



Province of Newfoundland

THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XXXIX

Third Session

Number 52

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Friday, 23 November 1984

Speaker: Honourable James Russell

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this time to announce to the hon. House of Assembly that the following recommendations contained in the Labour Standards Board Report for 1984 have been approved: Minimum Wage - the minimum wage will be increased from \$3.75 per hour to \$4.00 per hour with effect from January 1, 1985.

Overtime - the minimum overtime rate will be increased from \$5.63 per hour to \$6.00 per hour effective January 1, 1985. That is time and a half.

Meals, board and lodging - the deductions an employer may make from the minimum wage in cases where the employer provides meals, board or lodging is increased as follows: (A) single meals increased from \$1.10 to \$1.20 per meal; (B) board and lodging increased from \$27.00 per week to \$29.00 per week; (C) Board only increased from \$17.50 per week to \$19.00 per week; (D) Lodging only increased from \$8.15 per week to \$9.00 per week.

Uniforms - in cases where the employer requires an employee to wear a uniform or special articles of clothing, that the employer be prohibited from reducing the

employee's wages below the minimum wage by making deductions for the uniform.

Registration of wage claims - that the Labour Standards Act be amended to permit a duly authorized representative to file a single wage claim on behalf of a class or group of employees of an employer. What that basically means, Mr. Speaker, is that in the event that there is a group, a union, or something of that nature that has a claim before the Labour Standards Tribunal, that that claim can be put in on a group basis rather than on an individual basis. They do not have to make up 200 or 300 applications.

Exclusion Re: Beauty Culture - The provisions of the Labour Standards Act remain unchanged where the hairdresser is entitled to the benefits of the act where a contract of service exists between the operator of an establishment and a hairdresser. However, that it be clearly stated that where no contract of service exists between the operator of an establishment and the hairdresser performing the work, none of the benefits of the Labour Standards Act apply and that this information be circulated to all establishments and registered persons in this trade.

Adoption Leave - That the act be amended to permit an employee who adopts a child to be given adoption leave for a period of eight weeks immediately following the adoption, provided the employee informs the employer in writing at least one month in advance and provided also that the employee has continuously worked for the employer for a twelve month period.

Tips And Gratuities - The Labour Standards Act be amended to indicate that tips and gratuities are the employee's property and may not be withheld by the employer notwithstanding any consent given by the employee. Additionally, if a surcharge is levied in place of a tip or gratuity, then this should be deemed to be a tip or gratuity.

Minimum Wage For Underage Employees, Students, Inexperienced Employees And Trainees - The present arrangement whereby the minimum wage applies to all employees sixteen years of age and over will continue. In other words, there will not be a two-tier system and that students, etc., will get the minimum wage as long as they have reached the age of sixteen.

Domestics In Private Homes - The rate for persons employed in domestic service in private homes will be increased from \$2.25 per hour to \$2.75 per hour effective January 1, 1985.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there were several recommendations of the Labour Standards Board that were not approved and they are as follows:

(1) Overtime - The provision in the Act will remain unchanged and overtime will continue to be paid for hours worked in excess of 44 hours per week, except for shop assistants who are entitled to overtime after 8 hours a day and 40 hours a week. Farm and domestic employees continue to be excluded.

(2) Domestics in Private Homes - There will be no change in the definition of a domestic employee in a private home. The

recommendation to have the domestic employee definition divided into separate classifications, i.e., a person who performs normal household duties and a person who does not perform normal household duties but rather, performs such duties as child care and babysitting, has not been approved. The existing regulation in that regard remains unchanged.

(3) Standard Working Hours - The present regulation which provides for an 8 hour day-40 hour standard work week for assistants and a 44 hour standard work week for all other employees be changed to 40 hours per week, remains unchanged.

(4) Public Holidays - That Discovery Day not be established as a paid public holiday and the number of paid public holidays will remain at 5.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did not indicate to the House whether all the recommendations of the Labour Standards Board were accepted or not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
He did! He did!

MR. NEARY:
Well, I missed that.

MR. SIMMS:
You must have had a rough time last night.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, boy, I am asleep over here this morning. I am getting so bored and the House is so monotonous and the Premier is so silly that I am -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Come on over.

MR. NEARY:

Have you got a position for me? Mr. Speaker, the Premier is getting to be so co-operative and such a likable individual that I am almost tempted to accept his invitation. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that there are far too many exceptions.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If I could sit down with you for half an hour I would have you over here.

MR. NEARY:

Well, I tell you here lately I am getting concerned about the way I feel about the Premier because I am actually developing a liking for him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

I think basically, Mr. Speaker, he is a pretty decent fellow, a very fair fellow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, is this in order?

