

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 1984

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) concerning the seal hunt. I would like to ask him in view of the recent controversy concerning the attempted boycott of Canadian fish products in the U.S. market, could the minister now perhaps state or restate the provincial government's position on the seal hunt itself?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the position is, as earlier outlined to the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane), that if the companies in the U.S. decide to boycott the buying of sea food products from Canada, and if that would result, and we think it would result, in substantial damage to our fishing industry, that we would have to review the seal fishery with regards to taking into consideration the impact of the seal fishery to our economy versus the overall impact of the fishing industry to the economy of our Province. . . Because of reports from various consular offices across the U.S. to the External Affairs Department, and passed on to the Premier and to myself, . . . because the sealers themselves, the industry, decided not to go harvesting the whitecoat, not to carry out the clubbing activity, which is what the protestors are zeroing in on and emphasizing, that the companies in the U. S. have made firm decision - the large chains - upon receiving a full educational picture, I guess you can call it, from information supplied from the consular offices of the External Affairs

March 29, 1984

Tape No. 478

SD - 2

MR. MORGAN: Department and from the federal Fisheries Department , they have decided not to boycott the buying of our seafood products. So, based on that we see no reason

MR. MORGAN:

at this time to have a ban on any of the economic activity - because indeed it is an activity which means a return to the fishermen as an economic activity - of a ban on any part of our seal fishery. And last week, of course, when some controversy arose, when our national PC Party of Canada decided to develop a policy, I did say then, and I stand by it now, that we could not support any ban on any aspect of the seal fishery which would adversely effect the activities of our fishermen in trying to earn a dollar, in other words, an economic activity. And they earlier proposed, as we all know, to ban the killing of seals one year old and younger. I took a firm stand on behalf of the government, in consultation with the Premier and the government here, that we could not support that because of the very serious adverse effect on thousands of our inshore fishermen. I made representation to Mr. Mulroney, our leader in Ottawa, and to others in Ottawa, including the MPs from Newfoundland, as to what our position was and we asked to have detailed discussion with us before any final decision was made. Unfortunately, there have been too many statements made - and I say that sincerely despite the fact that a colleague and friend of mine made the statements - there were too many statements made by spokesmen for our party on fisheries matters which has further aggravated the situation at the international level, which in my view has, unfortunately again, aided the cause of the protest groups who are trying to stop the activity of our seal fishery and we asked that these kind of statements be stopped or a firm policy be developed. As of this morning I was informed by Mr. Mulroney's office that the new policy now approved by our national party is that, unfortunately again, the statements

March 29, 1984

Tape No. 479

MJ - 2

MR. MORGAN: are not being accurately carried in the media or the statements are not reflecting the true policy. The policy now is that a moratorium be placed on the clubbing of the seal pups, not a ban on the killing of any seals but a moratorium on the clubbing activity with whitecoats, the seal pups only, and that be the only moratorium and the only

MR. MORGAN: policy with regard to the stopping of any activity regarding the seal fishery.

I can live with that. We can live with it, I should say, the government here, because it means that what the sealers themselves decided not to take part in, people were asking for a moratorium on that kind of activity, that is the clubbing. And based on that we feel that the less statements made in the future by any national party, our own or otherwise, with regard to considerations for banning and taking away a right from our fishermen, a right Newfoundlanders have had over the history of our Province to take part in an economic activity, the less statements made the better. So I am hoping now, as of today, that now that our party has made a firm decision that that is the policy, a moratorium on the clubbing of our whitecoats, and the fact that the Government of Canada has taken a firm stand that they do not want to have any ban in place either, I am hoping this will defuse the whole situation with regard to the cause of the protest groups who are indeed trying to damage not only our seal fishery but our fishing industry.

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

MR. TULK: If I understand the minister correctly, what he has said to this House is that the policy of the PC Party, the policy of the PC spokesman, the policy of the Leader of the PC Party in Ottawa, is that there would be a moratorium on the killing of whitecoats. That is what he said. But is the minister not somewhat fearful of what is happening here? He

MR. TULK: also went on to tell us that the federal minister, Mr. De Bane, says that there will be no ban at all. Is the minister not now saying that the Tory Party in Ottawa, and he seems to be agreeing with it, has in some way given in to the protestors who have been for years using the whitecoats as the place to zero in, when they have already told us that once that is done they will move to the next older age of seal. Is he not now telling us that in fact the Tory Party in Canada, and he is agreeing with, has given in to the protestors?

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

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Speaker, that is not so. Because the key thing in the future is to have, I guess you could call it an educational programme, a proper campaign put on to clearly educate the international marketplace and the world that, despite all the campaigns put on against the clubbing activity, it is the most humane method of killing that type of seal, the pup seal. The moratorium would be on for a period, until all of these people out there, the general consumers in particular in the marketplace, understand that. International organizations have already done some work, and further work can be done by them to clearly portray to the rest of the world that indeed the clubbing of seals is a very humane method of killing. The moratorium prevent any decisions being made by the major buyers of our seafood with regards to boycotting buying our seafood products.

MR. TULK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the minister is saying that they have put the moratorium on so that the boycott of fish products in the United States and elsewhere will not work. Is he now telling us, contrary to what the federal minister has been telling us, that indeed the boycott on the other fish products coming out of this country may indeed have been working? Is that what he is telling us or is he just giving in to Crouse?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not giving

MR. MORGAN: in to any one. I think it was quite obvious last week that despite the fact I had to, and I did, criticize the policy that was being developed by our own party, I said publicly, and I say in the House now, I just could not support that policy as put forward last week. I could not see any national party, our own or otherwise, taking away a right that we have had throughout the history of our Province, the right to harvest seals in any method that was being given them through licences of the Government of Canada. And I did not support it then and I am not supporting it now. So as a result of the representations made and our opposition here from this government, our party in Ottawa, through consultation, indeed listened to what we had to say on the important issue because, indeed, Newfoundland is a very main participant in the seal fishery. So as a result of our representations they have listened to us and they have not imposed a ban, have not imposed any kind of policy that would adversely affect the landsmen sealers, or fishermen who are called landsmen sealers, who harvest the seals by shooting them in the water, the beater seals. It is not giving in to the protestors because we are saying we want to show the protest groups, and those whose emotions they are trying to play upon throughout the world with their campaign, that indeed if we want to again bring back the whitecoat harvest, if markets show that we could do that economically, that the clubbing

MR. MARSHALL: method of killing is indeed a very humane method of killing. We have always maintained that, that there is nothing wrong with the method of killing. It is the most humane than can be developed for that kind of a harvest, and it is not giving in to anyone. But again I will say that it is somewhat unfortunate that there have been so many statements made the last number of days on this very controversial matter. And as I told Mr. Mulrooney yesterday in a Telex to him, with a copy to the Premier and others, these kinds of statements have only further aggravated the situation in the marketplace and have further aided the cause of the protest groups. And that has been very unfortunate.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the minister can stand over there and say what he likes but the truth of the matter is he has moved from his original position. The government's position has always been, as far as I have understood it, and indeed the position of this House has always been that we would have absolutely no ban on the killing of seals at all, and now he has moved to a moratorium on the killing of whitecoats. Let me ask him a couple of questions about that. And I want him, again, to give us his reasons why he has done that, why he has moved from his original position. He tells us that there is nothing happening in the marketplace in regard to other fish products, that indeed we are quite safe in that regard. So I would like to hear the minister

MR.TULK: tell us his reasons again on why he has moved from his original position to the position that he now occupies? And indeed what is the age of seals that Lloyd Crouse in Ottawa is talking about? Is he talking about seals ten days old, is he talking about seals ten to fourteen days old, or just what is he talking about?

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

MR.MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, last week the indication from our party was that the policy being formulated was that they would want to see a ban on all the harvesting or hunting of seals one year of age and younger. And at that time we felt that this was the wrong policy, and we told our party accordingly, because it would have a very serious adverse effect on those landmen who harvest seals which are not pup seals, but seals in the water and sometimes three, four, five or six months old, and that would take away a very important economic activity as it pertains to our fishing industry. So as I said earlier, as a result of our policy position here as a government in this Province, our party listened to what we had to say and indeed changed their policy. Their policy

MR. MORGAN: now is, because there was no activity last year or this year of clubbing of whitecoat seals to have the moratorium. This is very important because of the possible and potential adverse effect on our overall fishing industry. Indeed, last week, although no decisions have been made by the large seafood buying chains across the US, the hon. gentleman, I am sure is aware, that McDonald's, which is a major buyer of seafood products from Canada and from Newfoundland, were picketed, their outlets across the US were indeed picketed by so-called protest groups and consumers organized by protest groups, to try to get them to stop buying Canadian fish because of the clubbing of seals by Canadians. It was not just the seal hunt or the seal harvest, but the clubbing of seals. So what we are saying, to prevent any kind of decisions being made which will have, I guess I could use the term 'a detrimental effect' on our fishing industry - such as losing our markets to these major US buying chains in particular - to prevent that, let us have a moratorium. The sealers say we can live with that. The sealers are saying we are not going to take part in the clubbing anyway, so let us have a moratorium on the clubbing activity. Let us carry out, through international organizations, studies to show the world that if clubbing is brought back again as a result of markets, and markets are developed, and if the sealers decide to take part, which is a right they have, let us show that clubbing is a humane method of killing. That is what we are saying.

MR. MORGAN: We have, I guess you could use the term as a party, taken a very responsible position, We have recognized the importance of the fishing industry to our economy in Newfoundland and Eastern Canada, and, in recognizing that, we have compromised somewhat the position on the seal harvest based on the input from the sealers. The sealers are saying they will not take part in harvesting whitecoats because they are concerned about what that would mean in the marketplace for our seafood products.

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

MR. TULK: There is absolutely no doubt that the sealers in this Province, especially the landsmen, are not concerned about the whitecoat hunt, and perhaps it is not the important part of the seal hunt anyway. But the real question the minister has to answer is, indeed, is the seal hunt in this Province doomed? Are we now going to see the anti-sealing groups concentrate on the older type seal? Just what age are we talking about? Are we talking about age ten days, fourteen days, in that category, and from there on up you can kill them or what? But let me ask the minister another question. There has been an apparent decline in the amount of seal products that we can sell, the minister will agree to that I am sure, but would the minister inform

MR. TULK: the House as to what attempts his government, never mind the federal government, is making to promote the sale of seal pelts and the seal products? Could he give us some indication of what he is doing in that regard?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, through the efforts of the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) and through Industry, Trade and Commerce and through ourselves here, the Department of Fisheries in particular, we did find and develop markets for the whitecoat product. This year, when people like Captain Morrissey Johnson made a decision not to take part in the seal harvest, it was not because there were no markets out there. There is a market right now for whitecoats. If vessels sail tomorrow morning to harvest whitecoats, they can sell their product.

MR. TULK: Well, why are you not doing it?

MR. MORGAN: Because the sealers made the decision. It was not a government decision saying you must not go out there, it was the sealers themselves. Being very responsible individuals, the sealers looked at it and analyzed it. They decided that to go out and club seals this year, because of the controversy in the U.S., might leave them to have to accept the responsibility of being blamed for the loss of our seafood.

MR. TULK: So you are saying the markets are being affected?

MR. MORGAN: So the sealing industry itself, the sealers made the decision to harvest any whitecoats. They said they did not do it last year and would not do it this year because of possible adverse affects on the overall fishing industry.

Now let me say one thing further, Mr. Speaker. One thing has to be clearly understood, and anybody, whether it be our party or the Government of Canada, the party presently in power, or anybody else, if they are of the opinion that we can suddenly ban the commercial seal fishery as we know it, whether it be whitecoat or any other seals, and feel that this is going to resolve the overall world controversy, this is going to stop any damage to our fishing industry, let us look at the other side of the coin.

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. MORGAN: If we stop the seal harvest tomorrow morning and ban the commercial harvest of seals, because we have a seal population of approximately 2 million off our coast now, the herd would grow to the point that its annual consumption of commercial species, like herring, salmon, small cod and other species, would consume more fish on an annual basis than could be caught by all of our deep-sea fleets within our waters. And that kind of destruction on our fishing industry would have just as bad an effect as if we lost our markets to the U.S.A. So there has to be an annual cull put in place. Even though next week, or next month, or next year there is no more commercial activity because of markets, somebody has to put in place an arrangement for an annual cull. Let me give you a prime example, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: Right now in Nova Scotia there is a grey seal herd with a total of 40,000 seals. There has been no killing of these seals in the last number of years. The herds are growing to a point that now what is happening is destruction of commercial species of fish normally caught by the fishermen. The grey seals are also causing a parasite infestation of worms in cod which is now a very prominent quality problem for Nova Scotia. I just came back from Nova Scotia two days ago, and the fishing industry there is demanding that the federal government put in place some kind of a cull, because if not that herd will grow and there will be destruction of commercial species in that part of the Atlantic region. So it has to be clearly understood that there is no point in imposing a ban on commercial activity in the seal industry, the seal fishery, unless there is put in place immediately behind that a programme of an annual cull to control the growth of the seal herds.

