

VOL. 3

NO. 20

THIRD SESSION OF THE
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M.
MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1984

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). But first of all, for my preamble, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that Statistics Canada released their unemployment figures on Friday which show 50,000 people in this Province out of work, a staggering rate of 23.3 per cent, the highest in Canada. New Brunswick, which is the next highest, is way behind at 17.6 per cent, or 5.7 per cent behind us. So we are the Province in Canada with the worst unemployment record. And do not forget, Mr. Speaker, that these figures only show those who are still looking for work and do not include those who have given up hope, which might bring the figure closer to 100,000 Newfoundlanders unemployed.

Now my question to the Minister of Labour and Manpower is this: What was he and his political colleagues celebrating on Saturday night, six years of a barbaric reign of terror of our people. And will the minister tell this hon. House just what his reaction is to these figures and how he intends, how the administration there opposite intends, to get this Province to even keep up with New Brunswick and get our figures down to some kind of a manageable level?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has been for

MR. DINN: for the last twenty-three or twenty-four years. He has long been a member of this House of Assembly and the member sitting longest in the House, I believe. What basically the government has done since 1972 is, number one, cleaned up the act of the former administration, the administration that operated since 1949 to 1971. And, Mr. Speaker, we cleaned up the act such that we did not treat Newfoundlanders differently, we did not treat the people on Bell Island any differently than we treated the people in other areas, unlike the hon. member who has a book written about him. But with respect to the unemployment figures, if the hon. member would read the figures very closely he would see that in March over February we had 6,000 jobs created, we had 6,000 more jobs in March over February. We have more people coming back into the labour force and at a fairly strong pace. We intend, when the restructuring of the fishing industry is concluded and we get our inshore fishery back this year, with the help of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) with his \$31 million in the offshore fishery that we concluded an agreement on, with something like another \$30 million that he has provided in loan guarantees, etc., to fish plants and to fishermen; with the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) working diligently for his new FESP programme, where he indicated only last week that he would have

MR. DINN: something like 2,600 people moreworking this year in the forestry sector; with the Minister of Social Service (Mr. Hickey) adding some \$6 million to his Social Services programme this year such that we will create someting like 4,000 to 5,000 jobs we anticipate that the unemployment rate will go down.

Now we do have about 7,600 jobs in the Department of Social Services alone. We do have a bit of a problem. We had a decision, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the offshore and one would conclude from that, if the hon. members opposite were accurate, we would conclude from that there would be a boom in the offshore because there is no question, according to the Supreme Court of Canada, as to who owns the offshore and, therefore, if things sort of come about the way the hon. members have been preaching over the past four years, we would have a boom in the offshore. Yet we understand that Petro Canada, as an example, is not continuing on this year with their offshore Labrador exploration programme and that will take away about 600 jobs from our economy, so we wonder where the hon. members of the Opposition and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) stand with respect to the offshore. We would like for him to support this government with respect to the offshore so that we would be able to capitalize on and make sure that Newfoundlanders are employed offshore, and we wonder where he stands with respect to the Local Preference Policy anyway as to whether he agrees with the local preference in the offshore. And if we were to get the boom that has been predicted by the hon. members opposite with the conclusion of who owns the offshore, if we were to get that boom we would have no problem with unemployment in the Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: A brief answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN: But I can say that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power), the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), the minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) are doing all in their power, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that the unemployment goes down this year as we hope and anticipate that it will.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of the Opposition, a supplementary question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we did not ask the gentleman for his old lip or sauce or a sermon, Mr. Speaker. What we asked the hon. gentleman was to outline specific plans that the administration have to deal with record unemployment in this Province. It is one thing to be indifferent to the suffering, Mr. Speaker, of people of this Province when your bravery does not affect you, as the hon. the Premier illustrates so often in this Province, but let me ask the hon. gentleman if he is aware that out of the figures mentioned, practically 100,000 Newfoundlanders unemployed, that 31,000 are between the ages of 15 and 24? Could the hon. gentleman indicate to the House what specific plans the administration have there opposite? Instead of the harangue about cleaning up, what they have done is shut down and closed down everything in the Province, Now what does the hon. gentleman intend to do, and the administration

April 9, 1984

Tape No. 790

NM - 3

MR. NEARY: there opposite, intend to
do for these young Newfoundlanders, and middle-aged
Newfoundlanders, and senior Newfoundlanders who are

MR. NEARY:

unemployed, who have given up hope and have nothing but, despair, Mr. Speaker? What specific plans? Never mind the sermon. Tell us what specific plans they have to deal with the record unemployment this coming Summer in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. member has not gotten around to reading the Budget yet this year. We have gone through something like forty-five or fifty hours in discussing the Budget and he has got on with the same harangue he gets on with every year. But as I say to the hon. member, if he were perchance to read the Budget, if he were to listen to the statements being made in the House of Assembly, he would understand that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has through his agreement with the federal government saved the fisheries this year so that we have something like 32,000 working in the fishery this year. The Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) has concluded an agreement - this is a government that cannot negotiate, they say - but he has concluded an agreement with the federal government for reforestation, etc., 2600 jobs there. The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), with his added \$6 million this year in the Social Service's budget, is going to create another 5,000 or 6,000 jobs. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) has gone on this year with -

MR. DOYLE: Thirty-five bridges.

MR. DINN: - not just the \$20 million that you would normally have, Mr. Speaker, in the

MR. DINN: roads programme but an additional \$15 million for roads and bridges this year that will create more jobs. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook), the same thing. We are doing what we can with the dollars that we have available to us to create as many jobs as we possibly can create. And, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the hon. member's comment about the tack that I have taken with my answer, if he had started off his question in a reasonable and sensible manner he would have gotten a reasonable and sensible answer. And, Mr. Speaker, the rule that I operate under in this House is that when I get a sensible question I attempt to get give a sensible answer. But when I get a harangue, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) led off with today, then he gets the same thing back. As I say to him, there is no minister on this side that I am aware of who has a book written about him as to how he should not operate when he is in office.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Fisheries arising out of a letter which I wrote him a little while ago and which I assume he has got. Could he tell the House, please, what is going to be done this year to open, or, to put it a little more strongly, when will the fish plants in the area between Blue Cove and Cook's Harbour in my district open? Now these are the small plants, as, of course, the minister is well aware, which were

MR. ROBERTS:

formerly operated in some cases by the Hardy Company at Port aux Basques, which I understand has now been folded into Fishery Products International, and in some cases by the Lake Group, in one or two cases did not operate and in one or two cases were operated by a private company including, for example, White Fisheries at Sandy Cove. I know the minister is very familiar with all of these. There have been delegations in, of course, from Anchor Point. I am not sure if they saw him, they met with his officials last week and had a good reception. Could he tell us when these plants will open, Sir?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the interim managers of the new company, Fishery Products International, consist of, as I mentioned some time ago, officials from the provincial government, Mr. Clarke, the Deputy Minister of Development, heading that group from the Province, Mr. Gordon Slade from the federal department, DRIE, and Mr. Clary Bartlett from the Bank of Nova Scotia. Those three officials primarily have been the main people involved. They have done a tremendous job as interim managers in preparation for the upcoming inshore fishing season. Of course, the deep-sea plants are all open and these plants now referred to are inshore plants.

I am pleased to report to the House that, as a result of the work done by the interim management team and input from this government and the federal level of government and the bank, these plants will be reopened this Spring as inshore plants.

The plant at Bide Arm and the

MR. MORGAN: plant at Englee were owned by the Lake Group and now will be operated as part of Fishery Products International, also, Cook's Harbour, but I understand, as of today, the final plan for Cook's Harbour has not been worked out but is being worked out; but Bide Arm and Englee are definitely completed in preparation for opening as inshore plants.

The plants at Anchor Point and Flower's Cove were, and indeed, are owned by the Newfoundland Government but leased and operated by T. J. Hardy's operations, which was the Nickerson combination with Mr. Hardy. And now that the negotiations have been completed to the point of that company coming in under the Fishery Products International, as well, as part of the large company, the plans are also finalized for these plants to be reopened as inshore plants; and further to that, a little further down the Coast, the plant at Cow Head in my colleague's district - he is not in the House today - the plant at Cow Head will also be opened, which was earlier owned, in fact, by the company - not owned by the government but owned by the company and operated by the company two years ago, but closed last year.

MR. ROBERTS: By the Hardy Company.

MR. MORGAN: By the Hardy Company. So that plant that was closed last year will indeed be operating this year as well.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to the House the interim management team. They have been doing a tremendous job, and

MR. MORGAN: I am confident that practically all of the deep -sea plants, of course, are operating and by the commencement of the inshore season all of the inshore plants to be owned by Fishery Products International will indeed be operating and supplying jobs to Newfoundlanders and markets for our fishermen.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir. A supplementary and I appreciate the minister's answer. I just want to be sure that we know where we are. Leaving aside the plants which are not owned or leased by one or more of the companies which have now been folded into the FPI umbrella, can the minister assure us that all of the plants now to be included in my district — and it is not that I am unconcerned about anywhere else, of course, I am, but I am primarily concerned with my own area — that these plants will be operated this year? And could he also speak, Mr. Speaker, if he would, to the length of the season. And let us be perfect candid about it, what counts is ten weeks. Anchor Point opened last year for nine weeks, and we all know, we are all grownups, we do not show it all of the time, but we are all grownups we all know what nine weeks work is worth compared to ten weeks work. Could he tell us, Mr. Speaker, whether these plants will be open for at least ten weeks so that the men and women who work in them will be assured of getting enough contributions to draw unemployment against the inevitable day when they will be laid off, as they have to be because these plants, as he says, are seasonal?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it is difficult, I guess, to be able to answer that question and say yes, definitely the plants will be open for the full ten weeks or for the full season. It will depend. The large factor, of course, will be the supply

MR. MORGAN: of the raw material and the availability of the resource in the area. But I am hoping, as a result of the enterprise allocations to the trawler fleets, on the West and Northwestern part of our Province, by means of boat allocations or boat quotas, the fishermen can take their time in harvesting and not be suddenly rushing out and having to catch all they can, to try and get all they can in a short period of time. That competition among the boats is not there as a result of the enterprise allocation system. It will give the fishermen a longer period of time to fish and, therefore, of course, ensure more than before that most of that fish will indeed be processed in that area of the Province and not be, as it was last year, because there was so much caught in a short period of time, some of it was trucked away to the East Coast and processed in plants on the Eastern part of our Province.

So with that kind of harvesting activity, hopefully it will mean longer period of employment in the plants in that part of the Province by having most of the fish processed in these plants. May I comment further, Mr. Speaker, by saying that another operator in the area of the Province the member asked a question with regard to White's Fisheries, at Sandy Cove in the hon. gentleman's district, is not part of the large company. We have assisted the company just recently to the tune of a \$200,000 government guarantee. That is the new government guarantee with regard to this year and again I do not want

MR. MORGAN: to leave the impression it is an add on, because these government guarantees are ending each financial year. We have to renew each application that comes in at the beginning of the fiscal year.

MR. ROBERTS: By accepting the renewal of the existing financial arrangements.

MR. MORGAN: The company has stabilized its financial position and we have been able to reduce the amount of guarantee required. So I think it is a little less than last year. I think last year it was \$300,000 and now it is down to \$200,000. But, however, Mr. Speaker, the point is that we are assisting through the government guarantee programme and it shows quite clearly that that programme we have in place with firm criteria set down and firm conditions, that three years ago when we set these conditions we were convinced then that company was able to turn things around, become economically viable, and indeed that is now proving to be true. So the company is coming around to be financially stable and again to be operating this year at Sandy Cove. So all in all, Mr. Speaker, we are ensuring the plants will be reopened and operating and we are hoping as a result of the harvesting method by the fishermen that employment will be at least ten weeks during the season in that area.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and it is on the newly announced Atlantic salmon management plan. The minister is quoted in various media as supporting the plan of the federal Fisheries Minister (De Bane). I understand from the minister that he has a very good relationship with the federal minister. He is always calling him back and forth so I can assume, I would imagine, that there was communication going on. Let me ask the minister to state for the record

MR. TULK: in this House if indeed the quote as referred to him in the paper is correct?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what he is referring to with regards to what medium but I do recall doing an article for CP while I was in Moncton over the weekend at meetings over there, and I said then and I say now that we are concerned with one aspect of the plan. In my discussions with the minister on Thursday past, we were of the understanding he was going to delay the opening in Newfoundland by no more than two weeks and on the condition that it would only reduce the amount of salmon by 10 per cent, the amount taken by commercial fishermen in Newfoundland; at the same time he would reduce the effort of the other commercial Maritime fishermen throughout the region of Atlantic Canada by 50 per cent to 80 per cent by cutting back the weeks from six weeks back to two weeks. He has done that, he has cut back the total fishing season for the rest of that region from six weeks to two weeks only. But he has delayed the opening in Newfoundland by three weeks and that is different from what I discussed with him on Thursday. The concept we discussed on Thursday was that he was going to delay the season by only two weeks, a maximum of two weeks, and that he was going to look at the removal of part-time fishermen holding salmon licences, and he would compensate those part-timer who would not get licences this year. And also further to that, he was going to do a number of other things which are firmly our policy and our position. We see no point as a government, and the Premier and others have discussed this at some time on fisheries policy, we see no point in talking about eliminating the activities of the commercial salmon fishery in

MR. MORGAN: Atlantic Canada and the activities of full-time fishermen, if that is the only thing they are going to do to try to conserve the Atlantic salmon stocks. There have to be more things done than that.

There has got to be, for example, set in place immediately, salmon enhancement programmes, there has to be action taken by the Government of Canada to deal with the Greenland fishery, which is catching just as much salmon last year and the year before as we are catching here in Newfoundland with 4,000 fishermen. He has to deal with the catch by the Greenland fishery, that has to be curtailed. And further there has to be action taken dealing with the poaching on the rivers, So poaching, salmon enhancement and the Greenland issues, these are there issues that we said we would want put in place immediately if we are to agree to any curtailment whatsoever on our full-time commercial fishery.