MR. NEARY:

But in the meantime, down on the farm, there are far too many exceptions to the rule. Mr. Speaker, apart from that, let us

face the fact that \$4 an hour is still starvation wages. I suppose, in one sense, we should be thankful for small blessings, but \$4 an hour is far too little. And I agree with the Federation of Labour, I think the minimum wage in this Province should be at least \$7 or \$8 an hour because people cannot survive on this.

The unfortunate part of it, Mr. Speaker, is this, that most employers in the Province will accept this figure, which is only meant to be a minimum figure, as standard. When employers hire people they say all I am forced to pay you under law is \$4 an hour. That is the unfair part of it. So as I say, I suppose we should be thankful for small blessings, but nevertheless it is still a starvation wage. I would like to see it \$6 or \$7 an hour. People cannot exist on this wage, Mr. Speaker. Employers do take advantage of it, as the hon. gentleman knows. And when they are confronted with paying a higher rate per hour they will say under the law that is all I have to pay you.

DR. COLLINS:

You do not understand what the minimum wage is.

MR. NEARY:

I do understand it. Because minimum is just what it says, minimum. The hon. gentleman talks to me about not understanding things. A year ago he said you buy something for a dollar and you sell it for two, 1 per cent profit.

MR. TULK:

Perfect understanding.

MR. NEARY:

So, Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can say about it, I suppose, is we

should be thankful for small blessings.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

I would like to take this opportunity to welcome to the Speaker's Gallery the hon. Brian Smith, the Minister of Justice in the Province of British Columbia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

ooo

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

I recognize the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West on a point of privilege.

MR. TOBIN:

On Wednesday there was a very serious allegation made in this House by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). I checked with Hansard this morning, Mr. Speaker, and the Hansard clearly indicates that the Leader of the Opposition stated that the member for Burin - Placentia West had concealed the original copy of a petition and instead delivered it to a minister.

It was further stated, Mr. Speaker, in that debate that the original copy had been lost or deliberately misplaced with the Minister of Education (Ms Verge). At no time did I ever receive from the PTA or anyone else the original copy of a petition presented in this House. Mr.

Speaker, I received a photostat copy of the petition the same as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) received, a petition that I knew, by law, could not be presented in this House. Unlike the leader, Mr. Speaker, I knew it could not be presented, nor was I ever asked to present the petition. That statement, then, should not be allowed to stand, that I deliberately misplaced an original copy or, Mr. Speaker, that I had the original copy concealed. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition in this hon. House that there was at no time an original copy of any petition presented to me. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I was presented by the PTA people with a copy of a petition, and was asked if I would deliver it to the Minister of Education (Ms Verge), which I did. I met with the Minister of Education and discussed with her for an hour the situation on the Burin Peninsula. I have met, Mr. Speaker, with the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and discussed the situation on the Burin Peninsula. As well, my colleague, the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power), and I had a discussion with three members of the PTA in Marystown on Wednesday and explained the situation as it relates to the strike down there. The fact of the matter is it is a very serious situation down there. There are students out of school who are losing very valuable time in the education field. The situation down there, Mr. Speaker, is far too big for either the Leader of the Opposition or anyone else to play politics with it and I do not think that those kinds of remarks should be allowed to stand on the record of this House when they are, in actual fact, not true.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, to that point of privilege.

MR. BARRY:

To that matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, it seems from what the member has said that rather than his being criticized for concealing the original of the petition, I now have to change that to concealing a copy of the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the additional statement would have to be made that the member made no attempt to contact the people involved to determine whether or not they wished him to proceed with the tabling of the petition. All the member had to do was to have three colleagues sign the petition and it could be placed on the Table of this House. The point is, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman's constituents wished to have their concerns brought to the House of Assembly and he failed miserably and shamefully to do that. Mr. Speaker, I received a late night phone call from parents concerned who wished to have it brought to the Table of the House of Assembly and they could not find their member to get him to do what should be done, the right and proper thing which is to bring their concerns to the floor of this House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please! The Chair has heard enough argument and shall take it under advisement and rule on it later.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has pulled a disappearing act. I have a question for the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Here he is.

MR. BARRY:

I am sorry about that. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier whether the result of the Minister of Energy's (Mr. Marshall) discussions with Mrs. Carney yesterday afternoon with respect to the Hibernia development and other matters has led to a decision with respect to the banning of Winter drilling. The government last year issued a statement that indicated that in their opinion Winter drilling should be banned because of the then information with respect to ice conditions and also because they were not satisfied that there was a sufficient search and rescue presence in St. John's, and that there were questions relating to decreased security as a result of the closing of the Shoe Cove tracking station, and because they wanted to review fully the effectiveness of certain guidelines set down for Winter drilling.

