

VOL. 3

NO. 7

THIRD SESSION OF THE
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. - 6: P.M.
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1984

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to make an oral statement to the House. As a result of this government's firm commitment to the rural parts of our Province and to the inshore fishery of our Province, I am pleased to announce that the administration has now put in place a new financing package for the Fogo Island Co-op to the tune of \$1 million, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: A \$1 million government guarantee which will ensure, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: The hon. member for Fogo, what a member!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, please, could I have protection from the Chair?

- Mr. Speaker, which will ensure the future of the 500 plant workers working in five plants on Fogo Island, and will also ensure that the 850 fishermen on Fogo Island will have markets for their product this year and future years. And this morning I travelled to Fogo Island, accompanied by my colleague, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), and we met with all the councils on the Island and the Development Association and the Co-op. In fact, they were very pleased with the information and announcements from both ministers, on behalf of the administration, on the matter involving fisheries and the matter involving the

MR. MORGAN: new ferry service to the Island. So I can speak on behalf of my colleague, that the information and the news that we gave the people of Fogo Island this morning, through their organizations, is indeed a firm commitment of this administration's policy and belief that we do and can and will have a viable rural Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, let me first of all, on behalf of all of Fogo Island I am sure, thank the minister for his sincerity in going to Fogo Island, in doing the right thing. I understand that the financing package is somewhere around \$1 million for Fogo Island, in the form of guarantees. Fogo Island Co-op is a new method of development, a new mode of development for rural Newfoundland and deserves, indeed, the backing of whatever government is in power. Recently it has run into some financial difficulties, and I am pleased to see that the minister has done the things that are right.

Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to believe that this government is out to get me and God bless them.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR.WARREN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Goudie), I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) a question as pertaining to yesterday's budget. Could the Minister of Finance advise if this government is still concerned about the fifty-two or fifty-five Rural Development Associations that are in place in this Province? I understand on page 118 in the budget estimates there is no money whatsoever, absolutely no dollars whatsoever for Rural Development Associations. Is the minister now saying to the fifty-two or fifty-three Regional Development Associations in the Province, 'Thank you very much. Good bye'?

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR.COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we are concerned and we are not saying, 'Good bye.'

MR.WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR.WARREN: Mr. Speaker, if the minister is concerned could the minister advise the hon. House and the people of this Province how he expects the Rural Development Associations to continue on if this government is not planning to give them any finances?

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR.COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, these Associations, of course, have in the past been funded by the provincial government and the federal government.

DR. COLLINS: There was an agreement there, an arrangement, and we have been endeavouring to put in place a continuation of that agreement for quite a number of years. We have had difficulties doing it. There have been suggestions that the federal government want to change their mind on the type of funding they are going to do, but nothing had been finalized up to the time that the budget was brought down, so we had no way of putting in something that we did not know about. Now we understand that these Associations do have some monies available in their budgets, in their accounts and so on at the present time so they are continuing on in the meantime. We are still making joint efforts to come to an agreement with the federal government so that funding for those Associations can be continued.

MR. WARREN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains, a supplementary.

MR. WARREN: I am sure the minister realizes, although he said that those Development Associations do have some money, and I assume the hon. minister that many of those Development Associations have very, very little money and they cannot continue very much further. I understand the Premier said sometime ago that if the federal government would not fund those development associations this government will. If the federal government does not come up real soon with dollars for the continuation of the Development Associations throughout this Province, could the minister guarantee this hon. House that this government will not see the Rural Development Associations fall in this Province?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, to some extent the hon. member is asking me to answer a hypothetical question. I think that the hon. member knows that this government is very, very committed to rural development. The record is plain and straightforward on that. We are very concerned. We have made great efforts. We know the value of these associations. We think that the best way of assuring their future at the present time is to continue negotiating and pressing the federal government, and that is the route we are taking meantime. We are always optimistic when we do these sorts of things. Obviously they do not all pan out the way we want them to pan out, but we push as hard as we can and we are not ready yet to give up on this one.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, here we have a situation where the budget is less than twenty-four hours old and we have an answer to questions asked by my colleague concerning financing for Rural Development Associations and the minister is waffling on the answer and no matter what happens, the budget is going to be thrown out, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDER: By as much as \$500,000.

MR. NEARY: Well, it would seem they have abandoned rural Newfoundland. They put in zero, zilch, a nil amount. Is it not customary to put in the budget a nominal sum? If you do not know where you are going, if you are going to have an agreement or not, or if you have to finance it 100 per cent out of the provincial

MR. NEARY: coffers, is it not customary to put in \$100 nominal amount so that you can have at least something in the estimates? There is nothing in the estimates now, and that is what my colleague is concerned about. Why was there not something put in the estimates? If the government is committed to financing 100 per cent Regional Development Associations in the event that negotiations are not successful with the Government of Canada, should there not have been something put in the estimates? Now, how many more instances, how many more examples are there in the estimates of the kind that was just raised by my colleague?

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

 The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is entering the realm of debate. He was recognized on a supplementary question.

 The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think there were a number of questions in there. I am not certain which one the hon. the Leader of the Opposition wants me to answer. But all I will say is this, when the Leader of the Opposition brings down a budget, he can bring it down the way he wants to bring it down. The way I brought it down is the way our government wants to bring it down. We will do with our budget the best thing that we can do, within the means available to us, for the people of Newfoundland, and I think the people of Newfoundland know that. As I have stated already, the best way of dealing with this thing is to press on with our negotiation with the federal government. We are doing that most vigourously. We remain optimistic but we are going to try as hard as we can before we take a second-best alternative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would think
that the hon. gentleman would try to hide his stupidity
instead of showing his complete incompetence over fiscal
matters.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the
hon. gentleman

MR. NEARY:

if it is the intention of the administration to live up to a commitment made by the Premier that Rural Development Associations would be funded 100 per cent by the provincial government if negotiations with the Government of Canada failed? A simple yes or no answer, that is all.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, if it is within human capability whatsoever we always live up to the commitments that the Premier makes. So I can assure the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) at this time any commitment that the Premier makes he intends to keep and we, the Government of Newfoundland, will do everything we can to keep it for him also.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. gentleman. Could the hon. gentleman tell us, because we are at a loss to know, why there was not something put in the estimates, zero, just a blank, two little dots? Could the hon. gentleman tell us if he has knowledge if there is new agreement or if there is going to be a new agreement? Are negotiations being pursued vigorously at the moment or is this just, you know, you pay your money and you take your chance? I mean, what is happening? It would look like the rural part of Newfoundland is being abandoned by this administration the way they have treated the Associations in the budget.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that if it is a question. I said that we are negotiating flat-out with the federal government to put in place the best

DR. COLLINS: arrangement for the Rural Development organizations in this Province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Could the hon. gentleman indicate to the House when we expect to get an agreement? And obviously, Mr. Speaker, they must be expecting 100 per cent from the Government of Canada because they have not even allowed for the 10 per cent that they claimed all along they have been paying, which is a myth by the way, it is a fallacy. So how near are we to an agreement and when will the administration

MR. NEARY:

reach the point when they have to go ask for a Lieutenant-Governor's Warrant to supply funds to the Regional Development Associations?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely sure just as soon as an agreement is reached-- if and when, and optimistically we will say when - when an arrangement is made there will be an announcement in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, just to change the subject for a moment. We all know that the freeze on hospital budgets will be devastating to the smooth delivery of health care services in this Province. Let me ask the minister this.

AN HON. MEMBER:

We did what the royal commission said.

MR. HODDER:

You did not do what the royal commission said.

MR. NEARY:

No, they did not, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman can hide behind that commission all he wants, but it is not going to work. He should have heard Dr. Hogan on CBC this morning, the President of the Hospital Association.

MR. HICKEY:

He does not know what he is talking about.

MR. NEARY:

He does not know what he is talking about.

MR. WARREN:

You do, I suppose!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the minister if the administration gave any thought to the chain reaction that they were going to set off by such drastic measures as putting a freeze on the budgets of hospitals and nursing homes? Or did they just rush head-on

MR. NEARY: into something out of desperation and ignore the plight of the sick and the dying in this Province? Let me ask the hon. gentleman if there was any prior consultation with the Hospital Association or with the hospitals themselves, direct consultation, to find out what kind of a chain reaction his drastic measures would have on the delivery of health care in this Province?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in terms of a chain reaction, I presume what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is saying is will something happen in hospital after hospital and so on? I suspect there will be something like that happen in each hospital. That is what the royal commission said, that things should be altered in just about every hospital in this Province, that things should be changed to improve their efficiency. And the royal commission laid out many ways in which this might be done.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is, intentionally or otherwise, a misconception when one says there is a freeze on hospital budgets and therefore the quality of patient care has to go down. The two are not

DR. COLLINS: synonymous in any way whatsoever. What the budget has done is to take care of the approximately 70 per cent of hospital costs which are related to salaries. That 70 per cent of hospitals are taken care of. The budget has got built into it the annualization of employees who came on halfway through last year, for instance; it has into it the annual increments that employees will get and so on and so forth. So if you look at the question of freeze, the only part of hospital budgets that are frozen are the 30 per cent which are non-salary. Now, as I mentioned, I do not know what proportion, but a very high proportion of the Royal Commission's 217 recommendations related to that very point, saying that there are many, many efficiencies that can be brought in, there are many, many cost-saving areas that can be looked at, and there is much, much money to be saved in the non-salary part of hospital operations. And, for that very good reason, we feel that the budgets we have given to the hospitals are quite realistic. Hospitals will have to do things to make sure that they stay on side, but that is the whole idea of the operation, that is the whole reason behind the exercise of having a Royal Commission, just to identify those areas where changes have to be made so as to achieve satisfactory costs.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, even a kindergarten student knows that in order for hospitals to deliver the standard of service that they are delivering at the present time they would need an annual increase in their budget of at least 10 per cent to take care of inflation -

MR. HODDER: At the very minimum.

MR. NEARY: - a minimum of 10 per cent. So, Mr. Speaker, what this means is there is going to be a deterioration

MR. NEARY: in the service provided by the hospitals throughout this Province. Could the hon. gentleman answer a specific question for me, if he knows, because obviously he did not answer my question about prior consultation with the hospital boards and with the Newfoundland Hospital Association. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House how many beds will be forced to close as a result of this cruel and drastic measure taken by the administration?

MR. WARREN: Three hundred and fifty.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) really should read the report given to government in the middle of February by the Royal Commission on Health Costs. The Leader of the Opposition said that if you do not give an increase, because there is an inflationary factor in our economy, therefore, negative things have to happen. Now that is not true, that is totally untrue. If you increase your efficiency,

DR. COLLINS:

if you increase your cost effectiveness, you can often, and in this case as we believe hospitals can, take care of the inflationary factor without an increase in overall budget. And that was the whole reason for putting in place a royal commission. And a royal commission clearly spelled it out that that in actual fact can occur. So what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is saying is just nonsense. It is rubbish. It is untrue. It is not factual. He has not read the report. He does not know what he is talking about. I would suggest that he go back and study the report, study the long list of recommendations that the royal commission brought in to show exactly how hospitals can get down their cost without requiring extra budgeting.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I read the royal commission report and I fully understand it, and I hear the message that is coming from the Hospital Association and from the administrators of the hospitals, I hear all of that, Mr. Speaker, and I heard Dr. Hogan this morning. And the hon. gentleman by the way, should know better.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is making a speech. This is about his fifth supplementary question. He is making a speech.

MR. HODDER: No, this is a new question.

MR. MARSHALL: That does not make any difference if he is making a speech.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): I did not understand it was a supplementary question but I certainly think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was entering into the realm of debate and I would request him to pose a question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. gentleman has no intention in this world of returning to his original profession. He would never be able to go back and face these people again, the cruel way that he has treated his former occupation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let the hon. gentleman tell the House - since he cannot answer me on hospital beds, obviously there was no prior consultation - how many hospital workers will be laid off as a result of this cruel and callous policy of the administration there opposite?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is implying by these questions that (a) there will be closing of hospital beds, and (b) that there will be staff layoffs. There is no fact behind all that at the present time. As a matter of fact, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition mentioned the Newfoundland Hospital Association. I heard that broadcast this morning also, and I thought that the Vice-President of the Association answered in a very, very responsible fashion. She said, "We do not have the budget yet. We have to wait until we actually get each hospital budget in our hand before we can think through the

March 21, 1984

Tape No. 227

NM - 3

DR. COLLINS: implications." She did not
jump to the conclusions that just because there is a
freeze put on overall budgets that

DR. COLLINS: necessarily this has to happen or that has to happen, and certainly not the drastic things the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) suggested.

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

MR. HODDER: I just wanted to ask the minister one question. The Royal Commission Report said that the Report should not be implemented piecemeal. And from the remarks of the minister and the remarks that I have heard, there is no doubt that some hospital beds will close. Last year there were 118 closed after restraint measures. What I am asking the minister is how can he reconcile the fact that there is likely to be a number of chronic care hospital beds closed with the fact that the Royal Commission actually said, and this is why they said not to implement it piecemeal, that they could close 350 hospital beds but they should open 700 chronic care beds. Now my understanding is that nursing homes have been frozen as well. We know that our hospitals are full of people who should not be in that particular type of bed. How does the minister reconcile that with the fact that he has frozen both the nursing homes and the hospitals?

MR. HICKEY: We are building nursing homes.

MR. NEARY: No, the federal government is building nursing homes -

MR. HODDER: How does he reconcile that fact?

MR. NEARY: - out of CMHC funds.

MR.HICKEY:

build them.

We are borrowing to

MR.NEARY:

No, you are not.

No, you are not borrowing.

MR.HICKEY:

MR.NEARY:

MR.SPEAKER (Russell):

Finance.

Those are loans.

They are CMHC funds.