Now we also said we did not want any situation where the sports fishermen would get preference over the commercial fishery. And it seems that he has taken some action on the sports fishery, he has cut back the size of the salmon, to be exact I think it is now any salmon less than 63 centimeters, that is what? Approximately 20 inches, I guess. So to be precise and give you detail, these salmon cannot be kept by the anglers. But I am still concerned over the fact that he has not cut back on the number of salmon anglers can keep. They still can take 2 per day and a maximum of 10, the same as it was last year. So there is no major curtailment of the sports angling activity, yet there is a major curtailment in the rest of the Atlantic region, and the three week delay

MR. MORGAN: here is of concern to us.

So as of today I have been in correspondence with the minister and the deputy minister, pointing out to him that what we discussed last week was a maximum of two weeks, open the season around the first week of June, not June 11 as now indicated. Because we are convinced his advisors are wrong, they are wrong in their estimation. They are saying by delaying for three weeks it will mean a mere 10 per cent reduction in the number of salmon taken from Newfoundland waters, we are saying it is more like 35 per cent to 40 per cent less salmon if they go for as long as a three week delay. Because that is when most of the large salmon

MR. MORGAN:

are in the waters, when most of the salmon are caught by commercial fishermen. So based on that, Mr. Speaker, I am hoping he will listen to reason and change that date and move the date ahead for the first week in June for our commercial salmon fishery.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the

minister is quoted in today's Daily News by the way, and I think in The Evening Telegram as well, as saying the only requirement that he had of the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) is that he must seek some sort of an agreement with Greenland that they would also cut back on their commercial fishery. But I take it then from what the minister has said that the only real precondition, and the government is good at that, that he put on agreeing with the new management plan was that there would be a two week delay rather than a three week delay. In other words, he did not have any deal on the compensation for fishermen, on the buy-back of licences or anything else. All he wanted was a two week delay rather than a three week delay. Is that correct?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I will table in the House this afternoon or tomorrow a Telex I sent today to Mr. De Bane pointing out quite clearly our conversation of last Thursday and pointing out quite clearly what we understood here in the Newfoundland Government was the new programme. And when the new programme was announced on Friday afternoon it was quite different from what we discussed on Thursday. For example, he mentioned on Thursday a buy-back from part-time fishermen of \$500 compensation. That was mentioned to me. And he asked me my

MR. MORGAN: opinion of that. I said if it is not full-time fishermen who is going to be affected, only part-time fishermen who are holding salmon licences, if you are going to take their licences away you have to buy back their fishing gear. And he agreed on that and he agreed to put an amount of \$500 to be paid for a part-time fisherman holding a part-time licence. He agreed on that. It was on Thursday. There is no mention of that in his new policy statement. He agreed to take action in dealing with Greenland. He is of the firm understanding as well that there is no point in cutting back in the Atlantic salmon fishery commercially if there is going to be still the major fishing activity of the Greenland fishermen. So he agreed that that was going to be dealt with. So these were the understandings. And I want to say further that, whether or not I was reported accurately in The Daily News, I do not recall talking to The Daily News. In fact, I have not talked to The Daily News about the issue. If The Daily News reporting is no more accurate than the reporting of the Estimates Committee last week on Fisheries, it is not very accurate reporting, and I say that very sincerely because I am finding it rather annoying -

MR. NEARY: Blame it on the press.

MR. MORGAN: No, I am only mentioning one press and one medium. And the inaccuracies in reporting, whether it is I should not say incompetence, just oversights. I do not know what it is, but the reporting is just not accurate. You read the report, for example, in The Evening Telegram of

MR. MORGAN: the Estimates Committees, what takes place, versus The Daily News and you would not know you lived in the same world, it is completely different. So I am saying, Mr. Speaker, I did not talk to The Daily News. What is being said in The Daily News, the morning newspaper, was not a quote from me because I did not talk with them. I talked to the Q network in St. John's, who called me, I talked to the C.P. in Halifax, who called me, I talked to the C.B.C., who called me, on voice tape. I talked to all of these and did interviews, but The Daily News did not bother to call me or talk to me on the issue, so I do not know why I should respond to the quotations of The Daily News. But I will respond to the questions asked about the issue.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. TULK: For the minister's information, the article is from the Canadian Press and I understand that he talked to the Canadian Press. But that aside, does the minister realize that regardless of whether it is a two week delay or a three week delay, in certain parts of this Province it means devastation for the salmon fishery? For example, I understand that on the Southwest Coast of the Province, like in the district represented by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), the district of LaPoile, that it will mean a 50 per cent to 60 per cent loss in income for those fishermen. Now, given those kinds of facts, will the minister now go on record as saying that he is opposed to the new management plan regardless of whether it is two weeks or three weeks? Because, if that is all the opposition that he had, he really did not accomplish that much by changing his position once he heard about the three weeks.

MR. TULK: I suspect that what really happened is that the minister, through the three weeks, got an out for what he knew was a bad negotiation stance that he had taken. But would he now, in view of that fact, consider saying, 'No, we disagree totally with the salmon enhancement management plan that you put forward'?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I said earlier, what I agreed to was that based on the fact that the rest of Atlantic Canada was going to be curtailed by 50 per cent to 80 per cent - and that is what the statement now says will be done, 50 per cent to 80 per cent curtailment of commercial fishing in Atlantic Canada outside of Newfoundland, that much curtailment - if that was done in the rest of Atlantic Canada, we would agree to a 10 per cent curtailment. Now, a 10 per cent curtailment did not mean three weeks. He set the date, three weeks, without discussing with me what would be the opening date. The discussion was along the lines of the percentage of less salmon taken by Newfoundland versus the rest of Atlantic Canada; and because he was going to meet the other conditions, the salmon enhancement, the poaching and the Greenland fishery, because he was going to meet those three conditions, and because he

MR. MORGAN: was going to cut back the Atlantic salmon commercial fishery in the rest of the region by 50 per cent, it was reasonable for us to agree to a 10 per cent cut for the sake of conservation. Now that is the whole issue. We are saying now is the 10 per cent estimate of his advisors, this estimation is much too low. He is saying it is only going to be 10 per cent less salmon by delaying the season for three weeks and we are saying that estimation is totally out to lunch. By just three weeks will mean, in our estimation, a 35 to 40 per cent reduction over last year. And we made our views known today in a telex to him from me, a telex from my deputy to Dr. May, the deputy in Ottawa, and we are hoping that he will listen to what we are saying and not listen to some of his advisors, who, I have no hesitation in saying, are a bit biased in their view on the Atlantic salmon, biased in favour of the sports fishery. For example, a recommendation to Mr. De Bane two weeks ago, because he told me so, was to ban the commercial fishery in Newfoundland completely, to ban it this year, 1984, completely and maybe for a two or three year period. We took a strong position on that, a very strong position, and said, no, we could not tolerate and were not going to tolerate a total ban on the commercial salmon fishery in Newfoundland. And it was based on that that he changed the policy paper put forward to him by his officials, backed up by the Atlantic Salmon Federation, and I understand the Atlantic Salmon Board as well, calling for a total ban on commercial fisheries in Newfoundland this year. So he agreed to cast aside that policy document and listen to us, and now he has put forward a policy document which I am inclined to agree he will review and hopefully change the dates

MR.MORGAN: and move it ahead and not have any reduction of the number of salmon taken in Newfoundland, which, in our estimation would be 40 per cent of the total catch.

MR.TULK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR.TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister is now backing off from what he said in his original statement. But we will let him do that because that is good for the Newfoundland fishery. One of the things that have been announced by Mr. De Bane is that salmon enhancement programmes will be started when money is available. Well, let me ask the minister if in his discussions with him on Thursday, I believe he said it was, if the federal minister had agreed to start those salmon enhancement plans right away, those programmes right away, or just when does he plan on doing it? Or did the minister ask him to start them if he was going to agree to the management plan as put forward by him?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is trying to leave the impression that we can suddenly dictate what the federal government is doing in Ottawa, what they do on all matter. The fact is the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) in Ottawa was of the impression last week that, based on the full consultation with the Liberal Party in Newfoundland, and including the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who represents a major salmon fishing area, that they were agreeing to his programme, they could not agree to a ban but they were agreeing to his programme of what he was going to announce on Friday. The Party in Newfoundland was consulted, and I certainly hope they were consulted on a major policy of that nature on the fishery. Surely the Liberal Party of Newfoundland was consulted, they were not ignored, I hope. Or where they ignored? So they were consulted prior to Mr. De Bane's announcement. And now that they, behind closed door, agreed with the policy of Mr. De Bane, now they are trying to condemn it and make it look like we are the ones who brought the policy in.

Mr. Speaker, that is utter nonsense, because the fact is we put forward our views in writing, put forward our views in Telexes, put forward our views in meetings and we want no curtailment any more than 10 per cent, maximum 10 per cent, on our commercial Atlantic fishery, and that was only agreed to on certain conditions, one of them being that there had to be a major curtailment in the rest of Canada and a major curtailment in Greenland.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Time for the Question Period has expired.

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

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

MR. TULK: I have to say that in the last statement that the minister made he is either misleading this House or the federal minister is misleading the minister, and according to what we have seen happen to the Newfoundland fishery in the last couple of months it is probably the latter case.

MR. MORGAN: You were not consulted?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. TULK: I did not say you were not consulted. I did not say whether we agreed or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
The hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has made a point but it could hardly be classed as a point of order.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSS: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the Government Services Committee has considered and passed the following department heads: Head IV - Finance; Head V - Public Works; Head XI - Transportation; Head XVI - Labour and Manpower; and Head XVII - Municipal Affairs.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question 23 on the Order Paper of Thursday, March 29. It is all written out there.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to respond to a question put forward by the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) with regard to the proclamation of Bill 18. Section 4 of Bill 18 states that this act or any section or sections of it comes into force on the day or days to be proclaimed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. I wish to inform to him that I have checked with the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and I understand that this matter will be considered within the next few days or in the very near future.

000

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker happened to be out of the House when the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) uttered an inaccurate statement, completely incorrect. I suppose I could if he was quoting the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) then he was quoting a gentleman who has a reputation of lying. But, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the hon. gentleman who made that statement that it is completely false, it is a false statement, it is incorrect it is inaccurate, that I have not spoken to Mr. De Bane or any of his officials in any way, shape or form since he lied about my colleague from Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). Mr. Speaker, I know I cannot accuse the hon. gentleman of lying -

MR. TULK: I think the federal minister is misleading the Provincial Minister of Fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - but the federal minister is either lying or deliberately misleading the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. gentleman to clarify that or withdraw and apologize to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. The hon. gentleman obviously was not listening to what was said. I said it was in discussions with Mr. De Bane on the salmon fishery policy for Atlantic Canada, major policy change this year, that I was of the firm understanding - and Hansard will show what I said - of the firm understanding and impression from Mr. De Bane that he had discussed this with

MR. MORGAN: the Liberal Party of Newfoundland, and I went further to say, Mr. Speaker, that surely the Liberal Party in Ottawa, in the formulation of such a major policy affecting this Province, would discuss that matter and consult with the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, they are getting upset now. You see, they cannot take this. So now, Mr. Speaker, we learn -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. MORGAN: - that the government of the day in Ottawa does not even consult the existing Liberal Party in Newfoundland on fishery policy. It does not even consult them. What a shame! What a disgusting situation to have!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: It is unbelievable that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would not even have input, or take the time to discuss with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) a major policy change on salmon fishery for his own riding all along the East Coast, the Northeast Coast, the Labrador Coast, and, furthermore, that no one from Ottawa would take the time to even bounce the policy off them: What is your opinion? How do you think the policy is going to work? What is your views on the policy?

Mr. Speaker, I will say again what I said today, and it is now in Hansard, I said I was of the firm understanding and the firm impression, Mr. De Bane in my conversations with him left the firm impression that he had consulted with the Liberal Party in

MR. MORGAN: Newfoundland, and with others in this region of Canada, this region of our country, and in this case involving the Liberal Party on this major policy. Now we learn, Mr. Speaker, they are out in the cold. They are totally out in the cold. Their own colleagues ignore them. Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please! The Chair has heard enough arguing on this point of order. It is not really a valid point of order, it is certainly a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

We are discussing Consolidated Fund Services.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we are still on the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I must say that I want to, right at the outset now, put hon. gentlemen's minds there opposite - the handmaidens of Ottawa over there - I want to put their minds at rest.

In connection with the matter that just arose, Mr. Chairman, I will read a telegram that I dispatched to Mr. De Bane before lunch today, that will show the hon. gentlemen -

MR. MORGAN: You could not show it before now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - show the hon. gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, who stands up for Newfoundland.

MR. MORGAN: You did not stand up before today? Shame on you!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Let me show the hon. gentleman who stands up for the fishermen of this Province and who stands up for the unemployed. Is it the hon. lapdog to Ottawa or is it the members on this side?

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: I see no dogs in this House, Mr. Chairman, and I think that term, referring to any member of this House as a lapdog, has to be withdrawn as being unparliamentary.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we hear that
remark coming from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall)
at least a dozen times a day, day in and day out, whenever
the House meets - at least ten or a dozen times a day,
Mr. Chairman. If I am out of order, then we have to make
it retroactive to include the Government House Leader,
who makes that statement ten or a dozen times a day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

To that point of order, the word
has been used and has been accepted in this House before.
Although I do not think it does anything by way of adding
to the debate, it has not been ruled unparliamentary.

The hon. the Leader of the
Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I want to
show the House who stands up for the fishermen in this
Province and I will read this telegram to illustrate
what I meant when I raised my point of order, that the
hon. gentleman was being taken down the garden path, he
was being misled. Telegram, April 9, Hon. Pierre De Bane,
Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Government of Canada:
"Your statement that fishermen would only lose 10 per cent
income due to your policy of delaying salmon season by
three weeks complete and utter nonsense. Perhaps you
should familiarize yourself with the inshore fishery on
the Southwest Coast of our Province to avoid making such
ridiculous statements in the future. Income of fishermen
on the Southwest Coast will be affected by anywhere from
50 to 75 per cent, which means severe losses for many of
them. In view of severe consequences to fishermen in this

MR. NEARY: Province, you should take immediate steps to put in place a plan to compensate fishermen for these heavy losses."