Now I would like to ask the Premier whether he has made a decision to ban or not to ban Winter drilling offshore this Winter, or has the Premier mistaken Mr. Mulroney for a successful King Canute who was able to tame the waves and calm the savage winds?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, that is best answered by the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) so I would pass that question over to the Minister responsible for Energy.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister responsible for Energy.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, make no wonder when the hon. gentleman starts asking questions about energy that he almost seems to swallow his tongue.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question I can say that we have had conversations with the federal government with respect to Winter drilling in the same way as we had conversations this time last year with the preceding government, the former government, with respect to Winter drilling. I believe the hon. gentleman may be referring to a statement that was made last year on December 15. The final statement if memory serves me correctly was made on January 15. So just as we did last year, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we will make our position known on Winter drilling in timely fashion. In the meantime, I can tell the hon. gentlemen that I have had conversations with Mrs. Carney about this and some of my colleagues have had conversations

with their counterparts in Ottawa. Mrs. Carney indicated publicly yesterday that we have discussed the matter and she is going to bring certain conclusions of that discussion to the Government of Canada and as soon as they have had an opportunity to consider various things, as I say, we will make a statement, we will make our position known on Winter drilling in the same way as we did last year.

MR. BARRY:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, is the minister prepared to indicate if the Government of Canada does not accept the recommendations made by this government that they will be imposing the same ban on Winter drilling as was done last year?

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, in the first place that is a hypothetical question, in the second place we have not hesitated to make our position known on Winter drilling and other issues affecting the people of this Province and we will certainly do it in a timely fashion. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) did not see fit yesterday or today to ask about the outcome of these very critical talks on the offshore of such interest to the people of this Province. All he seems to want to do, Mr. Speaker, is accentuate the negative. But he is not going to get a chance to

accentuate the negative because there are no negatives any more, it is all positive. But I can tell the hon. gentleman, to his consummate disappointment I am sure, that our discussions yesterday on Search and Rescue, our discussions with respect to the formulization of the offshore accord that is being entered into and other matters which are critical to this Province in energy matters took place in a very constructive and co-operative manner. I am very pleased to report a very positive attitude and outcome as a result of that meeting with Mrs. Carney.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Well, let us talk a little bit about the substance of this now, Mr. Speaker, instead of those vague generalities. Did the minister raise with Ms Carney the question of the 25 per cent back-in which was granted to Petro-Canada and which Mr. Mulroney has indicated will be returned to the oil companies? Did the minister raise that with his federal counterpart? And was he able to establish whether or not the decision to return the 25 per cent back-in with respect to the offshore applies to the Hibernia field itself?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, all questions pertaining to the offshore were discussed and they were discussed in fullest and complete detail. Mr. Speaker, the question that the hon. gentleman asks impinges upon

general federal policies that, as has already been announced, are in the process of review by the federal government. They will be enunciated and they will apply generally to all of Canada and its specific impact on Hibernia will be revealed at that time.

I can tell the hon. gentleman that we discussed just about every aspect of the offshore and the application of federal policies on Hibernia and on the offshore itself. It was a very satisfactory exchange. I am not going to get into specifics at this particular time except I can tell the hon. gentleman that there was once again reaffirmed the Atlantic Accord, which secured to the people of this Province the right to establish and collect revenues from the offshore as if those resources were located on land. Also reaffirmed was the joint management aspect of the offshore contained in the Atlantic Accord. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we reaffirmed the agreement that was entered into that the hon. gentleman said was impossible to enter into, under the ostensible guise he scurried across this House. Now I ask the hon. gentleman, since he is in the mood to ask questions, can he tell what justification the hon. gentleman possibly has to be on the other side of the House as a result of the success that we have achieved in the negotiations?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the minister cannot have it both ways. Either he is going to tell us all of the bounty

that is going to be received from this agreement or we, the members of this House, as will the voters of this Province, take the position that we have yet to see what the minister opposite and his colleagues are going to deliver. We have the framework for an agreement, Mr. Speaker, but to listen to Mrs. Carney yesterday and the minister today, we are now trying to figure out what has been agreed to. The minister opposite as well as his federal counterparts are now discussing and trying to find out just exactly what it is that has been agreed to. Now, I would like to ask the minister whether there was any discussion with respect to the impact of the fall international oil prices on the revenue which will be available for sharing between both levels of government. Would the minister provide to this House, along the lines of the report which I prepared when I was minister and made public, an economic analysis of the Hibernia development? Is the minister prepared to let us have an economic analysis of the Hibernia development today based upon prevailing international oil prices, based upon various positions with respect to the 25 per cent back-in, assuming it goes or stays, and based upon, Mr. Speaker, the principles of the Mulroney agreement? Because, Mr. Speaker, there will be no offshore agreement accepted by the people of this Province or by the members of this House until we have the type of detail which I was prepared as minister, not only prepared but published, for viewing by the people of this Province. Will the minister do the same?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the

Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

How sad it is! Here is the hon. gentleman asking us to share details, but when the hon. gentleman was in the Cabinet of this government he wanted to do it all himself. He did not even want to share details with the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet or his colleagues in Cabinet or the members of caucus. Now, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman indicates, we have the framework of an agreement, an agreement, I would remind him again, that was negotiated on the basis of a certain process that he felt so strongly was not going to work that he scurried across to the other side of the House. I just repeat to the hon. gentleman again that we discussed very carefully yesterday, as we have since the new Government of Canada has taken over, all aspects of the offshore, all aspects of the development of Hibernia, but it is not my intention at this present time to give specific details about it. All I can say to the hon. gentleman is the doom and gloom that the hon. gentleman hopes is going to be visited on the people of this Province, the lack of development of Hibernia upon which he hinges his political future, is not, Mr. Speaker, going to occur. What is going to occur is going to be development of a major megaproject, Hibernia, that for the betterment of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador in particular. As the Atlantic Accord says, as Mr. Mulroney indicated in his letter, the principle beneficiaries from Hibernia and from the offshore are to be the people of Newfoundland and Labrador on the one hand, and on the other hand the people of Newfoundland say it will be

developed for the benefit of all of Canada. So the doom and gloom that the hon. gentleman wishes to portray is not there. The future is very bright for the people of this Province, it is very bright for the Government of this Province, and I would suggest, if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) wishes to assure a bright future for himself he once more seek refuge in the area of Academe or some other place where he can much more appropriately carry out and fulfil his lifetime ambitions.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. I think he is out in the Common Room somewhere.

In the absence of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) -

MR. BARRY:
Ask the Minister of Education (Ms Verge).

MR. WARREN:
Yes, the Minister of Education.

There has been some controversy between St. John's City Council and the people of Amherst Heights and also those connected with the mentally handicapped, and so on in this Province, concerning a home for mentally handicapped people. Would the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) consider proposing to Cabinet a change in the Human Rights regulations and legislation so that there would be no discrimination against individuals who had been or are mentally

handicapped in this Province?
MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, that question is one that has to be fielded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), who is responsible for Human Rights legislation.

MR. HODDER:
Where is he?

MS. VERGE:
I thank the member for his question and I assure him that it is a matter which the government is quite concerned about.

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

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) is not here, the Premier is not here, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) is not here, I do not know how much further down the line you can go. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question to the Minister responsible for Housing. Could the Minister responsible for Housing advise this hon. House how many units in the area of St. John's are vacant at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Minister responsible for Housing.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, I have not checked this morning so I do not have an up-to-date figure for the hon. gentleman but I will check and find out for the hon. gentleman and make the information available to him on Monday.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the minister is going to do that on Monday, could the minister also advise if there are any units available? I understand that since last year with the controversy about the boarding homes in the city, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) has a large number of social assistance recipients living in hotels and motels in this city and it is extremely costly to the taxpayers of this Province. Could the minister also find out if some of those homes can be made available for those people who are presently living in hotels and motels in St. John's?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister for Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, it is a serious question so I want to take a little time to answer it. The fact of the matter is that public housing is provided to people in the Province basically on a point system. There are some 800 people currently requiring public housing in the city of St. John's and the immediate area, and obviously there are not 800 houses vacant so we cannot meet the full requirement. We are, of course, spending every dollar that is made available to us by the federal government for public housing in this Province. And as a matter of fact, I will be meeting with the Housing Minister. We are having a Federal/Provincial Territorial Ministers' Meeting on December 7, a meeting that I will be chairing, and hopefully some of the items that the hon. member brings up

will be addressed at that meeting. Hopefully next year we will get more money put into public housing in the Province more than we had last year. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, to our disappointment money was set aside in the budget last year for some 200 public housing units in the Province but that figure was cut back by CMHC to 130. We have those 130 well underway and they should be completed by the end of the fiscal year. But the fact of the matter is that it was cut down the previous year from 200 to 130. I think it is really a shame and we are certainly going to be putting our case forward to the federal government for funding for public housing in the next fiscal year.

But I say to the hon. member with respect to the question as to public housing right now, I will get a figure as to how many are available. I can say that as soon as a house becomes available it is filled almost within hours because there is a great demand out there. As I said, it is done a point system. Obviously if there is a single mother with three or four children who is on a very low income, we try to accommodate that family before single people. The other problem is, of course, the number of one bedroom facilities that we have available. We are currently doing a profile on public housing in the Province to see what, if anything, can be done or where the greatest need is, because there may be a problem with respect to one bedroom units.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

My question is for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) who will probably do the same as the hon. the Minister of Housing and let me know on Monday the results.

