pole so that my picture and my poster was high enough above the Tory pictures that nobody could tear them down and they stayed, of course, right up until election day.

MR. MATTHEWS: That is the only way you could get elected.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me say the final Recommendation, Number 29, to which the Chairman just referred says, "that there shall be another select committee chosen in five years to review this act," and it says, "To see that future problems are addressed we suggest that another select committee be put in place within five years after the next election." Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I give notice now that I fully intend to be on the next committee which will be meeting following the next election, within five years.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of

Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the subordinate legislation which has been filed in the Registry between May 13, 1983 and November 14, 1983.

MR. CALLAN: Read them. Read them.

MR. NEARY: That is the proper way to do things.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I do not think you would wish me to read all of this.

MR. NEARY: That is the proper way to do it.

000

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

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

MR. NEARY: I wonder if the Minister of Finance could tell the House if he intends, before this session ends, to table the Auditor General's Report?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! That question could very well have been asked during the Question Period. It is not a point of order.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if at first you do not succeed try, try again. Hon. members will recall that about a week or ten days ago I attempted to present a petition in this hon. House on behalf of residents of St. Bernard's in the district of Fortune-Hermitage. Now, Mr. Speaker, I was barred from presenting the petition. I sent the Hansard to the people who were involved in circulating the petition, and Mr. Speaker, much to my surprise there arrived in my office yesterday a second petition from the people in the district of Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMS: A proper one.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY:

I do not intend to depart from what the people said in their petition. The prayer may not be exactly according to Hoyle, but it is a prayer, Mr. Speaker, and I will read the prayer of the petition and I believe that will be sufficient to say. A petition from the residents of St. Bernard's in the district of Fortune-Hermitage, "Once again we, the people of Road No. 13, have chosen the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Steve Neary, to present a petition to the provincial government. We, the undersigned, demand an explanation as to what happened to the pavement for Road 13 that was listed to be paved under a provincial/municipal agreement in the paving programme of the years 1982 and 1983. We demand that Road No. 13 be paved as was agreed.

"Our allegations are as follows:

1982 - part of Road 13 was paved. In our area where eighteen families live, crushed stone was laid and 100 metres of pavement was taken for private roads in our community. 1983 paving programme - we were supposed to get 150 metres of pavement. The crushed stone was laid once again; the same old routine followed, private roads were paved and once again Road 13 was left out. But this time we have taken a stand.

"The member for Fortune-Hermitage, Don Stewart, was notified by phone by Mr. Banfield, Mr. Hackett and Mr. Hynes; a telephone call was made to the Minister of Municipal Affairs by Mrs. Banfield. The call was accepted by Mr. Ron Corbett, the Deputy Minister, he also returned the call to Mrs. Banfield concerning the matter. A letter and petition was also sent to Mrs. Newhook, to no avail. Did we get the answers we were looking for? Mr. Stewart told Mr. Hackett that it was not his responsibility how the paving was handled and, yet, after the pavement was taken from Road 13 and used on private roads in St. Bernard's, he issued another \$9,000 to pave

MR. NEARY: 100 metres of private roads to people who had good friends in the Cabinet.

"We repeat, we are not taking back any of those allegations, the proof is here to see. This is not one man's opinion. We want an explanation, why Road 13 was not paved, and we want the agreement fulfilled, 'We shall remember'. Signed, on this 24th. day of May 1983 by thirty-eight residents of Road 13 and backed by 129 supporters for a total of 167 voters. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to present this petition, lay it on the table of the House, and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second attempt that the people have made to get their grievance aired in this House and I am happy to say that today they have succeeded. So it just goes to prove, Mr. Speaker, that persistence pays off. I congratulate the good people of St. Bernard's for exercising their democratic right. I hope that their message, that their complaint will not fall on deaf ears and that there will be a thorough investigation into how the money was spent in St. Bernard's, and that they, indeed, will get their Road No. 13 paved as was promised and agreed to in a municipal/provincial agreement.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask the page to come and take the petition and lay it on the table of the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I do wish to respond to this petition. I did not receive a petition. I did receive a letter from a Mr. Russell Banfield and in that letter Mr. Banfield outlined his complaints and conditions of Road 13. He also listed in the same letter all of the people, the names of the people who lived on Road 13.

November 29, 1983

Tape 3511

PK - 3

MRS. NEWHOOK:

We have responded to Mr. Banfield saying that we are trying to get the facts and to find out what happened. We do know that Road 13

MRS NEWHOOK:

was included in the contract but we do not know for what reason Road 13 was not completed. We did also enquire about driveways being paved, and the mayor responded saying that the people who had their driveways paved paid to get them done, that it did not come out of the money approved for the roads programme under our 60/40 programme. We have responded to Mr. Banfield saying to him that we are now in touch with the contractor, we have asked the contractor for an explanation, and when we get that explanation we will be dealing with the matter.

MR. NEARY:

That is a very good answer, a very good answer. That is the most sensible answer we got this day. That Hansard will be sent down to Fortune-Hermitage.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

RESOLUTION: That it is expedient to bring in a measure further to amend The Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957, the Act No. 70 of 1957, to provide for the advance of loans to and the guarantee of the repayment of bonds or debentures issued by or loans advanced to certain corporations.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Bill No. 77 we were discussing at the adjournment.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, yesterday during the debate on this bill, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), who does not happen to be in his seat today, made some very irresponsible statements and they were reported in today's Evening Telegram and a very biased headline put on the report saying, "Liberals blocking help for plants, says Morgan." Now, Mr. Chairman, I was going to raise the matter today as a point of privilege but I felt that this bill would be coming up again and would give me an opportunity to tell the House, Mr. Chairman, just how this matter was misinterpreted and misconstrued. And not only misinterpreted and misconstrued, but the statements that were made by the hon. gentleman were completely misleading and false. What the hon. gentleman said was that "Morgan said he has been told by the Liberal friends in Ottawa that the Newfoundland Liberals were opposed to the plan because Mr. Cashin was against it." And then it goes on to say, "Richard Cashin is President of the Newfoundland Fishermen, Food and Allied Workers' Union." First of all to that statement, Mr. Chairman, let me say it is hogwash, it is balderdash. First of all the hon. gentleman did not quote his sources. Now have we resorted in this House



MR. NEARY:

to making wild, irresponsible statements about friends in Ottawa? Mr. Speaker, is that what we have lowered ourselves to now in this House? Will we be able to come in now and say, 'Our Tory friends in Ottawa told us this?' The hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) talks about rumours, talks about innuendoes. Mr. Speaker, this borders on libel and slander. In fact, it is not true. And, as I said to the House yesterday, we on this side of the House have not been asked for our opinion, neither have we volunteered our opinion, neither are we aware of the position of Mr. Richard Cashin, President of the Fishermen, Food and Allied Workers' Union. We are opposed to a principle. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me make it abundantly clear that the Liberals are not blocking help for plants, the Liberals are trying to persuade the government to help the resource-short plants, but we happen to think that this is not the way to do it, by bringing in the Portuguese and the Spaniards and the West Germans to do it, taking jobs away from Newfoundlanders. The hon. gentleman, if he has any courage, will stand in this House and admit that he was wrong and apologize to the House, Mr. Chairman. Liberal friends in Ottawa told him that the Newfoundland Liberals were opposed to the plan because Mr. Cashin was opposed to it! Let him quote his sources, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman, if he was correct, let him quote his sources. No, he does not have the courage to do that, Mr. Chairman. All he wanted to do was to slander the members of the Opposition.

Who?

MR. NEARY:

The Minister of Fisheries

(Mr. Morgan). Mr. Speaker, there is not an ounce of truth in it and I dare the hon. gentleman, who made these

MR. NEARY: wild and irresponsible statements, to stand up in this House and quote his sources, and if he cannot quote his sources, Mr. Chairman, if he is too cowardly to do it, then we can only assume that there are no sources but it was a figment of the hon. gentleman's imagination. And I hope that The Evening Telegram will report what I am saying today and give it a good headline.

MR. MORGAN: Ah, now you are in a bind!

MR. NEARY: Yes, I am in some bind, alright!

MR. MORGAN: You are changing your policy fast now!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we are not changing any policy at all. We are saying that the resource-short plants need help and need it badly, but bringing in the Portuguese is not the way to do it, Mr. Chairman, for slave labour. That is what we are opposed to. And the hon. gentleman can twist and turn and squirm all he wants like a worm, Mr. Chairman. The fact of the matter is that the hon. gentleman cannot quote sources, and if he cannot quote sources, let The Evening Telegram report that he cannot quote sources and then, Mr. Chairman, they can only come to one conclusion, that the hon. gentleman was bluffing when he made these statements.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to dwell on that and waste any more time of the House on it except to say that if we are going to lower the debate in this House to that sort of thing, 'My Tory friends in Ottawa,' 'My Liberal friends in Ottawa,' 'My NDP friends in Ottawa told me this,' and then quote it and have it reported as gospel without any investigation, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to lower the debate in this hon. House to that sort of thing, I would say is it any wonder that

MR. NEARY: the decorum of the House is  
in such a mess?