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask the minister one question in relation to his new-found policy and that is this: Now that the minister has put a moratorium on the killing of whitecoats, and the seal fishermen have agreed to it, does he now believe that the anti-sealing protest group will stop there and that there will be no more problems with them? That is a very simple question.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to be blunt and frank,

MR. MORGAN: no. I do not think the protest groups are going to stop until they have not only the seal fishery stopped, but the fur industry and the activities of catching of animals, whether in traps or by shooting, for the fur industry across Canada. But in the meantime what it will do, it will firmly indicate to those people who are buying our seafood products that the propaganda and the deceitful information being put forward - I will use the term blackmail tactics, and I will say it outside the House as well as inside the House - being used by the protest groups on those major buyers that the major buyers are now using the rationale and the logic, 'What is all this about? Those so-called barbarians up in Canada are not clubbing the baby seals anymore, so why should we listen to and why should we bend to the pressure from these protest groups telling us these lies?' So what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that it may not stop the overall activities of the protestors, they will not stop until the fur industry in Canada is wiped out, but it will help those big buyers in the US to make the decision that they will not agree to any kind of tactic put on by the protest groups to stop buying our fish which is so important to our overall fishing industry.

MR. TULK:
them, 'Jim'.

You have just given in to

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Torngat Mountains.

The hon. the member for

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. It is not necessarily a supplementary, but approximately one year ago I asked the Premier a question similar to the one my hon. colleague asked the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). I asked the Premier

MR. WARREN: if the government was planning to put on a literature campaign to offset the seal protestors. The Premier at that time said that it would probably cost too much money but now we can see that we have missed the boat and we have lost our seal fishery. I would like to ask the minister is the seal fishery doomed? I believe the minister practically has said that in layman's language, that the seal fishery in this Province is doomed. If this is the case, will the minister's department take the initiative, because according to the scientists if we do not kill x number of

MR. WARREN:

seals per year, our Northern cod, which is the mainstay of the cod fishery of this Province, is going to be in danger also from the overpopulation of seals? Will the Minister's department take the initiative, whether it be a commercial hunt or not, to make sure that X number of seals are killed - they could be killed and thrown away, I do not care what happens to them - to make sure that the Northern cod fishery is not put in jeopardy because of the overpopulation of seals over the next two or three years.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all a comment on the preamble: No, I did not indicate in any way or form that the sealing industry is indeed doomed, it is not. The sealing industry this year is going to market 60,000 pelts. Efforts are on going now.

For example, just recently the two governments, in conjunction with the Sealers' Association, appointed a Sealing Industry Revitalization Committee. It is Chaired by Mr. Mac Mercer, a well-known, prominent person involved in conservation, etc., as a federal employee. That Committee is a very active Committee. Now, if we felt the sealing industry was doomed, why would we as governments appoint senior people and very knowledgeable people to this Sealing Industry Revitalization Committee? Because we are convinced that despite the activities of the protest groups there is a future for that part of the overall fishing industry, the seal fishery, and we can develop markets for certain products from the seal fishery.

The sealing industry is not doomed. Nobody is saying that. We have a market for 60,000 pelts this year, and if everything goes well we

MR. MORGAN: will have an increased market for that kind of product next year. But the sealers will not necessarily take part in their clubbing activity, as they decided not to do this year.

Now, what are we doing?

Mr. Speaker -

MR. WARREN: Answer my question first.

MR. MORGAN: What are we doing? is the question. What are we doing? Are we sitting by on the sidelines and watching these developments? Are we making contact with the marketplace? As I mentioned earlier, the activities of the federal Department of Fisheries, the federal Department Industry, Trade and Commerce in conjunction with the Department of Development and the Department of Fisheries provincially, have done a substantial amount in promoting the seal fishery over the last year and a half. A key example that we are determined to keep the seal fishery alive is the fact that both governments, the federal minister and myself in particular, agreed just recently, no longer than two months ago, to appoint a Sealing Industry Revitalization Committee, chaired by Mr. Mac Mercer, a very prominent federal civil servant. Now, that is a clear example that we intend to work with the present government in Ottawa, or the next government in Ottawa, to ensure that we will always have a seal fishery as part of our overall fishing industry in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the minister's attempt to create a proper public relations campaign and to win the PR battle against Greenpeace and against the Brian Davies' group has failed totally and abysmally.

Now, it seems to me the only time, Mr. Speaker, that we had a successful public relations campaign against the seal fishery was when we made fun of them, when we showed how silly and stupid that they were.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister whether he has considered reviving that very successful campaign, possibly with the assistance of some of our local drama groups, whether it be The Rising Tide Theatre or the Resource Centre for the Arts or some other local group? Because, if members opposite recall, the Codco effort was a very successful poking of fun at the silliness, at the total alienation from their sources of subsistence that these protesters had who think that milk comes out of tin cans and think that meat comes from plastic containers.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I thought The Rising Tide was the hon. member's lowest ebb.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman now is making a speech. I do not know whether it is a leadership speech or what it is, but it is a speech and

MR. MARSHALL: it is not a very good one.

He is on Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To that point of order, it would appear that the hon. the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) had an extremely long preamble to what is supposed to be a supplementary question.

The hon. the member for
Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister whether he has contemplated utilizing the Codco members who may still be around, or other theatre groups, to assist in putting on a proper, effective public relations campaign to show just how silly and foolish these protesters are?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I know of the hon. gentleman who asked the question that his first priority has been shot down in recent weeks, and that is to become a leader. Now, I think he is aspiring to become an actor. We know he is a pretty good actor in the House!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: I do not know if The Rising Tide will accept him or not. They are a pretty good group who do some good productions and hopefully will carry on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: On a more serious note, Mr. Speaker, I was never convinced that, whether it be done through theatre groups

MR. MORGAN:

or done through the media, that by going out with campaigns and spending any substantial amount of funds to try to counteract the campaigns put on by the protest groups, which are available to them millions of dollars through playing upon the emotions of people with their propaganda, that we would ever be able to stop the kind of activity now being carried out. As an example, I recall when the former Premier had a campaign throughout the world. I at the time was never convinced it was successful because what it did was draw attention to the protest groups themselves and gave them more PR and coverage in the media, throughout the U.S. in particular. I was never convinced that worked. So the key emphasis now of both governments, after there had been some very thorough discussion, is rather than go out with a massive campaign through the media, rather than do that, let us do it through the channels that are most effective, let us do it through educational sessions and meetings and discussion and leaflets sent out to those people who are going to be affected by what the protest groups are saying, and in this case the emphasis has been placed on those people who are involved in buying our sea-food products. I do not think that we will ever be able to counteract the protect groups, whether we fund The Rising Tide Theatre to do it or we engage all the media professionals in our Province to go out and do a job for us - and we have good professional media in our Province - campaigning and spreading the programme or the policy of this government in combination with politicians. I do not think that we could, even if I took all the funds in my Budget this year in the Department of Fisheries, that the total funds would even match what could be raised in a period of months by the protest groups like Mr. Davies and the International Fund for Animal

MR. MORGAN: Welfare and others by playing upon the emotions of the bleeding hearts around the world.

And it is unfortunate but that is a fact of life.

To mount that kind of a campaign is not going to be successful, so we have chosen - and I say we, the two governments - to have a campaign placing emphasis on those people who are most directly involved and most directly affected by all of this, and they are those people who are being pressured to make decisions adverse to our economy here with regards to our fishing industry.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The time for the Question Period has expired.

NOTICE OF MOTION:

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting The Commission Of Offences Against The Laws Of The Province By A Young Person."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. the Premier, I table the answer to question Number 18 on the Order Paper of Monday, March 26, in the name of the hon. the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry).

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 2,429 residents of the district of Port au Port. Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition reads: "We, the residents, plant workers, fishermen and businessmen of the Port au Port Peninsula do hereby state we want and demand the continued operation and growth of the Piccadilly fish plant We demand the full operation of the plant and a buyer/processor that will purchase all species of fish with due regard to the interest of the fishermen and provide as much employment,

MR. HODDER: employment that is desperately needed in our area, as possible. We demand your immediate attention and devotion to solve the current problems in the fishery on the Port au Port Peninsula."

Mr. Speaker, this is, I believe, one of the largest petitions, certainly one of the largest petitions I have seen in the past ten years, to come from the Port au Port Peninsula, and also there are names throughout the district of Port au Port as well. There are a total of 2,429 names. The petition is not one that was signed by residents of the district as a frivolous thing. It has been an issue that has been growing and growing in the district for quite some time.

MR. MORGAN: What was the prayer of the petition?

MR. HODDER: If the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) did not hear, I am sorry. He was not in his seat. I only have five minutes but I will tell him that the prayer of the petition from the residents, plant workers and fishermen of the Port au Port Peninsula, asked for the continued operation and growth of the Piccadilly fish plant and that they want a full-time processor and they want the interests of the fishermen looked after as far as the species are concerned that are bought, etc.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I first would like to congratulate the people who circulated this petition throughout the Port au Port Peninsula. As I said, there are names on this petition representing some thirty communities. The fishery is the only industry in the district of Port au Port. The people there are fishermen. They have one fish plant in the community of Piccadilly, to which I referred in debate the other day when I raised the issue of the problems at that particular plant. Mr. Speaker,

MR. HODDER: it was very unfortunate for the Port au Port Peninsula that last year, just prior to the fishing season, the _____ former operators of that particular plant, National Sea Products Limited, pulled out on the eve of the fishing season. And members in this House know the problems which were created at that particular time in that there was no one to operate the plant, we were not sure whether there was going to be anyone to buy the fish from the fishermen, and there was a very short time in which to get things done.

MR. TULK: That was after National Sea pulled out, was it?

MR. HODDER: That was after National Sea pulled out, yes, Mr. Speaker.

After that time the government sent out proposals _____ to various fish processors and subsequent to that Bell Isle Seafoods was given the plant. Since that time, Mr. Speaker, the last year there was a salt fish operation there plus the fresh fish splitting line, and they had last year up to sixty employees.

MR. HODDER: During the negotiations last year, I sat with the Fish Plant Workers' Union and the owner of Belle Isle Seafoods, sat in with them while they were trying to negotiate jobs and job security with the new owner. At that time there was no mention, Mr. Speaker, no mention whatsoever that the plant would be downgraded to a feeder plant.

Shortly after that I met with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). At that meeting as well were the executive of the fish plant workers, as well as Mr. McCurdy from the Newfoundland Fishermen, Food And Allied Workers Union. Again, at the meeting with the minister no mention was made of a downgrading of that plant to a feeder plant. Assurances were given and certainly the feeling was prevalent that this plant would continue to operate as it had in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I should take one step backwards. Last year was a rough year for Belle Isle Seafoods, because once National Sea pulled out there were problems with the ice making equipment, there were problems in pick-ups and that sort of thing. But we had looked forward this year, Mr. Speaker, to a much more efficient operation and more employees. But, lo and behold, the union had been trying for years to expand the plant and this year the federal government offered monies to expand the plant. We had a meeting with the Port au Port Development Association in Piccadilly, which one of the officials of the minister's department attended, and we found out from the owner of the Belle Isle Seafood operation, Roger Pike, that there would only be up to twenty jobs this year.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

I have to advise the hon. member that his five minutes allocated for a petition

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): have expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the House want to grant leave to the hon. member to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HODDER: I thank hon. members for leave.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I will just conclude my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, at a meeting held by the Port au Port Development Association, which was attended by myself, officials of the minister's department, officials of various organizations in the area, we were told that this plant would only employ twenty people and the new owner of the plant strenuously objects to an expansion of that fish plant. We also know, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK: How many were there before, fifty or so?

MR. HODDER: There had been in the better years, when National Sea was there - the hon. member asked how many were there - seventy or eighty plant workers. But the last year that National Sea operated there - I stand to be corrected - I believe there were about sixty workers, and last year there were between fifty and sixty workers. These are just rough figures. Now, this year we find out that it is downgraded to a feeder plant.

We also understood last year that there was a \$400,000 guaranteed loan made to Belle Isle Seafoods by the government, and there was an understanding that this particular loan would assist in the operation of the Piccadilly plant. But, lo and behold,

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, we find out that the \$400,000 went for freezing facilities at the Stephenville plant. Now, I, for one, am not against expansion of the Stephenville plant, or growth of the Stephenville plant, but I have to stand with the residents of the Port au Port Peninsula as represented here, Mr. Speaker, in this petition, and the Fish Plant Workers' Union, and the fish plant workers in saying that I stand against, as they stand against, a downgrading of the only plant that gives hourly wages, the only industry that gives hourly wages in the district of Port au Port.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of organizations working on trying to keep that plant open, I would ask the minister before I sit down - I throw no barbs at him or anything else, I try to present the case as best I can - but I would ask the minister before I sit down to try and give his support not to me, Mr. Speaker, but to the people who work in that plant, or who did work in that plant, and to their families, and to the economy of the Port au Port Peninsula, and to the people of the Port au Port Peninsula. It is the highest unemployment area in the Province and there have been problems.

One more thing before I sit down, and I will be very quick, Mr. Speaker. The petition also refers to their wanting a buyer and a processor, but a buyer who would buy all species. I understand there were some problems that way. They would like to see the buyer taking lobsters, they would like to see him taking the Winter flounder which is sometimes a help to the fishermen.

Last year there were problems with pick-ups in that there was only one pick-up a day, particularly during the high-catch season, in June, when

MR. HODDER: they very often had to pull
up their boats at twelve o'clock on a Saturday because
there was nobody else coming to buy later that day, and
fishermen make their hay when the sun shines.