Could the minister advise what it has cost the taxpayers of this Province to date through the Department of Social Services to accommodate the number of people who have been placed in hotels and motels in St. John's due to the boarding house fiasco several months ago?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am not certain what the hon. member is referring to when he says 'a boarding house fiasco'. I know there was a boarding house difficulty because it is an extremely difficult area. If the hon. member is suggesting that it is just like, you know, a frog jumping off a log to take care of problems like this, he had better get into the real world. It is very difficult to handle a situation such as the boarding house thing.

MR. WARREN:

How much did it cost?

DR. COLLINS:

There was no fiasco, it was a difficult situation and certain things had to be done about it. I think certain things were done about it by the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) in a very expeditious manner and a very careful manner.

MR. WARREN:

How much did it cost?

DR. COLLINS:

I presume he is referring to an activity by the Social Services Department for the good of certain unfortunates in the Province and if he wants details on that, he should really ask the minister when he is available.

With regard to the expenditures for that amount, the Department of Social Services in its estimates puts in its requirements and these are then put into the budget, the budget is then handed over to the department and they are given the discretion, of course, to expend those funds to meet their needs. So it is not a matter that remains in the hands of the Department of Finance or in the hands of Treasury Board, it goes into the department. I am sure when the minister comes back, especially if he is given a little bit of warning so that he can dig into the files - he is asking about very detailed matters - if he gives the minister a little bit of warning so that he can dig into the files, he will be only too glad to give him relevant information.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask the Premier a question regarding the Come By Chance hospital and the meeting in Arnold's Cove last night. Is the Premier in the confines of the Legislature or not?

Well, Mr. Speaker, since the Premier is not here let me ask one of the two Ministers of Education a question regarding school tax authorities. Mr. Speaker, I

produce as exhibit number one the cheque with which I paid my school tax dated April 13 and it was credited to the school tax authority in Conception Bay and on April 18. I received a small cheque from government on May 1 and my wages were attached for \$10.00 even though I paid it on April 13. I had it investigated at the Department of Finance and also at the school tax authority. I received another small cheque from the government on June 12 and my wages were attached another \$10.00 for school tax even though I had paid it. This is just one example, Mr. Speaker, of the harassment and the total lack of organization at the school tax authorities all across this Province. I yesterday talked to the school tax authority in Gander. I want to ask the Minister of Education, when does this government intend to do away with these silly, stupid, school tax authorities?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The school tax authorities provide necessary, indeed essential revenue for the operation of schools in our Province. The net returns from school taxation provided to school boards throughout the Province last year amounted to over \$20 million. That is money that is badly needed to heat and light our school buildings, to pay our support workers and help finance student transportation as well as purchase learning materials. Mr. Speaker, the problem encountered by the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is one that I would be glad to have my official address on his behalf and I am sure sort out in

short order. I assure the hon. member that there have been great strides made in the administration of school taxation in the Province in recent years with the leadership and direction of the Department of Education.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Bellevue, a supplementary.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the minister does not have to iron it out. I mean, I got my refund of \$20 on August 23. It is the amount of duplication and the unnecessary paper work and so on that I am concerned about. Let me ask the minister is it the intention of government or her department to do away totally with the school tax authorities? For example, I was talking yesterday, November 22, with the School Tax Authority in Gander, which does not know yet what their exemption ceiling is going to be. It was \$5,000 last year. If you earned over \$5,000 you had to pay it, if you earned under \$5,000 you do not have to pay it.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman's last question, I suppose, was when is the minister going to abolish school tax authorities? Mr. Speaker, he got a bill and he paid the bill and now he tables the cheque and he tables the cheque stub and all of this. This happens to be the House of Assembly, it does not happen to be a financial collection agency.

MR. CALLAN:

This is where school tax authorities will be abolished.

MR. MARSHALL:

It happens to be the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and I could give you authorities, but here questions are suppose to be of urgency in nature.

MR. DINN:

Urgent public importance.

MR. MARSHALL:

Now to assist the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, we do not insist that questions be always urgent because since this government has taken over there is very little that is urgent in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

But we cannot go from the sublime to the ridiculous, I would suggest. I think the hon. gentleman is really trespassing on the House and on Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Bellevue was recognized on a supplementary question and proceeded to enter into the realm of debate on the whole issue. Maybe he should be very specific with his supplementary question.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I am asking the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) is would she consider raising the ceiling for exemptions, to \$12,000, perhaps, and then that would take care of all of the people who are on fixed incomes, who earn \$4,000, \$5,000 and \$6,000 a year or low-paid individuals in general? Would she

consider raising it?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the minimum income level for liability for school taxation is reviewed periodically and adjusted upwards periodically to reflect the rise in the cost of living that we have experienced in recent years. I anticipate initiating an increase in that level in the near future. I should remind members opposite that all senior citizens in this Province, people who are sixty-five years of age and over, are automatically exempt from the requirement of paying school tax.