Now, Mr. Chairman, yesterday I was asking the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), when the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) leapt into this debate, I was asking a few simple questions about Blue Ocean Products, and perhaps I could put it all into the one question. All I am asking the hon. gentleman is to give us some information in connection with these plants: Blue Ocean Products, W. M. Goudie Limited, Island Seafoods Limited, Port Enterprises Limited, Steelfab Limited and Whites Fisheries Limited. Could the hon. gentleman tell us where each one of these plants is located, the number of employees of each plant, the number of weeks and months out of a year that they operated and where they get their supply of fish? Now, this is legitimate information that the Committee is entitled to have, and surely the hon. gentleman has that information with him when we are going into Committee of the Whole on this bill.

So I will take my seat,  
Mr. Chairman, and I look forward to

MR. NEARY: getting the information. Once we get the information, then we can go on and pass the amendment to the Loan and Guarantee Act. But certainly the Committee has a right to this information. The minister has no right to treat it lightly, withhold information. It is taxpayers' dollars.

DR. COLLINS: I am not treating it lightly. You did not give me a chance yesterday.

MR. NEARY: I did give the hon. gentleman a chance and the hon. gentleman thought he was going to catch this side of the House with their ten minutes used up and ram the bill through yesterday evening. It did not work. They can try all the parliamentary tricks and little games that they want, Mr. Chairman, but the fact of the matter is that this is a money bill and we are asking legitimate questions. We had all kinds of abuse heaped on us by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) when he leaped into the debate. I am addressing my questions to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), who I would hope would be responsible enough to give us the answers and not have innuendoes and slurs and slander made by members of that side of the House that Liberals in Ottawa told them this or Liberals in Ottawa told them that. It would be like me coming into the House and saying, 'The Tories up in Ottawa tell me we are pretty near an offshore agreement,' or 'My Tory friends up in Ottawa told me the rural development agreement is about to be signed.' That would be false, inaccurate and untrue, it would be a lie. If I made statements like that, Mr. Chairman, it would be a lie. I cannot speak for other members, Mr. Chairman. And so I would gladly take my seat and give the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) an opportunity to give us some information on these plants. That is all we are asking of him, we are not asking for anything elaborate. All we want is

MR. NEARY: some basic information concerning these loans and if the interest payments are up to date. I believe the hon. minister indicated yesterday that to his knowledge the government has not been called upon to meet any of the interest payments. So I would just like to hear his answers to these questions, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman may not like this minister to answer questions on the Fisheries, and the reason being he is very seldom asking questions on the Fisheries of this minister. But the fact is any issue involving the Fisheries in this Province, it is my responsibility to reply to any questions and to supply all information, and that is the intention. Now to clarify a situation that the hon. gentleman finds himself in, which is not a very pleasant situation, where he is trying to squirm and weasel his way out as a Leader of of Party, but the fact is that the Liberal Party, the official Opposition in this Province, stood firmly and squarely opposed to any effort of this government, the Peckford administration, to get fish to resource-short plants in the last number of weeks in this Province. Now that is the issue, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MORGAN: He cannot take it, he cannot take the heat now.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there is another example of a completely irresponsible statement made. Just listen to what the hon. gentleman said, that yesterday I stood firmly and squarely against any opportunity for the

MR. NEARY: administration to supply these resource-short plants. Mr. Chairman, that is completely untrue, it is irresponsible and, if the hon. gentleman continues in that tone of debate, I am afraid it is going to severely affect the decorum of this House. I cannot call the hon. gentleman a liar, Mr. Chairman, but I can say that it is not true, it is just not true. The hon. gentleman will be reported again as saying that the Opposition blocked it. But we are only seven members. They are the government, there is a Government of Canada, we do not make the decisions, Mr. Chairman. If the administration wants to make the decision, let them go ahead and make it, Seven of us cannot block forty-four.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

To that point of order, I rule that there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the protection of the Chair from these silly points of order, because the fact is the hon. gentleman cannot take the heat. And the situation is quite clear, A number of weeks ago in a very sincere way this administration tried to do something for the independent companies. Yesterday the hon. gentleman was critical of the fact we were giving financial assistance to these independent companies, labelling it a 'bail out' and stopping bankruptcies and these kind of things. The fact is that what we are doing for the independent fish companies in this Province we are proud of as a government, both in financial assistance to the companies mentioned here, in this case Aqua Fisheries and Port Enterprises and Blue Ocean Products and Island Seafoods, which are encompassed in this bill of assistance to the independent companies, the government guaranteed loans. Now in some cases, in fact I would say in most cases today in our Province, it is not

MR. MORGAN: financial assistance these independents want, it is fish, it is raw material for their plants. And what did we do a few weeks ago? We put forward a proposal to get fish to these inshore resource-short plants at a time when they have no employment,

MR. MORGAN: at a time when their plants are closed, at a time when they have high overhead in their plant operations, and they would, eventually, be hurting financially unless they can get some operations going and some raw materials be processed in the off season to the inshore.

Now the hon. gentleman can try to criticize the media for the exposure in today's papers of what really the situation is that I put forward in the House yesterday. And I have to give them praise because they are doing a very adequate job of reporting the debates in this House. And what I said yesterday I stand firmly behind today, and that is that all the groups and organizations, the independent small group, the Independent Association of Fish Producers, stand firmly and squarely behind the proposal of having foreign fishing vessels engaged to land fish for processing in their plants this time of the year, right now, until the restructuring is complete, and then have the other half of the resource-short plant allocation landed by Canadian vessels or Canadian bottoms.

The Newfoundland Government made a proposal in a sincere way backed up by the independents because the independents had a proposal on the table from Ottawa and that was sit down with the representatives of the large trawlers, sit down with these companies and try to work out an arrangement whereby you will use Canadian vessels to catch half of the resource allocation, we used the figure 4,000 tonnes, and once you do that, then we will let you engage foreign fishing vessels to come behind and land the remaining portion of resource-short plant allocation. But you have to put the Canadian vessels in place first and you do that by -

MR. NEARY: Now you are changing your tune.

MR. MORGAN: Now this was Mr. De Bane's proposal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I want protection from the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!



MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman, this was the federal government's proposal to the companies in this Province. We told them we had reservations it would ever work. Why? Because the large trawler companies could never tell the independents how much cost per pound it would be for these plants to purchase the fish from the Canadian trawlers. They could not tell them it was going to be thirty-five cents a pound, thirty-one cents a pound, twenty-nine cents a pound, or twenty-seven cents a pound or less. They could not give a cost figure. So because of that the independent companies could not reach an agreement, there was a stalemate with the other sector, the deepsea sector, on the cost per pound of fish for their plants. And because of that, because of the stalemate, we said to the federal government, 'We know your policy, we know your programme, Do not force the regulations of having Canadian bottoms in place first, we know that is a problem right now, Let them go ahead and put the foreign vessels in place right now, let them harvest using foreign vessels this Fall, and when the restructuring is complete, in January or February, then we could look at putting Canadian vessels in place and carry on with the programme.' That was the Peckford's Administration proposal supported by the independents, supported by the Fish Trades Association, supported by everybody I know of in the industry, with the exception of one. And I said in the House yesterday, and I say again today, Mr. Cashin could not and did not support it, because he felt that he had to take a firm position on behalf of his union membership, in this case the trawlermen, and I would say that is a pretty fair stand for a union leader to take on behalf of his membership.

But that party, the Opposition, stood firmly in the House of Assembly and condemned the Premier, because he would not dare question the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) on the issue because he had all of the information, questioned the Premier during Question Period on two different

MR. MORGAN: days in the House of Assembly, and condemned, in the preamble on questioning, this administration on using foreign vessels to catch and land it for processing in those independent plants we are talking about now.

Now he can try to weasel all he wants to out of the issue, but the fact is the Liberal Party stood firmly opposed to using foreign vessels this Fall to create jobs on shore, to create jobs in our plants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on! Right on!

MR. MORGAN: And if he is going to now suddenly find out that it was a very untenable and a very unpopular political decision to make that is the consequences, because every single plant worker on the Northeast Coast is quite upset, because the Liberal Party stood firmly with the government in Ottawa and would not agree to our proposal, and stood with Mr. Cashin on the issue and we are losing jobs.