The hon. Minister of

DR.COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is jumping to a conclusion that is not warranted. He is saying, 'You are closing beds before you have opened cronic beds.' I have not said we were closing beds. The Hospital Association have not said they are closing beds. The hospital themselves have not said they are closing beds. The Hospital Association said, 'We are going to wait until we get our specific budgets and then we are going to have our plan of action put in place.' And the Royal Commission very clearly spelled out the source of actions that the hospitals can carry out without reflecting negatively at all on patient care or on the level of service. There are many

DR. COLLINS: ways that the hospitals when they get their budgets can deal with them so that the drastic conclusions that the hon. member is jumping to need not come about at all.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman obviously does not have the intestinal fortitude to come out man-fashion and say there are going to be hospital beds closed and layoffs in nursing homes and in hospitals. He is going to force somebody else to do his dirty work.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is entering into the realm of debate and I ask him to pose a question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in that masterpiece of deceit that we heard yesterday in this House, could the hon. gentleman tell the House if there was any prior consultation with municipalities, with the Newfoundland Federation of Mayors and Municipalities or the individual municipalities, before a decision was made to reduce grants to municipalities? And what impact is this going to have on the budgets of municipalities throughout the Province that have already been prepared and submitted to the hon. gentleman's colleague?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues have pointed out, there will be no impact whatsoever on this year's budgets for municipalities. The thing does not come in until their budget year starts for 1985.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me talk for a moment about the infamous convention center. Mr. Speaker, there is \$1 million allocated in the budget towards a convention center, Is this the number one priority of this administration, to build a convention center? Where will it be built? Who is going to get the contract? Does this warrant top priority on the part of this administration?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the hon. the Minister for Development (Mr. Windsor) will be spelling out the details of the implementation of many of the things that were mentioned in the budget that are the concern of his department and he will be doing that very, very shortly. One of the aspects of his exposition will be the convention center, and I would suggest that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) await that and he will get all the details. And if he pays attention to what the hon. Minister for Development says and takes it in and digests it and thinks about it rationally, I am sure he will be fully satisfied that all the facts are made available to him.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, a supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I will listen attentively but I am afraid from reports that we are getting that the thing may be cut and dried already Mr. Speaker, maybe they are trying to funnel the convention centre off to some of their buddies who pass cheques out to people their opposite to supplement their income.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me talk for a moment about the student allowance. I hope the minister responsible will give us the details of that convention centre as quickly as possible because there are substantial federal money involved in that, Mr. Speaker. Let me talk for a moment about the \$615,000 less for student allowance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What federal money?

MR. HODDER:

Like 90 per cent

MR. NEARY:

The minister

told us yesterday we were going to get the details from his colleague, the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), who is not in her seat today. Could the minister give the House some details of these cuts, how they will affect the future enrollment at Memorial and at the College of Trades and at the College of Fisheries and at the vocational schools? And what will these Draconian measures mean to the first class of Grade XII students who will be coming out and looking forward to a post-secondary education in September? How will they be able to pursue their post-secondary education, Mr. Speaker, when they will not have the assistance available to them to do it?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of

Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, you know, one hardly has to reject the charge that over the convention centre that

DR. COLLINS: that we are doing something improper in regard to that. That is totally ridiculous.

MR. NEARY: Do not worry, we know what is going on. We are not dumb.

DR. COLLINS: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) knows that it is totally ridiculous because he followed on immediately -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: - and said that there are federal funds involved in this too, and there will be. There will be federal funds. So he is suggesting what he calls often times hanky-panky, that the federal government and the provincial government get together and carry out some hanky-panky, which is, you know, totally ridiculous. It is just so nonsensical one should not, I suppose, refer to it whatsoever.

On the other matter, the hon. Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) will shortly be spelling out the details. I am sure the members of the House will be very interested in the details. I can say at this stage, though, that it will have no negative impact on students. Students will be able to get the assistance that they require at least to the extent that they had in the past, and in actual fact it is very likely they will get it much more efficiently and effectively.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: We are very familiar with hanky-panky over here. We saw it with the Green Bay ferry and with the museum space down at the Murray Premises, and we know all about the aircraft that was being chartered by gentlemen there opposite.

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

Several times now I have had to mention to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that he is entering into the realm of debate and making a speech, and certainly again would request him to pose a direct question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, will the minister confirm or deny that there will be no increases in the actual cash available to people on social assistance, such as widows, invalids, sick people, orphans and those who are unemployed through no fault of their own, apart from the shelter and accommodation increases in the budget yesterday? Can the minister confirm or deny whether that is the extent of any increases to people on social assistance in this Province?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned during the speech related to the budget, the Department of Social Services reviewed extensively the manner in which social assistance is given and they identified a particular problem area. That problem area related to shelter and they felt that the best way of helping out the needy was to take care of that particularly apparent problem, a problem that was troubling many people on social assistance. This was the number one priority if you really are going to grapple with the real concerns of the needy. And this is where

DR. COLLINS:

they directed their efforts.

Obviously this Province does not have unlimited means. We would like to give every person on social assistance \$2,000 a month if we had it but we obviously do not; we have to funnel, we have to channel, we have to focus the assistance we give. We like to give it in the most needy areas and this was the identified most needy area so that is where most of the assistance has gone. I would point out that there is other assistance given, particularly with regard to the care of children.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the administration there opposite is lurching from crisis to crisis. Mr. Speaker, they have yielded in this case to pressure in St. John's as far as the boarding homes are concerned and forgot about

MR. NEARY: all the rest of the recipients of social assistance in this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman - I can see that Your Honour is ready to come to the defence of the administration, leap to his feet -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that obviously calls for a retraction.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is saying that the Chair is coming to the aid of the government, which is not true. I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that comment.

MR. NEARY: Of course, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that. But, Mr. Speaker, in every other jurisdiction you are allowed a preamble to questions that you ask. Now, Mr. Speaker, will the minister consider using savings from transferring welfare recipients from social assistance to unemployment insurance benefits - because yesterday there was a programme announced for doubling the make-work projects on social assistance and the objective of that is to get people off the provincial welfare rolls and get them on to unemployment insurance - now, Mr. Speaker, will the savings be used to help people on social assistance to balance their household budgets and enable them to have a balanced diet, warm homes, and the other necessities of life that are so necessary to keep body and soul together?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is too generous. We cannot really take undue credit. The Community Development Programme is not being doubled, it is only going from \$9 million up to \$16 million, not \$18 million. We do not want to take more credit than is due us. So I would like to make a correction there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

DR. COLLINS: In regard to his other remarks,

DR. COLLINS: of course, we will try to, in short, to the extent we can that every person on social assistance has their needs taken care of. But in doing that, we want to make sure that we give the highest priority to their priority needs. And that is what we have done with this focused increase in social assistance.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman now has as much sense of humour and as much wit as the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter). Mr. Speaker, there will be countervailing savings as a result of the Minister of Social Services' (Mr. Hickey) transferring his clients from the provincial welfare rolls over to the federal unemployment insurance rolls. And, Mr. Speaker, there will be no jobs created in the end. Now will the hon. gentleman undertake to make a commitment to the people on social assistance in this Province, people who are sick and disabled and widows and orphans and invalids and people who are

MR. NEARY:

unemployed through no fault of their own, will the hon. gentleman undertake to make a commitment that any countervailing savings would be used to help these people balance their household budgets?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the revised budget for 1983-1984 for the Department of Social Services was \$117,937,100. In 1984-1985, the budget for the same department is \$122,864,700. So there is an increased amount of money going into the Social Services Department and, clearly, that is going to be used for the delivery of services to those in need. That is what the Department of Social Services is all about.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to be a little more specific, would the hon. gentleman undertake to give the House a commitment that the countervailing savings would be used to increase the slender, the meagre allowances that people on social assistance are currently receiving in this Province?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think I have already indicated that we have put increased funding in the department and the department has its programmes in place. Those programmes are designed to use the public dollar to the most effect, and I can assure the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) is continually reviewing his programme just to achieve that result.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Question Period has expired.

MR. NEARY: Too bad! We were just getting warmed up, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Port au Port on a point of order.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), when I was questioning him the other day, undertook to table a list of civil servants who were reclassified within the last eight months. I asked him to do that and he said he would table it. When can we expect that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HODDER: I notice nobody over there responded to the point of order though.

DR. COLLINS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Finance on a point of order.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I hope that if I am out of order, I am not too much out of order. I would like to correct something that the hon. member opposite just stated. I gave no such commitment. He asked a question. I think if he looks up Hansard, I made no such commitment.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port, to that point of order.

MR. HODDER: I wonder why the minister will not make such a commitment since the charge was made and he did not answer it in the House?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The point of order raised by

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is not really a valid point of order, it is more a matter of clarification.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): It being Private Member's Day, we will continue with Motion No. 6 on the Order Paper. I understand the debate was adjourned last day by the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), who has approximately nine minutes.

MR. HODDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am glad the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is in his seat as I think in the remaining nine minutes that I have I would like to talk about a couple of issues which have occurred recently on the West Coast of this Province with which I am not very well pleased.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister of Fisheries some questions in this House in the Session before Christmas. I asked him whether fishermen who had not been paid by Bay St. George Seafoods would be paid. The minister gave his assurance at that time, I do not know if the minister was fully informed of the situation because his answer was garbled. When I read it back afterwards in Hansard, I was not sure if he thought I was talking about Belle Isle Seafoods or Bay St. George Seafoods but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I received a commitment from that minister in the House that the fishermen would be looked after. Now these fishermen, Mr. Speaker, who sold their -

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

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is going to quote me during the Question Period in the House, he has to quote me accurately and the accuracy of it all is this: I was asked a question, whether or not I would ensure that the fishermen who were owed payments by the company, Bay

MR. MORGAN: St. George Seafoods, that they would get paid for the monies owed them by that company. My answer at the time was: If we were involved in a refinancing of that company through government guarantees, we would then establish a condition that that company pay the monies owed fishermen before they get money from us. Now the situation is that the company did not come to us looking for any additional monies, the company is now sold to a new owner/operator, and it is now the responsibility of the operator to pay the bills to the fishermen.

MR. HODDER: That is a lie.

MR. MORGAN: Get your facts straight.

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

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

MR. HODDER: The minister's facts are fabrications, Mr. Speaker. They are parliamentary inexactitudes, if I cannot use the word 'liar', because the minister knows that that company did come looking to him for money and that was in negotiations up until -

MR. MORGAN: That is not true.

MR. HODDER: Oh, yes they did.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order, I rule there is not a valid point of order. The hon. the minister used the opportunity to clarify statements attributed to him.

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, that company was in negotiations with the Department of Fisheries ever since last year. What had happened with that particular company was that the provincial government had given them a number of loans, the last one being a guaranteed loan for somewhere around \$80,000 or \$90,000. That loan was just enough, because

MR. HODDER: they were undercapitalized, it was just enough, and the Department of Fisheries should have known it, that loan was just enough to put them into bankruptcy. But they did not declare bankruptcy and they negotiated. The minister just stood in the House and said that they had never come to him. They negotiated with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) up until such time as recently the plant was sold.

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

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is misleading the House with this information. Because the fact is that we did assist that company a year and a half ago to the tune of, I think it was, a \$300,000 government guarantee. When the company came back looking for additional monies, because we felt the company was not in good management, because we felt it was not a viable operation, we refused any further assistance. My condition on the question asked last Fall was, if we provided any further, additional assistance we would attach a condition that the fishermen get paid for the monies owed. We did not provide any further assistance and now the company has sold its operation.

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

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker, go ahead.

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

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat the charge again. What happened was that the minister sold out

March 21, 1984

Tape No. 234

MJ - 4

MR. HODDER: the fishermen, and these were
fishermen, Mr. Speaker, who made from \$6,000 to \$8,000 a
year, all of whom live below the poverty line. The
minister knew very

MR. HODDER:

well what was happening with that company. The minister had granted them -the figure \$300,000 is a new one to me - a guaranteed loan of \$80,000 that I know about. There were a number of rural development loans which came from that government. By the way the owner of the Bay St. George Seafoods was a very well-known, prominent supporter of that administration. He would not declare bankruptcy, and he was negotiating with the minister, he was negotiating with the federal government, he was negotiating with everyone to try to get that plant open. The licences, Mr. Speaker, which are given out by the provincial government, were the key things. Now these licences have been sold with the plant. So when the minister gets up and says that the plant was sold by the operator, what happened to the licences? That is the question I would like for the minister to address. This plant was fully licenced.

MR. MORGAN:

Would you permit a question?

MR. NEARY:

No, you will have your chance.

MR. HODDER:

This plant was fully licenced, and the minister had a very good club to hold over the head of anybody who took over that plant, that they did not get the licences.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

A point of order, the hon.

Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

The member is giving the impression that we are going around bandying around licences and saying, 'you must sell your plant.' The fact is just in recent days, Mr. Speaker, a new company from the Western part of the Province came to the Newfoundland Government looking for a licence. A licence for what? A licence to operate a

MR. MORGAN: plant that was previously owned by Bay St. George Seafoods.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what is this? My hon. colleague has the floor.

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is going to speak in debate and quote this hon. gentleman here, he has to quote him accurately. And the fact is -

MR. HODDER: Hansard will show it all.

MR. MORGAN: - Mr. Speaker, we are not going around using the licences as a means closing plants. We may be using licences to get plants reopened. In this case Bay St. George would be closed last year because the company could not carry on, it was not financially stable, now a new company has come in and bought that operation and, naturally, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to say no to providing a licence to that new company.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: So if the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, wants us to say no to the new company, no new licences and no jobs in the fish plant this Summer, we are going to say no to him.

MR. NEARY: What is this, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To answer the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), that was a point of order raised by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. NEARY: It was?

MR. SPEAKER: He raised the point of order and this Chair can only rule on a point of order after it hears the arguments. I rule that there was not a point of order. It was a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, there were some 200 or 300 fishermen who were affected. Not only were fishermen affected, but small store owners to whom fishermen went to cash their cheques finally found themselves holding \$200 or \$300 cheques. We are talking about convenience stores here, where their cheques were cashed, because there are no large businesses in that particular area of the Province. And that plant was fully licenced and the minister could have protected those fishermen by making sure that the person who took that plant, with his understanding -

MR. MORGAN: How can you talk like that? You are talking nonsense.

MR. HODDER: Can the minister withdraw licences? Do you not have the control, does not the Province have control over licences?

MR. MORGAN: We have been using the licences for years. Do you not know that?

MR. NEARY: They want more control and they cannot even run what they got now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a fully licenced plant which had been forced into bankruptcy by this government -

MR. STAGG: Forced into bankruptcy?

MR. HODDER: Yes, forced into bankruptcy, and it was in the hon. member's district.

MR. STAGG: Yes, and I know an awful lot about it.

MR. HODDER: And the hon. member should be defending them because some of his plant workers did not get paid either.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, this I have to correct -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! On a point of order, the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: - for record of the House of Assembly, on a point of clarification. The company did not go bankrupt. The company is not in bankruptcy. The company has sold its operations. The company had never gone into bankruptcy.

MR. HODDER: No, it did not.

MR. MORGAN: Get your facts straight, boy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It is not permissible for the hon. member to stand up continuously on points of clarification. He has to stand on points of order or points of privilege.

MR. NEARY: Right on.
Learn the rules.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, just one final comment as my time has elapsed. Mr. Speaker, the licences that were in that plant went with the sale of the plant to the new owner.

MR. MORGAN: No, they did not.

MR. HODDER: Yes, they did.

MR. MORGAN: They applied for new licences.

MR. HODDER: And you gave them to them.

MR. MORGAN: Why should I not?

MR. HODDER: If the plant had not become bankrupt and if these fishermen had not been paid their \$50,000, that should have been a condition before these licences were given, and the minister knows it. He is trying to blindfold the devil in the dark because he knows, and the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) should know, too, because he had plant workers who lost income through that. And he sits there very -

MR. MORGAN: Get the facts. Get your homework done.