SOME HON. MEMBERS;

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Health could tell the House about the ambulance operators in the Province. There a few weeks ago they were up in arms because they could not negotiate new rates with the Department of Health, and the ambulance operators threatened to withdraw services. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House now just where the situation stands? Are we going to see a withdrawal of service by the ambulance operators or has the minister's department resolved the matter and settled up with the ambulance operators and given them an increase in their rates?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you very much, Sir. As usual you always seem to have that intimate knowledge that can make all of us lift and turn our ears to you. Yes, I have taken that under advisement. I have pursued it to the fullest extent that is humanly possible. I know they are paid the \$150 a month at the moment. I must say we have looked at it rather kindly but I cannot at this moment say what is going to happen in the future. They were getting 51.5 cents average a kilometer to travel their distances and there were a few other charges that were given to various groups; the private ambulance group got the \$150 and there was a subsidy for ambulances that were run by other organizations such as the Lions Club or a council. While I cannot say there is absolute satisfaction, we have been talking to our friend, if I may use that in a colloquial way, and I think that everything is reasonably under control.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, I would gather from the hon. gentleman's answer that the matter is under active consideration, that it has not been resolved. Can the hon. gentleman assure the House that during the period of negotiations there will be no withdrawal of ambulance service throughout the Province?

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

DR. TWOMEY:
I think it would be utterly

impossible for me to give the House that assurance but I can say that the communications that have been going on between the ambulance owners and my department have been rather tranquil, and I hope rather happy, and I might suggest I feel it is unlikely we will have withdrawal of services.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), which the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Goudie) yesterday could not answer. I am particularly concerned about fisherman, but it is a general question as well and it relates to the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the statements that have recently been made by the Finance Minister in Ottawa, Mr. Wilson. He is saying that he is making certain changes in the unemployment insurance regulations, such as a lengthened period of work time required to draw unemployment insurance and probably cutting down the amount of time that people can draw unemployment insurance for as well. I am particularly concerned about a district like my own where we have had a terrible year in the fishery. I understand the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in Newfoundland said at one point that fishermen should have some of the special provisions that they now have taken away from them. I would like to ask the minister just what the situation is as regards unemployment insurance in general and fishermen in particular?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a matter of widespread concern in the Province and I am glad the hon. member asked the question because I think one can allay a certain amount of anxiety about it. The situation is that the federal minister wishes to review the unemployment insurance programme as indeed the federal government wishes to review many of the programmes that are costing the federal treasury large amounts of money. So there is no particular finger being pointed on unemployment insurance, this is part of their general review. They are a new administration, they find themselves under a lot of financial pressure and it is only sensible and it should not cause undue anxiety if they feel that they have to get into a review process. Indeed, if they did not do that I do not know if they could even learn their jobs properly. So they are going to review this programme as they are many other programmes.

We have had some preliminary discussions with them about the nature of the review, and we have been given to understand that the review programme is not going to impact in Newfoundland to any significant degree whatever before 1985. There will be an ongoing review which will have impact in 1985-1986. But the main thrust of that review will be to try to get inefficiencies out of the system and also to get abuses out of the system. Now abuses in a relative term; what is abuse in one man's eye might not be an abuse in another man's eye. We will be involved as a province in that aspect of things and we certainly

will make sure that the federal government, to the extent we can do it, does not call something an abuse which in our view is not an abuse, but something related to local circumstances. And I think the fishermen of this Province are in a particular category and, of course, that is recognized in that there are special benefits under UI given to fishermen and we will make sure that there is no misconception or misunderstanding at the federal level as to these particular circumstances that relate to fishermen in this Province. We will be very alert to that. We will consult not only with the Department of Fisheries but with Labour and Manpower and so on and so forth, and any part of government that has any contact whatever with the workers involved or with the system to make sure that all points that should be put forward from this Province's point of view are brought forward vigorously and clearly to the federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear:

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The time for Question Period has expired.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Labrador Linerboard Limited Agreement Act, 1979 In Order To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Amending Agreement Entered Into Between Her Majesty The Queen In

Right Of The Province Represented
By The Hon. The Minister Of
Development And Abitibi-Price
Inc." (Bill No. 57)

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I
will on tomorrow ask leave to
introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act
To Amend The Workers' Compensation
Act." (Bill No. 56)

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I
will on tomorrow ask leave to
introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act
To Amend The Schools Act." (Bill
No. 55)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Motion, the hon. the Minister of
Finance to introduce a bill, "An
Act To Amend The Financial
Corporation Capital Tax Act,"
carried. (Bill No. 58)

On motion, Bill No. 58 read a
first time ordered read a second
time on tomorrow.