I sat down this morning with twenty-one companies from around the Province and the Fish Trades Association. I think it was a good meeting, a good

MR. MORGAN:

discussion, a three hour discussion. And one of the key issues today in the fishing industry for those independent companies - they are not looking for government dollars and government handouts, they are concerned over the restructuring and what may happen which could adversely affect them; and rightly so and I recognize these concerns - but the key issue right now today is, "Get us some raw material, get us some fish from the offshore." There are 10,000 tons out there not yet caught this year, 1983. Here we are coming on the end of November and that fish is not caught, 10,000 tons of Northern cod alone, a good resource, a good raw material, and it is allocated for these independent plants and not one pound has been caught this year. And all they are saying to the governments, they are pleading with us, "Put in place a programme that will work for this year. Do not let that fish just go on and not be caught and suddenly someone else comes in and puts a major lobby on to grab it from us." - and I will not get involved in that side of the topic today, but I will later on, I am sure, during the next number of months. - "Give us and find us a way of getting fish." And the hon. gentleman, again I want to say, it was very unfortunate for all of those people who wanted to go to work in the plants that he did not stand firmly and squarely behind this government and the Premier of the Province in our proposal to get fish to these inshore plants. It is unfortunate because we are losing by it. This Province is losing employment in the fish plants at a time of the year when you need employment, and God knows we do, all the jobs that we need, every job counts, coming into the Christmas Season

MR. MORGAN: and coming into the Winter season these jobs are indeed so important to the overall economy of our Province.

Now if some of these companies we are assisting here, for example, if they were given supplies of fish last Fall from foreign effort catching and landing here for processing in their plants, I would venture to say that, if not all, some of these independent companies here we are assisted in this bill and we did assist in government guaranteed loans, would not have had to come looking for government guaranteed loans. They would have had a longer period of employment in their plants and less overhead to cover accordingly by a greater cash flow, a greater return, and we would not have had to assist the companies that the hon. gentleman is asking questions about. And he can try to put off by having the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), who is quite capable of answering the questions, but the responsibility is here on these fishing plants and why we are assisting these plants, and we are assisting Port Enterprises in Southern Harbour. Why? They found themselves in a tight squeeze, going through some rough times. They employ 160 people. They buy from 125 inshore fishermen in the area. Why did we assist Blue Ocean Products? Because they are the mainstay of employment in Branch, in St. Bride's, in St. Mary's-The Capes, in Argenticia. They employed last year 450 seasonal employees in these plants and I understand that practically every employee qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits. Not a big positive thing, we should not be going around touting to have fish plants merely to have workers qualify for unemployment insurance, that is the last thing you want to stand for in this Province. We want year-round employment,

MR. MORGAN: or at least nine to ten months of the year in our plants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on!

MR. MORGAN: But in this case they did qualify to receive unemployment insurance from working in these plants in Argentinia, Branch and St. Bride's. Then there is Island Seafoods, My colleague from Twillingate (Mrs. Reid) will understand the importance of assisting the company, Island Seafoods. They had a plant operating in Herring Neck, a plant in Change Islands - he is not in the Chair now - in Mr. Speaker's district, in Whales Gulch and Virgin Arm. These are important plants on the Northeast Coast, in the Twillingate, Lewisporte districts. They employed 360 plant workers and they bought fish from 300 inshore fishermen. And then White Fisheries in Sandy Cove had 180 people employed in their plant up on the Great Northern Peninsula and it is not in any of my colleagues'

MR. MORGAN: districts, it is a district of the Opposition. Who cares what district it is in? That is not the issue. We assessed the applications put forward by the independent companies on their own merits, we determined they met the criteria of government to be able to qualify, we were also convinced they could be viable operations in the future - and in fact they are because some of these loan guarantees have now expired; I think White's Fishery has expired, if I recall correctly, on the date - but none of the companies we have assisted, and it is a very proud thing to be able to say, none of the total of twenty-five independent companies we have assisted in this Province to the amount of \$12.5 million, and that is a lot of money put into small and medium sized independent companies, none of these companies have gone into receivership, none of them have gone bankrupt, none of them that I know of, with the exception of one - and I will not mention that name today because it is a matter of discussion between the government and the company concerned - with the exception of one none of them will go into receivership or go into bankruptcy. And that is a clear vindication of this government's policy in helping assist independents at a time when they found themselves in a tight squeeze or in dire straits in some cases because of circumstances beyond their control. So, Mr. Chairman, in commenting again on this bill, I want to say that as for the rest of the bill, I am sure the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can talk about the other companies which are not involved in the fishery, but the companies involved in the fishing industry - Aqua Fisheries, Blue Ocean Products, Island Seafoods, Port Enterprises and White's Fisheries, these are the

MR. MORGAN: companies—the other companies have nothing to do with the fishing industry.

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

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman who just took his seat said - and Hansard will confirm this - that we would not agree to the provincial government's proposal to get fish to these plants. Mr. Chairman, he made statements like, 'We try to do something for the independents' and so forth' and that is the reason we made that proposal to the Government of Canada.' Now let us see what the hon. gentleman said yesterday, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman said yesterday, 'A few days ago he was condemning this government for trying to work in co-operation and agree with a proposal from Ottawa.' Yesterday he told us the proposal came from Ottawa.' The Fisheries Minister said, 'The proposal was not initiated by the Newfoundland Government.' Now today he is telling us that it was initiated by the provincial government. He says, 'It came from the (federal) Fisheries Minister (Mr. De Bane).' Mr. De Bane's policy, and we agreed with it, because we wanted to see a programme of using foreign vessels for temporary periods like they have always done.' Now today the hon. gentleman, on a slippery slope, Mr. Chairman, now gets up and tells us that it was the provincial government who took the initiative and said to Ottawa would you please let the foreigners catch the fish first and we will talk Canadian bottoms after. And we do not know where that proposal lies right now, Mr. Chairman. But

MR. NEARY: let it be recorded that the hon. gentleman does not know what kind of a policy he is stating. Yesterday he told us one thing, today he is contradicting himself and telling us something different. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me get it on the record again, just in case somebody within hearing distance of my words will misunderstand -

MR. MORGAN: You are going to change your policy. The calls are coming in today. I know all about them.

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman only knew, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MORGAN: The calls are coming in to your office today. The pressure is on you. Change your mind now.

MR. NEARY: No. Mr. Chairman, what proposal are we talking about? Let me clarify: We are talking about a proposal from this administration to let the foreigners come in, catch the fish, take jobs away from Newfoundlanders who are walking the streets hopelessly looking for work. That is the proposal we are talking about.

MR. MORGAN: No. We are putting fish in our own plants.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the key issue here is foreigners catching the fish. We are all for it, it is a motherhood issue to supply the resource-short plants with fish. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say that these lists of guarantees that we have before us, when these plants went in business there was no talk of foreigners catching fish. They went in and no doubt they did a feasibility study.

MR. MORGAN: Where have you been!

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



November 29, 1983

Tape No. 3517

MJ - 4

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, no doubt these companies did a feasibility study, when they established their businesses they were not depending on foreigners,

MR. NEARY:

buying fish from foreigners, they figured they could survive on the inshore fishery. Now, Mr. Chairman, a few years later they find they cannot survive on the amount of fish that they are getting, and that is the crux of the matter. And now the hon. gentleman tells us that they are clamouring for the foreigners to catch their fish for them. What does the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) have to say about that, where draggermen and trawlermen are walking the streets looking for work? Does he agree with letting the foreigners come in and take the jobs away from them? Does the member for Burin-Placentia (Mr. Tobin)?

MR. TOBIN: That is not what we are talking about now.

MR. NEARY: That is not what we are talking about? Mr. Chairman, we have the catching capability in Canada to catch that fish, and to allow foreigners to come in for cheap labour would deny Newfoundlanders an opportunity for jobs. The hon. gentleman knows that and, if he does not, his constituents know it. Down in Burin-Placentia West they know it, and wherever you have draggermen and trawlermen and unemployed Newfoundlanders and Labradorians they know it. Mr. Chairman, our hearts and our sympathy go out to the plant workers who only get a few weeks or a few months out of a year in these resource-short plants, our hearts go out to them. But is the answer bringing the foreigners in to catch the fish? Does the hon. member for Grand Bank think that is the answer?

MR. MATTHEWS: What is the answer?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it is not my place to tell the hon. gentleman what the answer is. But I am very concerned about the foreigners, about the provincial government's proposal to bring in the foreigners and allow them to catch the fish. And the hon. gentleman can call it a one-shot deal, but it will take a miracle to close the door once it is opened up, Mr. Chairman, and that is our concern. And the hon. gentleman can twist our words any way he wants and have them reported in biased headlines and what have you, but the fact of the matter is, let me repeat, that our hearts and our sympathy go out to the resource-short plant owners, to the people who work in the plants, but, Mr. Chairman, we are not going to allow foreigners to come inside of our 200 mile limit through the backdoor to take jobs away from Newfoundlanders who are hopelessly walking the streets looking for employment. That is the issue, Mr. Chairman, that is the proposal, the hon. gentleman is talking, He gets up and makes a general statement that somebody is against or somebody is for supplying the resource-short plants. The key issue is letting the foreigners do it. And I cannot help but look at the strained look on members' faces there opposite every time the hon. gentleman raises the issue, because it is not a very popular issue, Mr. Chairman, in this Province. No wonder the hon. gentleman is smarting under the -

MR. MORGAN: They are losing 3,000-odd jobs in fish plants because of your policy.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, when these plants were established they did not look to the foreigners to catch their fish. They felt they could survive and thrive on the fish that was available to them in the area. Now the minister is trying to use them as a scapegoat to

MR. NEARY: justify his proposal to the Government of Canada to allow the foreigners to catch the fish and deny Newfoundlanders, hundreds and probably thousands of Newfoundlanders employment.