MR. HODDER: I do not have to get my homework done. I know about the deal that was pulled. There was a deal pulled, that is what happened, and the fishermen were the losers, and you promised that they would not be the losers, and you could have stopped them from being losers in this particular instance.

Now, I have not even gotten to the other point, Mr. Speaker, about Belle Isle Seafoods, where the minister last year sat down with myself and

MR. HODDER: the union and said, and I realize I have a short time left, and said that the jobs would remain as they were, This year the new owner and I am talking about a different case, for clarification of hon. members, another case of where Belle Isle Seafoods took over the Piccadilly plant and now they have decided that they will downgrade this plant by twenty people, or up to twenty people. Now the minister can sit there -

MR. MORGAN: The owner of that company, I heard he will not talk to you.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! I have to inform the hon. member that his time has elapsed.

MR. HODDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will return to this particular issue again, do not worry.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Trinity North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to address a motion made by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), that great fishing district of Fogo where I was born and raised, fished with my father until I was out of high school, that district where I paved most of the roads while I was the Minister of Transportation, that district where I changed the ferry route to the joy of everybody who is using it, and that great district where, had I sought a seat for the government, I would suggest the hon. member would have been on shaky legs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: I think the hon. member was scared to death of me. He came across the House one time to talk to me over in the Common Room. He put his finger up in my face and told me how much he hated me and that someday he was going to get me. I wondered for some time why it was that he hated me so much and why he wanted to get me. Of course, I came to the conclusion that the reason was that he was scared to death that I just might go back home. He acknowledged in the Assembly here one day that I was a hero on Fogo Island and, as I indicated, he was frightened to death that I just might go down there and run and do him out of a seat. So he can thank me that he is still over there, the great gentleman that he is, the great organizer for the Liberal Party.

MR. MORGAN: He will go back to teaching after the next election.

MR. BRETT: The implications,
Mr. Speaker, of the hon. member's motion

MR. BRETT: is that this government has no policy for the fisheries. After hearing what the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) said earlier this afternoon I think the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) should thank God that we do have a policy. Because when the Fogo Island Co-op was in trouble last Fall, who rushed down or out or whatever to their assistance and guaranteed their loan to the tune of some \$700,000 so that the Co-op could keep going? And now we are being told by the minister, today, that a \$1 million package has been put in place to keep the fishery on Fogo Island going. So I think the hon. member should be grateful that we do, in fact, have a policy for the fisheries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our time is limited to twenty minutes. It is not possible in twenty minutes to speak to this motion in totality, so I will refer to some parts of it. I want to speak to it more or less as it pertains to my district, because I think a lot of people do not recognize the district of Trinity North as a district that depends very heavily on the fishery. Settlements like Grand Bank, Burin, Fortune, some of these places are synonymous with the fisheries whereas the district of Trinity North is not. I suppose when one thinks of Catalina or Port Union they might, but certainly not the rest of the district. And I would like to point out to the House of Assembly that without the fisheries unemployment in the district of Trinity North would probably be higher than anywhere in the Province. There are several fish plants, and I would like to talk about each one because I believe that they are there because this government has a policy. I will mention the largest one first and that is what was known, I guess, by all of us as Fishery Products Limited at Port Union, which is now part of Fishery Products International as a result of the restructuring. And, of course, without the restructuring I would say that plant would probably be closed

MR.BRETT:

I was told that the payroll averaged last year \$1.9 million a month I was flabbergasted, I could not believe it. That amounted to almost \$25 million a year. They employ around 1100 people a month, and that includes people who work in the plant and people who work on the draggers. So that means that that one plant alone in wages, just in wages and nothing else, contributes \$25 million to the district of Trinity North. And also in the neighbouring town of Catalina there is another plant which is operated by an old established company, the company of S.W. Mifflin Limited. It was a large operation at one time but now the owners are agents of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation. But they were around when the times were tough, back in the 60s when the government of the day had no fishery policy, and it was only because of the Conservative government which came into power in the early 70s and established a policy that they pulled themselves up by the boot straps with loans that they subsequently paid back. But today when compared with Fishery Products International, when compared to them they are small, but even so their payroll, their yearly payroll just in the town of Catalina is \$600,000 and they hire anywhere from thirty in the Spring to fifty-five in peak season. So, Mr. Speker, that is of great significance, as is the other plant, to the whole Bonavista Peninsula, because like Fishery Products International not only do they hire people from the immediate communities but also from all the way up the shore. And then as we come up Trinity Bay there is another small fish plant, established at least three or four years ago primarily for groundfish. That did not work, and

MR. BRETT: the plant was subsequently bought by new owners. And I can say in all sincerity that but for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), who is doing such a great job, that plant would never have been established as it is today to process shellfish, namely crab. It is called Trouty Sea Foods, I believe that is the name of the company. They paid out last year, Mr. Speaker, and will probably pay out more this year - last year they paid out \$450,000 in wages. On a single shift they employ anywhere from seventy to seventy-five people, and on a double shift, when you double that up, one hundred and forty to one hundred and forty-five. And that was only in a four and a half month period. The only reason that plant is there, Mr. Speaker, is because we had a policy and because of the interest and the co-operation of the Minister of Fisheries. And I doubt if anybody in the Province realizes that there are two fish plants in the town of Clarenville. That is not known in this Province. Everybody thinks of Clarenville - and I notice there are two people sitting in the gallery today from Clarenville. They live in St. John's but they are from Clarenville. And I do not know if they know it or not. Very few people realize there are two fish plants in the town of Clarenville. And I remember when the first one was to be established. I had some people come to me and say, 'Brett, you are out of your mind. We will never stand the stink.' I said, 'The money will not smell.' But there are two fish plants in the town of Clarenville. One is operated by Clarenville Ocean Products Limited and it is there because we had a policy, because we had interest, because the Department of Public Works co-operated with

MR. BRETT: the company and made a building built by the previous administration for what reason we have never been able to find out - to this day we do not know why the building was put there. It cost several hundred thousand dollars and when I got elected in 1971 or 1972, or whatever it was, it was sitting there a white elephant.

MR. BRETT: But the company came in and they made a good deal with Public Works. Because of the good deal there was not too much up-front capital money, which made it easy for them to move in, and today their payroll in that one plant in Clarendville is \$525,000 a year. That is what it was last year, and they have a high on their payroll of eighty-three employees and a low of fifty-four.

MR. STEWART: They are going to expand that new operation.

MR. BRETT: No, that is Ocean Products. That is one. Now, there are two plants. The other is called Terra Nova Fisheries. And again I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that because of policies that we are accused of not having, because of interests that we are accused of not having, because of priorities that we are accused of not having, that second fish plant came into Clarendville.

I had a visit from Dr. Cosmas Ho, well-known by people who are involved in the fishery. Dr. Ho is not getting the credit that he deserves. I wish I had more time to talk about him, because he was a pioneer in the squid fishery in this Province. He started it, and it has developed into a big thing. But his initial contact - at least the second contact, I guess the initial one was with the Minister of Fisheries, and it was the Minister of Fisheries of the day. But his second contact was with me. He came to me. He said, 'I want to start a fish plant in Clarendville and I want a building. Where can I get one?' And the old highways depot was there. Some people had highfalutin ideas about hanging on to it for the offshore, and I think we kind of had a tentative agreement that we would sort of freeze the building and hope that something might happen in the offshore whereby it could be used.

MR. BRETT: But anyway, again, through the co-operation of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), we arranged a lease and, the same as the previous company that I mentioned, because of a good lease, the company did not have to put a lot of capital up front and again they moved into Clarendville. I do not have the exact figures as I did on the others but I know that they employ at least fifty employees, they have at least fifty employees on the payroll for a period of four to six months, and I know that their payroll has to be in excess of \$250,000 a year.

So, Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that there are two fish plants in a service town. You know, when you think of Clarendville, you think of Gander, you think of Grand Falls. But very few people realize that two fish plants are responsible for directing into the economy of Clarendville in wages alone over \$750,000.

Mr. Speaker, the big point I wanted to make is that the fisheries in wages alone, contribute to the district of Trinity North, \$26 million a year - Mr. Speaker, that is staggering! - and in excess of 1,400 jobs. And that is direct. That does not say anything about the spinoff from that. I do not know what the multiplier factor is, perhaps somebody could help me on that. But if you apply the multiplier factor, then I suggest you would come up with-what? - well in excess of 3,000 jobs directly from the fishery. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this would not be possible if we had a government in power that had no policies with respect to the fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the Whereas number two. It will only take a second to read it. It says, 'Whereas the cost associated with

MR. BRETT: the harvesting sector of the inshore fishery has risen substantially, thereby placing these fishermen in a bankrupt position'. When I read that, the first word that sort of leapt out at me was 'bankruptcy' and I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that if I were a member of the Liberal Party in Newfoundland today talking about the fishery, the last word that would be in my vocabulary would be 'bankruptcy'. Because

MR. BRETT:

the only party that is responsible for putting fishermen in this Province into bankruptcy is the Liberal Party in Ottawa through Revenue Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, I can recall very vividly going into a little small community about two years ago and running into a constituent of mine, he called me into his basement to tell me the story of what Revenue Canada had done to him. He was a sick man, very serious bronchial trouble, As the saying goes, he had one leg in the grave, Mr. Speaker, and one leg out, And he had a small longliner, about a 36 foot to a 38 foot longliner and it is true, Mr. Speaker, to say that he had to make about three attempts when he came in from fishing to get from the boat to the wharf and, of course, going around with his overall clothes loaded with pills to keep him alive, The story he had to tell me was this, when he was not in the hospital he was in the fishing boat. But his drugs cost him a fortune. He managed to make enough to stay off welfare, so he had put a few dollars into a bank account, enough to bury him and his family, enough to give them a decent burial, and a few dollars now and then to pay his way to St. John's or wherever to get his pills. His income tax, the man was not illiterate, he managed to read and write, but he could not do his income tax papers so he had someone whom he thought was reliable do them for him for a number of years. What happened? I am sure everybody knows the story but I will finish it for the record. Revenue Canada decided they were going to audit him. Of course, he did not know but that was good to eat. He did not know what audited meant. But what he did know,

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, what he did know was that the end result was his bank account was wiped out. Not one single, solitary cent left to buy his pills, to get to St. John's, for that matter to buy groceries if he had a bad year. And that hon. member over there has the gall to put in a motion that this government is forcing fishermen into bankruptcy. As I said, if I were a Liberal I would not even dream about using the word because you are looking for a fight.

Now I think I have a few more minutes. Number three says, "WHEREAS the present government has been using the fishing industry as an employer of last resort." Now, Mr. Speaker, that is pure, unadulterated political rhetoric. It is bull-you know what. The only party in this Province that ever used the fishermen as such is the Liberal Party. Now I know the hon. member was not in that government, and I know that somebody over there is going to say, "Stop digging up the past." But there was never a Tory said, "Burn your boat." And there was never a Tory said, "Haul up your nets." The Liberal Party said it. Fortunately for the hon. gentleman he was not a member of that government. So the boats rotted, and the gear rotted.

MR. MORGAN: Resettlement was the key word then.

MR. BRETT: Resettlement, and our young people went away in droves. They went to Toronto. They went to work in the factories, wherever they could get a job. So, Mr. Speaker, how can the hon. member say that we are using the fisheries as a means of last resort.

Look, it is common knowledge in

March 21, 1984

Tape No. 240

NM - 3

MR. BRETT: the Province that when the Conservative Government took over this Province in the early 70s there was no fishing policy. And that the administration

MR. BRETT:

before this one, they really started the ball rolling and they poured millions of dollars into the fishery, and this administration has continued to do the same thing. And I might add, Mr. Speaker, that we are very proud of it.

MR. NEARY: You are not getting back into the Cabinet no matter how hard you try.

MR. BAIRD: He is a lot closer to it than you will ever be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, it is political rhetoric and I would love to spend more time on it, but we only have twenty minutes so I think I will sum it up by saying this, we have not used the fishery as an employer of last resort and neither did the Liberal Party because they did not use it at all. So neither one of us are really guilty of it.

Mr. Speaker, the district of Trinity North is just but one district in this Province that would not survive without the fishery. And I get a little bit upset when people make accusations against me and the government that all we care about is oil and gas. We have said over and over and over that the revenues that we hope to get from the oil will be used to generate the fishery and the other natural resources of our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to support the motion of my colleague, the member from Fogo (Mr. Tulk).

MR. BARRY: And, Mr. Speaker, when I look at it, when I see the resolution, 'That this House direct the present government to put forward a sound development strategy for the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery which will protect the interests of inshore fishermen, plant workers, trawlermen and the independent processors as well as the major companies involved in the recent restructuring agreement; AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the House direct the government to immediately resolve the unsatisfactory labour relations presently existing in the fishing industry as outlined by the "Unity 84" Campaign', what is it that members opposite are objecting to?

MR. NEARY: They are against motherhood.

MR. BARRY: Well, it would seem that they are against protecting the interests of inshore fishermen, plant workers, trawlermen and the independent processors as well as the major companies involved in the recent restructuring agreement, and they are against resolving the labour problems that are presently existing which are being discussed in the "Unity 84" Campaign. Now we are not asking the government to go down and accept the "Unity 84" Campaign, we are not asking them to go down and pass over the management of the fishing industry to the Newfoundland Fishermen, Food and Allied Workers' Union. We are asking members opposite to direct their attention to the problems of the Newfoundland fishery. And in voting against this motion, they are saying they are not interested in protecting the interests of the groups mentioned here. And I suppose, looking at the budget opposite, that is consistent. They are showing that they are not interested in protecting the interests of students, they are not interested in protecting the taxpayers and municipalities who are going to have their costs go up, and on and on. Mr. Speaker, we have a government which has reached the stage that it has lost touch with reality, it has lost touch

MR. BARRY: with the reality of our many fishermen out there who are going through very hard times.

Now as far as restructuring is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I and my colleagues, I am sure, support the attempt to see a restructured fishing industry and we believe that restructuring must be given a chance and we hope that it will work and we will do everything possible in the form of constructive suggestions, while this House is open and otherwise, to see that restructuring will work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: But, Mr. Speaker, what we are dealing with in this resolution, we are dealing with the fact that there are fishermen in this Province who are not being helped by restructuring. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) admitted that when he pointed out that the majority of our inshore fishermen do not sell to the restructured company, they will not be selling their fish to the restructured company.