 So I would ask the minister
when he stands, and

MR. HODDER: I am sure he will stand on this issue, to give his support to this petition.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I hope to respond in a sincere way, in the same way the petition was presented to the House by the hon. gentleman representing his constituents, and to say that we will, upon receipt of the petition to our department and now through the House of Assembly, endeavour to do whatever we can as a department to resolve the situation. But in saying that I want to again emphasize that when National Sea moved out of Piccadilly about a year and a half or two years ago, they moved out in a very callous way. In fact, I recall at the time criticizing that company inside the House and outside the House for the callous way they handled the residents and the fishermen and the plant workers. They moved out and abandoned the people. So we had to try and find an operator to move in to fill the gap left by National Sea. And we were successful, through calling for proposals, in attracting a company, Belle Isle Seafoods, Mr. Roger Pike being the principal of that company, who was operating businesses in the Province, and he chose to get involved in the fishing industry through the bid on that plant and tie in to a plant in Stephenville.

We did financially assist that company because they felt they were unable to operate without financial assistance. Once they got established they found that out and they came to us and justified their case in requesting financial assistance, and we did indeed financially assist them, as we did many other companies around the Province, through a government guarantee programme. Now at that time when they moved in to Piccadilly, they moved in with the intention of having an operation, which was made public by them, which was made known to the employees and to the fishermen in the area and the

MR. MORGAN: residents, which would indeed be a feeder operation feeding into the operation in Stephenville, that the main operation will be at Stephenville and Piccadilly would be a source of a supply of raw material and a source of semi-process material to operate at Stephenville.

When that was announced to the employees and the workers who were formerly employed by National Sea, there erupted at the time a labour-management dispute. And I do not think it is the role of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and I say it sincerely, to interfere and to be involved in any labour-management dispute with individual companies, it is a matter they should work out among themselves, and hopefully it could be done that way. But if there is anything we can do from a government level by sitting down with the company principal or principals and talking about what they had planned to do in Piccadilly, we will do that. But I cannot give the assurance that the matter will be resolved that easily. It is a matter of economic viability. We were successful in attracting a company, and were lucky to get a company, because we did not have our doors knocked on every day by people who wanted to move into Piccadilly to operate that plant when National Sea moved out. So we were fortunate in having a company move in and we gave them assistance. Mr. Speaker, we gave the company financial assistance to operate the plant as an operator and as an individual private-sector company, and they left us the clear impression that they would do the best they could to accommodate markets for the fishermen, number one, and the best they could do with regards to supplying employment at Piccadilly for as many people as possible. But they can only go to a certain limit because it really is a feeder plant to tie

MR. MORGAN: into the Stephenville plant, and I do not think we can ever justify going to any company and saying you must operate with a certain number of employees, you must do this, you must do that, because it is a matter of economics. And the fishing industry hopefully one day will survive solely on economic returns, on economic viability without any government assistance or subsidy. But in this case, as I said earlier, if there is anything we can do, I say it sincerely, we will do as a department. We will discuss the matter with the operator and see if we can help the cause of those people who have now taken the time to sign their names to the petition and have it tabled in the House and passed on to my department. If we can do anything to help the cause of these people we will indeed do it in a very sincere way.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, in supporting the petition so ably presented by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and responded to by the minister, let me first of all congratulate the people on such a petition. perhaps not only the problems in Piccadilly but certainly the problems that we are experiencing in all Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, it is very important to note what those people say. What they are saying is 'we demand the full operation of the plant' - which was intended, I guess - and a buyer' that will purchase all species of fish with due regard to the interests of the fishermen and provide as much employment' - as they point out - 'employment that is desperately needed in our areas, as possible I understand it is one of the highest unemployment areas in the Province.

MR. TULK: 'We demand your immediate attention and devotion to solve the problems in our fishery.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have seen this kind of thing happening in Newfoundland over the past two or three years on occasion after occasion after occasion. Because what we are seeing again is we are seeing the people of Piccadilly, as we have seen in so many places around Newfoundland, asking the Minister of Fisheries in this Province (Mr. Morgan) to repair some broken dreams, broken dreams that were created by the provincial Department of Fisheries and the federal Department of Fisheries.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to support the petition. The minister says legally he cannot get into the problems because they are problems between the private entrepreneur and the workers. Now, that coming from the mouth of a minister who has helped create the kind of problem that we are seeing in Piccadilly, where we have plants -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries on a point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Having been in the House for the last fourteen years, I have always understood that a petition, when tabled in the House, is not subject to debate, What the hon. gentleman is now doing is, in fact, debating the issue of the petition and this is beyond the rules of the House of Assembly.

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: Mr. Speaker, the minister just does not want to hear what the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has to say. There was no more debate from this side of the House, Mr. Speaker - and I was listening carefully - than came from that side of the House when the minister spoke.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

To that point of order, I would refer hon. members to Standing Order 92 which says: "Every member offering a petition to the House shall confine himself to the statement of the parties from whom it comes, the number of signatures attached to it and the material allegations it contains. In no case shall such a member occupy more than five minutes in so doing, unless by permission of the House upon question put." However, there has been some leeway given at times in speaking to the prayer of the petition.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I do not appreciate the minister trying to use up two or three minutes of the five minutes that I have to speak on this petition. I say to him that we do have - and that is what the people named in this petition are pointing out to us, that is the prayer of the petition. They are saying to us: Since you have created the kinds of dreams that you have created in Newfoundland, perhaps falsely, that you now have a moral responsibility to take care of some of the problems that are being experienced. And for the minister to stand in this House and say that fish plants have to be economically viable, goes directly against everything that he has been saying in this House for the last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: It stinks of Kirbyism!

MR. TULK: And it stinks of the kind of thing that we have been trying to fight in the deep-sea plants in this Province. It seems to me that the people of Piccadilly have brought a very important problem to our attention and that is that we have tried to solve the problems of the deep-sea fishery, but we have not, in this Province, solved the problems of the inshore fishery, of the smaller plants in this Province. We are again seeing a case in Piccadilly where we are taking the raw material from an area where it is caught and transporting it somewhere else, from a feeder plant into a larger plant.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the minister, in the minute or so that I have left, I would urge the minister to consider getting involved, not just to sit back and let Roger Pike, whoever he happens to be, or Belle Isle Sea Foods, whoever they happen to be, do what they want with the people of Piccadilly; rather, to get in, get in boots and all as he got into the deep-sea fishery last year, and help them solve their problems.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker.

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

I have to advise that, pursuant to Standing Orders, three people have spoken. The person presenting the petition and two others have already spoken to the petition so, unless by leave, the hon. member is not entitled to speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

Does the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) have leave to speak to this petition?

MR. TULK: No, Mr. Speaker.

March 29, 1984

Tape 492

EC - 4

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, let it be recorded that the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) would not let me speak on a matter that pertains to industry in Bay St. George

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

Leave has not been granted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Yes, yes. He has leave.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) whose timely intervention overrode the untimely and intemperate attitude of the member for Fogo.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this fishery resource in the Bay St. George area and the Port au Port area is vitally important to the 2,000 people who signed that petition and to the approximately 10,000 people in the Port au Port district and also to the approximately 10,000 people in Stephenville. And the resolution of the difficulties that have surrounded the maintenance of that operation in Piccacyll is important. The operation really goes back to

MR. STAGG:

1962 when the Government of John Diefenbaker put a wharf in the Port au Port Peninsula. It is the only bit of public works that has ever been done by the federal department in the whole district of Port au Port, done in 1962. And subsequently there arose in the district of Port au Port a fishing industry, The United Maritime Fishermen and the Fishermen's Co-op in that district ran it for quite a number of years. In 1972, when I happened to have the privilege of being the member for Port au Port, we expanded that plant considerably and in 1975 it was expanded further. National Sea Products came in and they operated a very good operation for a number of years. Unfortunately, I can only say that it resolved itself, or it foundered on labour/management relationships. There was a strike there and there was a considerable amount of ill will between the parties. I am not going to say who was at fault or whether anybody was at fault, but it did founder and probably because of that, or maybe because of others reasons as well, National Sea Products moved out. As the minister said, they moved out in a rather cavalier manner and left the people high and dry. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and his department generally came to the fore and applied for and really cajoled and asked fish plant operators if they would come in. And Mr. Pike, who has operated a plant in Stephenville for a number of years, did come in and is attempting to operate the plant in Piccadilly. And there are difficulties, There has been a strike, and I would try to impress, and I have tried to impress upon people -

MR. HODDER:

There was no strike.

MR. STAGG:

There was a strike there.

MR. HODDER:

There was no strike.

MR. STAGG:

Well, there was a labour/management

MR. STAGG: problem that resulted in no work going ahead. A strike by any other name is still a strike, Mr. Speaker. The member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) wants to get into his socialist rhetoric, which does not come to him very naturally since he is about as far to the right as you can get in other aspects of his life but he would like to be considered to be an orange or red -

MR. HODDER: That is right.. Get personal.

MR. STAGG: Well, the hon. member is interrupting me. I am supporting a matter that is going on in his district. I said there was a labour dispute and labour problems. Were there not? Am I lying to the House? Were there no labour problems? Were there not lockouts? Were there not demonstrations?

MR. HODDER: I think it lasted one day.

MR. STAGG: It lasted considerably longer than that, if the hon. member would recollect. Maybe that is because the hon. member lives in Stephenville and does not visit Port au Port often enough, or whatever. I do not know what it is. I know the labour dispute was simmering for quite some time and the aftermath is still being felt. I encourage the parties to get together and work that out because I believe there is a viable resource there, there is a considerable resource and that a fish plant of considerable proportions can result. The only thing that has to be resolved is there has to be a social compact between labour and management so that that operation can succeed. There is nobody bleeds any more for Port au Port than I do, Mr. Speaker, having been brought up there in my lifetime. I am not a carpetbagger who came in there and got elected in 1975 just on a fluke, like the hon. member. I am from the area,

MR. STAGG: I know what it is about and I certainly support the petition but I deplore the politicization of it by the hon. members opposite.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: I would like to speak in support of the petition, by leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I have to advise that -

MR. BARRY: By leave!

The House Leader (Mr. Marshall)

is saying no.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: By leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: If members of the legislature would keep from interrupting me, I was about to ask if the hon. member could have leave to speak. Does the hon. member from Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) have leave to speak to this petition?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. BARRY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, leave has not been granted.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, let it be recorded that we granted leave.

MR. BARRY: Was that the Government House Leader or the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms)?

MR. SIMMS: There were two on each side.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please!

We are discussing resolutions pertaining to Bill No. 10, Interim Supply.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, we are in Interim Supply. I presume it is Interim Supply, but it seems like eternal supply. But it is Interim Supply and we are getting on quite well. I think it is something like seven and a half hours spent now. Of course, the authority of government to spend on behalf of the citizens of this Province runs out at midnight on March 31, which is fast approaching. When we brought in Interim Supply, of course, we pointed out that the main estimates were down and all the points that were in Interim Supply would be also debated in the main estimates debate. And we encouraged, perhaps, the Opposition to do it that way in the interest of carrying on the essential services of government and, of course, paying the public service and so on. But that has not happened to the present time. On the other hand, there has not been anything of substance brought up really even though the members opposite did not want to wrap up the debate on the points in Interim Supply into the main estimate debate. But nevertheless they still did not get into any substantive matters in terms of Interim Supply itself or what is in the Interim Supply bill. Now there has been a fair bit of empty rhetoric and grandstanding and playing to the galleries and so on and so forth during this debate, particularly on the offshore matter, there has been that. We have had issues or points mentioned on that particular subject.

DR. COLLINS: I cannot believe though, Mr. Chairman, that the case for the Newfoundland people has been moved ahead or moved forward to any degree because of these remarks that have been made. As a matter of fact, I think that if there was someone from the outside came in in a dispassionate manner, they would say, my heavens, the Newfoundland case must be damaged by all this empty rhetoric and all these carping points that have been brought up.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to get into one aspect of it. I think there is something being spread around which is quite incorrect. The point is being spread around that we must rush into some agreement offshore so that we can get short-term benefits. Now, Mr. Chairman, we cannot just let that go by because a lot of what I have termed empty rhetoric is based on that, it is founded on that. It says we must do it. You know, there is a lot of beating of the breast and that sort of thing, but it is said we must do it because we need these short-term spinoffs. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is just a pile of something or other, because there are no short-term spinoffs related to agreement offshore. The agreement offshore is for the development stage, for the longer term aspect of things. There will be no short-term spinoffs other than what is coming, naturally, out of the exploration stage. And those spinoffs are coming now, they have been gradually building up over the years. They will continue to gradually build up over the years, they will not be accentuated or accelerated by any agreement. Now I can hear the argument coming back, oh, you must be incorrect on that, you must not know what is going on. Look at Halifax, look at what they are getting

DR. COLLINS:

there , all the short-term spinoff there. You must be incorrect in your interruption. Just let us look at Halifax. First of all, Halifax has no resource of any worth. It has a small amount of gas out there that you can hardly give away. The amount of gas off the Nova Scotia Shelf is miniscule compared to the huge amounts of natural gas already discovered in Canada, bottled up and locked into the ground and, you know, that cannot be sold. So there is no basis in the resource there for any spinoff. But, you know, I am sure the argument would be, but sure there is a spinoff , again you must be incorrect. And, of course, the answer to it is yes, there is spinoff. It is artificially promoted spinoff by the federal government. This is, pure and simple, a blackmail tactic. They have poured money into Halifax for which there is no justification, there is absolutely no justification on economic grounds. There have been reports come out which show that that there is no justification for it. It would not be put in there except it is loss leader stuff. The oil companies are not losing any money on it because this is all coming from the federal coffers. The citizens of Canada are funding this blackmail. Now I am sure the argument would be, 'Well, alright, surely we can get in on the blackmail if we reach an agreement. Can we get in on the same blackmail?' And, of course, the answer to that is no, we cannot get in on the blackmail because there will not be anyone around to blackmail then. The only reason why Halifax is getting all this federal munificence is to show those bad Newfoundlanders down there what they are missing, to panic them, as the hon. members opposite are being panicked, panic them into making the sort of deal, you know, that we will regret to our dying day .