MR. SIMMS: Why were you not out for the opening of the school in Port aux Basques?

MR. NEARY: A beautiful school, beautiful.

MR. SIMMS: How come you were not there last night?

MR. NEARY: I could not go because of the House, Mr. Chairman. I know the hon. gentleman is anxious to get her closed up. Mr. Chairman, I hope we will hear no more about this.

MR. MORGAN: Oh, you are going to hear more yet.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman gave us one story yesterday and a different story now today. And now he has watered it down, The minister is saying squirming now and watering it down by saying,

MR. NEARY: 'Well, first the proposal was to let Canadian bottoms catch the fish and foreigners after,' but now this afternoon he is telling us that the proposal of the administration was let the foreigners catch first and then the Canadian bottoms later.

Mr. Chairman, is it any wonder that the plant workers and the fishermen and the fish plant operators in this Province have no confidence in the hon. gentlemen?

MR. MORGAN: You will never run in Port aux Basques again. You know you are wrong.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it has nothing to do with politics. Do they have a leader over there at all to ask the hon. gentleman to restrain himself?

Mr. Chairman, I want to come back again to the questions I put to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). This bill is being piloted through this House by the Minister of Finance, and as long as the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) keeps leaping into the fray and making a fool of himself, Mr. Chairman, to protect ourselves from biased headlines in the papers, we have to respond.

MR. MORGAN: I will have more to say in this debate yet.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, let me make one thing abundantly clear to the hon. gentleman, that I have taken a position, and I guarantee you that that minister or nobody else on that side is going to frighten me or stampede me into going against my principles.

MR. MORGAN: You changed today. See those calls coming in.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman can get up and rant and rave all he wants, he is not going to scare us.

MR. NEARY: The fact of the matter is that the principle of allowing foreigners to catch our fish is wrong, Mr. Chairman.

Let me get back to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). We have seven items left on this bill, seven companies that were assisted by the government: Blue Ocean Products for \$500,000, W. M. Goudie for \$100,000, Island Seafoods for \$300,000, Port Enterprises \$150,000 -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: Yes. I will have to come back at him again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I guess it is very pertinent that this debate on Fisheries is going on under this bill because at this present time in the House of Commons, I understand, in the next five minutes, there will be a major debate on the restructuring bill, the last day before the House of Commons, where we will have two members of Parliament from Newfoundland taking some very irresponsible actions - and I have to say it, I said it outside the House and I will say it inside the House as well - where the member for Trinity - Conception (Mr. Rooney) says he is going to vote against the bill. Despite all his employees at Charleston, Catalina, Port Union, Bonavista, he is going to vote against the bill today, he says publicly. Mr. Rompkey is trying to scuttle the bill. Maybe he is getting even with the Prime Minister and his party who took him away from the position of a Cabinet minister, who really did show him

MR. MORGAN: up in his inabilities to do a job in the Cabinet post and took his job away from him. Maybe he is getting even, I do not know what it is, but he is trying to scuttle the bill by proposing an amendment which would really, in fact and in essence, violate the agreement worked out between the two levels of government. If Mr. Rompkey's amendment is passed it will mean a violation of the agreement already signed between the two levels of government, and that is irresponsible. It is totally irresponsible. It is fine to be parochial once in a while about your own constituency and your own problems, but Mr. Rompkey is trying to scuttle the people in Grand Bank and in Burin and in Gaultois and Ramea and Burgeo and on around the coast, Trepassey and Fermeuse and Bonavista and Catalina, trying to scuttle them. For what purpose? Because he wants to protect his own little political hide in St. Anthony. And that is irresponsible, that is totally irresponsible! And I understand from this morning's statement, maybe Mr. Rompkey is going to do that, try to stop the bill from going through the House of Commons today by proposing silly amendments, which he himself is aware of. But the Premier sat down with him, no longer than a few days ago, and explained to him what the bill encompasses on Northern Fisheries Corporation. It will be looked after. It is in the agreement. St. Anthony will be opening next Spring, it is part of the restructuring. There is no problem with St. Anthony. So why is Mr. Rompkey trying to scuttle the restructuring bill? My only assumption is it is the fact that he wants to get even with his colleagues in Ottawa, get even with them for being removed from the Cabinet portfolio for Newfoundland. That is the only thing I can see. And as to Mr. Rooney's objectives, I just do not know.

MR. MORGAN:

But, as I said, it is very pertinent that this debate is going on here because at the same time it is going on in Ottawa. And some of the concerns I heard when I held



MR. MORGAN:

meetings in Ottawa with the various members of Parliament from all sides - from the small party, the NDP Party, I met with them; and from our own party and from the governing party, including a number of ministers - that they were hearing views and opinions from the independents throughout Atlantic Canada, mostly from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and P.E.I. moreso than from Newfoundland, because Newfoundland is the only Province with a formalized government assistance programme for the independents, in this case, what we are talking about here today, a financial assistance programme of government guaranteed loans.

So, the concern did not have the same level as what was expressed by the independents of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

DR. COLLINS:

Question! Question!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is now going to leave the House because he -

MR. NEARY:

No, I am not going to leave.

MR. MORGAN:

All right. The hon. gentleman is going to have to recognize the fact - and he has been around the House of Assembly much longer than I have, maybe I have been here half the period of time that he has been here - but he has got to understand that he has got to sometimes live with wrong decisions that his party would make, and he made the wrong decision on this one issue.

I want to clarify for Hansard and for the record to make sure he understands, I will have to tell him in baby talk, I guess, so he will understand it. But he does not want to understand or he just cannot understand, one of the two. I would hope it is the first, he does not want to understand. Because

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. De Bane and the Government of Canada put forward the policy of using foreign vessels. It did not come from here, it did not come from anybody within the Province, it came from the federal level of government as a policy document of using foreign vessels and Canadian vessels, half and half, in the resource-short plants programme. That was not invented by anyone here. It was a policy programme and a policy position documented and forwarded to all the groups concerned, including the governments, that the foreign vessels would be used to harvest half of the resource-short plant quota in the offshore. Now that was a firm federal government Liberal policy, and I must say it was a good one. I believe in giving credit where credit is due. It was a good policy. It is a good policy today. Because I am not convinced we are ever going to be able to suddenly get the Canadian vessels to harvest the resource-short plant fish and strictly Canadian vessels to land in those plants not owned by the people who own the vessels. The harvesting fleet will be landing fish, for example, in plants not owned by the same company that owns the harvesting sector, the trawler fleet. The day is not going to suddenly come around when National Sea - and they are still independent, they are not restructured yet - and when Nickerson's is going to suddenly say, 'Yes, to Mr. Moores out in Harbour Grace, Mr. Quinlan out in Bay de Verde or Fred Earle in Carbonear or somewhere else, 'Yes, we will take our vessels and we are going to land fish for you and we are maybe going to have to subsidize the price of that fish. We do not mind doing that'. They are not going to do that. In fact, I have always been convinced that those large companies

MR. MORGAN: owning the trawler fleet found ways of not co-operating with the independent small companies, not co-operating with them to get fish to their plants.

That is the reason why Mr. De Bane, with the assistance of Dr. Art May, devised a policy of using foreign vessels, and I want to say it again, for the media's clarification if not the hon. gentleman's who does not want to understand, that Mr. De Bane put forward a policy to use foreign vessels in landing fish - it came from Ottawa initially, to land half from foreign vessels and half from Canadian vessels. And suddenly he wants to turn it around because he thought it was negative, he thought the issue was negative, so he tried to turn it around and say, 'Oh, it is the Peckford Government that is wanting foreign vessels in to land fish. Oh, it is the Peckford policy now and his Minister of Fisheries, that they get foreign vessels taking away jobs from Newfoundlanders to get fish to the resource-short plants.'

Well, the fact is that all we said to them was, 'If you cannot put the Canadian vessels in place first to land half the fish - because it was very obvious to everyone concerned, there was Fishery Products in receivership, the Lake Group in receivership and John Penny and Sons in receivership, those three companies alone have sixty-five trawlers, sixty-five large, deep-sea trawlers, they are in receivership, they are not stabilized as to the restructuring. The bill has to go through the House of Commons to become law to get the money from Ottawa to put the new company in place. So, with all this unstable situation and with all the restructuring being done but not complete - while this is being done, let us put foreign vessels out there to catch fish in the meantime for our plants.' Because they

MR. MORGAN: are going to catch it later on. The federal government policy says they will catch half the quota. That is a firm policy. So, that is all we said here from the government. But we got attacked by the Opposition, for allowing foreigners back in the 200 mile zone, trying to leave the impression that we want foreign activity back in our waters. And what minister of this government stood in this House over and over on many occasions and demanded, during the days of Mr. LeBlanc, demanded to stop the overfishing of the Russians and the West Germans and

MR. MORGAN:

others over the years, after our 200 mile economic zone was declared, for example? What were we doing? We allocated something like 60,000 tons of fish in 1982 to foreign nations. We allotted a fair amount of that fish from our 2J3KL NAFO areas the Northern cod zone to the European economic communities. What for? To trade fish for fish. They were going to buy fish in the European economic community, they were going to buy it in Great Britain and in Germany and in France. Did they buy it? Who then opposed foreign activity? This Premier and this government opposed it in the signing of the agreement. We went to Ottawa with the Fish Trades Association behind us, we had Mr. Cashin's union behind us saying, "No, do not give raw fish material to the foreign fishing fleets to try to gain markets in return for it, do not do that." We are the ones who have always been opposed to foreigners catching our fish and taking it back to foreign countries to be processed. And all we are saying now is, "Catch it here but do not take it away for processing as you have been doing over the years- 60,000 tons in '82 - have it processed right here in our Province to create jobs."