Now the minister and members opposite cannot wash their hands of the very serious problems that exist in the fishing industry. I went through Hansard a few moments ago and I looked at the comments of the Minister of Fisheries last week. The Minister of Fisheries listed statistics on the few numbers of fishermen who have actually filed in bankruptcy, presumably arguing, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a serious crisis out there amongst our inshore fishermen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Fisheries is either refusing to face reality or else he has been spending too much time on his Asian tours and should get back to getting out on the wharf head a few more times and talking to the fishermen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Listen to who is talking about wharf heads.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it is about time the minister started talking to his constituents and started talking to, Mr. Speaker, them about the problems which they are experiencing. And if the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) thinks -

MR. MORGAN: Come down to Bonavista South in the next election and run against me.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, that is very tempting. That is very tempting, Mr. Speaker, but the Minister of Fisheries, however much he may bluster, Mr. Speaker, in this House, however much he may go on the personal attack, is going to have to answer to the fishermen of this Province, Mr. Speaker. And they are seeing through, Mr. Speaker, the incompetence of the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: How about the Tory reception for you in Labrador last week.

MR. BARRY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, let us hear about the reception I got in Labrador, Mr. Speaker. Let us hear about the reception I got from the people on the Coast of Labrador, who tell me that the policies of the minister and the policies of government are failing, Mr. Speaker. They are failing to meet the needs of the fishermen on the Coast of Labrador, and that is from the people, Mr. Speaker, and that is from our fishermen on the Coast of Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the minister thinks that it is a personal attack to set out that the minister is incompetent, that his policies are not meeting the issues of the day, are not meeting the needs of our fishermen, Mr. Speaker, there will be others; that is the function and the role, Mr. Speaker, of the Opposition and we will be setting out, not just for the Minister of Fisheries but minister by minister, where their policies -

MR. MORGAN: Your attack on me
backfired last week.

MR. BARRY: The Minister of Fisheries
(Mr. Morgan) has done more with that Telex to support the
credibility of my statement than I could ever do in this
House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker. When one considers why
a minister of the Crown would call up and ask another minister
of the Crown for a certificate of stability and competence,
Mr. Speaker, one has to wonder, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: At least I did not call
him a liar like you did.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to
have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of speaking and making my
point without having to shout him down, Mr. Speaker, but I will
if I have to.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, Mr. De Bane himself -

MR. MORGAN: The shining star of the Liberals.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, nobody in this Province cares whether the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is a crybaby. What the people of this Province are concerned about, Mr. Speaker, are whether he is doing his job and whether the Premier of this Province is letting him do his job. And the point I made last week, and the point I make again this week is that the Minister of Fisheries had his legs cut out from underneath him in the course of negotiations on the most important issue then facing the fisheries, saving these plants that were insolvent, keeping these fish plants open. Now, Mr. Speaker, what did Mr. De Bane say?

MR. MORGAN: Collect your big legal fee and (inaudible).

MR. BARRY: What did Mr. De Bane say?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, Mr. De Bane said that the Minister of Fisheries had been rejected three times by the Premier. Now this was in his news conference here in St. John's on July 4th. Mr. De Bane said that the Minister of Fisheries had on one day initialed an agreement with Mr. De Bane and the next day had to come back to him and say that that agreement was not acceptable to the Premier and Cabinet. Mr. De Bane, at great embarrassment to himself, went back to the federal cabinet, Mr. Speaker, and had another agreement initialed by the Minister of Fisheries. And was that acceptable? Mr. Speaker, he went back to the Premier again -

MR.NEARY: Three strikes and you are out.

MR.BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) had to go back a third time. He had to say to the federal minister , 'My colleagues in Cabinet have undermined me again. They have cut the legs out from underneath me. They will not approve this second agreement that I have signed. Please go back and get another one.'

MR.MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. TULK: What about this personal thing -

MR.BARRY: Mr. Speaker, any work that I have done for any client I am very proud of, particularly the opportunity I had to force the Minister of Fisheries and the government opposite to finally get to the real issues, to finally get to the stage where they had to finally get involved in the restructuring agreement because, Mr. Speaker, that was the point I was coming to. After they finally walked away from the table , Mr. Speaker, with the Newfoundland Minister of Fisheries, Mr. De Bane had to say , 'Mr. Morgan, as much as I like you as a person, how can I continue to negotiate with you? Where is your credibility? You have come back three times and told me.' Now , Mr. Speaker, who cares whether the minister should have done the honourable thing and resigned. The question is, Mr. Speaker -

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

MR.SPEAKER (Dr.McNicholas): Order, please! The Minister of Fisheries on a point of order.

MR.MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the debate is on a fisheries motion, and the debate is on the policies

MR.MORGAN: on developing the fishing industry. Why is it the hon. gentleman still choses to go on this slanderous, personal attack again? Why does he not stick to the issues like his colleagues who already spoken in debate? The hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) put forward the motion and in doing so put forward questions on policy, questions on the issues in the fishing industry today, and not the kind, again, digging in personal attack by the same hon. gentleman who personally attacked me last week. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that the hon. member who is now speaking in this debate be more pertinent to the debate itself and get down to the issues and the problems of the fisheries today and the fishermen in particular. Stop being so personal.

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

MR.SPEAKER (Dr.McNicholas): To the point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour is aware, I believe, that that is not a point of order, it is merely a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen. Obviously the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr.Morgan) is hurting and, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to slanderous and libellous statements I do not think I have ever heard anything as low as the interjection by the hon. gentleman there a few moments ago.

MR.MORGAN: Listen to who is talking!

MR. NEARY: How low, Mr. Speaker, and how slanderous can you get? The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. colleague is putting forward a good argument for supporting this resolution, why hon. gentleman there opposite should support this resolution. Here is why the hon. gentleman is hurting: "WHEREAS the present government's lack of fishery development policy is threatening to destroy the economic, social and cultural fabric of Newfoundland and Labrador society". The hon. gentleman is making a good speech, a good case to try to entice members to support that resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I would submit that he be allowed to continue uninterrupted by hon. gentlemen there opposite.

MR. MORGAN: Speak to the issues.

MR. NEARY: And if the hon. gentleman cannot stand the heat he should get out of the kitchen.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please! Order, please!
To that point of order, I rule there is no point of order, it is just a matter of a difference of opinion.

The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if it is not a real issue in this Province whether the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) still has any credibility in terms of negotiating with the federal minister, in terms of negotiating with other people, if that is not an issue, Mr. Speaker, how can we have any issue that is more important to our fishery? The Minister of Fisheries, who will have to be, Mr. Speaker, who is supposed to be the one now to negotiate with the federal minister has no credibility. Now that is the point. Mr. Speaker, we may feel sorry for the Minister of Fisheries, his colleagues may feel sorry for him, we may like him as a person, but the issue is, can this man

MR. BARRY: preserve his credibility in future negotiations with the federal government after this happening? Can he do that?

MR. MORGAN: Now, schoolboy debater, speak for yourself.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), I would ask if you would prevent him from interfering with the debate, I would like to continue.

MR. MORGAN: Well, debate the issues.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I will debate whatever I want to debate.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. member has asked to be heard in silence.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of very serious questions and one, Mr. Speaker, has to do with this entire issue of quality. The Newfoundland fishermen are very concerned that they are being asked to improve quality. They support the concept, I support the concept, everybody supports the concept that quality should be improved. But, Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland fishermen are very concerned that it will not matter whether the quality of their fish is improved. When they land their fish, Mr. Speaker, they are concerned, after putting all this extra effort into improving quality, after putting this extra cost in terms of time and so forth into preserving quality, will they get the price to compensate them for this extra effort, for this extra time? And right now, Mr. Speaker, they see that they will not get a better price; they see that there are large unsold inventories, they see that there is competition from lower priced protein and, Mr. Speaker, they want to know what the Minister of Fisheries opposite and what the government is going to do to see that they get the price they should get

MR. BARRY: for their higher quality fish. And, Mr. Speaker, that is one question which the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has not directed himself to, has not shown any leadership on, and the time is coming, Mr. Speaker, when the minister's time will be running out. The fishermen of this Province are becoming impatient.

Mr. Speaker, another very valid point that is made by our fishermen is that one of the things affecting the price of fish is the strength of the Canadian dollar. Our Newfoundland fishermen are seeing the Canadian Government intervene to keep the Canadian dollar strong, to keep the Canadian dollar higher vis-à-vis European currencies. And they are saying, if the federal government is going to keep the Canadian dollar up, is going to actually intervene, use policies to keep the Canadian dollar up, and if that is going to mean then that European fish is going to be more competitive than Newfoundland fish in the markets of the world, should there not be, Mr. Speaker, some policy on the part of the Canadian Government, supported by the provincial government, that will recognize that if currency problems - and there may be other valid reasons -

MR. BARRY: currency problems, and there may be other valid reasons for dealing with the currency issue, but if decisions of the national government, the Government of Canada, are going to make the Newfoundland fishermen less competitive, then should there not be another policy? Whether it be, Mr. Speaker, a commodity support board or whether it be some other mechanism, should there not be? Are our fishermen not entitled to be protected from the adverse effects of such national policies? These are very real issues, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has not yet addressed and that our fishermen expect our provincial Minister of Fisheries to deal with.

MR. MORGAN: Both governments combined.

MR. BARRY: Both governments combined. I have said that. But at least this government has got to get away from these red herrings, Mr. Speaker, these issues that are thrown out as great propaganda but do nothing to meet the real issues of the day. Every day that the Canadian dollar goes up in relationship to European currency, the competitiveness of the Newfoundland fishery goes down, is hurt, is endangered. And, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Fisheries to get up in this House on the earliest occasion and to talk about what he is going to do, what he is going to recommend if not do directly, what he is going to request of the Government of Canada to ensure that the national policies of this country do not continue to place the Newfoundland fishery in a less and less competitive situation. And also, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister opposite, rather than rely upon these insubstantial statistics as to how many fishermen have actually filed bankruptcy papers, to have his department do some surveys and determine

MR. BARRY: whether or not what the party on this side of the House, whether or not the executive of the Newfoundland Fisherman, Food and Allied Workers Union, and whether or not what many fishermen say is true: Do we have a situation today where many of our fishermen can not even meet the cost of paying off their boats? Do we not have a situation where many of them today are earning less than the poverty level? Do we not have a crisis, Mr. Speaker, that will have to be dealt with to help our inshore fishermen earn a decent income in this Province?

I see my time is up. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): Thank you.

MR. MORGAN: By leave. He is making sense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

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

MR. DINN: There are a lot of hon. members who want to speak on this very, very important subject, Mr. Speaker, in the House of Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the minister, I would like to welcome to this Assembly, the Fogo Island Central High School and their Principal, Mr. Fudge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Also, before recognizing the minister, I want to give a ruling on a point of order that was raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). It was in reference to comments made by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) on Friday last. The comments made referred to members of the House of Commons, so it was not a point of order in this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak very briefly on the resolution. I understand that many hon. members in the House of Assembly would like to have a few words, especially those members who have fishing districts. I would like to deal with the part of the resolution that deals with 'AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the House direct the government to immediately resolve the unsatisfactory labour relations presently existing in the fishing industry, as outlined by the "Unity '84" Campaign.'

Before I get into that, I would like to deal with the hon. the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) as it relates to his attack again on the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). Now, Mr. Speaker, we had this sort of

MR. DINN:

thing happen in the House of Assembly last week and I believe the people of Newfoundland are basically fed up with that sort of nonsensical and silly sort of an argument used by the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). We know he is smarting. We know that what he said last week was found out not to be true, that the federal minister disassociated himself with the remarks made by the hon. member for Mount Scio. Mr. Speaker, the record of the House of Assembly clearly states what was contained in the telegram from the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane), who is an honourable man, who has dealt fairly with the Minister of Fisheries for Newfoundland (Mr. Morgan), who said in his telegram, "First of all it is a silly and unfounded charge." Unless he was referring to the charge made by the hon. the member for Mount Scio -

MR. WARREN:

Well, we said he was a liar.

MR. DINN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not getting into the unparliamentary comments made by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains. I do not want to get down in the mud because one is apt to get the mud on him.

So, Mr. Speaker, that was dealt with last week. The hon. member for Mount Scio in trying to make a name for himself got up in this House of Assembly and made a vicious personal attack on the Minister of Fisheries. He was not himself involved in the negotiations at all. There were two people who were involved besides officials, and one was our Minister of Fisheries who said what the member said was untrue. That should have been enough. Most hon. members

MR. DINN: in this House take the word of an hon. gentleman when he speaks. But to get clarification the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa (Mr. De Bane) wrote a telegram to the Premier saying that what the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) said was silly, unfounded and totally untrue. So I had to get up and put that back on the record again, Mr. Speaker, because that sort of thing cannot be left on the record of this House of Assembly. And I believe that anytime the hon. member gets up with that sort of personal and foolish attack on any member of this House that he should be rightly put in his place by an hon. gentleman on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, let us deal with some of the issues—that this government has done nothing for the fishery, that this government has no policy for the fishery. The hon. member was a member of a caucus not too long ago, I believe in June of 1982, when this government outlined quite clearly the policy of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador with respect to the fishery. The hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has a copy down there, I have read it several times myself, it is good reading and I refer it to the hon. gentleman for Mount Scio who, Mr. Speaker, I believe will only be a temporary member for Mount Scio.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to negotiations: Since 1980 negotiations have gone on with respect to trawlermen, plant workers, salt fish operations in this Province and the inshore fishery. We have had a lot of trouble with respect to negotiations. I am sure the

MR. DINN: hon. member is not asking government, or directing government to impose a settlement on either the union or the companies with respect to labour relations. That is not the way labour relations are carried out in this Province. Labour relations in this Province are carried out under a collective bargaining system whereby -

MR. BARRY: By sending letters telling them not to negotiate.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is now breaking the rules of the House. He cannot sit in his seat you see, Mr. Speaker, and listen to debate; he has to charge in there, Mr. Speaker, and break the rules of the House by interrupting. So I ask the hon. member to sit in his place, as I did, and listen to the hon. member. He did not make a lot of sense but I would like to make my few comments now. I do not have, as I say, a lot of time, but I would like to take the little time that I do have just to outline some of the things that are involved with respect to labour relations that the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), who introduced the resolution, and the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) apparently know absolutely nothing about.

So what happened with respect to the inshore fishery? Well, in 1980 we had a strike in the inshore fishery.

MR. TULK: What came of that?