Mr. Chairman, I now challenge the hon. gentleman to read his telegram and see if his telegram is worded as strongly as that.

MR. MORGAN: Stronger than that.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman had prior consultation with the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) and he did not show the courage but he sold the fishermen of this Province down the drain, the same thing as he was going to do in Burin and Grand Bank and St. Lawrence, Mr. Chairman, sell them down the river. The hon. gentleman now is saying in the House, 'Oh, I only agreed to two weeks delay, not three weeks. Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman does not know the fishery on the Southwest Coast of this Province very well when he even agreed to two weeks delay in opening the salmon season without compensation for fishermen.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, with a two week delay it means that they would only have about a week to salmon fish when the basking sharks would be in the area and they would not be able to put their gear out. The hon. gentleman obviously does not understand the inshore fishery in this Province, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope we will hear no more of that nonsense that the hon. gentleman got on with today.

MR. TULK: De Bane sucked him in again.

MR. NEARY: I think, by the way, they are having a little lovers' tiff. The provincial Minister of

April 9, 1984

Tape 801

EC - 4

MR. NEARY: Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the federal minister (Mr. De Bane) are having a little lovers' quarrel now, a little lovers' tiff.

MR. TULK: He realizes he cheated on him.

MR. NEARY: Yes, somebody cheated and they are having a little lover's tiff. Now it only remains to be seen whether or not they will be able to get back together again and carry on the love affair.

MR. TULK: De Bane may change his telegram.

MR. NEARY: Well the only thing you can do is present the federal minister with the flip side of his record, "Voices In The Wind". Now if he were to take that and present Mr. De Bane -

MR. TULK: the flip side, "De Bane Be Kind".

MR. NEARY: "De Bane Be Kind" or "Voter Be Kind".

MR. PATTERSON: What about, "Cashin Be Kind"?

MR. WARREN: You will be crying in the next election.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there is a big problem created as a result of the delay in the opening of the commercial salmon season in this Province, especially on the East Coast and the Southwest Coast of the Province. We have a unique fishery on the Southwest Coast and the hon. gentleman does not seem to realize that, Mr. Chairman, when he made his little deal with Mr. De Bane to allow a two week delay in opening the commercial salmon season on the Southwest Coast, the hon. gentleman did not realize the damage, the inconvenience and the hardship and the severe loss of income that he was causing fishermen in that part of the Province, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman is too anxious.

MR. ANDREWS: You were not even consulted.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. ANDREWS: You were not even consulted.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Why would we be consulted?

MR. MORGAN: Why would the Liberal Party in power in Ottawa consult the Liberal Party in Newfoundland? Yes, why would they?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, we are not the handmaidens of Ottawa. We are not Ottawa's lapdog.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, we are not Mr. De Bane's handmaiden or his lapdog.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, if we were consulted, I can say to hon. gentlemen there opposite that there is no way that you would have a three week delay in the opening of the commercial salmon season without compensating fishermen.

MR. WARREN:

No compensation?

MR. NEARY:

No compensation. You know, the only little gimmick that the minister mentioned today was that Mr. De Bane agreed to buy back -

MR. TULK:

\$500 for part-time fishermen.

MR. NEARY:

- to pay \$500 to part-time fishermen to buy back their licences.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

You talk about pressure, trying to put the pressure on the fishermen to give up the salmon fishery, buy their licences back for \$500; Mr. Chairman, what kind of a policy is that?

MR. TULK:

I wonder if he brought that back to the Premier to have a look at, too?

MR. NEARY:

No, he did not bring that back to the Premier.

MR. MORGAN: Now I see what is happening!
You are going to oppose Cashin for the leadership.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman has now got himself boxed into a corner in an embarrassing position, and I am sure the hon. Premier has said to the hon. gentleman, 'Look! Will you stay off the telephone and say off the television and off the radio because you are making a complete fool of yourself.' I had calls this morning from fishermen all over this Province, who said, 'When you get in the House this afternoon, will you give it to the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) for agreeing to allow three weeks to be cut off our commercial fishery, for selling the fishermen of this Province down the river?'

MR. MORGAN: Listen to him! Listen to him!
It is not our policy. We have no say over it.

MR. WARREN: You agreed with it.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman agreed to it by his own admission in this House today and his story with Canadian press, He agreed, Mr. Chairman, to it. He agreed to two weeks. And now he is trying to weasel out by saying, well, they announced three weeks instead of two.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman had demanded compensation for the fishermen, In my district I know there is going to be a drastic loss of income. There is going to be starvation.

MR. MORGAN: For part-timers?

MR. NEARY: No, for all of the fishermen.
Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman does not understand the small-

MR. NEARY: boat fishermen in my district.
The salmon fishery is 50 per cent of their income. How are we
going to get this -

MR. MORGAN: Well, they full-time fishermen, then.
then.

MR. NEARY: Yes, they are. How are they
going to get their stamps?

MR. MORGAN: Get the issue straight, then.
They are part-timers.

MR. WARREN: You do not know what you are
talking about.

MR. NEARY: I got the issue straight.

MR. MORGAN: Are they full-time or part-time
fishermen?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, all I am saying is
the hon. gentleman does

MR. NEARY:

not understand what goes on. You have fishermen down there and if you take two or three weeks off their salmon fishery, well, I would say they would not be able to fish at all because the basking sharks will be in and they cannot get their gear in the water, so there is no commercial salmon fishery, period.

MR. TULK:

Does he realize what salmon landings you get in two weeks?

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman does not seem to understand that. Let him go down. They are having a meeting down there. I challenge the hon. gentleman to come down to a meeting in Isle aux Morts.

MR. MORGAN:

Oh, I am going down pretty soon, do not worry, I am going down there.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman should come down to the fishery meeting in Isle aux Morts.

MR. TOBIN:

And I am going with him.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, they are going to have a meeting in Isle aux Morts, which is the central location in the district, to talk about this matter. And I challenge the hon. gentleman to appear at that meeting and justify why he agreed with the two week delay, which now turns out to be three weeks, and why he did not demand compensation to the fishermen for their drastic loss of income? These are the questions that the hon. gentleman has to answer, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I was not going to speak in this debate because I have too much other work to do, but I will now. Here is a gentleman standing up talking about a policy which was brought in by his own party in Ottawa, and now, suddenly, when he realizes that the policy may have some effects on his own riding on the Southwest Coast, which it will, indeed, because a few years ago when the same Liberal party in power, the same Liberal government in Ottawa, with a different Minister of Fisheries, curtailed in a severe way the commercial salmon fishery on the Southwest Coast of the Province, in the same hon. gentleman's district who now just sat down in this debate, when that occurred was the same hon. gentleman then effective in getting compensation for those fishermen? No, indeed not, Mr. Chairman. He tried hard but he had absolutely no influence on the then Minister, Leblanc, then Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa. He did not listen to him no more than if he did not exist, either as a MHA or, in fact at that time he was the House Leader. He was in-House Leader at the time. They did not listen to him then as a MHA, as a senior official of the Liberal Party here in Newfoundland, a senior member of the House, They ignored him then and they are ignoring him now because if he had any concern, if the Liberal Party in Newfoundland had any concern on the Atlantic salmon -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, they cannot take it. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has himself in a real bind. They are now defending part-time fishermen. And I said all along I will stand by my policy position and that is we are not going to give in to any major

MR. MORGAN: curtailment of the full-time fishermen of our Province, those fishermen who do nothing else for a living but fish. Any curtailment of our commercial fishermen we will fight and oppose. Now the Opposition have shown their true colours, now they are standing for the part-timers. Now why would that be, Mr. Chairman? Why would that be?

MR. TULK: A point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): A point of order. The Hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: The Minister of Fisheries can try to weasel his way out of the mess he has made of the Atlantic salmon management plan all he likes by trying to say we are for part-time fishermen. It has always been very clear in this House where we stood in relation to part-time fishermen, but it is not so clear with the hon. gentleman because he will switch from one day to the next whichever suits him. Let him withdraw that remark, Mr. Chairman. Or if he wants to let him go on but he is absolutely and totally wrong and he knows it.

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

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: They are merely trying to waste my time again, the few minutes I have in this debate. That is all they are doing.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that our policy position has been made quite well known in correspondence, in documents, in policy papers put forward to Ottawa, and there have not been one iota, one

MR.MORGAN: sentence, one comma of anything put forward to Ottawa until today by the Liberal Party. Now that is the issue, that is the issue. Everybody knew that there was going to be coming forward a major policy change this year on Atlantic salmon, because of the conservation measures which must go in place because stocks are down, the catches are down, the stocks are in trouble. Everybody in this Province, even those not even involved in the fishing industry knew that this year there were coming some changes in the policy for Atlantic salmon. Now I ask a mere question: Why

MR. MORGAN:

it is that the Liberal Party that seems to be so concerned about fisheries in the House of Assembly when they are here in debate, why is it the Liberal Party of Newfoundland did not put forward suggestions, proposals, ideas, concepts, policy positions on the new policy coming out of Ottawa? Why did they have to wait until today? That is a key question. Why would they wait until the policy was announced and made public and made official by the Minister of Fisheries? The other provinces had their say, the other parties had their say, the sports groups and others, but the Liberal Party chose to remain quiet and now that they see where the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), where his part-time -

MR. TULK: Will you be at this meeting?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I cannot speak with the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) carrying on!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is defending part-time fishermen. It has gotten the member for Fogo in very deep water because on Fogo Island the people out there want full-time fishermen only, and deal with full-time licences. Mr. Cashin wants full-time fishermen only.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman just made an incorrect, false statement. Your Honour, if it is allowed to continue in this House, to make false statements that are bordering almost on a lie, although under the rules of Parliament you cannot use that language, it will undermine the system. I have to say to the

MR. NEARY: hon. gentleman that he is incorrect, that Michael Best and Eric Strickland, two full-time fishermen in my district, will be shocked to hear the hon. gentleman make statements like he just made, one living in Petites and one living in Diamond Cove near Rose Blanche, Mr. Chairman. I am sure that these two gentlemen who are full-time fishermen, who depend largely on the salmon fishery for their income with small boats, would be shocked to hear that the hon. gentleman is completely ignorant of the inshore fishery on the Southwest Coast and I do not believe that the hon. gentleman should be allowed, Mr. Chairman, to continue with these misleading statements, and he should withdraw and apologize to the House.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): To that point of order, the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: I would say the same hon. gentleman, that the fishermen down in his riding, these full-time fishermen would be just as shocked or even more shocked to learn that this hon. gentleman, as leader of his party in Newfoundland, as their member in their respective riding, did not even make representation to Ottawa on this major issue until today. He did not make a representation, that is the key matter, Mr. Chairman. The key matter is the fact that the policies adversely affecting our commercial salmon fishermen are put in place without any input, with any representation being made by the Liberal Party in this Province. It goes to show they are not concerned. They do not care about the inshore fishermen. They do not care about the issues involving inshore fishermen.

MR. MORGAN: They do not care about the adverse affect on them because if they did why was it they did not put forward their views until today, when a few calls came in from Port aux Basques? I had a few calls from the Southwestern portion of the Province as well saying, "Why is that fellow up in Ottawa cutting us back on salmon again? Will he not listen to anybody down there at all?" That is the key question.

Now the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) wants to make it look like this is a new policy of the Newfoundland Government, that we dictate the policy to Ottawa and they change the policy when we want them to.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is there is a need for conservation. Any fishermen who are in our Province today who are not understanding the need for conservation of our Atlantic salmon is not genuine fisherman. I will tell you the reason why, Mr. Chairman. A few years ago they did not understand the herring stocks being depleted on the South Coast of our Province, today there is no herring fishery.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please! Is the hon. minister still speaking on the point of order, or can I rule on that point of order?

MR. MORGAN: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a point there is no point of order, just a difference of opinion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order, there is definitely a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries has two minutes remaining.

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that there is a need for conservation. There is no question in anybody's mind today that the Atlantic salmon stocks are down. The herring fishery is down to a point where there is no quota left for fishermen to catch herring anymore on the South Coast two years ago, and last year on the Northeast Coast. There are no herring stocks left because of overfishing, too much fishing. And there are no more quotas allowed, period. So rather than have a total ban on the Atlantic salmon this year, we said, "Yes, we will agree to some curtailment but only on certain conditions, for the sake of conservation." We are not stupid here, we are conservationists as well. We do not want to see the stocks depleted. Why should we agree to have the salmon stocks depleted by overfishing, whether it be in the rivers or in the waters along our Coast line. So we agreed to some curtailment with certain conditions. And if the Opposition wants to now say they want no conservation measures put in place, if they do not want to take into consideration the possibility of depleting the stocks completely in Atlantic Canada and no more commercial fishery, period, because it was so close to having no commercial fishery this year, it was that close, Mr. Chairman, that close to a decision in Ottawa being made for a total ban this year on commercial fishing for salmon in Newfoundland, a total ban. There is not a total ban but a curtailment, which has been proposed to reduce by 10 per cent the amount of salmon taken. And our concern now as a government is that

MR. MORGAN: the projections being made by the federal Department of Fisheries and by the minister and his advisors are out and the measures they have been taken will be more than a 10 per cent reduction. That is the major issue. We want to show them quite clearly, as we did today in our telex to the minister, that the three week delay will mean more than a 10 per cent reduction. That is the key issue. But there is indeed a need for conservation, we recognize that, and we support some of the issues and policies put forward in that regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Before I introduce the hon. member, I just wish to advise the House that there is approximately fifty-two minutes left in debate.

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, let me point out the minister has attempted and has tried to give, either knowingly or unknowingly, in the last half an hour since Question Period ended, false information to this House. He has kept at it, he has persisted. Whether he knows the difference or not I am not sure, he probably does not.