I commend Mr. De Bane and his policy. I commend him for a good policy and would hope he would eventually get it in place and come into action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, I might say that the hon. gentleman is on a greasy pole, he is like a bull in a china shop now trying to squirm out from under the policy and proposal put forward to Ottawa by the administration that he is a member of.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, all the hon. gentleman did in the last ten minutes was show the lack of planning and the lack of foresight on the part of the administration for the fishery of this Province. We argued several years ago that they had oil on the brain, Mr. Chairman, that they were neglecting the fishery, they had oil on the brain. And our words are coming true. If there had to be proper planning put into the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery we would not need to invite the foreigners inside of Canada's 200 mile management zone to catch the fish.

Mr. Chairman, it is lack of planning and lack of foresight and it is an admission of failure by the administration. That is what it is, Mr. Chairman. And the hon. gentleman can get up all he wants and make a vicious personal attack on Mr. Rompkey, which he did, who is not in this House to defend himself.

MR. MORGAN: I made them outside the House as well the day before yesterday.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman would not make the statements outside the House.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, I did, the other day before I came in here.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, listen to what the hon. gentleman said in trying to distract and cover up for his own incompetence and his own mismanagement and neglect of the fishery: "Rompkey", he said, "is trying to scuttle the bill for losing his job." To quote the hon. gentleman, "He is trying to get even."

MR. SIMMS: What bill are we on?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman has something to say, first of all he has to say it from his seat, but he is interrupting me there. I am surprised, a former Speaker of the House.

MR. SIMMS: I did not even speak to you.

MR. NEARY: No, but the hon. gentleman is not supposed to be carrying on another debate in the House with the Chairman, or trying to influence the Chairman.

MR. SIMMS: I was asking what bill we are on.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should go back to his seat.

MR. SIMMS: You are getting paranoid 'Steve' and senile.

MR. NEARY: He said, "He is trying to scuttle the bill for losing his job, he is getting even with somebody who took his job away from him."

MR. MORGAN: That is my interpretation.

MR. NEARY: That is the hon. gentleman's interpretation.

Mr. Chairman, do you know what that is? That is low, about the lowest I have ever heard in this House. It is hitting below the belt. It is a vicious personal attack on a man who is not in this House to defend himself. The hon. gentleman would not have the courage to make the statements outside the House -

MR. MORGAN: They were said outside the House.

MR. NEARY: - no more than he had the courage to answer me when I asked him about his Liberal sources in Ottawa. He skated around that. And let it be recorded that the hon. gentleman was only bluffing when he made that statement. It was just a gigantic bluff.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, Newfoundlanders and Labradorians must be aghast today. We have had the 200 mile management zone since 1977. We have had a Tory Administration in this Province during that length of time. They have



MR. NEARY:

neglected the fishery, they drove the fishery to the brink of ruin before the Premier finally succumbed, on his way back from Chicago from a baseball game, and signed a deal, Mr. Chairman. And, Mr. Chairman, the people of this Province are very concerned about that kind of policy. We have been saying for years they had oil on their brain, now our words are coming true. They completely ignored the fishery, they ignored the other resources in this Province, the other industries in this Province and as a result now, Mr. Chairman, there is chaos in the Newfoundland fishery. And the only way that they can see to get themselves out of the jam they are in, out of the incredible mess that they have created, is to invite the Portugueses and the Spaniards and the West Germans to come in and catch our fish while we have record unemployment in this Province; we have people walking the streets hopelessly looking for work, cannot find it, and so we are going to embark upon a short-sighted policy. Now is the time for imagination and initiative. Let the administration, Mr. Chairman, if they are genuine and sincere, let them put on the table a proposal to employ Canadians to catch this fish not bring in slave labour from foreign countries. So let it be recorded, Mr. Chairman, what we are opposed to -

MR. MORGAN: Read the agreement itself, Restructuring, it is in there. After the first of January we invite (inaudible) its place.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the principle is wrong.

MR. CALLAN: The practicalities though -

MR. NEARY: I do not know, perhaps the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) knows something that we do not know. We would like to know if the other options were looked at and what the other options are. We are not privy to the information, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of

MR. NEARY: Finance (Dr. Collins) is but we are not. We would like to have all the information the hon. gentleman just told us about laid on the table of this House so we could see if he is bluffing or misleading the people of this Province. We would like to see the information put on the table of the House.

DR. COLLINS: It is all in Hansard.

MR. NEARY: It is not all in Hansard. We want the telexes.

MR. MORGAN: I have tabled everything that is in the office and he still wants more.

MR. NEARY: We would like to see the telexes in connection with this proposal for foreigners, the correspondence, the reports, the information put on the table of the House where it should be. We cannot take the hon. gentleman's word for it, he keeps shifting his ground every day. So perhaps the Minister of Finance knows something that we do not know. We are not privy to the information, Mr. Chairman, but we would like to know if the options were looked at and what options were looked at.

Now to come back to a few simple questions, that sparked the exchange across the House, that I asked the hon. gentleman about these companies who received government loans and guarantees and there are six left on the bill. Now, could the hon. gentleman take them one at a time, give us the number of employees of each company - perhaps the hon. minister would like to write down my questions - the number of weeks or months out of the year that the plant operates, where the plant is located, and if they are up to date on the payment of their interest, to the best of the hon. gentleman's knowledge?

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Well, Mr. Chairman, the words of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) are familiar ones in this House. He has sat here for a long time, far too long in the estimation of many people in this Province, and had he stayed in the district that he was representing some years ago I am sure that he would be among the ranks of the former members of the House of Assembly. And the kind of debate that the hon. member has engaged in over the years has not changed substantially but if it is unrefuted it may gain a certain amount of credibility, so I will have a few words today to just jog the memories of hon. members and to get into the record just what the hon. member and his Party have stood for over the years. First of all, the hon. member bows

MR. STAGG:

down nightly to his mentor the former and the first Premier of the Province, Mr. Smallwood, whose credo for years was, 'Burn your boats.' Now, Mr. Chairman, the motivation of the Liberal party in this Province has not changed substantially over the years in that they still believe that Newfoundland should get away from its traditional occupations and -

MR. SIMMS: Try to get away from the former Premier now by saying the former Premier meant to say, 'burn you boots.'

MR. STAGG: Well, the first Premier also had a boot factory. One fellow said that they put out only left boots for the left foot, but I am not sure if that is correct or not. The member for Placentia, (Mr. Patterson) who is sitting there smiling, I would like for him to get into this debate. Mr. Chairman, I would certainly yield to him, because in his own inimitable style he has the ability to bring about a great deal of illumination on the subject of the history of the fishery and the Liberal party in this Province. I hope he is drawn into this debate and certainly I would yield to him immediately. But let us deal with the subject at hand. First of all the Province of Newfoundland which is generally recognized as being a Province which has limited financial capability, we are squeezing every last cent out of our people and to their credit they are not leaving the Province in droves, they are staying here, they are sticking it out, because it is a wonderful Province and the quality of life in the Province, despite the fact that we are the highest taxed people in the Country, is nevertheless a factor which keeps our people here. And the government of the Province in the exercise of its duties to maintain industries wherever possible and to intervene in the economy, on occasion this Progressive Conservative government,

MR. STAGG: which by any other banner would be considered to be left of centre, which constantly intervenes in the market place and assists industries, in 1983 has intervened and assisted a number of industries: Aqua Fisheries Limited, as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) pointed out, employing 100 people and servicing 150 fishermen; Port Enterprises of Southern Harbour, 160 employees being serviced by 125 fishermen; Blue Ocean Products Limited of Argentia, branch in St. Brides, 450 employees and 600 fishermen; Island Seafoods Limited of Herring Neck, Change Islands, Whale's Gulch and Virgin Arm, there are four plants, 360 employees and 300 fishermen. Now, these are the things that this government with its limited fiscal capacity believes must be done and certainly to the Minister of Fisheries' credit, and to the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins) credit, and all of these people within these two departments who are constantly investigating and keeping up to date with these government guaranteed loans. I know I have had some dealings with them in making representation on behalf of people in my own district, and in nearby districts, and I must say that the public servants who have been involved with the administration of these funds certainly do an excellent job.