MR. DINN: Now how was the strike caused in the inshore fishery? Well, Mr. Speaker, they went through the normal negotiating process. The unions and

March 21, 1984

Tape No. 246

NM - 4

MR. DINN: the companies at the time asked for conciliation. There was not a minute went by; the day the letter arrived on the desk for conciliation I had conciliation officers out there trying to and attempting to get an agreement between the parties. Unfortunately, as happens in

MR. DINN:

negotiations, sometimes you are not successful in getting the parties sufficiently close together to get a collective agreement. Now this is not a dictatorship, you do not haul them aside and say, 'You will do it this way'. You do not impose a collective agreement. That is what free collective bargaining is all about. The unions, the employees have a right to strike, the companies, if they cannot afford or if they cannot comply with what the employees are looking for through their representatives, can lockout, and that is what it is all about. Any government that comes along and imposes a collective agreement might just as well wipe out collective agreements in the Province, might just as well wipe out labour relations. They do not exist if you are going to dictate the terms of a collective agreement. So that did not happen in the inshore fishery, we had a strike and as a result of that strike a Royal Commission was set up. That commission reported and there was an interim agreement accepted, and, basically, on the basis of that Royal Commission Report there has been no strike in the inshore fishery since. Now, does that mean that everybody is happy? No. It means that they have come to terms. There may be some suggestions that the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) relates with respect to international currency and the fact that the Canadian government might be, through its support structures, affecting that international currency and thus possibly should support the inshore fishermen and the fishery in this Province. It is not a bad suggestion but that is the only suggestion the hon. member made in twenty minutes. It has been made by "Unity 84". It is not a bad suggestion but "Unity 84" is not saying to the provincial government, 'Provincial government, impose a settlement on us'. All the companies, with respect to the restructuring, were

MR. DINN: basically bankrupt. They could not afford to operate. Whether it was inefficiency, whether it was poor management, whether it was cost of product, they just could not afford to operate and they went bankrupt. Now the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in this Province, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) federally got together and worked out an agreement. The Minister of Fisheries federally, and I have no qualms about what he says, he said our Minister of Fisheries was a hard bargainer and a good bargainer for the Province. The hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) does not agree, but I believe he was. I believe we got a good restructuring agreement. And that restructuring agreement is just basically being put in place now. Only last week the Board of Directors of the new super company was put in place. The CEO is not put in place yet but that will be done shortly I understand. When that happens these people will be the management of the company. They will be the overseers of a successful, hopefully, successful company. And with everybody's co-operation the fisheries in that restructured company should do well, should go a long way towards becoming a success in this Province, and I sure hope it does for everybody's sake, because whether you live in St. John's, or Gander, or Goose Bay, or Labrador City/ Wabush, if the fishery is good in this Province, this Province is on good grounds.

MR. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, we all have to work together to make sure that this thing works. And it is not only the fishery in this Province, it is the newsprint industry, it is the mining industry, whether it is in Western Labrador or Baie Verte, or the new one that the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) is trying to get going down in St. Lawrence, restart down in St. Lawrence. Whatever it is is it impertinent, is it wrong for the Premier of this Province, the man who has responsibility for all of the Province, is it wrong for him to write a union and say, 'We have to be careful what we are doing here.' The newsprint industry is in a very precarious position. Is there anybody in this House does not know that it is? Is there anybody in this House does not know that it is going to take a lot of work on behalf of just about everybody in this Province in order for the fishery to survive in this Province and work? They are not being realistic, they are not in the real world. So it is going to take everybody, it is going to take the NFFAW, it is going to take the board of directors of the new fish company, it is going to take Abitibi-Price and it is going to take their unions, and it is going to take the miners in Western Labrador and their employers, whether it is the Iron Ore Company of Canada or Wabush Mines, it is going to take everybody in this Province working together to make sure that we come out of this recession and we move the way we were moving before we went into this recession. What was the situation then? The situation then was, if people will recall, that the employment growth in Newfoundland, just before we went into the recession, was the highest employment growth level of any province in Canada. When you think about it, that is something. We were at 6.5. It was ahead of Alberta, which was approximately at 5, it was ahead of Ontario. And that is what we can get back to

MR. DINN: if we all work together. If we want to waste our time on personal attacks in this House of Assembly, then the people of this Province are going to kick us out of here because we do not deserve to be here. We do not deserve to be here if that is what the name of the game is going to be. I tell you, gentlemen, that the name of the game in the next couple of years is going to be that the people of this Province are going to have to see that we are working together, whether it is in labour relations, whether it is mining in Western Labrador, in newsprint, whether it is in the fishery on the Grand Banks, the fishery on the Burin Peninsula, the fishery on the Northeast Coast. Wherever it is the people of this Province are going to be saying, 'Are these guys working together to make sure that this Province succeeds or are they in there fooling around, bickering, and having these foolish little personal attacks as to who cried last. How silly and foolish can hon. members get? Let us get up. Let us raise the level of debate in this House for a change, let us see if we can do something for this Province. Anybody who got into politics fooling himself, thinking that he was going to do something for himself, let me tell you there is not a member in this House who does not know that the job is a pretty tough one, that it is not easy on members in this House, it is not easy on

MR. DINN:

families, is not easy on anything. But if we waste our time fooling around attacking one other personally, it makes it just a little bit more difficult and the job is a little bit harder to accomplish. So, Mr. Speaker, with respect to labour relations, I can tell the hon members opposite that there is not a day, a night or a second in this Province, if I get a call with respect to assistance in labour relations in the fishery, that I will not have an officer there to sit at that table faster than the unions or the companies can get there. I made that commitment when I got into the Department of Labour and Manpower and that commitment still stands. And there is not a union nor a company can say in this Province today that they have not gotten the services of the Department of Labour and Manpower when they needed those services, but you cannot pull off miracles. If they do not want to agree they do not agree, and you are going to get strikes and walk outs. I hope we get no more, I am going to do my best to make sure that we do not, but if you get in a position where they cannot agree, we are not going to become dictators. That day has gone. We have given the people of this Province rights, their rights to free, collective bargaining and you do not impose - gentlemen that day is gone, long since gone - you do not impose on people if they do not want to agree. If a man does not want to work for what the employer wants to give him, he has the right not to. That is what it is all about. So let us forget about this foolish little resolution that talks about labour relations. There is no service that the people with respect to the fishing

MR. DINN: industry wanted from the government of this Province that they did not get, so how can anybody agree with that as a resolution in this House of Assembly? How can anybody in their right mind? No fisheries policy? Well, we have a fisheries policy. Not doing anything? Well, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) outlined what we are doing for the fishery, \$31 million, I believe in a new super company, \$30 million last year in loans guarantees for the small and independent plants in this Province to keep them going for another year, \$20 million in loans for fishing boats. We did not tell them to burn them. We got the Fisheries Loan Board to co-operate and loan so that people could buy boats and get out and do some fishing. Yes, there are people who have problems. I venture to say there are doctors who have problems, there are lawyers who have problems; a lot of people have problems, fishermen have problems. But there are a good few fishermen in this Province who are making a buck at the fishery and they are pretty happy that they got some assistance from the Minister of Fisheries through his department to do that. And it is a bit of a shame when they are going through a bit of a hard time with respect to income taxes that the heavy hand comes down -

MR. WARREN: The Minister of Fisheries department.

MR. DINN: No, not the Minister of Fisheries department. He is not the Minister of National Revenue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Now the hon. member for

MR. DINN: Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren)
is interrupting.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. DINN: He will be over soon, Mr.
Speaker, genuflecting to the Minister of Fisheries
(Mr. Morgan) about the Northern fisheries. That will be
going this year. He need not worry about the Northern
fisheries this year. That will be going this year
because the Minister of Fisheries is concerned about
that. He will have his turn to speak in this debate,
Mr. Speaker, and I intend to sit down and listen to what
the hon. member says because the odd time the hon.
member makes a little sense in this House.

MR. TULK: That is the worst he can say
of you, 'Garfield'.

MR. BAIRD: Quite odd though.

MR. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, we have
dispelled the fact that there is no policy. We have
talked about the dollars that just last year went into
the fisheries, put in by the hon. Minister of Fisheries.
We talked about his capability with respect to negotiations,
and nobody can doubt that for the hon. members' colleagues
in Ottawa, the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa (Mr. De Bane),
said what a great negotiator he is.

MR. TULK: You know what we called him.

MR. DINN: I know what you called him,
but, I mean, that is unparliamentary. I do not even want
to get down to that. I do not want to get down to that.

March 21, 1984

Tape No. 249

ah-4

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, there is the other hon. member taking about the fisheries, and he brings in a resolution on the fisheries and this morning the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) came back and just announced down in Fogo \$1 million for the Fogo Co-op to keep it going.

MR. TULK: What a member!

MR. DINN: Oh, yes, he is a great member. So, Mr. Speaker, what thanks. On behalf of his constituents, what did the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) do? Well, he

MR. DINN:

introduced a resolution in the House saying, 'THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House direct the present government to put forward a sound development strategy.' Is there anything wrong with the development strategy in Fogo today with respect to the fishery? It is okay, is it?

MR. TULK: (Inaudible) wrong (inaudible).

MR. DINN: Is it okay in Fogo today?
One million dollars for Fogo today, is it alright?

MR. TULK: A million dollars, boy! It is only a loan! Do not be so silly!

MR. DINN: It is only a loan, that is all, yes. Where would they get it if they did not get it from the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and this government?

MR. TULK: Where would they get it?

MR. DINN: Yes, I will ask the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: You would not know but you were passing out a gift.

MR. DINN: It is not a gift, and I know the hon. member does not appreciate it, but the people down in Fogo appreciate it. The over 500 people in the plant in Fogo appreciate it and the fishermen in Fogo appreciate it. The hon. member does not because it does not make him look good, because he is in here saying that the Minister of Fisheries is doing nothing for the fishery in this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not have a leg to stand on. When is he going back to Fogo?

MR. TULK: Whenever I am required

MR. DINN: Well, the hon. the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) said it today. He said, 'If I ever decide to run down in Fogo, the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) will never be heard in this House again.' And I am inclined to agree. Because here is the member for Fogo talking about what the government is not doing for the fishery, and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) got up in the House today and announces \$1 million for the Co-op in Fogo to keep it going and 'they are not doing anything for the fisheries in Newfoundland.'

We put out a book in 1982 that the hon. member - who is the spokesman, by the way, in the Opposition, for Fisheries -

MR. TULK: I am going back to Fogo on an \$8 million yacht.

MR. DINN: Yes, he is going back to Fogo on an \$8 million yacht. Another thing announced in the budget yesterday was a new ferry for Fogo. There you go! Now the hon. member will ride high on the hog and he will go down and try to get a little bit of credit for it, but how can he go down? He must have a face, Mr. Speaker, like a robber's horse!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! Order, please!
I have to inform the hon. member that his time has expired.

MR. DINN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me congratulate the member for Fogo for moving such an important and timely resolution in this hon. House.

MR. NEARY: I wish also to congratulate my hon. colleagues, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), who have already spoken in this debate and given such excellent addresses.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is probably the most important resolution ever to be brought before this House, because it concerns an industry that directly employed in 1982 approximately 13,000 fishermen directly and provided part-time jobs for another 13,000. The member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) may not be aware of that. In the processing sector in 1982, another 14,000 were employed. That is a total, Mr. Speaker, of 40,000 people employed either directly or indirectly in the fishing industry in 1982.

Many of the communities where you find these plant workers and fishermen, Mr. Speaker, are solely dependent on the fishery and will continue to be for a long time to come. The economy of this Province has survived for 500 years on the fishery and our whole heritage and our way of life in 600 or 700 Newfoundland communities is based on the fishery, Mr. Speaker. And, therefore, I think it will continue that way for a long time to come. And many of our young people will continue to live in rural Newfoundland, at home, because they want to stay home. But, Mr. Speaker, if we are to maintain a vibrant and prosperous rural society, we must make certain that we have a viable fishery in this Province. That was the purpose of my colleague moving the resolution that he moved today, Mr. Speaker, to try to influence, pressure, if you want to put it that way, the provincial government into

March 21, 1984

Tape 250

EC - 4

MR. NEARY: taking steps, into announcing
plans and programmes that would help to remove

MR. NEARY:

the chaotic condition the turmoil that exists today in the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery.

Mr. Speaker, the provincial government is a partner in this super company but they must remember, Mr. Speaker, that as partners in that super company that it is the primary producers in this Province who come first. It is the people who generate the new dollars, the fishermen, the plant workers, but moreso the fishermen because the fishermen are the primary producers, they generate the new dollars. They pay 50 per cent of the Premier's salary and 50 per cent of the salary of members in this hon. House.

MR. PATTERSON:

What about the Leader of the Opposition's salary?

MR. NEARY:

I said 50 per cent of the salary of the members of this House. The other 50 per cent comes from the Government of Canada.

MR. PEACH:

Are you not the highest paid Leader of the Opposition already in provincial politics?

MR. WARREN:

He pays his own rent.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member jealous? The hon. member is in serious trouble over in Carbonear and he is smarting under that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard in silence if I may.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, when we talk of the great future that now lies ahead for our fishery -

MR. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) on a point of order.

MR. CARTER:

I do not wish to interrupt the member who is making, or starting to make a fairly good speech,

MR. CARTER: but it is quite clear that he is reading his speech, and it has been written possibly by himself, but probably by someone else. It has been ghost written. Now I have no objection to listening to a ghost, but I do have every objection to a member reading his speech, especially when the rest of us have been constantly reminded by that hon. gentleman that anything we are reading we should table. So he is welcome to read what he likes, but I think it should be tabled, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

To that point of order, it is correct that members of the House are not permitted to read their speeches, but the members of this House are permitted to refer to notes from time to time.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when we talk of the great future that now lies ahead for the fisheries in this Province, we must first of all give credit where credit is due, and in this particular instance, when we are talking about the super company, Mr. Speaker, we must first of all give credit to the Government of Canada, to the federal government, to Uncle Ottawa, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. That department, Mr. Speaker, is putting \$75 million into the restructuring of the deep-sea fishery in this Province, and in addition to that are funding a development corporation on the Burin Peninsula.

MR. TULK: Thirty million dollars.

MR. NEARY: Thirty million dollars.

That is \$105 million, and all the provincial government is doing, Mr. Speaker, is converting equity into shares in the new super company. So we must first and foremost give credit where credit is due. There would be no restructuring, as a matter of fact the provincial government abdicated its

MR. NEARY: responsibility and turned its jurisdiction and its responsibility over to the Government of Canada, and this is the same administration that is asking for more control of the fishery.

MR. TULK: 'Jim' was not allowed to negotiate.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans spent in this Province during the fiscal year 1983-1984, that is just about to come to an end, \$80 million. How much is the provincial government spending?

MR. TULK: In what?

MR. NEARY: In the development of the fisheries in this Province.

MR. TULK: Seventeen million.

MR. NEARY: Seventeen million. Ottawa \$80 million. Salaries alone make up over \$23 million, while the cost of its operations is between \$34 million and \$37 million. On capital account, Fisheries and Oceans are spending to date almost another \$12 million. Somebody should write these figures down and total them, another \$12 million, while about \$4 million will be expended in grants and various contributions to the fishermen in this Province.

MR. TULK: Give me all the figures again.
I do not need a pencil.

MR. NEARY: There is \$23 million, \$37 million, \$12 million, \$4 million. Now, what is the total amount?

MR. TULK: About \$76 million.