MR. NEARY: He said this was the key issue.

MR. TULK: Yes, the key issue is did the Liberal Party make any representation to Mr. De Bane or his officials on the salmon enhancement programme, on the salmon management plan that they are now putting out? Let me read the hon. gentleman a telegram sent by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to the hon. Pierre De Bane.

MR. NEARY: How long ago?

MR. TULK: I will get to that. The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Government of Canada, dated - when? - March 8, 1984.

MR. NEARY: Three weeks ago.

MR. TULK: Let me destroy his argument once and for all that there has been no attempt by the Liberal Party

MR. TULK: to stop what is happening.

MR. MORGAN: Let us see if he listens to you.

MR. TULK: He does not have to listen to us because he has a Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) who will give away anything in this Province for his own political skin. But let me read, Mr. Chairman, the representation that we made. 'Salmon fishermen on the Southwest Coast very concerned over two week postponement in opening this year's salmon season.' Concerned over two weeks, not like the minister, concerned over three. 'Even in normal times our salmon fishermen cannot leave gear in water for a full season due to sharks destroying gear. If present regulations stand, our fishermen will only manage to fish approximately two weeks for the whole season. This is grossly unfair and, as there is no provision for compensation, some fishermen will lose as much as 75 per cent of their annual income.' Seventy-five per cent of their annual income and the Minister of Fisheries, I submit to this House, is not even aware of that. He started talking about part-time and full-time fishermen when the real issue, Mr. Chairman, is the length of the season. Now he is trying to get out but Mr. De Bane ignores it. Mr. De Bane has not had a good fishery policy in a long while for this Province, and it is precisely because he has been ignoring this Opposition and listening to that hon. gentleman, the two lovers in fisheries in Newfoundland. 'May we hope, therefore, you will give every consideration to reviewing this decision or providing compensation to fishermen affected'. Now who is that signed by? Stephen A. Neary, MHA, Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MORGAN: It had no effect, obviously.

MR. NEARY: But you said the key was we did not make representation.

MR. TULK: He does not have to listen to anybody! All he has to do is talk to the hon. gentleman and he can get what he wants. He can protect New Brunswick fishermen because the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan] in Newfoundland is so ineffective. Here we see the minister, he admitted it in the House this evening, that the only thing that he was concerned about in the salmon management plan was that it be for two weeks rather than three. That was the only thing he was concerned about.

MR. WARREN: Big deal.

MR. TULK: Big deal. And he wanted the minister to seek out with Greenland an agreement! To seek out! He did not even have to have one, just to seek it out. He did not look at the salmon enhancement programme. He does not know to this day whether the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane] is going to put a cent or not into the salmon enhancement programme, does not have a clue whether he is or not. He does not really know that the buy-back system is voluntary. He does not really know that. All he knows is that there is supposed to be \$500 in it somewhere. Mr. Chairman, the minister has again shown to this House his inability to represent the Newfoundland fishermen in Ottawa. He has shown that. He showed it to us first this Spring when he signed two agreements to close down fish plants in this Province. He signed them and then came back to his Premier and his Premier had the good sense - I think it was good sense - to tell him, 'No, Jim, you are wrong'. I wonder if this weekend, since he got back last night, I wonder if the Premier has again said to him, 'Morgan, you are wrong again. Fisheries Minister, you are wrong again.' Two weeks is not good enough and that is the only condition he had.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me speak

MR. TULK: to this idea that the government are conservationists and we are not on this side. Yes, this government is a lot of things and so are we, and so are we conservationists. But this government can be anything as long as they -

MR. NEARY: All things to all people.

MR. TULK: That is right. - do not have to pay or compensate anybody for some of the actions that they take. You can go on and find example after example of what I speak. But what are we doing here? The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) says, 'Look out for Rick Cashin'. Well I have to tell those hon. gentlemen that Rick Cashin is welcome in this Party -

MR. MORGAN: You have no choice but to like him. If he wants to come, he will come.

MR. TULK: - because the people on this side do not believe that you have to solve the fishery problems in this Province on the backs of fishermen.

MR. MORGAN: You will have nothing to say about Cashin coming to the Liberal Party or not.

MR. TULK:

You do not have to solve the problems on the backs of the fishermen in this Province; but that is what we have here again. We have a provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) who is allowing the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) to solve -

MR. NEARY: Sold them out!

MR. TULK: Sold them out! - is allowing the federal Minister of Fisheries to solve a salmon problem that is really a problem for New Brunswick and Greenland, but yet, the Newfoundland fisherman is again -

MR. NEARY: And the sports fisherman in New Brunswick.

MR. TULK: - and the sports fisherman. But the Newfoundland fishermen are again paying. Does the minister not realize that? You are going to destroy fishermen in the district of LaPoile, along the Southwest Coast.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. TULK: He did not even think about that. Or if he thought about it, he did not have the ability or the credence with the federal minister to solve the problem. That is the real issue.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. TULK: That is the real issue. Never mind whether somebody sold somebody down the drain, never mind whether somebody consulted with somebody or not, the truth is that the provincial Minister of Fisheries in this Province did not protect the fishermen of this Province.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. TULK: That is the real truth and that is where the shame of the whole matter is. To save his

MR. TULK: own political skin and look good, he will stand in this House and say anything, he will do anything that it takes; but he will not stand up and say to the federal minister (Mr. De Bane), 'Look, if you are going to cut back on the salmon catch in this Province, our fishermen have to be taken care of, because they depend on it for a living.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: That is what the provincial minister (Mr. Morgan) has not done. And he has agreed to such little terms as 'voluntary', that it is voluntary if you pass back your salmon licence. And the federal minister is not necessarily saying part-time fishermen either, let me remind him of that. What does 'voluntary' mean? That you have the ability to choose. Now, if you are going to cut a season off completely, as they are doing on the Southwest Coast, if you are going to cut a season off completely, you can wonder how much voluntary effort there is in that or how much choice that one has to do what he wants to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: The minister again has sold our inshore fishermen down the drain. There have been a number of occasions when the minister should have tendered his resignation and here is another example of that today.

On Thursday -

MR. MORGAN: It is not my policy!

MR. TULK: The truth is that regardless of whether it is his policy or not, on Thursday -

MR. MORGAN: Get in touch with De Bane. Show your influence to change something up there.

MR. TULK: You said in this House that on Thursday you met with the federal minister and agreed with

MR. TULK: the plan, the only thing you wanted was two weeks rather than three. Now we have a lovers' tiff going on. Last Thursday, the federal minister (Mr. De Bane) was a great man, a great Fisheries Minister!

MR. MORGAN: It is a Liberal policy to break the inshore fishermen.

MR. TULK: Talking about talking to your colleagues in Ottawa, who talked to Lloyd Crouse when he made that statement on the seal fishery? Was that the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan)?

MR. MORGAN: He is my buddy. He changed it!

MR. TULK: He fought it, yes.

MR. MORGAN: Did I get it changed?

MR. TULK: Yes, you got it half changed. You backed off. You backed off. You have lost your position, you will admit that in private.

MR. MORGAN: Put your money where your mouth is.

MR. TULK: You are the provincial minister - go do your job!

MR. MORGAN: Get your own party in Ottawa to change its policy. You have no influence in Ottawa.
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MORGAN: The hon. the member for Fogo! (Mr. Tulk). Oh, when I talk to the fishermen again on Fogo Island! Oh, when I talk to them again, very soon, when I go down for a meeting, a nice large meeting, when I talk to them again! Can you imagine, Mr. Chairman! Now, he criticizes me for attacking the P.C. Party on a policy on fisheries which I fought publicly, I felt I had no choice at the time. I fought it publicly and I was

MR. MORGAN: effective in getting it changed.

I know that from talking to the leader of our party and others in Ottawa; he changed the policy because he listened to what we in this party here had to say. But this same hon. gentleman is now admitting they have no influence with regard to getting policy changed, or influence on policies, period, as they pertain to the fishing industry in our Province. Now, that is the whole total weakness of the Liberal Party, they have no effect whatsoever on their party in Ottawa. That is the crux of all of this. Because, if a bad policy comes out, and this policy is going to affect more than 10 per cent of our catch, as I said today in the House, and today in a Telex to De Bane, and as I said in a conversation with him last week, it is a bad policy. If it is going to affect more than 10 per cent of the catch of our commercial fishermen, it is a bad policy. So let us get a bad policy changed. Now, I am going to fight it, but I am on the opposite side. It is not one of my colleagues in Ottawa who is bringing this policy in. It is one of the Opposition's colleagues in Ottawa who is bringing this policy in. Now, he is a fine man, a fine gentleman, but his policy and his advisers are wrong. He is out in his

MR. MORGAN:

estimation about 10 per cent, much more than that. So let us see the Liberal Party put its money where its mouth is. Let us get some action. Let us get some action from their position. If the Liberals in Ottawa, if they are sincere, let them fight it effectively.

Now why is it today, Mr. Chairman, that the herring fishery is closed? When the union is saying let us have a commercial herring fishery for fixed gear, Mr. Cashin is saying it, and I am saying it on behalf of Newfoundland Government, there has not been a word from the Liberal Party about the herring fishery and every inshore fisherman today along our coastline is asking us to take up the case for them and say we want a fixed gear herring fishery along the East and Northeast Coast of our Province. They are saying it. They are asking for it.

Now why is it, Mr. Chairman?

MR. TULK:
House again.

You are misleading the

MR. MORGAN: . Now if the Liberal Party was concerned for the inshore - now the hon. gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) must be sincere. I have no reason to question the hon. gentleman for Fogo about his sincerity, he represents a fishing district, he must be sincere or he would not be in the House today. Now why is it he could not get the herring policy changed?

MR. TULK:

I am crying!

MR. MORGAN:

Because he opposed it and again it fell on deaf ears. It fell on total deaf ears in Ottawa.

MR. MORGAN: The Liberal Party was not listened to. One of his own colleagues in Ottawa would not listen to him. Now how can a party aspire to become the government of this Province one of these days, fifteen or twenty years time maybe, aspire to becoming a government of this Province when they cannot even get along with their colleagues in Ottawa today which indeed is the Government of Canada, a government for the last number of years with a small break.

MR. TULK: The telegram said,
'Jim did not cry'.

MR. MORGAN: So the point is, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman in the Opposition is trying to make it look like - the media all know the difference, the public will know the difference - we do not set policies on harvesting, licencing, the length of the season, when the season opens, all of this is under federal government jurisdiction. Now that strengthens our argument for us to have more say over the fishing industry more than what we have. Mr. Chairman, we have no more say than the Liberal Party, not one word more say than the Liberal Party of this Province. But surely the Liberal Party, one of their own colleagues, the same political stripe in Ottawa, surely they would have more affect in dealing with him, putting forward their views in changing policy than an opposing party would have. Surely they would. So they are trying to make it look like now a bad policy comes forward from one of their colleagues, one of their own Liberal colleagues, and you want to make it look like we, the Government of Newfoundland, which has no say over the issue, that we are responsible for bad policy.

Now that, Mr. Chairman, is a clear example of the Liberal Party trying to play politics with fisheries and they keep on doing it. They try to twist the issues to try to make the government look bad or the minister look bad or the Premier look bad on fisheries matters. They keep

MR. MORGAN: on playing politics. And it is not a time to play politics.

Now let us join forces, Mr. Chairman.

I will make an appeal, Mr. Chairman, a very sincere appeal, My Telex today -

MR. TULK: You will be sorry.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman, look, we are talking about a serious matter, Mr. Chairman. Tell him to keep quiet over there.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: I will make an appeal, a very serious one. Let the Opposition combine with my efforts put forward today in a Telex on the issue, and let them show the Province of Newfoundland they have some -

MR. TULK: Fishery first!

MR. MORGAN: Keep quiet!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: He is embarrassed. He cannot listen. He is so embarrassed he cannot listen.

Mr. Chairman, my Telex went this morning and is now in Mr. De Bane's hands and it will be public, you will hear it this afternoon.

MR. TULK: Let us see it.

MR. MORGAN: We will get it this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, let me finish my appeal. If the hon. gentlemen in the Opposition are sincere about trying to get the policy changed, well let us .

MR. MORGAN: join forces and try to get it changed. Because up to now the Opposition was not listened to by the government in Ottawa. They sent telexes on March 5 - what was the date of the telex? - March 8, the telex?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. MORGAN: Went forward and the Liberal Government ignored them.

MR. BARRY: De Bane you said.

MR. MORGAN: My telex went off today and the Liberal Government hopefully will not ignore me but it has gone forward. My views went forward, Mr. Chairman, three weeks ago, two months. When we were travelling in Japan almost a month ago we had long discussion on the salmon fishery with Mr. McGrath there. Now, Mr. Chairman, I put forward my case then. We are almost identical on our positions, government and opposition, I will make a very sincere, serious appeal, let us put together our voices as one and go to Ottawa, in telex or in correspondence or a telephone conversation, call it what you wish, and let us get the Liberal policy changed.

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

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

MR. MORGAN: Oh, he cannot take it now.

MR. TULK: On a point of order. The minister is over there raving on and on about a telex he sent to the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) and he is looking for the agreement of this side. We are not going to take his word. When it puts it on the table and we have a look at it we will decide at that time whether we will

April 9, 1984

Tape No. 808

NM - 2

MR. TULK: agree with him or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): There is obviously no point of order.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I indeed welcome that.

MR. TULK: Put it on the table.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, tomorrow, I will have it tabled tomorrow.

MR. TULK: Why not do it now? We cannot wait. Get it done now. Send down and get it.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, if I would go around sending a telex one half an hour and putting it in the press the next half an hour, they would condemn me for doing that because I am being unfair in playing politics. Let us give the man a chance.

MR. TULK: You just wanted us to agree with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, you know the insincerity of the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is showing this afternoon because he is sitting so close to the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) over there. That is the reason why it is showing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the telex went forward to the minister. It will be in his hands this afternoon, the telex. And if the Liberal Party of Newfoundland, if they can show once throughout all the years - well, the last fourteen years for me here - that they can be effective in changing the Liberal policy in Ottawa well let us give them credit for it.