MR. CALLAN: What about White Fisheries?

MR. STAGG: Well, White Fisheries is not in Stephenville, if that is what the hon. member means by his innuendo. So I am quite pleased with the conduct of government on this whole matter. And with regard to the Restructuring Bill that is before the House of Commons and then looking for ratification of the agreement entered into by the Province and the federal government, I hope that passes speedily, and the two MPs who are, for various reasons, opposing it, I hope that in due course they

MR. STAGG: will get their just desserts.

I expect that they are going down the tubes anyway, Mr. Rompkey and Mr. Rooney, and I certainly hope that their positions are well placed before the electorate in the next election. Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. members opposite, you know, are adherents to the Liberal faith.

MR. SIMMS: Hon. member opposite.

MR. STAGG: Hon member opposite, yes, their numbers are decreasing. The quorum for the Opposition by the way, is one; they must maintain one person in the House at all times. The Opposition House Leader (Mr. Hodder) for instance, is out in Terra Nova, wrecking his havoc on Terra Nova. As I outlined to the House of Assembly some time ago, the record of the House Leader for the Liberal party in winning elections on the West Coast, he was campaign manager on the West Coast in 1971 and we won all six seats. So I certainly hope that Mr. Greening, our candidate out in Terra Nova, makes sure that the Opposition House Leader stays out there campaigning.

MR. STAGG:

It would appear as if hari-kari is being committed by the Opposition, sending the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Hodder) and the -

AN HON. MEMBER:

What did Bill Rowe say about the Opposition House Leader today? Snow White and the seven dwarfs and the Opposition House Leader was dopey - was it?

MR. STAGG:

Dozy and something else. I wish I had it here to quote, because it was quite something. I thought it was very unkind of Mr. Rowe, as a matter of fact, to say these things about members of the House of Assembly. We may have to say a few things about Mr. Rowe in the course of debate, and fortunately we are protected by the rules of the House when we say it. He is not protected by anything out there.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I expect that my time is rapidly drawing to a close but I would like to say before I close that the hon. members opposite who are adherents to the Liberal faith, they support a Party which in 1980 or 1981 allowed the Japanese to catch the caplin off our shores.

MR. SIMMS:

Any squid?

MR. STAGG:

Caplin and squid, but particularly the caplin, and it was for a vague promise of restraint in the importation of Japanese cars into Canada. There was nothing written, it was an expression of making their best efforts to restrain the exportation of cars from Japan into Canada and in return for that we allowed them free access to our caplin. Now, why I am asked did they want the caplin? Well, the Japanese apparently only want the female caplin. They do not want the male caplin, they want the female caplin for their roe because apparently it has a significant effect on their libidos.

MR. SIMMS:

What is that about libidos?

MR. STAGG: They use it as an aphrodisiac. They have run out of elk horns and antler horns, apparently, and the rhinoceros is an endangered species, so the Newfoundland caplin, because of the Japanese libido and the acquiescence of Herb Gray and the former Minister of Fisheries, Mr. LeBlanc, the caplin may go the way of the rhinoceros. Now the hon. members opposite may wish to address themselves to that and to make some representation to their colleagues in Ottawa, not to be making such short-sighted -

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

MR. MARSHALL: They should make representation (inaudible).

MR. STAGG: Make representations, yes, Well, I expect, Mr. Chairman, I will get another crack at this and I ask the hon. member to deal with some of these points that I have raised, if he dares.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman, it is ironic indeed that we hear so many people from the opposite side calling the kettle black. The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), the first thing he did when he got up was to accuse the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) of giving the same speech, or essentially the same speech over and over and over, and here we hear the member for Stephenville -

MR. NEARY: Talking about the female caplin.

MR. CALLAN: - talking about the female caplin, Mr. Chairman, and I think I have heard it about six times. I do not know if it is a coincidence or not, but everytime the member for Stephenville smiles and starts to tell that story it seems to coincide with the entry into the House of Assembly of new Pages. I do not know if it is meant for their ears, because everybody else has heard it, but this Fall, Mr. Chairman, we have a new male and a new female Page, I do not whose ears it is meant for, perhaps it is meant



MR. CALLAN: for some new people in the Gallery the Press Gallery, I do not know. But, obviously, for the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) to get up and accuse the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) of making the same speech over and over again and then get up himself and say what he instances a half a dozen times, is the kettle calling the pot black.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the member for Stephenville, because he had some facts and figures there I notice which we do not have at our disposal. He talked about Port Enterprises, Phonse Best's fish plant in Southern Harbour, and he talked about the number of employees and the work weeks and so on, I do not know

MR. CALLAN: where he got that. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has been asking the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to produce some of these facts and figures in vein, he has been asking for it.

What about White's Fisheries?

I asked the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) about that one and all he said was , it is not in Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Yes.

MR. CALLAN: It is not in Stephenville. Well, where is it?

MR. STAGG: Sandy Cove.

MR. NEARY: How many people did it employ?

MR. STAGG: One hundred and eighty employees.

MR. CALLAN: One hundred and eighty employees in this one in Sandy Cove, you say?

MR. NEARY: Still operating?

MR. CALLAN: Still operating?

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Oh, you do not know.

You are going to give the House false information, you do not know.

MR. CALLAN: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, where did the member for Stephenville get these figures? I am wondering if he is fabricating them?

MR. STAGG: From the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. CALLAN: Was it tabled in the House?

MR. STAGG: Does all information have to be tabled in the House, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CALLAN: If it has not been tabled in the House, Mr. Chairman, then the member for Stephenville has no other choice but to table it, he was quoting from it.

MR. STAGG: Yes! Do you want me to table all my research material?

MR. CALLAN: He was quoting from it, Mr. Chairman. He was quoting from it. He read from it, he read from an article there, where he got it I do not know, talking about the number of employees at Port Enterprises, and he also mentioned Aqua Fisheries in St. Mary's - The Capes, and he quoted some facts and figures.

MR. HEARN: No, no, Ferryland. Ferryland.

MR. CALLAN: From Ferryland, I am sorry. That is where the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) campaigned on behalf of the present Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) before he went to St. Mary's - The Capes and campaigned on his own behalf.

MR. BAIRD: And both of them will be here for a long while.

MR. CALLAN: Yes, a very, very fine man, Mr. Chairman, the member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Not only was he successful in getting himself elected to the House of Assembly but he was very instrumental in getting the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) elected, back two years ago, before he got involved in the elective process himself.

Mr. Chairman, we have some questions and we cannot seem to find the answers. I do not know if the Chairman is going to ask the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) to table that brochure or whatever it was he was quoting from there.

MR. NEARY: Breaking the rules again. You have no regard for the rules of the House over there?

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: I would like to know where he got these notes and where he got these facts and figures, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STAGG: They are the same figures the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) read into the record earlier.

MR. CALLAN: Earlier this afternoon?

MR. STAGG: They were up here.

MR. CALLAN: Earlier this afternoon?

MR. STAGG: Yes, earlier this afternoon.

MR. CALLAN: If they were up there, how come you were looking down on your desk and reading them?

MR. STAGG: I was just refreshing my memory, that is all.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman, these are fair amounts of money in this Loan and Guarantee Act. We hope that it has meant the continuation of employment. Most of the funds were meant to be used as working capital, but we know, of course, that some of it was not used for that purpose. Apparently there was one fish plant owner on the West Coast who obviously did not use his money for working capital, because the workers ended up with rubber cheques, cheques that were bouncing all over the West Coast. That is what happened to that gentleman's working capital.

MR. NEARY: That is why we are asking questions.

MR. CALLAN: That is right.

And if I remember correctly, it was White's Fisheries.

MR. NEARY: Is there anybody over there who can tell us? Can anybody give us the information on this?

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance is not in his seat, and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is not in his seat. Could we have some information on White's Fisheries? Mr. Chairman, I notice that the Premier (Mr. Peckford) is very smart, he has kept the member for - I am not sure what it is actually - Humber

MR. CALLAN: West or East, he has kept that member out of Terra Nova district hoping that he will have a better chance of winning it. Judging from the way he bawls from where he is sitting -

MR. MARSHALL: You have kept the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) out.

MR. NEARY: I was there last weekend and I will be going again.

MR. CALLAN: The Leader of the Opposition has a role to play in the House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY: If we could only get this adjourned I would be gone again.

MR. CALLAN: I would be out in Terra Nova myself but my colleague is gone away on a trip that I gave him with the Public Accounts Committee. He is bringing back toupees, by the way, for himself and the Minister of Health (Mr. House).

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is back in his seat now, I am wondering if he will answer some questions about White's Fisheries. Where is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, tell them.

MR. STAGG: Your time is up.