DR. COLLINS: So the question is should we, as members opposite, go after this will-o'-the-wisp, this blackmail money when there is no blackmail money there? If this government did pick up this foolish argument and go into some agreement like the Nova Scotia agreement, which was what was offered, and, of course, the Nova Scotia agreement is based on a resource that is of little value, it is not even the same resource as ours, and it is not even related at all to the situation off our coast. They do not have icebergs off the Nova Scotia Coast, therefore their agreement does not address that very, very important issue. They do not have the sort of fishery we have off our coast. Compared to the Newfoundland fishery, the Nova Scotia fishery is a little pup of a thing. They do not have the same concerns over fisheries off the Nova Scotia Coast that we have off our coast. So, I mean, this empty rhetoric and this grandstanding and this playing to the galleries which has been going on in this Interim Supply Bill is based on foolishness, it is based on nonsense. It is trying to build up a feeling of panic and, of course, the Newfoundland people have stated many times that they are not that foolish themselves. They know the issues. That is why they supported this government so whole-heartedly. No matter where you looked in elections, in public opinion polls, when any issues come up and groups get together, the Newfoundland people say, 'Look, we have been bitten before by all this foolishness of develop at any cost and regret at your leisure'. We are not going to get into that and especially, of course, they are not going to be panicked into going for something, you know, to get a bit of blackmail such as Nova Scotia has gotten from the federal government, at the cost of the Newfoundland and Canadian taxpayer when, of course, if we ever did get into a foolish agreement such as was suggested by

DR. COLLINS: members opposite ,there would not be anyone to blackmail. And of course the other point is that if there was to be all this spinoff that is what is going to turn things around dramatically. Why is it not happening now? The hon. members opposite say that the Supreme Court put the total development prerogatives in the hands

DR. COLLINS:

of the federal government, So if that is so, where is all this great activity?

So I think we have to remember that the agreement that everyone desires, that is, a good agreement, a good sensible agreement that will be good for the federal government, be good for Canadians generally, will be good for the Newfoundland Government, will be good for Newfoundlanders generally, will be good for present-day Newfoundlanders, will be good for the next generation of Newfoundlanders, that sort of agreement that all of us want is related to the development stage that is coming up on the horizon in a couple of years, but it is certainly not related to what is going to happen. As some people down on Water Street, you know, the more unthinking people down on Water Street who have the sort of operations where you do get flash returns, you know, by fire sales and all this sort of thing, you are not going to get that sort of spinoff in Newfoundland from an agreement, a foolish agreement we entered into, It just is not going to happen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: So we do not need to be panicked into anything in that way. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of comments to make on the Hydro-Quebec negotiations or lack thereof in a moment. If the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) is around, he might be interested in

MR. BARRY: responding. But before I get to that I would like to add my support to the petition brought in by the people of Piccadilly for government to give them some assistance in seeing that they have a fully operational fish plant.

We are all aware that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was prepared - the Minister of Fisheries does not seem to be around either - that he was prepared to see the closure of Burin, St. Lawrence, Grand Bank and, in fact, Mr. Chairman, signed agreements indicating he was prepared to have these closed, and now, apparently, he does not have enough concern for the people of Piccadilly; he is prepared to permit the phasing down of that plant. Are we going to see the ultimate closure of that plant as well?

Now, Mr. Chairman, the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) got up and attacked the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) for having the audacity to come in and try to put some pressure on the Minister of Fisheries to do something for the people of Port au Port. Now, I believe that the member for Stephenville, if he were doing his job as member for the district of Stephenville, coming from the Port au Port area, being a government member in that region, he would be assisting the member for Port au Port to see that the Minister of Fisheries pays attention to the needs of the people of Piccadilly.

Where is all this concern for rural Newfoundland all of a sudden? Where is this concern for the smaller communities of rural Newfoundland? Are members opposite satisfied to have the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier deal with the big companies, the big insolvent companies, and then settle back and assume that that has met the problems of the Newfoundland fishery?

MR. BARRY:

Is that the fisheries policy of members opposite?

Now, the request has been made, Mr. Chairman, for assistance; a heartfelt cry has gone out from the people of Piccadilly for assistance. Is this government going to ignore them in their hour of need? If we listen to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and we listen to the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), the answer appears to be, 'Yes, we are going to ignore them, we are going to throw them back on their own resources, we are not going to help them.' Now, I say the member for Stephenville should be assisting the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) in pressuring the Minister of Fisheries to do something for the people of Piccadilly. He owes them no less.

Mr. Chairman, there was a news report on C.B.C. radio today quoting the Quebec Minister of Energy, Mr. Duhaime. Mr. Duhaime indicated that Quebec had made a new offer to Newfoundland with respect to Labrador hydro development and, presumably, with respect to renegotiating the Upper Churchill as well.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Duhaime indicated that he wanted to meet with the Newfoundland Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall), that he was awaiting some indication from the Province whether the provincial government accepts the offer of the Province of Quebec. He would settle even for an indication that the Government of Newfoundland is prepared to discuss the matter further, and he has indicated that unless one of these is received, either a response to the offer or an indication that the Province is willing to discuss this matter further, then there will be no further requests for a moratorium in the court case. He is prepared if he gets that indication, either a response to their offer or an indication that the Province wishes to discuss it further, that they will consent to a further moratorium. However, unless, Mr. Chairman, there is some response - and apparently we only have today and tomorrow - unless there is some response by the Government of Newfoundland, then Quebec's position is that the courts will decide it, they will proceed, they will not seek any further extension from the courts, they will let the courts decide the matter and the talks will be off. Now I believe it is incumbent upon the Minister responsible for Energy and the Government of this Province to indicate whether they are prepared either to respond in a positive fashion to the offer of the Province of Quebec, or at the minimum indicate to the Province of Quebec that they are prepared to discuss the matter further. This is too important an issue to let this opportunity pass to try and get a renegotiated Hydro Quebec deal, to see further development of hydro in Labrador, to see the revenue that could be available to stimulate the Newfoundland economy. This is too important, Mr. Chairman, to let the opportunity pass. What bothers me most of all, Mr.

MR. BARRY: Chairman, is that Mr. Duhaime indicated that he expected to meet - this was last evening he was speaking - indicated that he expected to meet with the Newfoundland Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) today. Today we had another offshore negotiation scenario here where Mr. Chretien is waiting at a table in for the Newfoundland minister to sit down to the table and the Newfoundland minister is here in St. John's. Now, I would ask the minister to indicate whether there will be any response. I understand his reluctance not to reveal what that response might be and we are not going to attempt to pressure him unfairly to negotiate in public. The minister is correct that there are certain things he deserves to have the opportunity to put in place before making them public. However, Mr. Chairman, he owes it to this House, he owes it to the people of Newfoundland to indicate whether he is at least prepared to respond and whether he has any plans for meeting with the Quebec minister in the near future. I would ask, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister responsible for Energy is within the precincts of the House, or members know where he is, that we get some indication from the minister with respect to these points.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we saw another sorry show, I suppose the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was just seeking to act as a filler, to kill some time and I hope that he will take up time for more constructive debate, He fears the risk of his being criticized, his department being criticized, government being criticized, as they should be for the disastrous job that they have done over the past year in dealing with the finances of this Province. And he gets up and he goes on for ten minutes in some sort of nonsensical fairyland picture of Halifax.

MR. BARRY: The people of this Province who pass through Halifax can see what is happening. They can see that there are people obtaining employment in the offshore who probably would be working in Newfoundland, or the employment would be available in Newfoundland had it not been for the intransigence of members opposite, of the Newfoundland Government. Now, Mr. Chairman, any people going through Halifax or Nova Scotia from this Province can see the construction that is underway there, can see the buildings that are going up, can see the new business relocating in that Province. Now, Mr. Chairman, to a certain extent there is a limit in what Newfoundland can lose. The oil that will be developed will

MR. BARRY:

be off Newfoundland. It will be most efficient to develop that oil from Newfoundland, but there are opportunities, immediate opportunities that are being lost to Newfoundland. And if the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) denies this, then he is threatening to destroy whatever little credibility remains with him as far as the people of this Province are concerned. There are risks for this Province. If a company, for example, has a choice of setting up here or setting up in Halifax, and because of the negative attitude of government, the negative attitude of the Minister of Finance, the negative attitude of the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Morgan), the negative attitude of the Premier, they decide, look, life is too short to be concerned about these hassles with this type of negative government, let us set up in Halifax. And if they go ahead and they expend \$500,000 or \$1 million or more on a head office building, they are not going to necessarily pack up and leave that building in a year or two years or three years because they will have business operations in Newfoundland once oil, hopefully, starts to be developed here.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: That is the type of loss for this Province that is on the shoulders of members opposite, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STAGG: I would just like to continue briefly on certain remarks that I was making on a petition that was presented earlier by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder). There were subsequent interventions in that by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), and that was a relatively intemperate intervention by the member for Fogo, and then certain remarks made by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), which I believe indicated, as I walked into the House, that I should not be criticizing the member for Port au Port in his endeavors to get industry for his district and get jobs for his district, I should be supporting him. Now lest there be any misunderstanding of that and that be twisted in any way, I cannot remember anything that was contained in the remarks of the member for Port au Port with which I disagree. I do not think he made any provocative remarks to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). It was said in a relatively conciliatory tone, as conciliatory as this partisan arena will allow. And I would just like to say that that particular industry, the Belle Isle Seafoods operation in Piccadilly, is one that I want to see expanded. I want to see the present operation made viable. And in order to do so there has to be a consensus, what I call a social compact, between labour and management and the fishermen, and I urge all parties to co-operate together in that regard. I think on that particular issue the member for Port au Port and I see eye to eye, and we do not require the gratuitous, political partisan interventions of the member for Fogo or the member for Mount Scio to cloud or muddy up the waters. So I suggest to these hon. members that they

MR. STAGG: can take their partisan comments and go with them where they will.

MR. CARTER: They should shut up.

MR. STAGG: The hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) says they should shut up. But unfortunately in the electoral process only the electorate can take care of that and I expect they are waiting for the next crack at both hon. members.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct myself to some of the latter remarks made by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), who became after 1981 the self-styled great conciliator, the person who had the power of oratory, self-proclaimed, and the power of persuasion and could be conciliatory with anyone. I must say, Mr. Chairman, that these qualities have not manifested themselves in any of the speeches of the hon. member, the deportment of the hon. member or in any of his activities either before September 1981 and certainly not since. When he says that the Premier and

MR. STAGG:

the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) are negative and unable to make an agreement on the offshore, he is only then trying to build up some sort of an argument for having left the ship in September 1981. Now nobody knows why he left. He has never really satisfactorily explained that. He has made over the past month or so some comments indicating that he tried desperately in caucus and to caucus members to change our minds, to change the attitudes of this side of the House. Now, Mr. Chairman, I attended practically every caucus, certainly I attended every one that the hon. member attended, and I recall the emotionally charged atmosphere of February 1982. We met in emergency caucus many times concerning the SIU case and the federal government's attempt to piggyback on the SIU case their claim on the offshore. It was a matter of considerable import at that time. And, Mr. Chairman, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), the great legal mind, the great Messiah, and whatever else you want to call him, and we acknowledged that he has credentials in the field of law, he is wont to display them for us and to indicate that he does have certain credentials, but we acknowledge all that. And I vaguely recall him saying, "Do you think that is a good idea?" When he came into one caucus late he said, "Do you think that is a good idea?" That is about it.

MR. SIMMS: That was one of the few times he was to caucus.

MR. STAGG: I believe that is what he said, but certainly any passionate pleas for a reversal

MR. STAGG: of attitude or a change of attitude certainly did not come from the hon. member.

MR. BARRY: Not true. Not true.

MR. STAGG: Not true? And then the hon. member has compounded that, in May of that year, May of 1982, After going through a provincial election, and we all rode to victory to a certain extent, Mr. Chairman, in 1982, on the backs of our stand on the offshore which was a good stand, which was a patriotic stand and it was a stand that we still adhere to today, those of us over here, we still adhere to it today and the hon. member rode in, he rode by Ray Winsor, who ran against him for the nomination, he rode by Ray Winsor on the back of that particular policy.

MR. BARRY: I am riding by you.

MR. STAGG: The hon. member can ride where he likes. I am stating the facts now and history. The history of the hon. member's position of this particular issue is one that is confusing to say the least, and that is giving the hon. member the benefit of the doubt. He won the nomination in 1982 against Mr. Winsor, who was a very well revered member and had a great record in that particular district, the district of Mount Scio between 1975 and 1979, and there was never anything uttered about his differing from the party line in that regard. And I would submit, Mr. Chairman, there was the time for a man who had the courage of his convictions. If you really felt at that time that what we were doing was wrong, that was the time to speak out. What did the hon. member do? He did nothing of the sort. He endorsed the policy and confirmed it in May - I believe it was the 24 May - no, it could not have been the 24 May - it was some time

MR. STAGG: in May, I do not have the quote here, in the House of Assembly when he made a speech and I recall that many of us were waiting for it. I recall waiting for it myself and when the hon. member got up and supported the government's position there was a loud sigh of relief because we never really knew whether the hon. member supported it or not. But we all know that he had ridden to victory.