MR. TULK: Put your telegram on the table now.

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Chairman, there is no hesitation. It can be done tomorrow, Mr. Chairman. It is down in my office in Atlantic Place, I have not got it here with me.

MR. NEARY: I just had mine sent up.

MR. MORGAN: You can walk to your office next door. My office is down in Atlantic Place, down on Water Street.

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

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Chairman, let the Liberal Party prove at least once that they can be effective.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Could I have silence, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I have to remind hon. members that the -

MR. TULK: Where is the Telex - Table it!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I wish to remind hon. members that each member while speaking has the right to be heard in silence.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, telexes have gone forward from both the government and the Liberal Party, so they say, sometime ago, some weeks ago. They were ineffective. The policy now is different from what we thought it was going to be. So what I am saying is why be partisan on this issue? Why play politics? Let us combine our efforts, Opposition and Government. Let us go to Ottawa together with one voice and say, "Mr. De Bane, your advisers are wrong, Sir. Your policy, put forward based on

MR. MORGAN: advisers' opinion and advice, is wrong. We think your policy is wrong because there is going to be more than a 10 per cent reduction in the salmon taken by Newfoundland." Now if we go together with one voice maybe it will prove -

MR. TULK: You want credit for the policy.

MR. MORGAN: I do not want credit for changing the policy. What do I care if I get credit or not for the policy? I want it changed. Mr. Chairman, we will give the Liberal Party full marks, full credit for getting the policy changed if we can combine our efforts and change it.

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

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Fisheries has said that he sent a telex this morning to the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) concerning this programme. Now let me make two points for the minister; If that telex is to the advantage of the fishermen of this Province, the Liberal Party has no doubt about signing it or going forward against the Federal Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: And let me make one other point. If he wants that telex in this House by ten to five, he can write the note authorizing me to get it and I will go to his office and get it.

MR. MORGAN: Superman.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order, the hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I would submit it is quite obvious that there is no point of order. I would not insult the Chair's intelligence by putting that argument forward, but I think that what is obvious is that hon. members are using points of order in an attempt to interrupt the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. TULK: No. No.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: In this kind of debate, of course, there is an opportunity every ten minutes to go back and forth, so I would suggest that if the Opposition have any points to make that they make their points when they have the opportunity to speak rather than by continuous interruptions.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): To that point of order, I do

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

take note of the comment made by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) that each of the members here, every ten minutes, would have the opportunity to speak. There is no point of order, it is a difference of opinion. The hon. Minister of Fisheries' time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Opposition.

The hon. Leader of the

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, if you ever saw a man get himself into a trap, you saw the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) do it this afternoon. He told us in his earlier ten minute statement that the key issue was that the Liberals, the Opposition did not do anything about this matter until today. He said that was the key issue. And then my colleague, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), produced a telegram that we sent to hon. Pierre De Bane on March 8th, a month and one day ago. And, Mr. Chairman, let me point out to the hon. Minister of Fisheries that a copy of that telex went to Mr. Richard Cashin, to Mr. Roger Simmons and to a number of other people.

MR. MORGAN:

What was the reply?

MR. NEARY:

silence there please.

Mr. Chairman, could I have

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

I wish to once again remind hon. members that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has asked to be heard in silence. He should not have to request to be heard in silence, since it is his right.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, copies of my telex went to Mr. Richard Cashin, President of the Fishermen's Union, Mr. Roger Simmons. But who else did

MR. NEARY: copies of my telex go to? They went to at least four full-time fishermen, salmon fishermen in my district who had complained about the two weeks, let alone three weeks cut. Now the hon. gentleman tells us this afternoon in this hon. House that we cannot defend these full-time fishermen. Who are they? I will name them for the hon. gentleman.

MR. MORGAN: You cannot depend on anyone listening to you in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: I will name them for the hon. gentleman. Mr. Chairman, Michael Best -

MR. MORGAN: That is a Liberal. That is why you are defending him.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, Michael Best of Diamond Cove. Is he a part-time fishermen? Does he have a part-time license? Is he going to lose 50 per cent or more of his income? What about Albert Herritt in Rose Blanche? Is he a part-time fisherman? And what about Eric Strickland in Petites? Is he a part-time fisherman? And what about Roy Spicer in Rose Blanche? Is he a part-time fishermen?

MR. HOUSE: You should know. They are your constituents.

MR. NEARY: I should know and that is why I am defending against the accusations and attack of the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). He says you are only over there defending part-time fishermen. The biggest bulk of his income, Michael Best in Diamond Cove, comes from the Salmon fishery. Now Mr. Allan Munden is a part-time fisherman, but even a large part of his income comes from the commercial salmon fishery. Mr. Chairman, the fact

MR. NEARY: of the matter is that Mr. De Bane has politically seduced our provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). And I knew that it would only be a matter of time when they would have their little lovers' tiff. And now what does the hon. gentleman do? In order to try and kiss and make up to Mr. De Bane, what does he say in this House? He says Mr. De Bane advisors are wrong. His advisors are wrong. Is the hon. gentleman telling us that he listens to his advisors? Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that the buck stops with the minister. It is the minister who has to take the responsibility for his policy and not his advisors.

MR. MORGAN: Nobody is arguing with that.

MR. NEARY: But the hon. gentleman does not have the courage to say that Mr. De Bane's policy is wrong. He says it is his advisors.

MR. MORGAN: He is your colleague.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman says Mr. De Bane's advisors are wrong. Now we know why we do not have any provincial fishery policy. The hon. gentleman listens to his advisors too much. It is the minister who pioneers policy. It is the minister who has to accept the responsibility, the blame or the credit for his policies, and not his advisors. And it is a cowardly thing to say, Mr. Chairman, very cowardly, that it is his advisors who are wrong. It is the minister who is wrong and not his advisors. Just the same as that minister over there was wrong when he was in the rickshaw

MR. NEARY: in Tokyo with Mr. De Bane and they talked about the salmon fishery in Newfoundland and decided that he would go along with allowing two weeks to be whipped off the salmon season. My hon. friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) should be up, leap to his feet on this matter, because his salmon fishermen are going to be in trouble. The member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) and Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) and Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews).

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say this that I am prepared to put my two telexes on the table of the House - it would seem to me that the hon. gentleman does not even have his written yet - March 8th over a month ago and today, very strongly worded telexes not mamby-pamby or wishy-washy, very strongly worded. And I ask the Page to lay them on the table of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to switch now to another matter that I raised earlier today and it is the matter of record unemployment in this Province. I questioned the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) as to what specific programmes the administration has to deal with the record unemployment in this Province, and the hon. gentleman stood up and my ears nearly dropped off when I heard what he said. He said, 'Oh, we have been busy over here for the past fourteen years trying to clean up the mess the Liberals left behind'. In the last fourteen years they have not developed one policy or one programme of their own. They have not had one original idea of their own. They have shut down industry after industry. And the only answer I could get from the hon. gentleman was that they have been busy cleaning up, and he then went on to say that this minister and that minister and this minister were going to create jobs for our unemployed. Well, Mr. Chairman, let me tell the House what

MR. NEARY: the unemployment figure was. The member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) might be interested in this because I believe he was in law school at the time. In 1966 the hon. gentleman was in law school, the unemployment rate in Newfoundland was 5.5 per cent. In 1972 the unemployment rate took a sharp increase 9.2 per cent. When the government changed on January 18, 1972, our unemployment rate in this Province was 9.2 per cent. Well, what was it in 1975, three years after the Tories took over? It was 14 per cent. And what is it today, Mr. Chairman? It is a whopping 23.3 per cent. We have a total provincial labour force of 214,000 and the total number employed is 164,000 - 23.3 per cent. We are worse off now because of the gravity of the situation that we were in the depression years, more Newfoundlanders unemployed than in the depression years. Statistics Canada say 50,000 were unemployed. We happen to think it is closer to 100,000 because an awful lot of Newfoundlanders have given up looking for jobs. They have given up going around, going down to the manpower office and registering for employment. They have just given up, period. So the figure is closer to 100,000 we think, probably about 45 per cent of people available and able to work in this Province are unemployed and 21,000 or 25,000 are in the younger age bracket, between the ages of sixteen and twenty-four, and it is shameful that they should be unemployed at a crucial time in their life when they should be working.

Now, Mr. Chairman, how did the Tories celebrate fourteen years of doom and gloom, of closing down industry, one industry after another? How did they celebrate this horrendous track record? Well, they decided Saturday night that they would throw a party, Mr. Chairman,

MR. NEARY: They would have a party to celebrate five years of the present administration governing this Province. Mr. Chairman, how could they sit down in all conscience and celebrate something when they know the Province is on the brink of economic and financial ruin?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!
The hon. member's time has elapsed.
The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, every time the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) rises to his feet and talks about something and uses statistics, then one has to dig into the files and dig up a few of these statistics, because you have to have something to compare with just to see what really is the case in Newfoundland today as it was when the hon. member was a minister.

MR. WARREN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: A quorum call.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A quorum call, you say?

MR. WARREN: There is nobody here. Bring somebody in, for Heaven's sake.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.
Is it agreed to start? We have not gone the three minutes yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a quorum present. Is it agreed to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed.
The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: So, Mr. Chairman, what we really have to do when the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), as I was saying before, starts talking about statistics, really what we have to do is compare what is happening. He used the one figure about the unemployment rate, and that is an accurate figure according to Stats Canada, and I do not think there is anybody who can be proud of the fact that we have over 20 per cent unemployment rate in this Province. But what are we comparing it to?

The hon. Leader of the Opposition harkens back to the great days prior to 1971 and says that the unemployment rate at that point in time was 5.8 per cent. But really what you have to do, in order to do a complete analysis of the figures, is say how many people are capable of being in to the labour force. And of that number of people, how many people worked. And if you do that, we had 42.2 per cent was the employment rate. In other words, people did not bother to look for jobs.

The other factor that you have to look at is what happened to the labour force as it grew? Well, what happened to the labour force as it grew, and the hon. member will undoubtedly go to Stats Canada, but he can harken back to 1969-1970 and he will find that 7,000 - to get the figure accurate now - 7,734 Newfoundlanders left the Province.

MR. WARREN: What for?

MR. DINN: Just got out of the Province, there was no hope here.

MR. WARREN: When was that?

MR. DINN: In 1970-1971.

MR. WARREN: Just left?

MR. DINN: Well, now in 1983, he is comparing the high unemployment rate this year so we have to compare what

MR. DINN: happened before. Now the hon. member is interrupting. He will have ten minutes after I am finished. I just want to make sure that people are aware of what we are comparing here. So as the labour force grew, and it grew by about 8,000 a year, 7,000 of those people left the Province. They went to Toronto or Alberta or to the United States looking for work because there was no hope here. You had the John Doyles coming in and getting \$119 million to stick in their back pocket to go over to Europe to peddle a linerboard mill, that is what you had. There was no such thing as money for job creation. You got 500 jobs constructing, -

MR. WARREN: How many left in 1972?

MR. DINN: The hon. member is interrupting. I have asked for silence because I want to make sure -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. DINN: - he is clear about the figures. And he is out of order in the House. But the fact of the matter is that 7,000 Newfoundlanders in that year left the Province. They had no hope of anything. Now they had the odd hope when the former, former, Premier would stand on his pedestal and say, 'We are going to build a linerboard mill.' Well, who would not build a linerboard mill if somebody came along and said, 'Here is \$119 million, go out and build a linerboard mill. And if you lose any money on it, we will pay that to you, so you have no worries about losing money, and if you make the money, well, you can buy it from us for \$1.' And that is what happened in the linerboard case, that is what happened in the Come By Chance refinery case, that is what happened in those cases. In the case of the Upper Churchill, he said, 'You can have all of the water rights. Develop it. We will get a few jobs, and, thank God, I hope you will make a few dollars for the Province.' So

MR. DINN:

what did we get out of that?

After we paid \$167 million to buy back some of the rights, we get about \$16 million a year, which is not enough to pay the interest on the loan we got for the Upper Churchill. And the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has the nerve to get up in this House and say what are we doing?

MR. DINN: Just to compare now, 'This is the worst time,' he says, 'since 1932'. Well, the employment figure for last year, which is the latest Statistics Canada employment figure, is 42.6 per cent. That is better than any year recorded by Statistics Canada. 1966 was 42.2 - now this is supposed to be the worst - 1967 was 42.3, 1968 was 41.2, 1969 was 40.5. So the employment rate, the people who could go to work versus the people who went to work, in this drastic situation that we have now there are more working than there were in those years; plus the fact that when a person became ready to go to work, was available to go to work, the labour force did not increase. What happened was 7,000 people left the Province. So how many people left the Province last year? Well, a lot of people left and a lot of people came back, but the net figure shows that there are 800 more people in than out.

AN HON. MEMBER: Now, 1969, 1970 -

MR. WARREN: How many went out?

MR. DINN: Listen! The hon. member is going to get a bit of an education here and I am giving it to him in English, I know it is hard for him to understand everything. In 1969 we are talking about 7,000 people moving out. The employment rate of the people who could go to work versus the people who worked was lower than it is now, and this is supposed to be the worst, that is number two. Number three, people now are not moving out of the Province. They talked last year about a resettlement programme to Alberta. Well, they are not moving to Alberta, they are moving back. So what happened in the last month? The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) jumped up on his feet today in Question Period, he had something! Statistics Canada

MR. DINN: put out a figure. What was the figure? What was the figure that Statistics Canada put out? The figure that Statistics Canada put out was this: We had 6,000 more jobs in March than in February. Well, what does that mean? It does not mean that the unemployment rate went down, it actually went up, it was over 20 per cent. And why was that? That was because the labour force grew faster than the jobs.

MR. TULK: The number of jobs (inaudible).

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, I have had about five minutes. The hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), who apparently does not know any of the rules of the House, breaks them all the time, cannot sit in his seat and listen.