MR. CALLAN: I was going to tell that story, Mr. Chairman, of actually what Mr. Smallwood said. He did not say, 'Burn your boats', I can guarantee you that. But anybody who read Ray Guy's column about a couple of years ago will know exactly what he said. I thought it was the funniest thing that I had ever read. But, Mr. Chairman, I am going to see if we can get some answers. I will take my seat and let the Minister of Fisheries answer the question about White's Fisheries.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. MCNICHOLAS): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to answer questions on White's Fisheries and any other fish company that we are involved with. White's Fisheries is located in Sandy Cove over on the Great Northern Peninsula. He had a pretty good operation going there and he got involved in spending his cash flow, I guess you could term it that way, in capital improvements to his plant, and he carried out substantial improvements, ice making, etc. and mostly out of his own resources, and he found himself about a year and a half ago in some financial

MR. MORGAN: difficulty. He came to us for assistance. And because of the fact that he was employing at the time 180 employees in the plant and, I do not know the exact number of fishermen but my guess is around the 300 mark, he was buying from, inshore fishermen in the area - again it was totally an inshore plant depending on the inshore fishery - we put in place a loan guarantee to help him overcome the difficult time when the bank was not, at the time, very co-operative with him.

MR. NEARY: How are they doing now?

MR. MORGAN: They are coming along quite well. They have overcome some of their debt problems. I am confident it will be a viable operation in the future and will be able to contribute to the employment and to the fishing industry in that general area of the Great Northern Peninsula.

Now, looking at that company on the Great Northern Peninsula, maybe there is a possibility that company will be encompassed in this Northern Fishery Development Corporation that Mr. Rompkey is talking about so much these days, because the Northern Fishery Development Corporation came as a result of a recommendation by Mr. Kirby and his task force that all plants, and I think the people on the South Coast should be very much concerned about this, because suddenly the Northern part of our coast became more important for fishery development than the Southern part of our coast. And Mr. Kirby singled out an area north of fifty degree latitude and that area would be taken over by a Northern Fishery Development Corporation and would operate the plants. It came about primarily

MR. MORGAN: because of a problem at St. Anthony, which was operated by the Saltfish Corporation a couple of years ago and again last year. Maybe plants like White's Fisheries and others, when they in the future find themselves in financial difficulty, will become part of this Northern Fishery Development Corporation.



MR. MORGAN: I want to see the Northern Fishery Corporation come into play as quickly as possible. And I am hoping it will be by the Spring of the year. Why? Because in the Northern part of our Province, if you get beyond the Northern Peninsula to Labrador, everything in Labrador is presently operated by the Newfoundland Government. We never get any bouquets, we never get any compliments, but we are the operators of the Labrador plant. We own them. We operate them. We run them. We came across a little problem that was brought up in the House of Assembly recently about the unemployment insurance deductions in one plant in Labrador, but other than that we hear little about the work we are doing in Labrador as a provincial government. And I think, with all due regard, if the other party was in power they would do the same thing. Because you have to recognize the difficulty in attracting the private sector people to go down to Labrador and develop the industry and do the things that should be done on shore, especially with regard to developing onshore processing facilities, and government has to fill that gap. There is nobody to go in and invest and do the things that we would like to see done.

So based on that Mr. Kirby has recommended that there be a Northern Fishery Development Corporation put in place. And I said some time ago, in this debate today, that Mr. Rompkey's proposal on that matter is wrong and I say again it is irresponsible, because it violates -

MR. NEARY: Apologize for what you said about him.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, when I make a speech in this House I say the same thing outside the

MR. MORGAN: House as I say inside the House. I am not going to hide behind the curtains of the House, or immunity of the House of Assembly. And I stand by what I said earlier. I just do not understand why a member of Parliament, a former minister, would want to scuttle this major fisheries agreement which means to 9,500 plant workers jobs in their plants starting January or February. It means jobs for over 1,000 trawlermen who are working on these sixty-five trawlers in our Province. And if the restructuring happened to get scuttled and the bill stopped from getting through the House of Commons tonight - and I am convinced, by the way, as of reports five minutes ago, when I went down to the office downstairs, that the restructuring bill will get approved by, I would say, Ottawa time, around six o'clock or six-thirty this evening and get final approval of the House of Commons and become law upon being proclaimed accordingly, and that is very positive. But it is not through any help from Mr. Rompkey. It is not through any help from Mr. Rooney, who is going to vote against the bill. The 9,500 plant workers cannot thank these members. I think it is irresponsible, because Mr. Rompkey is trying to scuttle the bill. Now, I do not think he has the bad intentions of suddenly saying, "I do not care about the people in Grand Bank, in Burin, in Gaultois, in Harbour Breton, in Ramea and Burgeo - not Burgeo, but National Sea - in other plants along the North East Coast involved, Charleston and Dildo and these places'. I do not think he is that irresponsible. But somebody has to explain why he would try to scuttle the bill, especially when the Premier (Mr. Peckford) talked to him and explained to him what we are trying to do on the Northern fisheries. St. Anthony



MR. MORGAN: If I recall correctly, we helped out Smith Seafoods in Bellevue district for basically the same reason. The banks were not very co-operative. They caught themselves in a tight financial squeeze because of high interest rates and having to hold inventory for awhile - small and medium-size companies - and we assisted that company. And the hon. gentleman fully agrees with that kind of a programme. So I would like for the Opposition to stand up today and say, 'Yes, the Newfoundland Government have a great programme of assisting independent fish companies.' Why not give credit where credit is due? Members of Parliament in the Liberal Party in Ottawa said last week, 'Why is it that Nova Scotia did not put in place a programme like the Newfoundland Government put in place to help the independent fish companies?' You would not have the same argument from the independent companies in Nova Scotia today concerning restructuring and about how it could affect them adversely. Why is it New Brunswick did not do the same thing? So why do not the Opposition stand up and say, 'Yes, the Newfoundland Government, Peckford and his government, have done a great thing to help the independents; we look forward to more bills of this nature coming forward showing loan guarantees to A, B, C companies in the Province to help them overcome difficult times and become viable in the future'? Why do they not get up and say it? Let us hear it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, in 1968, every fish plant in Newfoundland was bankrupt. And, Mr. Chairman, who was it that developed the policy of bailing out the

MR. NEARY: fish plants which were bankrupt at that time? And I am not using that term unkindly, Mr. Chairman. What administration was it that developed the policy of helping these fish plants and who had helped them on a number of occasions before that? Was it the Moores Administration? Was it the Squires Administration? The Coaker Administration? No, Mr. Chairman, it was the Liberal Administration headed by the gentleman who was maligned again this afternoon by the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg).

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ignore what the member for Stephenville said this afternoon. I am going to ignore it because it does not warrant any comment at all. One thing that this bill has done, however, it has focused attention, temporarily granted, on the problems of the fishery. We have heard, in between all the abuse that was heaped on this side of the House and the low cuts, the low remarks that were made by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), in between all of that we did get a glimpse of the fly by the seat of your pants policy of this administration. Because that is what they are doing, Mr. Chairman, flying by the seats of their pants. They have no policy or plans for the fishing industry, none whatsoever. They have had oil on the brain for the last ten or eleven years, especially the last couple of years, oil on the brain. They have neglected the fishery, and now, Mr. Chairman, we are seeing the results of this neglect and incompetence and mismanagement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe we have aired this matter long enough. It is now quarter to six and no doubt we will get this bill through before

MR. NEARY: six. We have had a good debate, I believe, on it, a good debate on these loans and guarantees. But there is one item that I would like to raise before we pass the bill, that I would like to express an opinion on, and I would like to express the policy of this side of the House. I have not heard it from members there opposite, maybe because they are so short-sighted in their thinking and in their policies that they have not had time to deal with it yet. And that is the matter, Mr. Chairman, of trading off with the European common market countries fish quotas on the East coast of Canada to allow Canadian fish access to markets inside the European common markets.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) there understands. He is listening intently to what I am saying. I do not know about other hon. members. But we have not heard their policy on this item. Would members like to hear our policy?

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, I would like to hear it.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member for Naskaupi very graciously says, 'Yes, he would like to hear it'. Well, our policy is that we are against that, we are against it.

Mr. Chairman, if we produce a good quality product and our price is competitive, we will find markets throughout the world. We do not have to give away the quotas on the East coast of Canada to get access to the European common market countries. Hon. gentlemen there opposite may think we have to do that. Negotiations are currently in progress regarding that very matter. It is a matter of grave concern, Mr. Chairman. It is an item that is similar, by the way, to letting the foreigners come in and catch the fish, you will be damned if you do and double damned if you do not. Somehow or other the bureaucrats in Ottawa think that they have to give away thousands of tons, metric tons, of fish on the East coast of Canada for us to be able to sell our fish in Europe. Mr. Chairman, we are opposed to that policy.

DR. COLLINS: Are you attacking the feds?

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

DR. COLLINS: Are you attacking the feds?

MR. NEARY: We are attacking the policy.

Mr. Chairman, we have yet to hear the position of the members there opposite. Before

MR. NEARY: we end this debate on this bill I would be interested in hearing what they have to say. We do not think, on this side of the House, that you have to give away 4,000 or 8,000 or 10,000 or 12,000 metric tons of fish on the East coast of Canada to countries who are members of the European common market in order to get access to these countries to market Canadian fish.