Motion, second reading of a bill,
"An Act To Amend The Livestock
Act." (Bill No. 4)

MR. SPEAKER:

Debate was adjourned last day by
the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr.
Neary).

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday when the
House rose at 5:30 p. m. we were
in the process of debating the

principle of a bill, "An Act To
Amend The Livestock Act." Now,
Mr. Speaker, I must say that I was
in full flight, I was making one
of my better contributions to the
House, and perhaps the Attorney
General from British Columbia, if
he would just stay for five or ten
minutes, might hear the eloquence
of Newfoundlanders at its finest.
Mr. Speaker, I have to say to the
hon. gentleman that I love his
province. I do not get there as
often as I would like. This time
of year, when it is cooling off in
Newfoundland and the snow is on
the ground, our thoughts turn
westward to beautiful British
Columbia, the flower garden of
Canada. Now I do not know if they
have to regulate people's lives in
British Columbia like we have to
do in this Province. Mr. Speaker,
everything today is a law for this
and a law for that, people are
overregulated. In this Province
the next thing they will be
regulating is the number of times
you go to the men's room. I do
not know if you have the same -

MR. SIMMS:

Or the woman's room.

MR. NEARY:

Or the people's room, that is
right. I do not want to be
accused by the Minister of
Education (Ms Verge) of
discriminating against women.
They have almost reached the stage
now where they are regulating the
number of times, let me put it
this way, that you go to the John
or Jane, Mr. Speaker. I do not
know if they have that problem in
BC. I do not know if they have the
problem of roaming dogs or roaming
cattle or livestock in British
Columbia. I wish I could talk to
the Attorney General. I wish he
was in on the floor of the House
so I could ask him if they impose

urban thinking on rural British Columbia. Because what is happening here in Newfoundland and what seems to be happening in Ottawa is that they are imposing city thinking, city policies, Bay Street, Fleet Street, Water Street, Wall Street policies, on rural Canada and on rural Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if they are doing that in British Columbia but I hope not. One of the Premier's big lines when he is making an emotional pitch to the Newfoundland electorate, is, 'Let us not change our lifestyle. Do not change our traditions.' I do not know what it means, the Premier's advising us, lecturing us, "Do not give up your lifestyle," he says. "Do not give up your heritage or your traditional way of life." Now I do not know if he means that people should still use the outdoor toilet, that they are only entitled to have one car and others can have two, whether they have insulated homes or they still have to live in cold, damp homes, or whether they still have to live in isolation. I do not know if that is what he means. But maybe some day we will get a definition of that, an explanation from the Premier. But the fact of the matter is that what we are doing here is imposing city thinking, city policy on rural Newfoundland, and as I said yesterday I have mixed feelings about this bill. I can understand and appreciate the feelings of people who will have their property damaged by roaming cattle and roaming dogs and livestock. For instance, pigs still roam in certain parts of this Province. I am not talking about hon. gentlemen there opposite either, Mr. Speaker. I am talking about the four-legged pigs, the four-legged hogs, Mr. Speaker, that in certain parts of

Newfoundland are still allowed to roam.

You know this piece of legislation reminds me of the old song, Gene Autry, I believe it was, or Roy Rogers sang it, 'Don't Fence Me In'.

'Give me land, lots of land under the starry skies above, /Don't fence me in. /Let me roam through the wide open spaces that I love, /Don't fence me in.' Well, what we are doing with this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, is we are shifting the responsibility from people having to put up fences to keep cattle out and to keep livestock out, we are now making people who own livestock, who own cattle, put up fences to keep them in so they will not be roaming at large. I have had complaints from various parts of the Province about damage done to people's property. For instance, I had a call the day before yesterday from the Codroy Valley, from a very irate Tory, by the way, who told me he would never vote Tory again -

MR. DINN:

That might be my wife.

MR. NEARY:

- because he has not been able to reach his member on this matter. What his complaint was that sometimes when you are driving down the highway you run into a herd of dairy cattle and it is very difficult to manoeuvre along the highway with so many head of cattle in one herd.

So I can understand both sides of the argument. It is one of these predicaments when I find myself speaking with mixed feelings on a bill.

MR. BARRETT:

You know nothing about it.

MR. NEARY:

I know all about it. I know more about it than the city slicker knows about it.

MR. SIMMS:

Tell us in two minutes now what that bill does?

MR. NEARY:

What that bill does?

MR. STEWART:

Put it in baby talk.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, I will put it in baby talk so the hon. gentleman can understand it.

MR. SIMMS:

You would not ever understand it, but some of your colleagues over there will understand it.