MR. BARRY: Speak for yourself now.
Speak for yourself now.

MR. STAGG: We were never sure of the hon. member.

MR. BARRY: I thought you said in caucus you were.

MR. STAGG: No, I was never sure of the hon. member. Whether the hon. member was sure of himself is another thing.

MR. BARRY: You are contradicting yourself now, 'Fred'.

MR. STAGG: I am not contradicting myself. The hon. member contradicts himself. Anyway, he said in May that he supported the policy and then subsequently, about a month or so ago, he comes out with this revision of history. Only the Russians, I thought, could revise history in that regard, Mr. Chairman, The Russians invented baseball, the Russians invented football, the Russians invented everything. And the hon. member invented history between February 1982 and whenever -

MR. SIMMS: February 1984.

MR. STAGG: - February of 1984, two years. The hon. member rewrote history. So for the hon. member to come in here and to attempt to break down the very strong position that this government has taken on a very

March 29, 1984

Tape No. 499

NM - 4

MR. STAGG: vital issue, and something
that has historical significance - this is not a trivial
issue, Mr. Chairman, that we are involved with here.

MR. STAGG: that we are involved with here. This is a matter of historical proportions and when the history books are written, when the historians of the twenty-first century write the story of this particular issue, the hon. member may - I was going to say will - but he may figure prominently in it, but he will figure prominently in the footnotes to it, Mr. Chairman, as those who fell by the wayside, those who did not have the intestinal fortitude to stand by the Province in its vital position. And the hon. member, unfortunately, has spent too much time in the corporate -

AN HON. MEMBER: Board rooms.

MR. STAGG: - board rooms, yes, and with other groups in this Province, many of them, unfortunately, centered in St. John's, who are subversive - I can only say that they are subversive - to the Province's position. The people of Newfoundland, however, have a much different attitude towards this. And if you only speak to those people who are well to do now, fairly well to do now, some even what you would call rich, other you might even call filthy rich, who want to be richer or more filthy rich, then you run the risk of doing what the hon. member has done, which is to desert this government, the forty-four members of the House of Assembly who are a reflection of the attitudes of the Province of Newfoundland. There can be nothing more graphic, Mr. Chairman, than in April, 1982; the issue was clear, there was no camouflage, we went to the Province in the depth of the worst Winter we had in fifty years. When the election was called I said, "My God, have I got to go out to the people of Stephenville at this time of year, all of the poor people of this town, and talk to them about a matter of principle: Are they going to buy it?" And I had my reservations about it. I went out and, sure enough -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member have leave to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Leave has been granted.

MR. STAGG: - the people of my town bought it. They believed it then and they still believe it now, and unfortunately for hon. members opposite in the comfort of the board rooms of the nation, the people are comfortable but they want to be more comfortable, it is they who are the faint of heart, they are the faint of heart in this Province and, Mr. Chairman, they are not going to succeed, they will never succeed, their numbers are dwindling, their numbers will continue to dwindle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: And I would maintain that maybe the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Leave has been withdrawn.

MR. STAGG: - will be the only one left, All other hon. members are going down the tube.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, I gave the hon. member leave but I did not know he was going to make a show of himself so I withdraw the leave.

Mr. Chairman, for several days now we have been debating Interim Supply and each time a hon. member on that side of the House gets up, for some reason the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is attacked.

MR. WARREN: It is unreal how members on that side of the House will all of a sudden use the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) as a target. It must have some connection with the surge of Liberal growth within the Province. In fact, it was just today in today's Evening Telegram, the paper that this crowd here gives a lot of credit to, that the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) was obliged to go and make a press statement in the Evening Telegram saying that he is not worried about the surge of Liberal support in Carbonear. The hon. member must be worried in order to go and do a press release.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to get on to a particular item that we discussed in the estimates this morning.

MR. WARREN:

I know it is not in the Department of the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), but the minister did make some comments this morning pertaining to the four social workers that were dismissed, expelled, fired, or whatever you want to call it. The minister, and the minister can correct me if he gets an opportunity later on, did say that he was not fully aware of the circumstances of the telegram from some particular group in Labrador, although the hon. minister got it.

In fact I had a telephone call today saying that a letter went out to the four social workers from Cabinet saying that Cabinet approved their dismissal. Now, the minister is a member of Cabinet and I am surprised that the minister was unaware of this action being taken by Cabinet. From Peter Bown's request to the Supreme Court I would like to read paragraph 23, which shows something most unusual. I think the minister alluded to the fact this morning that he was not even consulted by the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey). But that was not the worst. Here is what Mr. Bown alleges: 'Without notifying either him- or the other employees of their status on March 9, 1984, the Minister of Social Services in a public press conference informed the public that they would be dismissed.'

Now, the Minister of Social Services without consulting with either of those four social workers called a press conference and advised the general public that those four social workers were going to be dismissed. That was on March 9. So there was no notice given to the four social workers. The lawyer representing Mr. Bown on March 14, five days later, wrote another letter to the minister saying, 'Look, you did not advise the social workers as to why they were dismissed or what grounds you were dismissing

MR. WARREN: that that the minister responded.

Now, Mr. Speaker, surely goodness any minister of the Crown would advise his employees of the reason they were being dismissed. In fact, under the Collective Bargaining Act, under the Social Assistance Act which my colleague from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is quite familiar with having been a social worker for a number of years, clause 13 of that Act I want to read in to the record. "If any person affected by a finding or a decision of an officer of the department feels aggrieved by a decision or determination of the officer of the department in respect of the granting, refusal, suspension, discontinuance, reduction, resumption or amount of social assistance etc. etc."

This was the first clause, this is clause 13, that the four employees had at their disposal, and without the minister or his officials referring those four to this particular clause, without giving those four employees the benefit of appearing before a review committee, the four employees were suspended.

To me, Mr. Speaker, this is a grave injustice. To me this is pure discrimination against the native people those four employees were serving. We saw, within the matter of a week, downright dirty discrimination by the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) against native groups in Labrador and on the Southwest coast of the Province, down around Conne River. Because at the same time this was happening in Labrador, an employee of the Department of Social Services, down in Milltown, issued a directive to the Indian Band Council in Conne River advising them of further measures against the Indian people in that community. I believe that

MR. WARREN: the Department of Social Services has taken a unilateral decision, by suspending four social workers, of suspending the essential means -

MR. HICKEY: They were given every opportunity.

MR. WARREN: No, I correct the hon. minister, They were not given any opportunity. I would be only too glad to let the minister read this document that will be appearing before the Supreme Court in due course. Those four workers were not given any opportunity.

MR. HICKEY: What! You have an advance copy?

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, I will table it. I will be only too glad to do so. And, Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the hon. minister, who does not understand the situation involved, can say that they were given advanced notice. Is the minister letting secrets out of the Cabinet now? The directive came out of Cabinet three days ago, when the four social workers were dismissed by Cabinet. Is the minister saying then that that is when the advanced notice was given, three days ago? I am surprised that the minister would make such an unnecessary statement.

I would like to say further that we have to be prepared to stand and be counted regardless of where the people in this Province live. I believe social workers have an obligation to serve the people in the best interests the people they are appointed or selected to serve.

MR. HICKEY: Within the law.

MR. WARREN: Within the law. Exactly, within the law. I say, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister, that the law does not state if an Indian

MR. WARREN: family moves in the country for four months at a time that they should be charged board for someone else who is not even living with them. And this is where the whole crux of the matter lies. This family that has had their welfare reduced were not even living in the houses, they were living one hundred miles in the country in a tent. So is that within the law? What it all boils down to, Mr. Chairman, is whether it is within the law or not.

Mr. Chairman, I will close now.

I am sure I will have a chance to speak again.

MR. SIMMS: Oh, Lord, no.

MR. WARREN: I will tackle the Minister of Wildlife (Mr. Simms) very shortly.

MR. SIMMS: I am waiting with bated breath over here.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, it is not too late yet, and I suggest the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) should reconsider the decision and it is possible that these social workers can be reinstated and the Inuit people in the Province can get the benefits they justly deserve.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TULK: Fools rush in where angels fear to tread.

MR. TOBIN: I feel that I must make a few general comments in the beginning, if I may, as it relates to the statements that have been just made in this House by the hon. member regarding the social workers. I had the opportunity, as a matter of fact I considered it an honour, to serve the Department of Social Services and my clients

MR. TOBIN: for ten years. I can assure you that during that period of time on several occasions I am sure there were times when I became frustrated with certain sections of policy and I am sure that that happened to every social worker in the field, and I am sure that it happens to every one in public life, no matter what profession or trade you choose, there will be times when you will not be totally satisfied with what you have to do.

However, Mr. Chairman, as a social worker I had to make a decision whether or not I was going to carry out the policies of the Department of Social Services, which I was being paid to do, or whether or not I was not going to carry out the policies. And I believe that the day I decide not to carry out policies is the day that I should tender my resignation or the day that somebody should tell me what I was there to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: A good man! A good man!

MR. TOBIN: I further state, Mr. Chairman, that when you are a social worker you are there to carry out policies. The policies that you carry out are policies that are put in place by the people in the Department of Social Services under the direction, I am sure, of the minister.

MR. TOBIN: Social workers do not make the policies. Social workers are not there to make the policies, but obviously they can have input into policies. I must say, Mr. Chairman, that during my term as a social worker under the regime of the hon. the minister who is presently the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), there was ample opportunities for social workers to have input.

MR. SIMMS: Under the old regime?

MR. TOBIN: Under the hon. the minister who is presently there.

MR. SIMMS: You were never there when the other member was?

MR. TOBIN: No and I do not think that I would have been able to last under the hon. member who is now Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), like many others.

MR. WARREN: Did you ever bend the rules? Now tell the honest truth in the House, did you ever bend any rules?

MR. TOBIN: Bend the rules? I do not know what that is, bend the rules.

MR. WARREN: Now, tell the truth, Did you ever bend the rules?

MR. TOBIN: Now, Mr. Chairman, I can say that we had ample opportunity as social workers, and social workers today still have ample opportunities to have input into policy making decisions, The minister's office is there, his telephone is there, the field staff, the regional directors and whatever the case may be are there. There is certainly ample opportunity for social workers to have some input into policies. But once that policy is made and once that policy is decided upon, then it is the responsibility of the social worker to get on with

MR. TOBIN: the job and to carry out the policies that have been put in place.

I would also like to say, Mr. Chairman, in this debate while speaking of social workers, that I know the district manager, Mr. Chairman, who is involved in this situation right now that exists in Labrador, and I must say that I, as a social worker, have many friends in the social service field, as I am sure the hon. gentlemen do, but I feel that he has gone beyond his call of duty in the performance of his duty to try to stress a point. I want to also say that the social workers of this Province are one of the best collective groups of committed individuals to serve the people who find themselves in a situation and must request assistance or request the response of the Department of Social Service.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to a comment that was made earlier by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) when he referred to the member from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) not having any great input, or not assisting the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) as it relates to the Piccadilly plant. Well, I can say without fear of contradiction that I have been in our caucus on several occasions when the member for Stephenville was certainly assisting not just the member for Port au Port on the Piccadilly plant, but was speaking on the fishing industry in this Province in general and offering support to all of us. I have difficulty in believing that the member for Mount Scio was genuine in what he said because the member for Mount Scio never attended caucus as it relates to the fishery, the fishing restructuring industry or anything else. I have travelled to the Burin Peninsula, Mr. Chairman, on several occasions for special caucuses regarding the fishery, the member from Stephenville

MR. TOBIN: travelled to St. John's from Stephenville on several occasions to discuss the fishery, but on none of these occasions did I see the hon. the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) participating in the fishing discussion as it related to the restructuring of the fishing industry or the problems that existed in the fishing industry.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Chairman, I cannot think of one occasion, I cannot-and I am sincere and genuine in saying this - I honestly cannot think of one occasion when the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) ever spoke in our caucus as it relates to the fishing industry in this Province.

MR. SIMMS: That is correct.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Chairman, the member for Mount Scio again said where is the commitment to rural Newfoundland? Well, I would say to the member for Mount Scio, Mr. Chairman, that the commitment to rural Newfoundland is on this side of the House, it is very genuine and it is very sincere. And all you have to look at is the last budget as it relates to my district. And the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), Mr. Chairman, who is representing any more of rural Newfoundland than the member for Fogo? To that rural Newfoundland this government has committed \$8 million, this government has committed \$8 million to rural Newfoundland in the member's district.

MR. TULK: I am a good member, boy.

MR. TOBIN: Well, I do not know if you are a good member. I would say that that is questionable whether or not you are a good member. I would suggest that I probably had more input into the ferry going to Fogo than the hon. member from Fogo had.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. TOBIN: But in any case, Mr. Chairman, is that not a commitment to rural Newfoundland? What about the hospital that is being opened this afternoon in Port aux Basques, Is that not a commitment to rural Newfoundland? What about the hospital in Clarendville that is presently under construction? What about the hospital on the Burin Peninsula? The hospital on the Burin Peninsula, Mr. Chairman, that is going to be going under construction, That was started last

MR. TOBIN: year and over \$1 million has been spent for site preparation and \$3 million allocated this year in the budget. And the policy, Mr. Chairman, of the Liberal Party in this Province, and the policy of the Liberal Government of this Province was that we will not build a hospital on the Burin Peninsula, was that all we will offer the people of the Burin Peninsula is an improved ambulance service. And it was the member, Mr. Chairman, for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) who went to Marystown in 1968 to address the Hospital Committee and said, 'Forget the hospital, This government will not build a hospital on the Burin Peninsula.