I would like to hear what the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) has to say on that matter. We have not heard from the great defender of Newfoundland's resources, the hon. the Premier (Mr. Peckford), who spends a few minutes a day in the House now, comes for the Question Period and then dashes down to his office and last year gave us a lecture in this House, he told us that the number one priority for members is this House.

MR. DOYLE: The Premier is on urgent public business.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, no doubt he is on urgent public business. No doubt! But, Mr. Chairman, no matter whether he is or whether he is not on matters of urgent public importance, I would be interested in hearing what the hon. gentleman has to say about the current negotiations that are going on between the Ottawa bureaucrats, the External Affairs Department, and the European common market countries. I do not like it. I am concerned about it. I would like to hear the views of the administration.

MR. SIMMS: Have you got an inside track on what they are saying?



MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman. I do not ask Ottawa or they do not ask me for my opinion, neither do I volunteer my advice or my opinion to them.

MR. SIMMS: Well, how can you criticize if you do not know what is going on?

MR. NEARY: I can criticize it because of the fact that it is even being thought about. It is on the Table in these negotiations that are currently taking place. That is what the negotiations are all about.

MR. SIMMS: I think it is all abroad now until the Spring.

MR. NEARY: The negotiations are going on. It is only a matter now of striking a deal. That is all. It is only a matter, I would say, of agreeing on the quotas. That is what it would appear to me to be, just a matter of Ottawa, the bureaucrats agreeing with the European common market to give them so many thousand metric tons on the East coast of Canada and they will remove the tariffs from Canadian fish entering the European common market.

MR. SIMMS: Do you think their discussions are restricted to fish only?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, in this particular instance I understand

MR. NEARY: the only item that is on the Table in this round of negotiations is Canadian fish. I am not privy to the information. But, Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned about it, because this fish is out there to be caught by Canadian vessels, to be processed in Canadian plants. As I said earlier, if we produce a good quality fish and we are competitive - they have a shortage of fish in the European common market - if we have good salesmen, good marketing techniques, then I feel that we do not have to give away, Canada does not have to give away, so many thousand metric tons of fish for us to find markets for our fish. Unless somebody can convince me to the contrary, that is my stand as of this moment.

DR. COLLINS: Why are your buddies in Ottawa doing it then?

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

DR. COLLINS: Why are your buddies in Ottawa doing it?

MR. NEARY: The question I am raising in this House, Mr. Chairman, is why the administration is silent on this matter, why they are silent. Why are they not raising an objection or do they agree with this policy? Does the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), who just interrupted me, does the hon. gentleman agree with that policy?

DR. COLLINS: We have been objecting to that for years.

MR. NEARY: Well, I have not heard a peep - the negotiations are currently in progress and I have not heard one word of complaint or objection from the administration there opposite. Now they may come out tomorrow or the next day as a result of my remarks in this

MR. NEARY: House today and try to upstage us. They may try to grab the ball and carry it as they did on the offshore. They may attempt to do that, Mr. Chairman, but let it be recorded -

MR. SIMMS: No, that is not our style.

MR. NEARY: Oh, it is the style of the administration. In 1968, I believe it was, the first oil rig sailed into Newfoundland waters, issued permits by the Province, to drill and explore for gas and oil offshore. We laid two plaques on the ocean floor, on the Grand Banks, claiming the Grand Banks in the name of Newfoundland. We were the first to issue provincial permits. And then that hon. crowd grabbed the ball in 1971 and they have been carrying the ball every since.

MR. SIMMS: Who laid the plaques, 'Steve'?

MR. NEARY: Two university professors.

MR. SIMMS: They dove in, did they?

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not know how they got down. One of them got killed in a car accident after, by the way.

DR. COLLINS: That was a very practical and useful initiative.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

DR. COLLINS: That was a very practical and useful initiative.

MR. NEARY: Well, it just goes to show the foresight of the administration of that day. But, Mr. Chairman, I raise this matter before this bill goes through to try to get a reaction from the other side. We believe in keeping our resources for Canadians, For Canadians who man the fishing boats, Canadians who process the fish, Canadians who own the plants, Canadians who market the fish, we say that it should be kept, and primarily, of course, Newfoundlanders.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, we have had a long debate on the fisheries, and, of course, it only goes to show what we have known all along, that the Liberal Party has absolutely no idea about the fisheries whatsoever. They do not have a policy. They do not have any concept of it. I do not blame the present members opposite. After all, as they have stated many times, there are only eight of them. But, I mean, this has been typical of the Liberal Party all along. There was some doubt about what the policy of the Liberal Party was a number of decades ago. Some people have said that it was burn your boats. I understand today that it might have been burn your boots. Now, other people say, burn your goats. But anyway it was burn something.

AN HON. MEMBER: Burn your goats.

DR. COLLINS: Burn your goats, I think the hon. member said. But, in any case, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has only once again reaffirmed that they have no concept of what the fishery is all about. For instance, he states that the problems in the fishery is the oil policy, the policy of this government offshore. Now, I read the Kirby report with some care and attention. I think that other people have read it. It has been widely acclaimed as a very detailed report, a very knowledgeable report, and there is not a comment in it anywhere about Newfoundland Government oil policy in regards to the fishery being a harmful one. There are many things

DR. COLLINS:                    said in it as to what did cause the troubles in the fishery. For instance, the federal government monetary policy which pushed interest rates out of sight and caused tremendous difficulties to the companies, especially the small companies. There is a comment in it about the very poor marketing effort that the federal government mounted over the years in terms of fish products. And, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has just mentioned, they are now over there marketing and the fear is that they will market as they have done in the past. In other words, they will give away rather than get anything for our fisheries. But there has been no comment until today. For the very first time today there has been some comment that the offshore oil policies of this government were the cause of the problems in the fisheries for the last number of years. Now that is an index of the insight that the Opposition have into the fisheries.

DR. COLLINS: Another comment the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) made is that when these small companies put their plants there they were going to be profitable, so, why change things? Now, he forgets that circumstances have changed. If a plant was put in position, say, twenty years ago perhaps it was profitable on the basis of the local inshore fishery available to it. But circumstances have changed. Expenses have gone up. The cost of running the operation has gone up. So they need to have more resource available to them now so that they can cover their running costs, they can pay their bills and they can make some sort of a profit.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition wishes, however, not to take that into consideration. He just wants to go back, say, twenty years when they were first put in position there and that is it, just leave them like it. Now, of course, as the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) pointed out, these plants now have a major need and that major need is more fish. If the fish can be brought to these plants in Canadian trawlers, Canadian vessels, more power to them. But any number of studies have shown that that is not practical at this point in time. So until such time as it is practical the federal government and this government, too, reluctantly but nevertheless with a very practical view of things, have said well, we will go along on a very temporary basis with foreign vessels doing the thing. Now, that is the practicality of the situation.

The Leader of the Opposition does not want to think in practical terms. He just wants to criticize any move that is made. And, as was pointed out, on this particular occasion he got himself caught out because he made a criticism of a policy or a move that

DR. COLLINS: this government and the federal government decided to take in view of the particular circumstances pertaining at this time. He decided to criticize that and, of course, the roof fell in because what he was criticizing - if he had his way what would have happened and what is likely to happen or what may well happen because of that type of criticism, is that any number of plant workers will not get employment that would have been available to them if this temporary policy of allowing foreign bottoms to bring fish to these resource-short plants had been put into effect.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on with a number of other points that were brought up. Another one that was brought up earlier in debate was old chestnut that when the previous, previous government was in place, that is the Smallwood Administration, their total public sector debt was \$750 million. That is not the figure, it is greater than that. But anyway, even taking it at that - and now the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is saying that the present debt which he calls \$4 billion - it is not \$4 billion, it is \$3.6 billion, total public sector debt - that difference there is a terrible and horrendous thing. What he forgets to say is that at the time the debt was \$750 million plus, when the Smallwood regime was in place, the total income of the Province, the annual income was \$350 million, about half that total public sector debt. Whereas now with our total public sector debt \$3600 million, our total income in a year is \$1.8 billion. So the ratio is much in favour of things as they pertain at the present time, and the ratio is against the situation that pertained when the Smallwood regime went out of office.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of other points that were made. I suppose the most foolish one that was made was that Tory times are bad times. Well, if that is so, it shows the good sense of the people



DR. COLLINS: because when tough times come along they cannot depend on the Liberal Party being able to handle them. They say, 'For gosh sakes, let us get the Tories in there and they will handle the tough times'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I move the resolution.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I could not let these remarks go unanswered, especially from a Townie who has all of the sudden become an expert in the fisheries. And the hon. gentleman has given me an opportunity to talk about the policies that are developed by this administration for St. John's and not rural Newfoundland. I will do that on Thursday, Mr. Chairman. I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

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

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

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered the matters to them referred, have made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m.