MR. SIMMS: He is only a rookie here.

MR. DINN: He is only a rookie in the House. He is the president of the party, he writes the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa (Mr. De Bane) and they will not listen to him. He sits in the House of Assembly and interrupts and breaks the rules all the time. Of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) he says, 'You are doing nothing for the fishery.' The Minister of Fisheries several weeks ago went out to Fogo and paid \$1 million to keep the Co-op alive out there so his fishermen would have a place to sell their fish, Mr. Chairman, and he says, 'They are doing nothing for the fishery.' The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) gets up and says, 'They are doing nothing; they are closing hospital beds,'

Mr. Chairman -

MR. TULK: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): On a point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. DINN: - and we build our first hospital in Port aux Basques. And now the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) cannot take it and he is rising on a point of order which will be ruled no point of order.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is - I think it is unknowingly - misleading this House when he says that the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) paid \$1 million to keep the Fogo Island Co-op going. As a matter of fact, they have not paid anything, all they have done is guaranteed a loan, which is appreciated on Fogo Island; but do not try to make believe that you are passing out gifts and money to Fogo Island, that is misleading this House.

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: To that point of order, the hon. member knows that if the Fogo Co-op did not get the loan guarantee from this government it would not be open. Now that is what it means. It saved the jobs for the people in the co-op out in Fogo and that is the point that I was making and the hon. member knows that. He knows I was making some good points in the House and it was only a point of interruption, which is out of order, and indeed it is no point of order at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please! To that point of order, I have heard enough arguments on that point of order. There is no point of order, merely a clarification on behalf of the hon. member for Fogo.

The hon. Minister of Labour
and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Do I have a minute left,
Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: About a minute and a half.

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, so I make the
following points. Number one, -

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman
in his statement over there referred to the hospital in
Port aux Basques, and I can only say to the hon. gentleman
that it is due to the hard work of the member and the
hospital committee. But let me ask the hon. gentleman this,
is the hon. gentleman aware that any government worth its
salt would have put up a loan and guarantee for the Fogo
Co-op? Any government! They did not give them anything.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman not aware that any government would have done the same thing to save that co-op in Fogo? Or is the hon. gentleman saying that it is the only government over there that would do it? He should go back and look at the record over the last thirty-five years in this Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please! To that point of order, there is no -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower, to that point of order.

MR. DINN: Now obviously there is no point of order and I would be giving some credibility to the hon. member if I said there was. There is no point of order but the hon. member is attempting to kill my time in the House because I only have a minute and a half left. He stood up in this House for ten minutes, I shot down every argument that he had. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) interrupted, he could not take the truth. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) interrupted about the hospital, the first hospital that we built in our five year programme was the hospital that we built in Port aux Basques, so there is no bias there. So, Mr. Chairman, it was just a point of interruption. They cannot take the truth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order, I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower's time has elapsed.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, I just tried to listen to the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), and if there was ever a minister who tried to blindfold the people in this Province the minister has been trying to do it for the last two and a half years.

The minister knows that the unemployment rate in this Province is getting worse and it is thanks to this government that we have such a high unemployment rate in this Province. And the minister just now got up on his feet and he started talking about the Upper Churchill; he started talking about the linerboard mill. All I could say is God bless the Premier of the day who had the intestinal fortitude of making sure as many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians went to work as could go to work. Because, Mr. Chairman, since that hon. gentleman left power in 1972, all we have seen in this Province is a downward trend. And for some reason this government figure that people should not go to work. So what they did was close down the linerboard mill, they sold out to John Crosbie. We have to blame John Crosbie, Mr. Chairman, for the demise of people not going to work in this Province, for people not finding employment.

Mr. Chairman, on the Upper Churchill, I believe the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) at the time when the deal was made was in the House, is that right my hon. leader?

MR. NEARY: Oh, absolutely, Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WARREN: He was the Leader of the Opposition at the time when the Upper Churchill deal was signed.

MR. NEARY: He voted for it.

MR. WARREN: - and he was one of the main persons, the Leader of the Opposition, and I believe the other member was the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey). Was he there?

April 9, 1984

Tape No. 813

NM - 4

MR. NEARY: Yes, he voted for it, too.

MR. WARREN: He was there also, And the former member for St. John's Centre, I believe, Ank Murphy, was he there?

MR. NEARY: Yes, and he voted for it.

MR. WARREN: That is right.. So those are the three hon. members, on the Opposition side at the time, agreed with the Upper Churchill. Because

MR. WARREN:

they agreed with the Upper Churchill the same as the hon. minister today, if he had his way, would agree with the Lower Churchill. They would agree because they want to see people in Newfoundland and Labrador employed. That was the main reason, Mr. Chairman. And you can say what you like that Mr. Smallwood took every gamble in the world, he lost many and he won a few, but one thing we can say about the hon.

Premier that we have today is that he will not lose very many attempts, he will not lose very many because he has not tried either one yet. How can you lose any when you have not even tried? Maybe I should correct myself. The Premier tried once and he succeeded, unfortunately for the Newfoundlanders and Labradorian, he succeeded on April 6th in bringing forty-four Conservatives into this House. He succeeded, he manipulated the people of this Province.

MR. TOBIN:

When?

MR. WARREN:

On April 6, 1982. And the

hon. member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) was one of the fortunate ones who came in on the coattail of the hon. Premier. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman from Burin - Placentia West will go just as fast on the Premier's coattail. He will go out just as fast as he came in because all we need is the Premier to call an election any time. Let us face it, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member from Placentia (Mr. Patterson), he just now said we want Richard Cashin on this side. Mr. Chairman, we do not care if there is Richard Cashins or Christine Fagans or the Harry Steeles, we do not care who they are as long as they are fighting Newfoundlanders and people who are going to fight for the rights of the people. That is the kind of people we want. We do not want someone to run this Province like the Premier is running it. We do

MR. WARREN: not want a Minister of Fisheries to go up to Ottawa and get a deal and come back and the Premier will say, no, it is no good. We do not want a Minister of Fisheries who has to be beckoned to. We do not want a Minister of Fisheries to come into this House and not tell the truth which he did today, Mr. Chairman. Listen, Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned it is not correct and, Mr. Chairman, furthermore if I said the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) did not tell the truth I withdraw it, but he did not tell the whole truth.

However, Mr. Chairman, to continue on my trend of thought, since I saw the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) was going to get up on a point of order, so to save time I am sure I can continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WARREN: The hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt), I should tell him that in all fairness to him that one of his strongest supporters, one of his most vigorous organizers is now out to get him. So he may as well be prepared.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I apologize the hon. members took me off my train of thought. Let us go back and look at the jobless rate in the Province. Now the hon. members are representing forty-four districts on that side of the House, and just look at the jobless rate in Bonavista North, a member on the government side. Look at the jobless rate in Burin - Placentia West and compare it to three years ago when they had a Liberal member down there. See what a difference there was. So you see, Mr. Chairman, it all boils down to that the people have been fooled, they have been fooled, completely blindfolded by the Premier and now you listen to the

MR. WARREN:

Open Lines in the morning, you read the newspapers, you go our around the bay and you talk to them, you go down to the Board of Trade, you go down to the Newfoundland Hotel, wherever you go everybody is saying, 'When can we get rid of this government?' In fact, I had a call the other evening from Bonavista and, Mr. Chairman, what he said was, 'How can we get rid of this government? Can you fellows call an election?' I only wish that we had the same kind of rules in Newfoundland as they have in the United States. I only wish that the Premier could be only elected the same as the President of the United States for only two terms, four year a term, eight years maximum. I would say the Premier now probably would be looking for the job his brother got, because by now I am sure he would be prepared to look for another job because he would know that the people would be so sick and tired of him that they would have to get rid of him.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) may get up and say a few words about the employment rate in Baie Verte-White Bay, and I will say it is one of the few districts in this Province where we have seen, in the past two or three years, surging employment, in the Baie Verte area, where the mines closed down, and, all of a sudden we have people employed and the mine was taken back again. The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is right excited about this. I should say he should be excited about this because 90 per cent of the money is federal money that has gone in there, in Baie Verte- White Bay. This is why people have gone back to work in Baie Verte-White Bay, because it is federal money going in to get the mine revitalized. This is why there is employment.

MR. TOBIN: Who got that?

MR. WARREN: Mr. Rompkey got it, of course. You know who got it. And, Mr. Chairman, you know why the Marystown Shipyard is going to stay going.

MR. NEARY: They bought the vessel down there, \$14 million.

MR. TOBIN: How much?

MR. NEARY: \$14 million.

MR. TOBIN: Roger and I say \$19 million.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Simmons to you.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, you can see that only for the federal government we would be a doomed we would be a goner. And the hon. gentleman from Carbonear (Mr. Peach) just came in and sat down, and he is so scared over in Carbonear, with the upsurge of the Liberals in the poll over there, he may as well go back teaching. He may as well make sure he gets in contact with the school board over there as soon as he can because if the Premier calls an election he is a dead duck.

MR. TOBIN: There is one other thing he can do; get so scared he will get some experience in real estate fast.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member wants to talk about real estate, by all means, why not, because there is no problem there. In fact, I have twenty houses for sale in Nain at \$1.00 each that this government owns. If the hon. member wants to buy some houses, I have twenty in Nain selling for \$1.00 each.

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

April 9, 1984

Tape No. 815

ah-3

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member for
Baie Verte-White Bay has approximately three minutes.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, that is just
the thing I wanted to speak about on the public record
for the three or four minutes that are left. We have
never seen the

MR. RIDEOUT:

likes of it, Mr. Chairman, what has happened in this House this particular session with the discussion at the estimates that had to be done here in Committee of the Whole. We have Consolidated Fund Services, Executive Council, and two or three others that must be done here on the floor of the House.

Now what are we talking about?

We spent the last two and a half or three weeks in Committee of the Whole here doing Consolidated Fund Services. But what are we talking about, Mr. Chairman? Granted, you can raise any -

MR. NEARY:

The public debt.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, we are talking about \$1.9 million under this head which is discretionary. The other \$365 million under this head is statutory. There is nothing you can do about it no matter if God himself was here running the government. It is statutory. It is public debt, it is employment retirement programmes and things like that. And the Opposition, so let it be noted, Mr. Chairman, that out of all the discretionary money that the government is responsible for spending in Executive Council, in the Ombudsman's Office, in the Auditor General's Office, in the Legislative vote, out of all of those several millions of dollars, the Opposition have taken whatever time was available, however many hours - I do not know, I did not check with the Table - but I know it was several hours the Opposition have taken talking about a discretionary vote of \$1.9 million. Now that is what they have done. And, Mr. Chairman, it is a crime to the taxpayer of this Province. It is a crime that not one question was asked about spending in Executive Council. Nothing was asked about what the Ombudsman was doing with the several million dollars that goes down to keep his office going, or nothing was asked about the Auditor General, or nothing was asked about the thousand and one other things for

MR. RIDEOUT: which there are several millions of dollars provided in those heads that must be debated and passed here on the floor of this House.

Mr. Chairman, it is a crime.

I will say that the Opposition have let down the people of this Province. They have let them down badly. They have refused to debate the estimates that are to be debated in Committee of the Whole on the floor of the House, and that will get out. They spent all of their time, the last several hours, talking about \$1.9 million. That is the only discretionary money that is in this \$365 million. All the the rest is statutory. All the rest is taken care of by statutes of this House. All the rest, no matter if they were over here or no matter if anybody was over here, would have to be provided anyway because it is statutory financing. It is statutory. There is nothing you can do about it. And they are taking all of the time of the House just to talk about \$1.9 million. They have taken the last several weeks just to talk about \$1.9 million. They have not asked anything on the Executive Council. They have not asked anything on all the other several millions that are going to go now, I suppose thirty seconds time, that are going to go. Mr. Chairman, what we got left? We have nine hours Concurrence Debates that is what we have left, when you cannot get into an individual head and talk about a particular item. Those items were to go head by head in this House. And it is unfair, it is a total dereliction of duty that the Opposition did not make sure that every head that was to be debated on the floor of this House was debated. Then, Mr. Chairman, you had them making weird cries about wanting to take all of the estimates back on the floor of this House. And I saw that! I saw it one year in the seventy-five hours one year, Mr. Chairman, we did two departments and started the third. I hope it never happens again. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward)

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please!

On motion 1.1 through

1.2.1.05 carried.

On motion Head I - Consolidated

Fund Services , carried.

On motion 2.1.1.01 through 2.2.03.

01.02, carried.

On motion Head II - Legislative,

carried.

On motion 3.1.1.01.01 through

3.3.2.01.06 carried.

On motion Head III - Executive

Council, carried.

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

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

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report the passing of Head I, Consolidated Fund Services; Head II, Legislative; Head III, Executive Council, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee reports that they have considered the matters to them referred, report having passed Heads I, Consolidated Fund Services; II, Legislative; and III, Executive Council and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I think it has been agreed with the Opposition that the motion, notice of which was given by the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross), which will be the motion on the Concurrence Debate on the Government Services Committee, would be called now. So before the hon. gentleman gets up to present the motion, the rules would allow thirty minutes for each speaker. Now, in some years, the House has gone with - but that would have to be by agreement - ten minutes for each. So really, the government is open to whichever way as long as we agree; in other words, would members prefer to have the full thirty minutes - they do not have to use them - or to go as we do in Committee with ten minute intervals?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I believe in the past

MR. NEARY: the custom has been that the gentleman moving the motion would speak for fifteen minutes, somebody on this side would reply for fifteen minutes, and then we would have ten minutes back and forth the same as in Committee of the Whole. That is the way we would prefer to do it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: We can certainly agree that there will be fifteen minutes allocated for the presenter of the motion, fifteen minutes to the speaker of the Opposition who replies immediately thereto, and then ten minute periods afterwards for this, and presumably for the other Concurrence Debates as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that the speaking times be as allocated?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. CROSS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSS: Certainly, I can say all that I have to say in fifteen minutes.