MR. NEARY: \$76 million just for research for the operation of the Department of Ocean and Fisheries in this Province. By comparison, Mr. Speaker, for 1983-1984 the Provincial Department of Fisheries will spend only about

MR. NEARY: \$17,396,000 out of a budget of \$1,900,000,000, Mr. Speaker. So we can see the importance and the priority that the administration there opposite place on the fishery in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in discussing the role of the federal government in our fisheries, it is easy

MR. NEARY:

to lose sight of the fact that after the extension of the 200 mile limit it was then the federal Fisheries Minister, Mr. Romeo LeBlanc, who fought hard, and often against the objection and the criticism and pressure from the Newfoundland government, to preserve part of our fishery for the inshore fishermen. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it was the policy of the former Tory administration in this Province, the Moores' administration, that favoured joint ventures, if hon. members' memories serve them correctly, favoured joint ventures with foreign investors. In 1977 the provincial government attempted to sell the provincially owned Harbour Grace fish plant to North Sea, a German subsidiary of the joint Anglo-Dutch firm Unilever, which had a share in the Harbour Grace fish plant at one point but had sold it. Much of the fish for this plant, Mr. Speaker, I hasten to point out to hon. gentlemen, would have to come from the inshore fishery. However, Mr. Speaker, Mr. LeBlanc refused to give fishing permits to the North Sea trawlers and the proposed project died, and I say thank God for that, it was dropped. For his action Mr. LeBlanc was strongly condemned by members there opposite, Mr. Speaker, strongly condemned by members of the Moores' government, but his action, indeed, was correct, LeBlanc's wisdom was borne out to be correct and his courageous stand on this issue, as well as his genuine concern for the interest and welfare of the Province's inshore fishermen, Mr. Speaker, must not be lost sight of by members of this House and by the fishermen of this Province. As Mr. LeBlanc said - I do not know if my hon. colleagues recall - Mr. LeBlanc said in 1977, "I have a clear bias for the inshore fishermen, not because of some romantic regard," he said, "not because of his picture on the calendars, but because he cannot travel far for fish, because he depends on fishing for his income, because his

MR. NEARY: community, in turn, depends on his fishery being protected." Mr. Speaker, it is to Romeo LeBlanc that Newfoundland and Canada owes almost total control and ownership over its East Coast fishery today from foreign investors and the joint ventures, which may have had the benefit of providing immediate capital to the processing industry, but at the price of giving control of the fishery to capitalists in West Germany, Holland and Japan. And, Mr. Speaker, have they abandoned that policy there opposite? Did we not hear the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in November and December, when this House met, advocating that foreigners be brought in to catch fish to be processed in Newfoundland plants, to do away with jobs for Newfoundlanders? Mr. Speaker, we must ensure the fishermen and the plant workers of this Province that the fishery remains a Newfoundland industry. And to this end, Sir, I commend my colleagues for supporting and listening to the voice of "Unity 84".

MR. PATTERSON: You will get your (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we will support any measure or any provision that is in the best interests of the fishermen of this Province. Last session Your Honour will recall that we supported a resolution of

MR. NEARY: this House, calling on the federal government not to allocate any of the Northern cod stocks to non-Newfoundland fishermen until our local needs are first fulfilled. We have also supported, Mr. Speaker, and we will continue to do so, that the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks be included within the 200 mile limit. We have not heard the position of the administration there opposite, Mr. Speaker, that keeps the fish plants going on the Burin Peninsula.

Mr. Speaker, we also supported and demanded during the restructuring talks in 1983 that all our fish plants which have been closed for whatever reason - I want my colleague to hear this - in 1983, we supported and demanded in the restructuring in 1983 that all our fish plants which had been closed -

MR. STAGG: You supported it?

MR. NEARY: Yes, we supported it at the People's Conference. We were the first, Mr. Speaker, that for whatever reason they were closed that they be reopened and revitalized with new and secure stocks and capital funding.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt, no question on this side of the House, the great and historic Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador has always stood strong for our fishermen, and will continue to stand shoulder to shoulder with them as they struggle, Mr. Speaker, to get social and economic justice under the fishery restructuring.

Mr. Speaker, the fish companies, despite their past record of mismanagement and incompetency, have been bailed out by the federal and provincial governments. I now say it is about time that the

MR. NEARY: governments came to the aid of our fishermen and enable them to earn a decent working wage, Mr. Speaker. This year we are going to see possible chaos in the fishing industry this Summer. And, Mr. Speaker, who is responsible for the mess? Well, my colleague for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) pinpointed the gentleman responsible for the mess, none other than the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, real incomes of our fishermen have decreased from 1978 to 1979 alone, as we learned from my colleague, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), our spokesman on fisheries, who so ably demonstrated the other day his knowledge of the fishery, that the fishermen of this Province have experienced a loss of 2.5 cents a pound in real cash, in real income. Fishermen's costs have dramatically increased, yet the price of fish has stayed virtually the same, Mr. Speaker. And at the same time I might point out for the benefit of hon. gentlemen, that if the Kirby Report recommendations are followed these fishermen will be asked to produce a higher quality product through such means as to ice fish, to gut the fish, to bleed the fish at sea and so on. Yet the amount, Mr. Speaker, that they will receive this year will be less, there will be no increase in the price of fish over last year.

In short what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, as my colleague said the other day -

MR. TULK: I am going to have to say it again.

MR. NEARY: You are going to have to say it again. Their expenses have increased yet they will receive

March 21, 1984

Tape No. 253

NM - 3

MR. NEARY:

added cost.

no compensation for the

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask hon.
gentleman, is that fair to the fishermen, the lifeblood
of rural Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not. The failure of the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and the administration there opposite to act on these matters, is now sowing the seed of discontent among our fishermen and we are now witnessing the result of this discontent, Mr. Speaker, Unity '84. Now, Mr. Speaker, I only wish that I had a longer time to deal with the fishery. It is the lifeblood of Newfoundland. It has been neglected by this administration. They have put all their eggs in the offshore oil basket, they have neglected the fishery, they have neglected all our other natural resources and all the other industries in this Province, Mr. Speaker. But I say to hon. gentleman, what is needed now, Mr. Speaker, is for the Minister of Fisheries to sit down with the Fishermen's Union, let the collective bargaining work, debate the merits of this so-called social compact theory they are talking about, and finish the restructuring so that is just as advantageous to the fishermen as it will be to the shareholders of the bailed out companies.

A final word, Mr. Speaker; it is my understanding that the federal Cabinet has approved \$15 million in funding for the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation and that another \$6 million awaits at our disposal under the DREE agreement for native assistance in the fisheries. The administration there opposite, Mr. Speaker, is dragging its feet in setting up this corporation. This neglect is shameful and is typical of the indifference that the administration has towards Labrador and towards the fishermen and the fish-plant workers in this Province, Mr. Speaker. So I would urge, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman thinks he has a cozy arrangement, a cozy relationship with Mr. De Bane, that he get on with the job of restructuring, because what we are concerned

MR. NEARY: about is the slowness in which the restructuring is being implemented and we are very, very concerned, and we will make this our top priority in this Session of the House, Mr. Speaker. They can try to distract the Opposition and distract the people of this Province all they want from the real issues, they can bring in all the red herrings they want and they can create all the controversy and all the confrontation they want, but we will hold firm, Mr. Speaker, that the fishery is our most important, basic industry and we will make it a number one priority in this Session of the House of Assembly whether the hon. gentlemen there opposite like it or not.

MR. MATTHEWS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MATTHEWS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am most pleased today, Mr. Speaker, to have the opportunity to respond to the resolution as been put forth by the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). As hon. members will recall, in my address of thanks to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on Monday past I expressed some concerns that I have for the inshore fishermen who are attempting to make a living within the district of Grand Bank. The problems I addressed at that time, Mr. Speaker, were those of marketing difficulties and low catch rates which over the past number of years have led to very low incomes. I might say that most of the marketing problems that were experienced were experienced with some operations that were then operated by the former Lake Group, which now, of course, have been brought under the new Fishery Products International.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to go on record in this House of Assembly as saying that I totally support the inshore fishermen, the trawlermen

MR. MATTHEWS: and plant workers within my district, and, of course, within the whole Province, in their efforts to achieve a decent living from our fishing industry.

Mr. Speaker, as I read the resolution so ably presented by the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), I had some concerns, but I read with interest a section of the resolution that refers to the rising costs associated with the inshore fishery harvesting sector. And, of course, my colleague, the

MR. MATTHEWS:

hon. the Minister

of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), referred to these factors last week. And, of course, any person in this Province who has any knowledge of the fishery whatsoever, and, of course, one would expect that the former Fisheries critic of the Opposition (Mr. Tulk) - I say former because I believe from the activities of the House in the last few weeks that he now has been replaced by the hon. the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), who I might say, in some areas of the Province right now, particularly my area, is known as the Member Messiah -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

- because there is no doubt

from his performance in this House, he thinks that he is the best lawyer, not only in Canada but the U.S. He thinks he is a better MP than anyone in Ottawa; he thinks he is a better minister than anyone in the provincial Cabinet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

He thinks he will be a better

Leader of the Opposition than the present Leader and, of course, we all agree with him on that. There is no doubt about that. That is not much of a contest.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that these factors that have led to increasing costs and so on with the inshore fishery, this government, any provincial government, particularly the Government of Newfoundland, has no control whatsoever over the cost of purchasing licences for fishing or the cost of improved quality. Of course these improved quality methods are being imposed by the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to become personal this evening in my speech, but I think the hon. the member for Mount Scio started the attack on

MR. MATTHEWS: the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and I was somewhat surprised that for two weeks in a row now he has continued that aim.

In his remarks to the hon. minister, he made such remarks as that he was incompetent and other such things. Mr. Speaker, you know, there are some of us in this hon. House today who do not have short memories. If there was anyone who was incompetent when it came to fisheries matters, it was the hon. member when he was the member for Placentia West. And we all know what the people of Placentia West did with him after he demonstrated his incompetency down there, they gave him the boot. And, of course, the fishermen in the area were very, very upset with the hon. member because most times when he was supposed to be visiting his district, he was in the holiday resort area down there, the Golden Sands and Freshwater Park. And consequently, the fishing that he was doing was for recreation and he was not looking after the fishery in his district. Of course, we know what happened there.

The hon. member now for two weeks has been coming in here and shouting about the fishery, which to me demonstrates that he has no knowledge whatsoever of the fishery or he obviously would act in a more reserved manner and get to the issues at stake. I think what he is doing is shouting and ranting and raving, trying to pretend to the people of the Province that he knows about the fishery, but it is my belief that he would not know a fish if he fell on one.

MR. BARRY: What about the vote I turned around down there?

MR. MATTHEWS: That is right, Sir.
Exactly. That is a good majority. When you turn around 2,000 votes it is not bad, not bad at all!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS: Would the hon. member like to know what Pat Canning turned around on him in 1975?

MR. BARRY: I will be back.

MR. MATTHEWS: Yes, I know you are going down. You are going down soon, and there is a message down there for you. I will tell you when you talk to the people down there, you tell me the day after the message in Grand Bank for you and the number who are going to be there to see you.

Mr. Speaker, there is another point that I would like to refer to when we talk about escalating costs for the inshore harvesting sector, and that is fuel, of course, of which, again, most of the increase in fuel is directly related to the increases imposed by the federal government. And I cannot pass this subject without making reference to the present Liberal MP for Burin - St. George's, Mr. Simmons

MR. CALLAN: What about John Crosbie?

MR. MATTHEWS: Exactly. When the then Minister of Finance, John Crosbie, was going to put 18 cents a gallon on fuel, the hon. MP down there, still the MP, Mr. Simmons he will not be the MP much longer, but still is - said that the fishermen would only be able to get half-way to their fishing gear because the cost of fuel was going to be so expensive; 'Only get half-way out,' he said, 'What are they going to have to do to get back?' And, of course, we have

MR. MATTHEWS: seen what has happened to the cost of fuel since the last federal election. And, of course, you cannot blame that on the Minister of Fisheries in Newfoundland, Jim Morgan.

 Mr. Speaker, as I read the hon. member's resolution, I was somewhat surprised that at the end he did not resolve that this House direct this present government to compel more fish to swim inshore, because he has tried to put everything else over on the present administration here.

 I would be remiss,

MR. MATTHEWS: Mr. Speaker, if I did not endorse the very positive restructuring agreement that was put in place between the provincial and federal governments. And I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that representing a totally fishing district, as I represent, with three processing plants, at Fortune, Grand Bank and St. Lawrence, that, yes, I do not mind saying in this House that I am very, very grateful for the input of the federal government into the restructuring programme. Because I am not silly enough to think that without that the plants at Grand Bank, particularly, which was threatened with closure and amalgamating the work force in Fortune, and the plant at St. Lawrence which was excluded totally from the assets of the then supposedly new company, they certainly would not be there and I am the first to recognize that. But at the same time I want to say that because of the stand that was taken by this administration here, which was an all plants open policy, we did stand up and be counted. And I will tell you right now that for the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), who says that we do not have a policy, you go down to Grand Bank, Fortune and St. Lawrence and knock the all plants open policy that this government stood up and fought for, and I will tell you something, you will not be long in that environment. Because I will tell you right now, the people are grateful that this government stood up and were counted on the issue of all plants open, which saw Grand Bank have a new lease on life, St. Lawrence included in the new company and they will be reopening, and, of course, there will be no disruption in the workforce in Fortune. There would have been great employment and social disruption within the town of Fortune if the merger had taken place. So I am very, very grateful for that, Mr. Speaker. And the Premier of the Province and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) are to be complimented for their very strong stand in having these plants included.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MATTHEWS: As I listened to the hon. member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett), when he spoke about the fishery related employment factor in his district, at present in my district there are approximately 1,300 people who are employed directly in the fishery.

MR. PATTERSON: How many?

MR. MATTHEWS: Approximately 1,300. And that tells me that the restructuring agreement that was struck between the provincial government and the federal government is very, very positive, because without that the numbers employed in the fishery would be significantly less.

Mr. Speaker, there is just one other point, and it is too bad the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is not in his seat, because last Wednesday he made reference to the possibility that a CFA - would be coming and heading up our new fish company. He said, 'Why would a person such as this come in to head up the company, a CFA?' Well, I just want to say to him that, you know, he is not the proper person to be talking about CFAs because in this House today I am sure on his side he must say, well, you know, he has a CFA there - Come From Away - so I figure it is going to be putting the hon. member out of a position very soon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS: Mr. Speaker, I just want to conclude by echoing some thoughts so ably presented last Wednesday by my hon. colleague here from St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn).

MR. TULK: Do not use all your time.

MR. MATTHEWS: That is fine. You will interrupt me enough so that I will go over, probably, you know. You see you do not like to listen to sense and I have realized that for a while now, so I would just ask that you be quite and listen.