Because Mr. Jamieson, Mr. Chairman, that great Newfoundland and that great federal government, had built a new highway on the Burin Peninsula, 'the best we will give you, because you now have a new highway, is an improved ambulance service to take your sick, your suffering, your dying to St. John's.' That was the policy of the Liberal Government, Mr. Chairman, that was the policy when they had the ability to make decisions as to whether or not hospitals were going to be built in this Province. They turned their backs on the people of the Burin Peninsula and several other places. Is that a commitment to rural Newfoundland? Is that the type of commitment the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) now wants us to make to rural Newfoundland, to desert the people?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. TOBIN: Now, Mr. Chairman, we can look at several other improvements, and I can look at my own district. I can look at my own district and the money that this government has spent in Burin - Placentia West in the past couple of years. I can look at road programmes, water and sewer programmes, Mr. Chairman. I can look at Placentia Bay and see new fishing stages and bait

March 29, 1984

Tape No. 504

SD - 3

MR. TOBIN: holding units in places like Southeast Bight, Baine Harbour, Mr. Chairman, Red Harbour, assistance to fishery committee in Burin and Epworth, all of these places. I can see water and sewer programmes in

MR. TOBIN: places in Burin - Placentia West, Mr. Chairman, that I do not think were really recognized before.

Now, Mr. Chairman, much has been done in my district, as well as in other districts, but there is much more left to be done. I am committed to that, as is this government, and that is why the Premier of this Province, and that is why his colleagues in Cabinet, and that is why the backbenchers or the private members are supporting the Premier in getting a fair deal from the offshore for Newfoundlanders.

If it is the wish of some hon. gentlemen in this House that the resource we have in the offshore oil, that we throw that away, Mr. Chairman, if that is the wish of some people, that we accept less than what we believe is fair for Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders, then I suggest that the district of Burin - Placentia West, like all other districts in this Province, will be the big losers.

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

MR. TOBIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I will get back to it.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, I am going to start off the few words I have to say in the ten minutes that are available to me by saying that I believe I heard the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) correctly when he said that he had heard nothing in this debate from this side of the House that was of any consequence. I believe that is what he said. Mr. Chairman, I do not know where

MR. TULK: the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has been. I know where he should be. He should certainly not be the Minister of Finance, but I do not know where he has been in the last couple of days. We have been pointing out to him the economic mess that he has created in this Province. We have been pointing out to him that there is a public debt in this Province of \$4 billion created by this government in thirteen years.

MR. CARTER: No!

MR. TULK: The member for St. John's North needs to be educated, so I will educate him. When they took office, the public debt in this Province was \$700 million; now, today, just twelve years later, they have added \$3.3 billion to the public debt. That is what this crowd have done in twelve years. The total public debt, as I said, is now \$4 billion.

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

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

On a point of order,
the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. TULK: Oh, my!

MR. CARTER: The hon. gentleman from Fogo is misleading this House, not deliberately, I am sure, because he is too high-principled a man for that, but he is nevertheless misleading this House. When he talks about the debt being such-and-such in 1972 and the debt being such-and-such in 1984, we all know that we have suffered a disastrous amount of inflation in those intervening years and either the debt should be discussed in terms of 1984 dollars or else it should be discussed in terms of 1972 dollars, or else the member should say at what level he is discussing the debt. So I think the

MR. CARTER: hon. gentleman is creating a false impression and is, therefore, unwittingly misleading this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. McNicholas): To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: I submit that that is not a point of order. The only thing that is inflated in this House is the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter).

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order, there is no point of order, it is a matter of a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, the Opposition has been pointing out for some time that this government has created an economic mess which is one of the worst of any province in Canada. And we have been giving them positive suggestions. The member for Burin - Placentia West who just took his seat (Mr. Tobin), for example, said what a wonderful government we had, what a wonderful Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) we had, that he was using the Marystown Shipyard to build a ferry for Fogo Island. I would like to remind the member for Burin - Placentia West of a meeting that he was in - it was in this House and it was a meeting of the Estimates Committee on Transportation - where, I believe, the member for Fogo looked across the House - and Hansard will bear me out - looked across the House at the Minister of Transportation and pointed out to him the world of things that he should do. One of the recommendations of a Commission that that government had commissioned was that there be a ferry capable

MR. TULK: was that there be a ferry capable of breaking ice built for Fogo Island and that they indeed use the shipyard in Marystown to do it. I suggested to him that that would be a good route to follow. The date, I believe it was last April 17.

So, Mr. Chairman, in spite of the fact that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will rise continuously in this House and say the Opposition offers nothing, that is one example of the kinds of things that the Opposition has been suggesting to the government. As a matter of fact if you look in the budget, if you take up the budget and look at the few positive things that are there, you will find that most of the suggestions have come from this side of the House.

Last night, for example, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and myself spent in Committee with the Minister of Education and we tried to point out to her - and the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) as well - we tried to point out to her some of the problems that were being experienced in Education in the Province in terms of curriculum development. The one single part of her estimates that has been cut this year is in the area of curriculum development. And we tried to point out to her some of the problems in education that we have in the type and the methods that we are using to teach some of our children, that some of them have to change, that if we are going to live in a new technological society in the year 2000 and beyond we have to change our outlook on education.

I do not know whether she understood us or not. I hope she did. For the sake of

MR. TULK: the the children of this Province and for the sake of the students in this Province I hope she did.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. TULK: Now we have the pious chairman up.

MR. CARTER: The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) does not need to bother to correct the hon. gentleman because it is possibly too small a point and so obviously incorrect. The gentleman is suggesting that curriculum development was cut in Education. I have in front of me the budget in black and white, and the estimate for the total for curriculum development for this year, 1984/1985, is \$239,100; the revised for last year, that is the amount actually spent was \$212,700; the budget last year was \$214,000. So now we have an increase from \$214,000 to \$239,000. Now how is that a cut? How is that a decrease?

MR. TULK: The dollars are inflated.

MR. CARTER: The member is again misleading this House. Now I cannot say he is doing it deliberately, but he is certainly misleading this House and the records should be set straight.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: If there is anybody misleading this House it is the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter). If you look at the total in Instruction and Curriculum Development revised 1983/84- you can try to twist the figures- it was \$2,269,000. This year we have \$2,623,000 for a lowering of \$46,000 in Curriculum Development. So, Mr. Chairman, it is not a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please! To that point of order, I rule that there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. And if I might interrupt the hon. member, it being five o'clock on Thursday I have to inform the House that there are three questions for the Late Show. The first question was submitted by the hon. the member for Mount Scio, and the minister to respond not being here today, he asked that it be placed on next week's Late Show.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, the usual practice has been that another minister can reply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the hon. member asked that it be placed on next week's Late Show. There is no rule that I researched to say that he cannot ask for it to be placed on the next Late Show.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order, the hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Just on a point of order for clarification, because obviously any ruling of this nature will have a precedent-setting implication for any future situations of this kind that might arise and I think it is important that the Chair rule on this matter before 5:30 at least. The understanding that I and I am sure other members had all along is that the member putting down a question for the Late Show debate is entitled to get up

MR. SIMMS:

and put his question and debate it, and whether there is a minister over here to respond or not is irrelevant. It is the same as in Question Period. A member can ask a question and a minister may or may not answer the question, as he wishes. And another minister can answer in the case of the Late Show. We have lots of precedents for that. So I would recommend and suggest, Mr. Chairman, that when you are considering this matter that you give consideration to that and that the member be allowed to put his question forth, and if there is a minister over on this side who wishes to respond on behalf of the government he may rightly do so. We have lots of precedents for it.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order,

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

To that point of order,

the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I think the question is

not whether the question is debated this afternoon. The question is whether the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is allowed to debate his question next Thursday on the Late Show and not whether the minister is in the House or not. I understand that the Chair has been requested to check and see if indeed that is allowed, and we can leave that ruling to the Chair for a decision sometime between now and next Thursday.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Further to that point of

order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Further to that point of

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

MR. SIMMS:

Maybe the simplest way

to deal with it, and it would be a lot easier for the Chair,

MR. SIMMS: because I think it would be a difficult one for the Chair to rule on, quite frankly, the simplest thing to do is if the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) does not wish to proceed with his question now and wants to raise it next week, let him ask the question next week during some Question Period and let him give notice that he is dissatisfied with the answer.

MR. TULK: Let the Chair rule as to whether it is valid.

MR. SIMMS: Yes. The only thing is I am trying to help the Chair make that ruling, because it is a difficult ruling to make.

MR. TULK: There will be lots of time to research it.

MR. SIMMS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): To that point of order, I refer hon. members to Standing Order 31(g) which states when a person has to submit a question for the Late Show, and Standing Order 31(h) states: 'At 5:30 p.m. on any Thursday the Speaker may, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 14, deem that a motion to adjourn the House has been made.' It does not say that is an hon. member submits a question it has to be discussed on that Thursday. The question was submitted the day it was asked and it is to be debated on a Late Show, as I understand it.

The Chair has discussed this with the hon. the member affected and I understand he is not present in the House to make his point.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Obviously if he is not here he cannot make his point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, he is not here because the Chair agreed that it would come up next Thursday.

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

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

MR. MORGAN: I have a problem as
well. There is a question on the Late Show regarding a
fisheries matter and I have to be away from the House, I have
to leave right now for a very important meeting. I
would like to know if some other member on the government
side, some other minister could respond on my behalf.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any minister may
respond to the question if it is put. The hon. member
who wishes to put the question can put it. And the hon.
member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) could have put his
question today if he wished and another minister could
have answered. He requested that it be left until next
Thursday, that is the difference.

MR. TULK: No problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The second question to
be discussed is from the hon. the member for Bellevue
(Mr. Callan) to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins): 'I
am not satisfied with the answer given by the Minister of
Finance regarding the scrapping of the Come By Chance
refinery'; and the third question is a question from the
member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk): 'Under Standing Order 31, I
wish to debate on the Late Show the answer given by the
Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) concerning a question
asked on the seal hunt'.

The hon. the member for
Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, as I was
saying -

MR. CARTER: Your time is up.

MR. TULK: How much time do I have
left, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CARTER:

Too much.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

About five minutes.

MR. TULK:

As I was saying when

I was so rudely interrupted for the second time by the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), the positions the Opposition have been putting forward in this House and in Committee. I want to tell the member for St. John's North that he spends a great deal of time in Committee trying to protect ministers, but he does not have to do it in the House, not at all.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, last night in Committee, again we put some very important suggestions to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), some things that she should certainly take a look at. We pointed out to her that one of the areas of her budget that has been cut, perhaps the last area that should have been cut, was the area of Curriculum Development. Last year she spent something like \$469,000, I believe, on Curriculum Development; this year that has dropped by \$40,000.

MR. CARTER: It has not. No.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) can try to twist figures how he likes. The fact is that what was spent was revised budget for last year. And if he cannot subtract, then I suggest to him that he get one of those little calculators.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We just cannot allow this nonsense to continue.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): A point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Again I am reading from this year's budget, page 167, the bottom of the page, The total for Instruction and Curriculum Development last year the budget said \$2,247,300. The revised was slightly more than that \$2,269,800. Again slightly revised, it was slightly more than budgeted. They budgeted estimate this year year is \$2,623,600. Now by my reckoning, and I did learn to count although -

MR. TULK: You did not learn to subtract

MR. CARTER: I presume the hon. member learned to count. He does not count, but I am sure he learned to count. By what yardstick can he say that there has been a cut? It is ridiculous.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order. I am not going to allow the member for St.

MR. TULK: John's North (Mr. Carter) to waste my time.

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

The hon. member for Fogo has two minutes.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, we pointed out to the minister that indeed from the revised estimates of last year there has been a cut in our budget for Instruction and Curriculum Development.

MR. CARTER: I cannot allow this to go on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. TULK: Are you going to allow this to go on, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CARTER: I do not know what I have to do, Mr. Chairman, to point out that the member is misleading this House. I have the facts and figures in front of me in black and white. I would table them except there are plenty of copies available to the Table and to the Opposition and to the press and to the general public, but what the hon. member is saying is not correct. And in the face of the black and white facts in front of him, I have to say he is telling a lie. He is lying to this House. And you can make what you like of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, he has to withdraw that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to ask that the hon. member for St. John's North withdraw the remark that the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is lying.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, obviously I am in your hands and I have perhaps spoken in anger. I will withdraw that remark, But I will continue to submit, and the hon. Chairman can have a look at the figures himself, that what the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is saying is not correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!
To that point of order, once again, as was pointed out by the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), these figures are available for all the public and to all the members of this House to see. They are being interpreted differently by two hon. members, which is certainly a difference of opinion.