I want to apologize today for having a very rough voice and a very heavy head, a product of this 'flu that is on the go, and all I hope is that not too many hon. members will be afflicted and put in as much time sneezing, coughing and barking as I have over the past week.

Certainly, I will say it is a pleasure for me to lead off the debate in the Concurrence

MR. CROSS:

Debate for the Government

Services Committee.

First, I would like to thank all the members of the Committee for their active participation in debate in the Government Services Committee. Also, I would like to thank the ministers of the various departments, The Departments of Finance, Public Works, Transportation, Labour and Manpower and Municipal Affairs, for their co-operation at these Committee meetings and the adequate way in which they did answer the questions that were put to them.

In my opinion, the Committee system is working well. Under the old system where all the debating took place in the House, very often

MR. CROSS: some department estimates were passed without any scrutiny whatsoever. Under the committee system all departments of government are debated for at least three hours, and then each committee's estimates is given a further three hours in the Concurrence Debate in the House. While the Opposition members criticize the committee system from time to time, I believe that it is only for the sake of opposing.

Government has done its best to ensure that the Opposition is catered to. This year only one committee meeting was held at any given time, which means that any member of the eight in Opposition could have attended the meetings. For that matter, Mr. Speaker, the whole eight in Opposition could have attended at any time if they so desired.

Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to note that in the Department of Transportation this year we will be spending some \$36 million in capital works, \$15 million of which will be expended on highway and bridge rehabilitation, and \$21 million will be spent on upgrading and paving of secondary highway systems, and the construction of new bridges.

Mr. Speaker, this work will create much needed employment for our people in the areas where the work is carried out.

Mr. Speaker, also in the Department of Public Works, the extension to the Confederation Building Complex will continue and a further \$11 million will be spent this year. The new hospitals at Clareville, and Burin, on the Burin Peninsula, will continue during this year and a further \$12 million will be spent. The institute for the Fisheries and Marine Technological College, which is cost shared with the

MR. CROSS: federal government, will continue, and an Arts and Culture Centre will be built for Labrador and become a reality. Mr. Speaker, again the capital works projects will mean employment for people.

Mr. Speaker, Municipal Affairs again this year will spend some \$25 million in capital works projects in water and sewer. Mr. Speaker, over the last eight years millions of dollars have been spent in the district of Bonavista North for water and sewer projects. We have had ongoing capital works in Municipal Affairs in water and sewer projects in the communities of Gambo, Dover, Greenspond, Trinity, Badger's Quay and Wesleyville.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that it has taken a little longer than one would like and the main reason is that we need more dollars for these projects. I have every confidence that more will be found.

Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the departments that did come before the Committee for Government Services got detailed scrutiny and a lot of information was given by the ministers for the various departments. The ministers and their staffs co-operated in supplying answers to questions that were asked. Our Committee, Mr. Speaker, approved for the five departments in Government Services a total of \$274 million.

Thank you.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we just heard valid reasons why the committee system is not working. It has not worked in the past, it is not working now, and it will not work in the future. And the hon. gentleman just confirmed for the ears of hon. gentlemen in this House why it is not working.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I might say for the benefit of the hon. gentleman who moved concurrence for the estimates of these departments that there was more representation from the Opposition than there was from government members at these meetings. But the trouble is, Mr. Speaker, that the reason the government favours this system so much is that the media coverage is very meager indeed.

It is good coverage what you get but it is very meager. I would say most of the time The Daily News, loyal and faithful, have been there consistently. CBC occasionally, not regularly, occasionally; the rest of the media could not care less. Now, Mr. Speaker, why is that I wonder? I would assume that they are probably short staffed.

MR. MORGAN:

CBC short staffed?

MR. NEARY:

No. I am talking about The Evening Telegram and VPCM and CQ radio, probably short staffed or they are disinterested because they figure it is just a gigantic farce anyway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I went to a couple of meetings this year and let me say what the experience was. Here we are scrutinizing the estimates of ministers' departments, but if you criticize the minister or if you ask a penetrating question of the minister, what happens to the government members on the Committee? Do they ask questions of the minister? Do they criticize the minister? No. Here is what they do. When an Opposition member criticizes the minister or asks embarrassing and penetrating questions, the government members then think it is their job to defend the minister.

MR. SIMMS:

How many meetings did you attend?

MR. NEARY: I attended about four, I guess, and, Mr. Speaker, that was what I saw: A gigantic farce, that is all it is. Mr. Speaker, I have to repeat again what I have said so often in this House, that the government, when they sold Mr. Jamieson on the idea of reforming Parliament, and he figured that was the legacy that he was going to leave behind in his short span as Leader of the Opposition in this House and Leader of the Liberal Party, in his short, tenure while he was crossing over the bridge, Mr. Speaker, in his short span in this hon. House, we were told, and as a matter of fact we have it in writing, that the government would review the rule changes after a year's experience. They did not do that, they will not allow the rule changes to be reviewed. They are forcing this Committee system on the House. It is far inferior, Mr. Speaker, it is inferior to the old system we used to have in this House, and the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) will recall the system when you would scrutinize the estimates. There were only three members here once - ~~thirty-nine~~ to three.

MR. SIMMS: You would only cover one or two departments then.

MR. NEARY: One or two departments! Mr. Speaker, who put the limit on debate?

MR. SIMMS: That is all you would ever get done.

MR. NEARY: That is not all we would get done! That is where the hon. gentleman is wrong.

MR. SIMMS: Read the Hansards and you will see.

MR. NEARY: Do not worry, I was here. I have been here for twenty-two years.

MR. SIMMS: If you were here you do not remember. How many times did you end up saying, 'We did not finish this department or that department'?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, every department of government was scrutinized in great detail.

MR. SIMMS: That is not so.

MR. NEARY: That is so. There were only three members of the Opposition over here once and they, Mr. Speaker, under the system we had, were able to scrutinize the estimates far better than is done today.

MR. DINN: That was because of their quality.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the system was far superior to what we have today. The reason they want to continue the system, of course, is they know the media are not interested, they get bored with it, they do not have the staff, irregular hours, and so the people of this Province are not getting the information that they should be getting from the eyes and ears of this House. They are getting shafted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, once you remove the power of the purse from the Legislature, you strip that Legislature of its power, everything is gone. One thing that the administration there opposite have succeeded in is moving the authority off the floor

MR. NEARY:

of the House of Assembly down to the eighth floor in the Cabinet Room and down in the Colonial Building before the Committees, and I think it is shameful. And now, Mr. Speaker, they put a limit on debate. The hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) got up earlier and went in to a great harangue about how we did not debate this and we did not debate that. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to stay here all Summer, if necessary, to scrutinize the estimates and to debate the estimates. But the administration there opposite put a limit on debate. When we had the old system there was no limit on debate, no limit. The old system was, Mr. Speaker, that you would come into this House, the budget would be taken item by item, there would be a complete analysis of every item in the estimates, questions would be asked, ministers would have to answer and defend their departments, which they do not have to do now. They do not have to do that now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

Did you vote for it?

MR. NEARY:

No, I did not vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, we would like to see live broadcasts of the sessions of the House. We know the government would not welcome, they do not relish that idea, they are afraid of it. They do not have the courage, they do not want the people to see what goes on in their House. They do not want the people to see how bankrupt of ideas they are. They do not want the people to see how they try to cover up for their incompetence and their mismanagement. So, Mr. Speaker, as a result, the government - the government, not the Opposition - the government have refused to allow daily broadcasts of the House of Assembly. It is being done in practically every other jurisdiction

MR. NEARY: except here in Newfoundland.

MR. SIMMS: Not true.

MR. NEARY: It is true. It is being done in Westminster, in the Mother of Parliaments, it is being done in Ottawa, just about every other jurisdiction in the world except Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. And we are not surprised that they will not allow live sessions of the House of Assembly. We would have loved to get into Executive Council, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman told us we skipped over Legislative and Executive Council. We would have loved to get into it except for the limit on the debate. Time ran out, Mr. Speaker. So the Committee system is not working, it is not going to work. We have a budget of almost \$2 billion. The items are not being adequately scrutinized. It is virtually impossible to do it. And, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious now that the government are going for a short session of the House. All you have to do is look at the Order Paper, the way they are trying to ram things through this House.

MR. SIMMS: Ram them?

MR. NEARY: Yes, the estimates, ram the estimates through. They are trying to bring the Opposition to their knees, they are trying to grind

MR. NEARY:

us down and wear us out, Mr. Speaker. You are here morning, evening and night and it is virtually impossible to do justice to it. Now, Mr. Speaker, take a look at the Order Paper and compare it to other years. Just to show you how the administration is going for a short session of the House, on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, you have five bills so far, and the House has been open since March 12. Four of those are in second reading stage and one Committee of the Whole, and we will probably dispense of that later on this afternoon, the Young Offenders Act. That will leave us with four pieces of legislation on the Order Paper, four, Mr. Speaker. And in addition to that we have five money bills. So once the money bills are disposed of there is no legislation worthwhile on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, and the House will grind to a halt, the House will close. And I would not be a bit surprised but hon. gentlemen there opposite are trying to get their holidays before the school children get their Easter holidays. But they will not succeed. I can tell them right now they will not succeed. It is going to be a long, hot Summer in this House if we have anything to do with it, Mr. Speaker. They will get their holidays Ash Wednesday or Holy Thursday, and hon. gentlemen over there already have their reservations booked for the sunny climates, Mr. Speaker, hoping the House will shut down, the House will grind to a halt. After today on the Order Paper we will have four pieces of legislation in addition to five money bills. And the money bills have to be passed, the Budget debate has to finish, Mr. Speaker, before they can adjourn the House for a Fall session. That is the strategy of the

MR. NEARY: administration there opposite. And then the hon. gentleman from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has the face to get up and accuse us of procrastination, wasting time, when it was the administration. When he was over here, by the way, he criticized that administration for limiting debate and it was the administration that he is now supporting, Mr. Speaker, that brought in the changes to limit debate in this hon. House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the headings that we are doing now is Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. DINN: Labour and Manpower.

MR. NEARY: Labour and Manpower. I would like to revert back to something I talked about earlier today. I might say, by the way, in passing, that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) pulled a doublecross on my colleague. We were suppose to have a second session with the Minister of Manpower and my colleague, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), when he asked him about it that day he was told there was no need for him coming down. And then when nobody showed up he criticized the Opposition for not having anybody there. I was out for the opening of the hospital that I fought so hard for in Port aux Basques. Mr. Speaker, what a record I have! Two hospitals now. When I was the member for Bell Island, a hospital. When I was the member for LaPoile, a hospital in Port aux Basques. Mr. Speaker, not a bad member. And my hon. colleague, I have to congratulate him for getting his ferry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to revert back to Manpower because we did not get a chance to finish up the estimates that night. I was out in

MR. NEARY:

Port aux Basques and my colleagues were told that they need not come. But, Mr. Speaker, the Premier and his Tory friends this past weekend celebrated at a special party the five years of the administration's rule in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, while the hon. gentlemen were out celebrating, there were few people in this Province, in Newfoundland and Labrador, who had little to celebrate about. On Saturday night they were celebrating five years of this administration -

MR. BAIRD: You had better be brief. You only have ten minutes.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. They like to brag Mr. Speaker, the Premier likes to brag about willing he is to hang tough.

MR. TULK: Where was this on Saturday night?

MR. NEARY: The Knights of Columbus Hall, they had a big do over there to celebrate. 200 or 300 Tories got together to have a party. Well, the hon. gentleman did not enjoy himself as well as he did down at the Thirty-fifth Anniversary of Confederation.

MR. TULK: You mean they only had 300 people out for a celebration?

MR. NEARY: They had 200 or 300 people out to celebrate five years of Toryism, Mr. Speaker. And the hon. gentleman, who likes to advise Newfoundlanders to hang tough, spoke for an hour and bored everybody to death, rehashed and repeated things that we have been hearing in this Province now for the last five years.

"Fight the good fight", he says,
"Fight the good fight, we are going to hang tough,"
Mr. Speaker. But anybody who knows, who can read in between

MR. NEARY: the lines knows what is being said, knows what is going on, that it is not the Premier who is hanging tough, he is asking the people of Newfoundland to hang tough while he himself has his private dining room and his apartment over at Tiffany Towers, and his two cars to drive around in, Mr. Speaker. But he asked the people of this Province to hang tough, asked the unemployed, "Hang tough," the people on social assistance, "Hang tough", the people who are sick, "Hang tough", while he himself lives in the lap of luxury.

Mr. Speaker, on the weekend
Statistics Canada -

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

MR. NEARY: Fifteen minutes, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Fifteen minutes? The hon. member had fifteen minutes?

MR. NEARY: Oh, absolutely.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Fifteen minutes for the opening and then ten minutes after.

MR. SPEAKER: Just check with the Table to make sure that it is fifteen minutes.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I believe Your Honour was not in the Chair when the agreement was made, Mr. Speaker, and the agreement was that there would be fifteen minutes for the proposer of the motion, and fifteen minutes for the Opposition member who replied, and then there be ten minutes after. It is different from the rules, but it is agreed it would be done that way.

MR. SPEAKER: I was just checking with the Table to make sure the hon. member had fifteen minutes his first time up. He had fifteen minutes.

MR. NEARY:

Fifteen minutes is up?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Recreation and Youth.

The hon. member for Culture,

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

He already spoke.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, he already spoke. But, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to speak briefly on this debate on this concurrence motion that has been put forth by the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross), and specifically I wanted to make some comments with respect to the committee system and try to address some of the comments that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) made with respect to the committee system.

I must say, first of all, that it is a speech

MR. SIMMS:

that I have heard over and over and over and over and over. There is nothing at all new in what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) had to say. His criticisms are the same as they always have been. No substance, nothing new at all with respect to the issue which he dwelt at length on, which was the operation of the Committee system itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of being in the Chair at the time when these rules were brought into the House, And these rules were agreed to by both sides, I believe, with one possible exception on the other side. But for the most part, the Liberal Party officially endorsed the rule changes bringing in the Committee system and certainly we endorsed them. They were only brought in after a considerable amount of discussion had taken place between both sides, particularly the Premier and the then Leader of the Opposition, one of the most distinguished Canadians -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

- that we have, one of the most distinguished parliamentarians that we have ever known, somebody who is well experienced in parliament and parliamentary activities.