MR. MATTHEWS: The hon. member mentioned marketing, Mr. Speaker, and we all know the importance of marketing in this whole total fishing industry and that the marketing arm must become aggressive so that we do obtain a good price for what we are now striving in this Province to provide, a good product.

MR. TULK: Are you reading?

MR. MATTHEWS: Yes, I am. If we can accomplish this we will ensure that the fish companies profit and consequently provide employment for thousands of Newfoundlanders. And, Mr. Speaker, you know, I think there is a mentality in this Province, and I must say that it is certainly a small mentality, that there is something against companies making a profit, because all through the restructuring issue all we heard was, you know,

MR. MATTHEWS: against the companies. But if the companies do not make a profit and become financially viable, then what incentive is there for them to continue operating and consequently employ thousands of Newfoundlanders within their industry? So we have to get away from the mentality that there is something all bad about the companies, and there is a sector and a segment in this Province that are continuously knocking companies and companies, you know, make profits and consequently do not give it back. But the more profits companies make, Mr. Speaker, then the greater the chance that the inshore fishermen, the trawlermen and the plant workers will have of negotiating good contracts and consequently making a better living in this Province. So I think we have got to try to get rid of that mentality that profits are not good for companies. They are good and consequently will be good for the Province.

Mr. Speaker, the people engaged in our fishing industry are most deserving of a decent living because they have been and will continue to be, and I re-emphasize will continue to be, the cornerstone of the economy of our Province.

There are twelve communities in the district that I represent and all twelve are totally dependent upon the fishery. Soon, Mr. Speaker, I am sure we will have an announcement that the fluorspar mine in St. Lawrence will be reactivated and really that will be the only industry that will diversify away from the fishery. All the communities are totally dependent upon the fishery. And as I have stated before, there are approximately 1,300 people there directly employed

MR. MATTHEWS: within the fishery,
Without that there would be nothing, and I am the
first to admit it.

Mr. Speaker, the district
that I represent is a total fishing district and I
sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that all parties involved,
the provincial government, the federal government,
this side, that side, the Fishermen's Union, the banks
and all concerned will sit down and face the problems
and difficulties that we are experiencing today, because
you know it is malarky for anyone to say that there are
no problems, it is also malarky for anyone, such as the
hon. member, to say that they are not being addressed.
But there is a lot of work to be done yet, Mr. Speaker,
and having been involved in the fishing industry myself
and knowing the total consequences of the fishery and
what it means to this Province, my sincerest wish is that
we will all sit down and work together to resolve the
problems that are present today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, the member for
Fogo (Mr. Tulk) ended up saying that the member for Grand
Bank (Mr. Matthews) was not using all his time that was allocated
for speaking here today, and I am sure the member for
Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) would agree with me that the
time that he did use was not used at all.

I was rather surprised also that
the member for Grand Bank, and obviously it is going to
be the strategy of all the members of the government when
they get up to turn around and make a personal attack on

MR. HISCOCK: the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). And I was rather surprised to hear the reason given for his defeat when he sought re-election in the area. With regard to what is going on today, if it was not for the rules by the member for Mount Scio when he was Minister of Energy, the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) would not be Premier today. One of the main reasons he got defeated down in Placentia West, was probably too much emphasis on the offshore and the fishermen had a backlash against that. But the advice to Premier Moores and to the Minister of Energy of the day to let the oil companies go ahead came from the member for Mount Scio. And these regulations were some of the strongest regulations in the country and in the world, and it is the Premier of the day who gets the credit for these rules and regulations and the stand, and not the member for Mount Scio.

But I would want to get back, Mr. Speaker, and just talk on this issue and say that there has been a lack of fisheries development in this Province not only for the past five years that I have represented the district of Eagle River and Southern and Eastern Labrador, but long before that. I have to ask the question where is the super port that Premier Moores was going to have? What became of the other great plans that we had from Mr. Moores and Mr. Carter and Mr. Morgan? This policy and this fishery department is much like the budget that was brought down; it is a budget that reacted from one crisis to the other. The people and the media latch on to all the positive things that are in the budget, the \$65 for welfare, the sales tax reduction in Southern and Western Labrador, and the ferry for Fogo being built down in Marystown. All of these are fairly positive things and the media and the people latch on to them. But they are all, Mr. Speaker, as a result of reacting to a crisis, and this is like the Department of Fisheries,

MR. HISCOCK:

from one crisis to the other.

The people and the media latch on to all the positive things that are in the budget, the \$65 for welfare, the sales tax reduction in Southern and Western Labrador, and the ferry for Fogo being built down in Marystown. All of these are fairly positive things and the media and the people latch on to them. But they are all, Mr. Speaker, as a result of reacting to a crisis, and this is like the Department of Fisheries.

MR. HISCOCK: The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) only does something as a result of one crisis or another. Take the Loan Board , the Loan Board, around the time the 1979 election, overspent by \$12 million. When they found out it had overspent by \$12 million, they got rid of the fishermen who were on that Loan Board, put in another Loan Board and then, once they got back in for another term, straightened it out. What did they do? Any purchasers of longliners over \$50,000 were turned over to the bank. They gave up that responsibility.

So, Mr. Speaker, we do not have the super port. We find out that if a fisherman wants a longliner, he has to go to the bank. The other thing I would like to do, and we have heard much about the restructuring in this House and across Canada, is take this opportunity to compliment the new Board of Directors of the new company. I think it is commendable that men of such business calibre have offered to sit on the board of this super company. I have to again say, Mr. Speaker, that we will find from time to time ministers and government and other people criticizing these men who are volunteering their time in the service of the Province and the nation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: And I would like to commend these people who are offering to try and help straighten out the fisheries. And there is a lot more that can be said about these gentlemen. Since 1979 the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier have been looking at one thing only and that is the offshore, and they have neglected our primary resources, such as agriculture, fisheries, and tourism. We do not have any manufacturing in the Province as a result of the poor economic climate and the poor business climate.

So, Mr. Speaker, we do need a good fisheries policy. But I would like to concentrate now, Mr. Speaker, if I may -

MR. STAGG:

Stand up and be counted.

MR. HISCOCK:

The member for Stephenville

(Mr. Stagg) periodically gets up and takes cracks at each member on this side and all the federal government, but one of the things he has never done since he has been here, that I can remember, is talk about his district of Stephenville. I would like to take the remaining time, Mr. Speaker, to talk about the problems of the fishermen in the district of Eagle River, which results from the lack of a fishery policy. Twenty-eight plants, Mr. Speaker, are owned by this government along the Coast of Labrador, and last year we found out a lot of those plants were not operating to full capacity, had to layoff plant workers, and in some cases close. Why? Because of the failure of the fisheries.

And did the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the Premier take responsibility for those plants that

MR. HISCOCK: they own and create jobs to make sure these people had enough stamps, at least for the Winter? The answer is, no, Mr. Speaker. There are still fifteen people in Black Tickle who do not have enough; you still have them in Cartwright, you still have them in Mary's Harbour and you still have them in Williams Harbour. Mr. Speaker, not only did government give up their duty because of their lack of fisheries direction, they also gave up their corporate responsibility as owners of the plants along the Labrador Coast. Mr. Speaker, last Summer, last July those plants had to close their doors and reduce the number of jobs, Is there now a corporation in place to look after this so that the fishermen starting a new year can at least know that when they are on their stages and in their basements mending their nets, that within the next couple of months they will be taking part in a salmon fishery? Do they realize, this government, that many of these people, the fishermen and plant workers along the Labrador Coast, are extremely anxious, that they do not know if they should continue to invest in their salmon nets because of the low price they got last year? Not only if they continue to put their money into their salmon nets and go at the salmon fishery but also if they are going to have a buyer. And, of course, this government, which owns the twenty-eight plants, is responsible to get companies to operate them, and if they cannot get companies to operate them, then they have to operate them themselves. But are they doing that, Mr. Speaker? No. The answer is no. Here it is now the end of March and

MR. HISCOCK:

we still do not have an agreement with the Northern Development Corporation. And I, Mr. Speaker, and the fishermen and the plant workers and other individuals along the Labrador Coast, and the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), are becoming extremely anxious and we are wondering why it is that there is not an agreement? Mr. Speaker, I have a sneaky feeling that feeling that the federal member for that area wanted it to come under the auspices of the Saltfish Corporation, and so do the fishermen and so do the plant workers themselves. Why have another level of bureaucracy for the fishermen along the Labrador Coast? And who are the ones who have to pay for the towers, the buildings, the ninth floor of Atlantic Place or the Royal Trust Building, whichever ones they will be in, the new companies they have set up? It would be the fishermen. Whatever profits are made would have to go into looking after, the managerial part of it, first the directors, the secretaries and paying for rental space. We have the Saltfish Corporation now in place, so why do we not just make use of it? But there is speculation behind the scenes that government wants to go it on its own, to set up a new corporation along the Labrador Coast, the Northern Development Corporation, run it themselves, the Province, but have the federal government finance it, give them the money and let them run it themselves. Then, of course, there is another proposal, an option, and that is the federal and provincial governments operate it jointly, but again financed entirely by the federal government. Then,

MR. HISCOCK: of course, there is a third option, that it be a provincial corporation and we finance it ourselves. But, of course, we know that we cannot do that because we can not afford it.

MR. MORGAN: That will all be resolved.

MR. HISCOCK: The minister says it will all be resolved. Well, I say since last July the people have been wondering why it has not been resolved. So if the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was determined about getting these things done, then he would have recommended to the federal minister that the amendment go before the House of Commons when the super company was being structured. With regard to the Development Corporation, I asked the Premier about that two weeks ago, it was about two weeks ago, and now the minister says it was only sent up last week, which means the Premier, when asked whether it was being negotiated, said it was put before Ottawa two weeks ago and now the Minister of Fisheries says it was only put before Ottawa a week ago. But again it is being long drawn out when this should have been resolved like the super company. This

MR. HISCOCK: should have been resolved like the super company was, but it has not been. Where, Mr. Speaker, are the bait depots along the Labrador Coast?

MR. MORGAN: Bait depots are a federal responsibility.

MR. HISCOCK: I know a federal responsibility, but what about the responsibility of the provincial government?

Where are the stages along the Labrador Coast? Where are the slipways? I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, about the provincial Fisheries representative who is in Goose Bay, stranded in his office, he probably has a chair and a table and a phone, much like the Development officer in Labrador West, no funds, neither one of them. And when he wants to go along the Labrador Coast to visit the fishermen's communities, does he have a boat provided to him, the provincial representative down there? No. Does he have any funding? Again, Mr. Speaker the answer is no. But where are the slipways that are owned and operated by the provincial government? Mr. Speaker, what we have down in Southern and Eastern Labrador are these twenty-nine plants that are operated by the provincial government, and Earl's Freighting Company and Hiscock's and Mifflin's and the Labrador Shrimp Union Company and H.B. Dawe can back me up, and the media can check them - and the provincial government charges so much in their lease that those leasing these plants, own them in a three or four year period. And if the Department of Fisheries is really concerned about keeping the plants operating in Cartwright, Williams Harbour, Black Tickle, Mary's Harbour, St. Lewis, then the end result will be, Mr. Speaker, they will turn those plants over to these companies for a dollar.

MR. MORGAN: What companies? The Union is in Mary's Harbour.

MR. HISCOCK: I said the Labrador Shrimp Union Company.

MR. HISCOCK: But, Mr. Speaker, if they turned responsibility for these plants over to these companies for a one dollar lease and said, 'You are responsible for maintaining them, looking after them, and paying the insurance', then they would be a lot more viable. But having these leases over their heads and the high cost of keeping the inventory throughout the Winter, with the low price they are getting for the salmon, the answer is no, Mr. Speaker, they are not viable

So, Mr. Speaker, in concluding, with regard to along the Labrador Coast, as well as in a lot of other areas, these facilities are not being used and operated to the maximum capacity.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) here can sit back in his seat and allow over-the-side sales to boats operating in Makkovik and operating in Balck Tickle are plant workers in Black Tickle and Cartwright and Williams Harbour and all along the Coast who cannot even get enough stamps for the Winter? What kind of policy is this? And the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), Mr. Speaker, has stated -

MR. MORGAN: bankrupt, because of the income tax.

MR. HISCOCK: I agree they went bankrupt, but you had a responsibility to those fishermen and plant workers. You own the plants and at least you could have come up with some temporary make-work projects, as you do down in your own district of Bonavista South and other areas, But, no, Mr. Speaker, out of sight, out of mind. So, Mr. Speaker, there is no fisheries development policy, there is no development policy in Tourism - we finally now, after 400 years, got a masterplan in Tourism - there is no development policy in Municipal affairs, nor, Mr. Speaker in Forestry. There is no masterplan, there is no strategy, we are going from one crisis to another.

MR. BARRY: All we have is a master, but we do not have a master plan.

MR. HISCOCK: We do not even have a master.

But we are struggling, Mr. Speaker, from one crisis to another and it is the same thing with our schools. We introduced Grade XII and then what did we find out? We got to use the gymnasiums for the Grade XII students or for the Grade IX students, we have got to use the libraries, we have got to use the science labs as classrooms And then what do we do? We add on another \$1.5 million this year for school construction, when three years ago the DECs said they would need \$400 million, \$200 million to pay off the loans which now the Province has accepted responsibility for and the other \$200 million for new schools. And what do we have for our young people coming out of school? There are no jobs, there is a freeze on everything, there is a freeze on hiring and yet the government here gets up

MR. HISCOCK: and talks about affirmative action for women in the civil service and in our Province, and are sending out special school kits to the female students in the Province. Then the budget says that there is going to be a freeze. So how can you have programmes? It is all cosmetic, Mr. Speaker. And this is what this side is fighting. I hope the unions and I hope individuals all throughout this Province will realize that we can have Speeches from the Throne and Budgets, but the majority of them are cosmetic. Also, I would like to say in closing that not only is no strategy in the fisheries, there is none in any of the departments. It is like a leaky boat that has finally gone down and gone under everybody is trying to swim for their lives and clutching on to each other. It is utter confusion, one crisis after another.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very very glad that the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has brought in this resolution for we need it. Because, Mr. Speaker, as has been said by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), the fisheries is the backbone of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: It is our mainstay. It is the main part of our economy. And what have we done about it? We have let it slide. We have let agriculture slide, we have let tourism slide, Mr. Speaker, all for naught, the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. It is like the fable about the dog carrying a piece of meat in its mouth, crossing over the bridge, looking in the water and seeing the magnified reflection of the meat, drops the real thing, goes after the magnified reflection, and ends up losing all. That is what is happening with the offshore.

MR. TULK: this side of the House were the first people, we were the first on record to say that all plants in this Province had to be kept open. That can be shown. We know that it is their policy. They accepted it on March 26, that was the date, I believe, last year. After the People's Conference down here, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Premier rushed into this House with a policy on fisheries for the deep-sea plants, and the first thing on that list, Mr. Speaker, was all plants had to be kept open.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are, on this side of the House, making some inroads, we are teaching the government somethings that they need to know. And in that regard I want to congratulate the Minister of Fisheries. We can get him down on Fogo Island anytime we want him; We smoke him out, we get him down on Fogo Island.