The hon. member for Fogo has thirty seconds.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, my time has gradually been wasted by the member for St. John's North. At least we got to the point of telling the minister, ~~that she~~ and she agreed, I believe, partly, that she has to move in new directions in Curriculum Development. She agreed with us, too, and I appreciate the fact that she has but I would like to see her take some action on it, that the school boards in this Province are perhaps not exercising the kind of authority that they should use, that they have to use, that they have legally to use, and that they have not been as publicly oriented and perhaps politically oriented as they should be, because they are political bodies. And she agrees with us too I think, and I think she is going to find some information for me, as to whether indeed there has been a superintendent fired in this Province. And I think that is a very important thing, that we look and see just who is ruling, Is it the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge)? Is it the school boards in this Province? Or is it the superintendents themselves, as I said last night, who have created their own little fiefdoms in many

MR. TULK: cases? I am not saying they are not good professional people, but I think they have to be ruled by the public because education is a public affair. I think she is taking our advice in that regard, Mr. Chairman, I believe, but I would ask her to look at the whole education system and see if she can indeed put the education system of this Province back into the hands of the public.

MR. SIMMS:

Order, order!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please!

elapsed.

The hon. member's time has

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) is not in his chair. I respect you but not that man.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, I have listened intently over the last several days during the debate here on Interim Supply to various members from the other side. Particularly I have listened attentively to a number of comments made by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), I have listened attentively to a number of comments made by his colleagues in his defense, and there have been a number of occasions when I have attempted to rise to make a few remarks but there always seemed to be somebody else who was more in a rush to do so. I am glad to have an opportunity to do so this evening and perhaps later again tomorrow.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to try to engage in any character assassination. I have been a victim, Mr. Chairman, so I am not going to try to engage in character assassination. I have been called a traitor. I know what it is like, Mr. Chairman, to be called a traitor and I would never call anybody in this hon. House a traitor for two reasons. One, Mr. Chairman, it is unparliamentary, that is the most important, and, secondly, Mr. Chairman, I would never call anybody a traitor who does something that he believes in. I would never do that. Mr. Chairman, I have been called a Benedict Arnold, I have taken it day after day, week after week, month after month, Mr. Chairman, I sat over here and I took it. Why? Because I did something that I believed in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: I have, Mr. Chairman, been called Judas. I have been offered thirty pieces of silver. I have

MR. RIDEOUT: been vilified.

MR. CARTER: By whom? Name them.

MR. RIDEOUT: By all the twelve or fourteen, I think it was on the other side at the time for the first year and a half that I sat on this side as a Tory, as a PC. I was called all Judases, all the Benedict Arnolds, all the traitors, Mr. Chairman, quisling.

Mr. Chairman, you talk about squirting poison! The former member for Grand Bank (Mr. Les Thoms) who is not here to defend himself because of the wishes of the people, thank God, but the former member for Grand Bank would never get up for one day but he would have a squirt at me, he would have a flick at me. But, Mr. Chairman, I survived. By doing what? Bay going back to the people who sent me here first in 1975. I survived by going back to them. And my question to the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) - and I hope he will be here tomorrow and I can debate it with him back and forth - my question to him, Mr. Chairman, is will he do the same thing? Will the hon. the member for Mount Scio go back to Mount Scio? That is the question, not whether he goes to Baie Verte - White Bay or if he goes to Port au Port or if he goes to Burin - Placentia West or if he goes to any one of the other fifty-one districts in the Province. The question is will the hon. gentleman go back to Mount Scio? That is the question that he has to answer and then his constituents will answer. Now, like I said, Mr. Chairman, I understand how the gentleman feels, I have gone through it, and

MR. RIDEOUT:

I shall be the last one to attempt to tear a strip politically off that hon. gentleman. I will be the last one to do it. I am as political as anybody else. I apologize to my colleagues, and I am as political as anybody else, but I will be the last one to do it because I sat on the receiving end. I sat over here for a year and a half or two years before an election was called, I sat on the receiving end and I know what it is like. I know how it feels to almost crawl under your desk. I know how it feels, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIMMS:

It hurts.

MR. RIDEOUT:

It really hurts. We all

have our pride.

MR. HODDER:

We ignored you.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Oh, yes, Mr. Chairman,

Hansard will show they ignored me when every day, day after day, week after week, you could hear 'Judas', you could hear 'Benedict Arnold,' you could hear anything except an honourable word towards the man who had made up his mind to do something that he believed in. I shall not do that to that gentleman, Mr. Chairman. I shall not do it. Because I believe no matter how misguided he is, no matter how much I disagree with what he did, no matter how much I disagree with his motives, no matter anything, I think he had a right to do what he did. And I will not, I shall not, I hope the tongue is cut out of me tomorrow if I do say a degrading word about the integrity of that gentleman. But, Mr. Chairman, the other point of the matter, of course, is that they still continue to do it. They still

MR. RIDEOUT: continue to do it! The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is a master at it, The member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is a master at it.

MR. TULK: What are you talking about?

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, that has been ruled parliamentary, has it not? That has been ruled parliamentary - dirtbag. Anytime they want to take the heat off one of their own, their new-found own, they look at me and they say, 'Mr. Chairman, there he is.' What are they talking about the gentleman for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) for? There he is. He is over there. He squeezed or slithered - the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) uses the phrase, 'he slithered across the floor.' There he is, he is over there, Mr. Chairman. He turned his back on his people, he was a Benedict Arnold, he was a Judas, he was everything dirty, He was a dirtbag, That is what he was.' And they keep saying it every time they want to get the heat off their new-found friend. Every time they want to get the heat off their convert, every time they want to get the heat off the latest convert in politics in Newfoundland, they turn on me. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not really care. Why do I not care? Why is it, Mr. Chairman, that I do not care? Because I have been to the mountaintop, that is why I do not care, Mr. Chairman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: - and it is not Mount Scio. I have been to the mountain top and I have not been burned, Mr. Chairman. I was down in the depths of depression, I was down with the dirtbags, Mr. Chairman,

MR. RIDEOUT: I wallowed in the dirt,
I rubbed shoulders with them. But, Mr. Chairman,
'While the light holds out to burn/The vilest sinner
may return.' And I came home. Free at last.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: I came home, Mr. Chairman.
I saw the light.

MR. SIMMS: The prodigal son.

MR. RIDEOUT: The prodigal son came home
but they cannot forget it. And why do I not care, Mr.
Chairman? Because, as I said, I have been to the mountain-
top, I have done the ultimate. I went out to a
district in rural Newfoundland - not Tory St. John's;
I did not run in Pleasantville -

MR. DINN: That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: - I did not run in St. John's
Centre, I did not run in Mount Scio. - I went out to
rural Newfoundland, to the wild people in Wild Cove, to the
people down in LaScie, where in 1979 there were seventy-
six Tory votes and in 1982 the count was 341 to 351,
that is where I went, back to my roots, Mr. Chairman,
back to the people who sent me here first, back to the
people where I was born, back to the people that I
grew up with,

MR. RIDEOUT:

they said, "Continue, my son, Our faithful servant, continue. You have done an excellent job. You have been right." They said, "Carry on," and they did it. Here he is, our friend. And, Mr. Chairman, you talk about how people change, because who came to Baie Verte-White Bay and campaigned with me one day, and who talked about the offshore and who talked about the fact that we had no choice but put the issue into the Supreme Court of Newfoundland? Who came to Burlington, Mr. Chairman, and said, "Peckford is right. Rideout is right. The government is right. We have no choice."

MR. SIMMS: Who said that?

MR. RIDEOUT: "The federal government have tried to cut off our legal proceedings by trying to expand the SIU case." Who was it came to Baie Verte, Mr. Chairman, and rode in the motorcade?

DR. COLLINS: Does his name begin with "L"?

MR. RIDEOUT: Who was it came to Baie Verte and rode in the motorcade and waved his arms around the streets of Baie Verte and said, "The government is right. I support the government. I am 100 per cent behind the government. For God's sake, for the sake of Newfoundland return Brian Peckford, return Tom Rideout." Was it Steve Neary?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. RIDEOUT: Or the hon. the Leader of the Opposition? Was it the hon. gentleman for Exploits (Dr. Twomey)? Was it the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer)? Who was it, Mr. Chairman? The member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry).
I rest my case.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have heard it all now. We have heard it all. We have heard a gentleman stand in his place and talk about how good he is and how he is not going to deal in character assassination and then he sets out to do the very, very thing. But the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), Mr. Chairman, is on shaky ground, as he knows. But I notice one thing, Mr. Chairman, that he is still a Liberal at heart, because you notice the quote that he used, "I have been to the mountaintop." He used a quote from one of the great Liberals in the United States, Martin Luther King, and one of his followers, Jesse Jackson, and the Kennedys. That is the kind of stuff that that member sincerely believes in, Mr. Chairman. He did not quote any of the Tory prime ministers or any of the Tory presidents of the United States. He had to quote somebody like him, way down deep his philosophy is Liberal.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is quite easy for the member for Baie Verte-White Bay to talk about the move that he made and compare it with the move that the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) made, it is easy for him to do. But this man went to a government that was riding high. Then he went back to his people when the Premier was riding high on an issue that created euphoria and dealt in emotions, not thinking Newfoundlanders but emotional Newfoundlanders. And that was the 64 per cent who voted for the Premier in 1979 and 1982, Mr. Chairman. They did not do it in Bellevue. And, Mr. Chairman, I am

MR. CALLAN: prepared to take my seat if the member for Baie Verte-White (Mr. Rideout) has the honesty and integrity to come into this House and stand in his place and answer me a simple question: Did he go to the Premier before the 1979 election and ask to join his party and then deny it when he saw that Don Jamieson was coming back to lead the Liberal Party? Did he or did he not? If he says no he did not, then why was the Premier on the radio and on the television and in the papers saying that he had a visit from two former Liberals? And they were Hazel McIsaac, apparently, and the member for Baie Verte-White Bay, or that is what the Premier said. Now who is telling it the way it should be told? And let us look at something else. The member for Baie Verte-White Bay talks about going to that side and joining the government, on what issue, Mr. Chairman? I was not here. On the ownership issue, the issue that has been dropped by this government. Now they have dropped it. The Premier stands in his place day after day and he talks about the moves that we made. Ottawa has not moved but we moved from here and put ownership aside. And the member who crossed the House on that one issue is still there. Especially after listening to that speech, Mr. Chairman, I think the member is about ready to come back, ready to come back again,

MR. CALLAN: because he is a Liberal at heart. It is quite easy for him, Mr. Chairman, to stand there and talk about the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) running in the district of Mount Scio. I have a funny feeling, Mr. Chairman, that the member for Mount Scio will not be at all afraid to go back to the district of Mount Scio if that is the right and proper thing for him to do when the time comes. But, Mr. Chairman, I did not even want to talk about that nonsense! I mean, the member talked about how the member for Mount Scio when down to Baie Verte and helped get him elected. At least he admitted to that, that he did not win it all on his own strength; he had to have the Premier down there campaigning for him and he had to have the member for Mount Scio down there campaigning for him, that is how he managed it. That is how he managed it, Mr. Chairman, He admits it. He just admitted that somebody else won it for him.

MR. CARTER: That is terrible rubbish!

MR. CALLAN: Yes, it is, and what we heard just now was terrible rubbish! But, Mr. Chairman, if the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) wants to deal in that sort of nonsense, then I can remind him that he also was down in Twillingate in the by-election of 1977, on stage, campaigned for the then leader in a by-election, the then leader, Bill Rowe, and he, Mr. Chairman, is the same man who stabbed him in the back. And I can deal in that too if that is the kind of nonsense he wants to get on to. But, Mr. Chairman, the kind of thing that I want to talk about is the kind of stuff that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) led off with this afternoon. He was comparing Halifax and the Province of Nova Scotia and the oil up there with what we have and so on.

MR. CALLAN: And, Mr. Chairman, he was comparing apples and oranges. He was not comparing apples and apples. I mean, the minister cannot have it two ways. He cannot say that there is nothing off the coast of Halifax and there is no development up there. Of course there is not; if there is nothing up there, why should there be any development? Then he says in the same breath, 'But we have millions and billions of barrels here.' Well, obviously, if we had it and we had a deal, then there would be triple times the activity in this Province that there is in Nova Scotia. You know, it makes sense.

DR. COLLINS: You missed the point of the argument, I am afraid.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman, I adjourn the debate.

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

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

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of Supply reports that they have considered the matters to them referred, report having made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 5:30 p.m., we have two questions for the Late Show, Number one to be debated is by the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) on a question

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): for the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) pertaining to the seal hunt. Question number two, asked by the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), is directed to the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), with regard to the Come By Chance oil refinery.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the reason I have chosen to put this question on the Order Paper for the Late Show is that I am somewhat concerned about the answers that the Minister of Fisheries gave me, not that he did not answer the questions, but that the questions that I put to him, I think, tells me something

MR. TULK:

about what is happening to the sealing industry in this Province. And I refer, of course, to the first question that I asked him when I asked the minister to restate the government's position on the seal hunt. In view of the recent controversy that has gone on between the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the federal PC spokesman on the sealing industry itself, I asked him if he would restate the government's position. As as I understand, what the minister restated was that the provincial and the federal wings of the Tory Party are now in agreement as to the whitecoat hunt itself and that is that there is to be, as far as they are concerned, as far as the Tory Party in Ottawa - they will never be the government - and the Tory government in Newfoundland are concerned, that the hunting of the whitecoat seal is to be no more, there is to be a moratorium. You can call it a moratorium or you can call it a ban or you can call it whatever you like, the effect is still the same. And I am concerned about that. I am not necessarily concerned about it from the point of view of whether it will be of greater benefit to the Newfoundland economy to have the whitecoat hunt, or not to have it. Because I know that when the Minister of Fisheries makes the statement that the fishermen in this Province really do not care whether there is a whitecoat hunt or whether there is a hunt off the Front, or not, they are not really concerned.