MR. RIDEOUT:

He had lunch with the Queen the other day.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, just recently he had lunch at Windsor Castle, I believe, with the Queen. Now surely the then Leader of the Opposition who supported the rule changes bringing in this Committee system, a distinguished parliamentarian, and obviously somebody of that stature, Mr. Speaker, would not agree to these rule changes -

MR. CARTER:

If they were not for the best.

MR. SIMMS: - Unless they were not for the best, exactly, as my friend for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) tells me.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I would not doubt the Queen supports them.

MR. SIMMS: Well, I am not sure. if I would go that far. I have no knowledge of what the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) is suggesting. perhaps if he has knowledge he will raise it in debate later on during the course of debate on this particular Concurrence Motion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that what has transpired since the initiation of this Committee system is an opportunity has been provided for members of the Opposition in particular, as well as private members on this side of the House, but particularly members of the Opposition, to give them the opportunity to question ministers about expenditures related to their department and to scrutinize their department's estimates, whereas in the past it was always one or two members, particularly one member, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), who is now the Leader of the Opposition. And hon. members only have to reflect back a few years ago when the old system was in place, when you had the member for LaPoile being the one individual to monopolize the time that was allotted for debate on the estimates and scrutiny on the estimates of various departments. And so, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly, I suspect, the reason why he is opposed to the present system because he does not have the same opportunities he did then in Committee, in the House when he could get up and go on ad infinitum about the same old stuff that we hear day after day in this Legislature and that the people of this Province are quickly becoming tired of. And that is exactly the reason, Mr. Speaker, why the hon. Leader of the Opposition is opposed to the Committee system.

MR. SIMMS: The member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) I know has attended many of the Committee meetings and has taken the opportunity to scrutinize the estimates of various departments and has asked some good, penetrating questions undoubtedly, and has received some very competent answers, too, I might say, from what I have seen and heard.

MR. MORGAN: Who? Who?

MR. BARRY: After awhile.

MR. SIMMS: The member for Mount Scio just came in and he is not aware, of course, that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has been criticizing the Committee system and saying that it does not give the opportunity for members to scrutinize departmental estimates. And I am trying to point out and put forth an argument that that is not accurate, that is not so.

Mr. Speaker, I found in the five years or so that I had had the opportunity to observe the working of this Committee system that it is working extremely well -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: - as opposed to in the old days, when the estimates were in Committee of the House, right here in the Legislature, and what happened frequently, Mr. Speaker, is that the Leader of the Opposition in particular and the member for LaPoile would get on with the usual foolishness that he gets on with and took up the whole amount of time that was available and, as a result,

MR. SIMMS: they would only get the chance to scrutinize two or three government departments' estimates - and hon. members opposite know that this is true and quite accurate - and as a result of that, many departments, of course, did not get scrutinized at all. That is not the case now, Mr. Speaker, with this Commi'tee system. That is not the case any longer. All government departments in the past four or five years since the Committee system has been in - I have attended lots of the meetings - and most of the departments, if not all of them, have been scrutinized and all members opposite, as well as private members on this side, have had the opportunity to ask questions with respect to the estimates of the various government departments. That, Mr. Speaker, is quite different from the way it was in the old days when the estimates were debated right here in the Legislature in Committee; because, as I said, there was so much time taken up with foolishness and repetitiveness that many things did not get scrutinized or addressed.

Mr. Speaker, we have other examples of the Committee system working in this Province, working quite nicely. The Public Accounts Committee, which has a majority, I admit, of government members, the same as Estimates Committees, seems to be working quite favourable. I never hear the members complaining about the operation or workings of the Public Accounts Committee. It seems to be working very well.

MR. NEARY: It is a different system.

MR. SIMMS: It is not a different system. You have a majority of government members and you have a Chairman who is an Opposition member, quite rightly so, and I believe that that Committee system worked quite nicely. I think that the Select Committees that we have

MR. SIMMS: had in the House have worked very well. So I believe that the Committee system is working well in other areas and, certainly, the Committee system with respect to the estimates, I believe, is working extremely well. And as I said, Mr. Speaker, to repeat myself, when these rules were initiated back in 1979, I believe it was, it was done with the concurrence of both sides of the House with one possible exception - with one possible exception, I acknowledge that, but it was done with the concurrence of both sides of the House and after a good deal of discussion had taken place between the leaders and House leaders and so on.

MR. NEARY: It was supposed to be reviewed after a year.

MR. SIMMS: I suspect the rules are always under review, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour knows that very, very well.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make that point, because, as I say, I was honoured to be in the Chair at the time those rules were brought in and I remember the debate on them and the discussion that took place, and certainly, at that time, it was well accepted by both sides of the House.

MR. NEARY: No, it was not.

MR. SIMMS: It was well accepted by both sides of the House, 99 per cent of them.

MR. DINN: That is right.

MR. SIMMS: And I believe, Mr. Speaker, after having the last five years to experience the working of these Estimates Committees, that they have proven to be successful, very successful. Every government department gets scrutinized, as opposed to the past, when only two or three got scrutinized because time was taken up so much

MR. SIMMS: with foolishness and repetitive-
ness, and the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) knows
very well what I am referring to.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with
those few remarks. Thank you.

SOME SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I want also to
make a few remarks.

I am surprised that we are
discussing the estimates on Finance, Public Works,
Transportation, Municipal Affairs, and Labour and Manpower
and the minister who stands up to make a few comments is
not the minister for either of those five departments.
The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is back
there having a coffee somewhere, the Minister of Municipal
Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) is there in her seat, I believe
the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) is around some-
where, and -

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Transportation
(Mr. Dawe) is up in the gallery.

MR. WARREN: - the Minister of Transportation
is up in the gallery. Here they are now, they are
coming into the House. And neither one of the five of
them would talk about how the Committee meetings work.
And the minister of another department has to be the guy
who gets up and says a few words. Why? Because he was
the Speaker of the House at the time the rules were brought
in.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. WARREN: As far as he was concerned it was his doing so, therefore, he had to get up and probably try to correct the record. However, I have to say in all fairness that the Committee system should be looked at, should be reviewed. I believe it can work better than it works. I believe last year there were two or three meetings on at one time, which is not happening this year so far. The only problem, and I believe the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said it, is unfortunately that the estimates are not getting the media attention that it deserves. The estimates are not getting the media attention that they deserve.

MR. TULK: That is true.

MR. WARREN: And I believe, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness there are a lot of things that are not coming out on the floor of the House because of time restraints and the media is not picking it up and Newfoundlanders and Labradorians out there do not realize the complete chaos and turmoil that the different departments are in. Now take, for example, Public Works and Services, My hon. colleague, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), has asked the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) very serious questions and the minister even admitted there were things going wrong, and all we could see in one medium was two lines saying that the hon. minister admitted there was something going wrong. Now, you know, I have to say this too, Mr. Speaker, and that is if there is any credit to be given to a particular newspaper, a particular medium in this Province, I think hon. members on both sides of this House will say that The Daily News did cover more than any other media. The Daily News gave more coverage to the estimates than any media. I can see hon. members on the other side nodding their heads in the affirmative. In fact, for many of the estimates they were the only ones present. And that same newspaper members on the other side describe it as a rag.

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

MR. MORGAN:

Oh, no. Nobody said that.

MR. WARREN:

Oh, yes, Sir! The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) said it. He referred to The Daily News as an old rag. Now regardless what kind of a rag it is, it is the only one that is reporting the happenings in the estimates. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we can, maybe it would be worthwhile to look into, if it is possible, that for the fifteen days - I throw this suggestion out to the hon. members, and it may not be possible - that the estimates are under review, why not for those fifteen days after the Budget Speech is read, not have any sessions of the House of Assembly from 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., but have the Estimate Committees for the first fifteen days after the Budget Speech.

MR. NEARY:

In the House.

MR. WARREN:

In the House? I do not care if it is in the House or down on Water Street, I do not care where it is. But for the fifteen days when the estimates are discussed, so the media can cover it adequately because it is the taxpayers' business - the media cannot cover the Estimate Committees now because of manpower or financial restraints -

MR. WARREN: why not, after the Budget Speech is read and the minister announces the Estimates Committees are going to be meeting, there be no House sittings on those days?

MR. NEARY: That is when the Public Accounts Committee meets.

MR. WARREN: The Public Accounts Committee do not meet when the House is in Session.

MR. NEARY: Exactly.

MR. WARREN: And I would strongly suggest that would be a positive approach. I am glad that the former Speaker is back in his Chair. He said that the set up of the Estimate Committees are always under review.

MR. NEARY: Untrue.

MR. WARREN: So I would like to know who is doing the review?

MR. NEARY: We have a letter saying it would be reviewed after one year.

MR. WARREN: So, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks I would beg the government to act, because the government controls the procedure. If need be I would be only too glad to get on my knees to see if this government has compassion enough to realize that there is injustice done to the people of this Province because they are not getting adequate news reporting of the estimates because the House of Assembly is in session the same day. The Public Accounts Committee does not meet when the House is in session. I do not care where they meet, but during the fifteen days, the fifteen days for the Estimates Committee, the House need not sit.

MR. WARREN: The media can only cover so much at one time. And every day from three to six o'clock the media are in the House of Assembly when the House is in session.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. WARREN: So therefore if the House of Assembly is not meeting from three to six o'clock for the fifteen days after the Budget is read, then why not consider those fifteen days for the estimates and do not have any other House of Assembly business being carried on. I think it is a serious offer to look at. It may be that we can satisfy the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) on this request.

MR. NEARY: The House will close when you are having committee meetings.

MR. WARREN: I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will buy this one and I believe the people of the Province will buy it. Let us get the media there to report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a good suggestion. Those who are on the committees, whether it is five government members and two opposition members, regardless of

April 9, 1984

Tape No. 827

NM - 1

MR. WARREN: who they are, they will be the ones who will have the conversation back and forth and it could work very properly.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, there have not been very many questions -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: We could continue on with this tomorrow and we can go into Committee on this bill now.

MR. DINN: Today? Well, have you got agreement for that?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes.

MR. DINN: Okay.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Is it agreed that we now go to Order 3?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please! Bill No. 11.

"An Act Respecting The Commission Of Offences Against The Laws Of The Province By Young Persons". (Bill No. 11).

On motion, clauses (1) through (32), carried.

April 9, 1984

Tape No. 827

NM - 2

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Could we revert to clause

(2) for an amendment -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Could we revert to clause

(2) in definitions?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

- at the very beginning, and sub-paragraph (2) in the definitions, and then turning over to page 4, sub-paragraph (ii) of paragraph (e) of clause (2) of the Bill is repealed and the following substituted in (ii). And Roman Numeral (ii) would read, "Until April 1, 1985, under seventeen years of age and thereafter under eighteen years of age." What it is is that for the first year of operation the age is seventeen,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: or the consequent years after the first year, the effective age is eighteen. And what it means is by putting it now we will have to do it in a year's time.

MR. BARRY: How does that compare with the federal law?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It is made because of the federal law. So what it means is seventeen is the operative age this year and eighteen becomes the operative age April 1, 1985.

On motion amendment carried.

On motion Clause (2) as amended, carried.

On motion Clause (33) carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Shall the title carry?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: Before we carry the title, does the hon. gentleman have any figures as to what this is going to cost the Province and when will the agreement be signed with Ottawa? And will the agreement include cost sharing for turning Whitbourne into a jail? You know, how will we fare off economically in the whole matter?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, it is estimated that the cost to the Province, let us say over a three year period, will be between \$10 million and \$15 million a year. It is hoped that the agreement between the federal and provincial governments will be signed very shortly, within a few weeks. There is cost sharing on a 50/50 basis covering certain items. It is certainly hoped that with respect to Whitbourne it will be possible to cost share the agreement on 50/50 basis. But it is going to cost the Province between \$10 million and \$15 million for, let

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

us say, the first three years.

MR. NEARY:

will get from Ottawa?

Is this in addition to what we

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Yes.

MR. NEARY:

\$10 million or \$15 million?

The Province will have to pay

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

That certainly is what it appears.

MR. NEARY:

you know. It is unreal.

I mean, that is out of this world,

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

the whole thing comes to a standstill.

We do not have any choice. Otherwise

MR. NEARY:

what?

Have they gone insane up there or

On motion, enacting clause carried.

Motion, that the Committee

report having passed the bill with amendment, carried. (Bill No. 11)

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. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

the Whole House has directed me to report that it has met and passed Bill No. 11 with amendment and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of

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

On motion amendments read a first and second time, bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment, I would point out to hon. members that the Social Services Committee will examine the estimates of the Department of Environment at 7:30 this evening, and the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth at 9:00 P.M. And tomorrow evening at 7:30 the Resources Committee will continue its examination of the estimates of the Department of Fisheries.

MR. NEARY: Is there any meetings tomorrow morning?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There is nothing here for tomorrow morning. So if there is anything for tomorrow morning, somebody better give me notice now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Nothing tomorrow morning.

No, apparently nothing tomorrow morning.

I will point out as well, in the House tomorrow we will continue with the Concurrence Debate on the Department of Government Services.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 11, 1984 at 3:00 P.M.

INDEX

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

9 APRIL 1984

9 Apr, '84

Answer to Question #23 on the Order Paper of Thursday,
March 29th., 1984.

Question:

Mr. Barry (Mount Scio) - To ask the Honourable the Premier to lay upon the Table of the House all correspondence the Premier's office has sent in 1984 to all labour unions requesting them to curtail wage demands in contract negotiations to be held during 1984.

Answer:

No such correspondence has been sent. Union leaders that represent employees of Government have been informed personally of Government's most recent wage restraint program, but no correspondence has been sent to any other Unions requesting them to curtail wage demands during 1984.