MR. TULK: He was down there again today.

MR. ROBERTS: The trouble is you let him come back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt the sincerity of the minister.

MR. MORGAN: They believe in me as one who will help them. I cannot say the same for the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: They should have tied him on when they had him down there.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, would you ask that mouth over there to close?

MR. MORGAN: You are asking for it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, we did get him down to Fogo Island and in that regard we are glad, again, because what he is doing is keeping open the inshore plants and putting dollars -

MR. MORGAN: It is good news for Fogo Island.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, keep him quite. Make him behave himself over there.

MR. MORGAN: You are not in the classroom now, you know, you are in the House of Assembly.

MR. ROBERTS: If he were, he would send you to stand in the corner.

MR. TULK: If I was, you would be outside the door.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: That is where you would be, outside the door. If I were in the classroom, you would be outside.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: Keep the mouth closed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: I know where you will be after the next election.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, we congratulate the ministers who are set on doing doing that , because that is the kind of thing that we have been advising them to do for months and months and months. So we are proud that he went down there today. It is good stuff. And if somebody from that side of the House wants to come down in Fogo district and run please go ahead. If it is the minister, we will have the best three weeks that ever we had in our lives, both he and I, but I can tell him that he will not find it as easy as he does in Bonavista South, not near as easy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to what I said in opening the debate on this resolution. I said that we put this resolution first on the Order Paper because we believe on this side of the House that the most important thing in Newfoundland is the fishery, and in particular the inshore fishery. Both sectors are important, but the inshore fishery looks after, I think, more people, so that is the reason we put it first. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said the other day - and my time again is starting to run out; time flies in this place -

MR. MORGAN: By leave, by leave.

MR. TULK: - nobody in this House will stand up and disagree that the fishery is the most important industry that we have. While we look at the pulp and paper industry in towns like Corner Brook and agree that it is important, it is certainly not near as important in terms of the overall effect on the economy as is the fishing industry in this Province. Now the government says the same thing. But I pointed out in last week's debate, and I will point it out again in relation to this budget this year, that what the government really does say and how the government

MR. TULK: acts are usually two different things. We saw that yesterday in the presentation of the budget. We had a budget a few weeks ago with the Premier on television, yesterday we had another one in this House which was not nearly as bad. But to get back to the fishery, last year in the budget I pointed out, as my hon. friend did from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) this evening, that there was a total amount spend in Newfoundland last year by the provincial government of \$1.863 billion. How much was spent in fisheries? How much was spent in that most important industry that we have in the Province? \$17,396,000.

MR. NEARY: Shameful.

MR. MORGAN: More than that with loans and everything.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, a loan is a loan, it is not your expenditure. You are just passing out a loan to a fisherman to be paid back to you. Mr. Speaker, less than 1 per cent of the total budget in this Province goes into the fishery, less than 1 per cent. You have to raise the figures to get 1 per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition says, that is cruel.

MR. MORGAN: Only last year alone we put many millions of dollars into the fisheries.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, he had his chance. I am going to get to his speech later, but he had his chance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Just keep your mouth closed.

Mr. Speaker, what do we have in the budget this year? Just look at the budget again. You would expect that in a year when the inshore fishery is in a crisis - and the minister will not deny that it is - that being the case, than surely Lord we should see -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, would you make him stay during recess time or something?

MR. MORGAN: Your time is up.

MR. TULK: Make him stay during recess time anyway. He is like a child so make him stay in.

MR. MORGAN: The people on Fogo Island say, "Where is our member? We never see our member". Pass the message along to get him out here."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, send him outside somewhere?

MR. MORGAN: 'Where is our member?' They were asking my colleague and me.

MR. TULK: His mouth is opening up over his fact, Mr. Speaker way up over his fact.

MR. MORGAN: "Where is our Member?" They ask. They do not know where he is.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: The member is in here getting an \$8 million ferry for them, beautiful, is it not! Out of your government an \$8 million ferry, and any time he wants to he can smoke the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) out to get him down to Fogo Island. What a member! Is that not wonderful? What a member!

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the budget this year, you would normally expect that in a year

MR. TULK: of crisis, the amount spent in the budget would be increased substantially.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is, is it not?

MR. TULK: Is that the case? No, Mr. Speaker. The amount in the budget is actually decreased slightly so that we are now again spending, on that most important resource in Newfoundland, less than 1 per cent of the provincial budget. Mr. Speaker, that is shameful! That is shameful!

It is time for this government, it is time for this Premier, who proclaims the importance of the fishery, who stands and says how important the fishery is to outport Newfoundland, it is time for this guy who rails on about the Northern cod stock, rails on and on, tries to find some motherhood issue to coverup his own inadequacies, it is time for this government to put its money where its mouth is in the fishery, and it has not been done.

MR. MORGAN: You should have been on Fogo Islands this morning.

MR. TULK: Yes, but that is the member. You are forced to do it.

MR. MORGAN: The member! You were not even home! They will not even talk to you down there. When have you been in my office to talk fisheries?

MR. TULK: What? Jim! Jim!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Why talk to you? You only get political. I talk to your officials.

MR. MORGAN: And you try to take credit for it then!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, last week we pointed out -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to believe that this crowd must be out to get me.

They are treating me so well -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. TULK: They are treating me so well, Mr. Speaker, that I believe they must be out to get me.

MR. DAWE: You are so incompetent as a member that we have to look after your constituents for you.

MR. NEARY: You should be out looking after your own, not having them calling me every day!

MR. TULK: Oh, my, oh, my! Incompetent as a member and you had to look after me. Well, is that not wonderful!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: Is that not wonderful! You have to go down and look after them! Look after your own!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I want to see his face again, tell him to close his mouth!

Mr. Speaker, last week we pointed out in this House that we believed that fishermen - and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) did it again this evening - we pointed out that we believed that the fishermen in this Province have to be paid first out of what comes out of the fishery because they are the primary producers. What have we seen? Again, I think the Leader of the Opposition and myself must be reading each others notes or something. But again, Mr. Speaker, we pointed out that the price of fish, the real price of fish, the real income from fish has decreased by about 2.5 cents a pound.

MR. TULK: And that minister had the gall to stand in his seat over there last week in this debate and say that there were fishermen - trying to leave the impression that fishermen in this Province are rich, are making a fortune out of the fishery - he tried to create the impression by saying last week that some fishermen in this Province made more money than a minister in the Cabinet. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the same minister who was rebuked this Fall by long-liner owners around this Province for saying that some people had Cadillac boats when they should have had, I believe it was Chevrolets he said.

MR. MORGAN: And I still maintain that.

MR. TULK: What he does, Mr. Speaker, is pick a few specific incidents in this Province and try to gloat to cover over his own incompetencies in dealing with the problems that fishermen have. Mr. Speaker, the truth is that the real incomes, the money that fishermen have to spend, have decreased since 1978. Now, when he gets that fact through his head then I think he is ready to start off and do something.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: Well, the cost of insurance for boats I think last year increased 50 per cent. In one particular case of a fellow I was talking to last week, it went from \$6,000-something to \$9,000. The cost of living in Newfoundland, as everybody knows, has tripled since 1977; the cost of nets and gear in this Province has tripled; the cost of fuel has gone from 85 cents a gallon to \$1.85. And if we have to disagree with them, we will. Unlike yourself, we will not play partisan politics with the fishery.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I made the point last week that when you look at all of those factors, and nobody on the other side has addressed them - we have heard the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) go at the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). We have heard the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) go at the member for Mount Scio. We heard the member from Trinity North (Mr. Brett) take a few little swipes at me this evening but nobody has addressed the issue

MR. TULK:

of what we are going to do, what that government, elected by the people, elected in April 1982 by the people, what that government are going to do about the incomes of primary producers in the fisheries. We have not heard one single iota from them. They have tried to blame it on everybody, they have tried to say we are blaming it on the companies and that is not true.

MR. MORGAN:

I thought I made some good debate on the first day.

MR. TULK:

I am going to get to his speech in a few minutes to point out some of the inconsistencies and illogical arguments that that minister put forward. Now, Mr. Speaker, we said that one of the things that the government should do is try to straighten out the labour relations that exist in the fisheries as exemplified by Unity '84. We made the point that if you look at fishermen - and the Royal Commission a couple of years ago, and I think the Kirby task force showed that many of our fishermen are living below the poverty line - if you look at that and look at the fact that those people are, as we say, the primary producers, you have to sit down and wonder why it is that somebody in this Province has not organized the fishermen so that they are in the streets rather than in halls holding meetings. You have to wonder when you see those things. They are perhaps the most civilized people, they must be the most civilized people that this world has ever seen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to something that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) said. He said that this government, he made the statement that this government does not go around - and I think his words were - 'imposing settlements on labour.' Now, Mr. Speaker, what a statement for a Labour Minister to make after that little

MR. TULK: thing that we saw, that budget, that first budget that we have had this year, that we saw the Premier present on television the other night. 'They do not impose settlements on labour,' he said. What a statement for a man to make. No, they do not impose anything. The Premier just gets on television and says, 'Here you are, you take that or you take nothing. No raise for anybody.' We saw it again -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Time is up.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have got six more minutes yet. If they do not want to listen they can leave and come back in for the vote, it is up to themselves, or they can stay and they can just be quiet.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a Labour Minister standing up and saying, 'No, they do not impose settlements', and we are talking about a government which last year - and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was part of this, I suppose he was part of it, I do not know, I suppose he was just told - but the Minister of Fisheries was part of that thing called the 'social compact,' that new word.

MR. NEARY: That came from Cabot Martin.

MR. TULK: I would say that it came from Cabot, yes.

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is right. Send down their flunky to try to negotiate with the unions.

MR. TULK: 'Social compact!' Mr. Speaker, what did that mean? When the restructuring agreement came out we heard the Premier and the federal Minister of Fisheries, Mr. De Bane, say that they wanted to sign the agreement and wanted to have a social compact with fishermen and plant workers. Well, Mr. Speaker, it has become obvious what that means.

MR. NEARY: That was bribery to get his member on the Board of Directors.

MR. TULK: Yes, and in return for all of that, the union was going to get one member on an eleven member board. Now that is almost as stupid as what the government did when they put three and lost every bit of fisheries control that they had in this Province, every fisheries jurisdiction that they had in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the 'social compact' meant a non-wage increase for fishermen. And that Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) stands in this House and says, 'No, this government does not impose settlements on people.'

I have got four more minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has asked me to get into some of the things that he said last week. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Minister of Fisheries that I do not doubt his sincerity about fisheries matters. I do doubt his ability but I do not doubt his sincerity, not at all. I do not doubt that the Minister of Fisheries, when he wants to do something for the fishery, is sincere. I mean, he will play a bit of politics but overall I think the minister is sincere.

MR. NEARY: But incompetent.

MR. TULK: But incompetent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in that statement last week he made the point -

MR. BAIRD: It is time to kiss and make up now, is it?

MR. TULK: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to kiss and make up with anybody. I do not want to be lovey-dovey with the provincial Minister of Fisheries in the same way that he has got the love affair going with the

MR. TULK: federal Minister of Fisheries

(Mr. De Bane). I do not want that.

MR. MORGAN: Somebody has to take it up for
the Province's economy.

MR. TULK: Nobody, absolutely nobody is
going to tell me to stay clear of the telephone. I do
not want to get into that, I do not intend to get into that.

Mr. Speaker, he goes on to say,
'Well, why is the Opposition talking about the restructuring
agreement in this debate on the inshore fishery?

MR. TULK:

the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that less than 50 per cent of the fishermen in our Province will be selling their fish to this new deep-sea company. Why? As I mentioned, it is a deep-sea company. Well, lo and behold!, what does he think the resolution is about? We are talking about the inshore fishermen, we are talking about the people who do not sell to the deep-sea company, but we are also talking about the affect that that restructuring will have on them. And, Mr. Speaker, the restructuring agreement will affect the inshore fishermen, it will affect them in marketing, and the minister knows that.

MR. MORGAN:

It will help in marketing.

MR. TULK:

It will help them in marketing!

They have got the independents in this Province have second call on the marketing apparatus of that new super company. They have second call. That is in your agreement.

MR. MORGAN:

The independents are now going to the big Company.

MR. TULK:

Yes, and when you get in a time of crisis in this Province, who will market their first fish? The super company.

MR. MORGAN:

They will be going to the Saltfish Corporation.

MR. TULK:

You know what I am saying is correct.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more notes here that I want to get to and I will get them in some other debate. I do not expect the government - let me say in closing - I do not expect the government to vote for this resolution, I expect them to vote against it. I expect them to play politics. But, Mr. Speaker, we are going to see if they will vote. I do not believe anybody has done this in this House, Mr. Speaker,

MR. TULK: and I would like to take the opportunity to welcome to the gallery I think it is some twenty-five students from Fogo Island Central High School with some of their teachers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) that they have heard every bit of nonsense that he has been getting on with over there in his seat and seeing what a fool he has made of himself.

Mr. Speaker, I close the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Is the House ready for the question? All those in favour of the resolution, "Aye"?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary, "Nay"?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: The "Nays" have it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Divide.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Is it agreed to stop the clock for a few moments?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): DIVISION

Is the House ready for the vote?

All those in favour of the resolution please stand:

Mr. Warren, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Hiscock,
Mr. Neary, Mr. Barry and Mr. Callan.

All those against the resolution please stand:

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power),
the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), Mr. Brett, the
hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. President of
the Council (Mr. Marshall), Mr. Stewart, Mr. Aylward, the
hon. Minister of Communications (Mr. Doyle), the hon. Minister
of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), the hon. Minister of
Transportation (Mr. Dawe), the hon. Minister of Public Works
and Services (Mr. Young), the hon. Minister of Municipal
Affairs (Mrs. Newhook), Mr. Carter, Mr. McLennon, Mr. Baird,
Mr. Greening, Mr. Peach, Mr. Cross, Mrs. Reid, Dr. Thomey,
Mr. Patterson, Mr. Butt, Mr. Hearn, Mr. Woodrow, Mr. Osmond.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The vote was
eight for and twenty-five against.

I declare the "Nays" have it.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, perhaps before you
adjourn the Government can advise the House, in the spirit of
co-operation, as to the Estimates meeting tomorrow.

From 9:30 A.M. to 12:30 P.M. at the Colonial Building
the Department of Social Services estimates will be taken into
consideration. And from 7:30 to 10:30 P.M. tomorrow night,
the Resources Committee will meet and will be considering
the estimates of Mines and Energy.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 6:00 o'clock
I do leave the Chair until 3:00 P.M. tomorrow, Thursday,
March 22.