As a matter of fact, most of the fishermen in this Province, I think, would like to see the seal hunt discontinued at the Front. I believe they would, because it is really only benefitting a few people as compared to the number of landsmen who benefit. What concerns me is that we have carried on a fight in this Province for a number of years to protect

MR. TULK: what we consider to be a traditional right and to protect what we consider to be a way of life which says that we hunt animals how we like, yet we have the most humane hunt in the world, but we have the right to hunt whitecoat seals. We have said that, we have stated that, we have made government policy on that and we have agreed, on both sides of this House, that that is to be the case. Now we see the federal Tory Party and the provincial Tory government of Newfoundland agreeing that indeed that hunt is to be no more. Yet when I ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) if he had to do that to protect the markets for other fish products coming from Newfoundland, he could not answer the question. As a matter of fact, he was not sure whether indeed he had to do those things or not. So I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if indeed what we have seen here, and I would hate to believe that this is the case, is an attempt by the Province, an attempt by the provincial Minister of Fisheries, after he got into a row with his federal counterpart in the Tory Party, the federal Fisheries spokesman for the Tory Party in Ottawa, through no fault of his own but through the fault of a man called Mr. Lloyd Crouse, from the South Shore, I believe, of Nova Scotia, then, to save face for that Tory spokesman in Ottawa, the provincial Minister of Fisheries has agreed to a moratorium on the whitecoat hunt. And I do not see the reasoning behind the minister's arguments. And the other thing that he says is, it not going on anyway, it did not go on in 1982. It did not go on in 1982 because the markets were not there, yet today he tells us that the markets are there for the whitecoat seal. So, Mr. Speaker, that was the concern that I have. I am not necessarily concerned about whether the answers were given, but I am

March 29, 1984

Tape No. 513

SD - 3

MR. TULK: concerned about what the answers
mean to the seal hunt in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of the Environment responding on behalf of the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. ANDREWS: I have been asked to reply by the Minister of Fisheries, I think the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) understands that.

MR. TULK: No problem.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister of Fisheries did answer the question. It is a very difficult question to answer, whether or not we should abolish or set a moratorium on or ban the whitecoat hunt and whether that action would affect or not affect the markets of the world, indeed, for our fish products. I believe what the Minister of Fisheries did say was that it could very well damage the markets for the rest of our fishing industry.

MR. TULK: But he does not know?

MR. ANDREWS: No, we do not know. Nobody knows. This here is an action of one step backwards right now with the hope that in the future we will have two steps forward.

The beater hunt will survive.

The beater hunt is worth a considerable dollar to Newfoundland at this point in time. I think that has been straightened out with our colleagues in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a very serious dilemma here, and I am glad to see that the member for Fogo is not bringing too much politics into this because I think this is the last issue that we should bring partisan politics into. It is only going to hurt the fishermen of Newfoundland and indeed the fishermen of Canada. The issue is a very emotional one, it is a very difficult one to approach. These people are very well organized. They raise millions and millions and

MR. ANDREWS: millions, if not tens of millions of dollars. There is no difficulty for them to send out 4 million or 5 million cards to householders and organizations in the United States. And they do not aim at the facts at all, they do not present the facts, they present emotions and play for the heart and the soul of people who know absolutely nothing about the argument. This is a difficult, if not impossible problem to overcome, so I think our strategy has to be one of one step backwards, probably two steps ahead. Now when we are saying this, Mr. Speaker, we have to also recognize that we are playing with something very much more serious than the whitecoat hunt or even the beater hunt or even the total seal hunt in Newfoundland. We are talking about an industry that is worth tens of millions, hundreds of millions of dollars to the communities and the societies all around Newfoundland, the fishermen and the plant workers, the people who catch and process codfish, redfish, flatfish, turbot, salmon, herring- you name it -all the fish species. We are talking about a multi-million dollar business affecting tens of thousands Newfoundlanders. This is too touchy an issue for us to debate back and forth the House. Now for political reasons we can certainly debate the issue of whether we should ban the whitecoat hunt for a while or should we ban the beater hunt for a while. I will certainly be quite willing to debate that, but not to make politics out of it. We had a problem this past week in our own party, thank God that is resolved. That was not partisan politics that was a little squabble amongst friends. But more important is not to make this a political issue. Sealing is important. It is very important that we save it and, as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) said this afternoon, if we do not save it we are going to have to revert to what we were

March 29, 1984

Tape No. 514

MJ- 3

MR. ANDREWS: doing anyway, we will have to have a cull on the seal population. We have, I think the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) said, a couple of million seals. I believe we have in excess of 2 million seals. If you get a survival rate of even 50 per cent- scientists tell me it is even higher - if you have 2 million seals, half of them are female seals so you are talking about probably 600,000 or 700,000 pups a year -I do not know, these are ballpark figures - and if you do not cull those seals it will not take very long before you are back to what some of the scientists said were the historic levels of the seal population off the Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador, 8 million or 9 million seals. You can see it will not take very long. And the seals

MR. ANDREWS: live for twenty-odd years and they bear young every year after the first year, is my understanding.

So we have a very serious dilemma and, as I say again, we should not make politics out of it. I think the move by this government and by the federal P.C. Party is a very good move at this time. I am inclined to disagree with the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) when he says that we will never, ever bend, and we will never, ever abolish the seal hunt. I think that is too hard a line, and I am sure he will have to come down a little bit on that.

MR. TULK: That is a good bargaining stance.

MR. ANDREWS: I hope he does not, I hope he does not, but I think he should be in a position to be able to move if he has to.

MR. TULK: Yes, but that is taking the political side.

MR. ANDREWS: That is the political side.

MR. TULK: That is taking the political side.

MR. ANDREWS: He is playing too hard a politics on this with the people that he is dealing with in the United States, the fish processors. We saw on television last week - or was it earlier this week? - where they picketed one of these -

MR. TULK: The McDonald's chain.

MR. ANDREWS: - McDonald's. Now, once that starts happening, we all know the power of pickets. It is easy enough to write a letter to a Canadian Embassy, it is easy enough to do that, but once

MR. ANDREWS: you start to picket an organization like McDonald's or Wendy's and other organizations, we can find ourselves in very, very big trouble.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!
I have to advise that the hon. minister's time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Speaker, the gentleman for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) said that he was on the mountaintop, he went to the mountaintop. The people from Come By Chance have been to the mountaintop as well. But in 1976 that mountaintop crumbled around them. Twenty, twenty-five, right now eighteen people, up until a few days ago, were still on that mountaintop and they were hoping that their world would not crumble around them.

I have several questions for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). The Minister of Finance tells us that it costs about \$25,000 a month to maintain that refinery, in other words, to keep eighteen people employed and to mothball that refinery. \$25,000 a month for twelve months is \$260,000, about a quarter of a million dollars for eighteen jobs, and that is just over \$14,000 per job, per man. Let me ask the minister why does he not say to Petro Canada, and why does he not come into this Legislature next week and introduce legislation to put a stop to the scrapping of the Come By Chance oil refinery? It can be done.

MR. CARTER: It is rubbish! Scrap it now. It is trash. The Daily News said it was trash.

MR. CALLAN:

The Daily News may

have said it, I do not know. But I know this, Mr. Speaker, that it has been suggested more than once, and it was suggest at the time when Petro-Canada bought the refinery from this government three years ago, that part of that agreement should be that, yes, the refinery is yours, but if and when the day ever comes that you have to make a decision to back out and you are going to scrap it, you will not be permitted to do so, it is our refinery.

Mr. Speaker, I think I can make an allegation which is based on firm ground, that if an offshore agreement had been signed last year or the year before, or three years ago, or even if an offshore agreement were imminent right now, Mr. Speaker, if an offshore agreement were imminent right now, which it is not, because the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) and the Premier get up in this House of Assembly day after day - over the last couple of weeks they have done it several times - and they point to a Tory government

MR. CALLAN:

in Ottawa: That is when we will get a deal. So everybody in this Province, Mr. Speaker, knows that no offshore agreement is imminent. Everybody knows that the Premier and his ministers are not prepared to pick up the phone and say, 'Okay, let us go back to the table'. They know that an offshore agreement is at best eight months, twelve months, perhaps a couple of years away. And, of course, that is why, Mr. Speaker, Petro-Can was forced to make the decision that they made a few days ago. But the minister can stop it, Mr. Speaker, the minister can stop that. This government can bring in a motion, bring in some legislation whereby the scrapping of the refinery is stopped in its tracks and the facility is allowed to stay there. And not only for the sake of the eighteen jobs at \$14,000 a year, which does not cost the Province that much, Mr. Speaker, what is \$250,000 when we are talking about a budget of well over \$2 billion? What is it? A drop in the bucket. In comparison to the money, Mr. Speaker, spent on patriotism and the unnecessary secretaries that are half Cabinet Ministers, the post that was resigned by the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) a couple of years ago, and on all of these things that the government is doing, like keeping employees like Jim Peddle on the payroll and that sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, \$250,000 to keep a refinery intact and in mothballs is nothing. The minister can do something about it. The question is, will he?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member

opposite is to be commended. Throughout the years, throughout these painful years since 1979 anyway, since this administration has got involved -

MR. CALLAN:

Since 1975.

DR. COLLINS: - as the hon. member says, since 1976, really, he has been involved. He is to be commended for his drive to keep this thing going and, when it got into difficulty, he used to turn it around and support his people's desire out there to have the refinery come back to life again. I think he has been helpful in that regard. He has not tried to use this in any great partisan way. He has had to ask some hard questions at times but he really has not tried to turn it into a partisan issue. I mean, he is to be complimented on that because strictly speaking it never really was a partisan issue once the thing went down. I mean, there were things before that should never have happened and I think that there were terrible things done. Once the thing went down, it really was not a partisan issue. Everyone's efforts were bent towards trying to do something about it, trying to retrieve something, not only the jobs for the people out there, and I suppose not even for the money that some people in this Province lost in it. I was speaking to a gentleman the other day, a contractor, and he told me that he is out approximately \$500,000 because of the Come By Chance refinery. He was only one of quite a number who are out a considerable amount of money. But it was not even just for those even, it was for the fact that an industry in this Province which seemed at one stage to have some possibility of surviving was gone. It was a pity that we could not have kept in this Province an oil refining industry. So everyone was bending towards that effort. Now when we came in, one of the things we did not want to do though, and we strived very hard to prevent this from happening, we did not want, once the thing had gone down, someone else to pick it up only to have it go down again. It was bad enough, you know, to have people disappointed once and people to have to lose their money once and that

March 29, 1984

Tape No. 516

SD - 3

DR. COLLINS: sort of thing, and the provincial
government make a contribution and losing that. But certainly
we did not want the thing to

DR. COLLINS:

be resurrected, limp on for a few months and then go down the tube again. And there were quite a number of approaches along that line and we had to vigorously reject them even though at times we were criticized, and criticized quite heavily, for doing so.

There were a number of possibilities: I can remember one, Mr. Tamraz, but that did not turn out, and even that was really perhaps grasping at straws a bit. However, when Petro Canada showed the slightest interest in the place, we went after them like dogs after a bone. As soon as they even said, 'H-m-m! It might be interesting to look at Come By Chance,' the minute they said that, we were after them, you know, full bore ahead and we did manage to ignite their interest, we did manage to get them more and more involved there, and we were absolutely delighted when they took it on; because we were absolutely convinced that if anyone could turn that around it was Petro Canada, with the huge resources they had behind them and with their 'in', shall we say, with the federal government. If anyone could do it, they could turn it around.

I must say that, right from the outset, they made no promises. They said, 'Look, we are only going to pay a pittance for this, really, compared to what was originally invested in the thing, but we are doing that because we are hard-headed; and, secondly, we are not going to make a promise that we will turn it around. We will turn it around if we can. If we can make a profit on it, if we can make this a viable institution, operation, we will do it, but if that is not the case, well, you will have to recognize that.'

DR. COLLINS: And, over the years, I do not think we had any cause for complaint. They met with us whenever we wanted them to, they carried out the studies that they said they would carry out, studies on the refinery itself to make sure it had not deteriorated to a stage where it was pointless to do anything about it, studies on the world markets and so on and so forth. I will not go into it in any great detail, but they really put their back into it, they were very forthright in their assessment of the thing, and I am convinced to this day that if that refinery could have survived, it would have survived in Petro Canada's hands. Now, the corollary of that is if it cannot survive in Petro Canada's hands, it is just not survivable in the foreseeable future in present world circumstances.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 30, 1984 at 10:00 a.m.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MARCH 29, 1984

Answer to Question #18 on the Order Paper of Monday,
March 26th., 1984.

Question:

Mr. Barry (Mount Scio) - To ask the Honourable the
Premier to lay upon the Table of the House the
following information:

All correspondence, telexes and telegrams the Province
has had with the Province of Quebec since January 1,
1983 concerning the re-negotiation of the Upper
Churchill Falls power contract and the possible
development of hydro-electric power along the Quebec-
Labrador border with the Province of Quebec.

Answer:

It would be inappropriate to comment publicly in any
way while sensitive negotiations are continuing.
To table the information requested would be negotiating
in public. We cannot and will not do that.