MR. NEARY:

They understand it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to explain to the hon. gentleman what the bill means. The hon. gentleman should know. But the minister who introduced the bill yesterday by the way, told us that it was a very minor amendment, a very minor amendment he said. It is a major amendment to rural Newfoundland and the hon. gentleman knows that, because the hon. gentleman represents a rural district in this Province.

So I can see some problems enforcing this law. I can see some problems with that, because it is going to create a terrific problem with enforcement, finding the owner of the livestock, finding the owners of the cattle, prosecuting them. Who will have

to take the action? Does the individual himself have to take the action, the initiative? Is it a civil case before the courts? Is it a violation of the statutes of this Province?

The point that I was trying to make yesterday when we reached adjournment time was that if this administration had only followed that great Liberal concept of community pastures in this Province, then we would not have this problem, we would not have this bill before us today. If they only had expanded -

MR. PEACH:

If we had had a community pasture we would have expanded it.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman who represents Victoria should know what I am talking about because I had a group of horsemen come to see me from his district a few years ago and I had to get them straightened out and as a result we have had the support of the people of Victoria in the last couple of elections. In the last federal election the people of Victoria overwhelmingly voted Liberal.

MR. PEACH:

That is not correct.

MR. NEARY:

That is correct for the last federal election. And it was the horse issue, by the way, that had a lot to do with it. I went to a meeting over in the Stadium in Harbour Grace during the federal election, I was chairing the meeting and I looked out over the audience of 2,000 or 3,000 people that were there -

MR. SIMMS:

Where was this?

MR. NEARY:
Harbour Grace.

MR. PEACH:
That was a hockey game you were over to, boy.

MR. NEARY:
- I recognized some of the people in the audience, men and women. So when the meeting finished I went out and shook hands with some of them, some of them former miners from Bell Island, friends of mine of long standing, people whom I have established friendship with that still continues to this day.

MR. PATTERSON:
Diehards.

MR. NEARY:
Yes, they are diehards. They do not forget the good old times, and they do not forget the good old Liberal days either.

MR. SIMMS:
Tell us about the good old days.

MR. NEARY:
I could tell the hon. gentleman about the good old times. But here I am now in the stadium, I am shaking hands with some of these people, and then I came to this group of people and I said, look, where have I seen you people before? They said we are the people who came to see you about the problem with the horses. When the government would not give us pasture land for our horses, and you got it straightened out for us. Prior to that we were all Tories.

DR. COLLINS:
Are you quoting them accurately now?

MR. NEARY:

Yes, absolutely, Mr. Speaker. I can put my hand on the Bible.

They said, you got it straightened out and we will never, never vote Tory again -

MR. SIMMS:
Is that right!

MR. PATTERSON:
They should put out out to pasture with the horses.

MR. NEARY:
- and I cannot wait for that to be put to the test.

MR. SIMMS:
When was this done? I thought it was years ago.

MR. NEARY:
That was in the federal election campaign just prior to September 4.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is an example for the administration to follow. They should have expanded instead of curtailing by imposing higher fees on the owners of cattle and horses and livestock; instead of imposing higher fees, making it more difficult for these owners of livestock and cattle to have access to community pastures, they should have lowered the fees, they should have expanded the existing community pastures and they should have built new community pastures throughout this Province. They could have very easily done it with the make-work programme but they did not do it, Mr. Speaker. In an atmosphere of desperation they bring this bill in to make people who own livestock keep them barred up or keep them fenced in rather than the other way around like it was before, people having to put up fences to keep them out.

MR. DAWE:

Are you going to be long?

MR. NEARY:

Do you want to speak on this?

MR. DINN:

Yes.

MR. NEARY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to take my seat and give the hon. gentleman a chance because I am curious to hear what he is going to say on behalf of so many cattle owners in the Codroy Valley and I see them there all of the time. I would say that most of them keep their cattle barred up, keep their cattle in, they have lots of land to graze their cattle and so forth, but it is going to create a bit of difficulty and a bit of a problem for a lot of people and we are changing a tradition in rural Newfoundland whether the minister cares to admit it or not. We are changing a tradition. Maybe it should be changed. Maybe the minister when he concludes the debate can convince us that this was not a desperation move but this was merely a result of a bad situation, that the situation is bad and that he is just not doing it for the cabin owners, the big shots who have cabins around the bay or down by the pond somewhere, that he is doing it in good faith, that he is doing it because the majority of Newfoundlanders want it this way. I would have preferred to see it the other way. I would have preferred to see the community pasture programme enlarged and expanded and developed. Anyway, here we are now and we have this bill before us and it will go through because you have the majority. I do not know if I am for or against it to be honest with you. I really do not know. I have mixed

feelings. Perhaps the minister when he concludes second reading can convince me to vote for it. I will wait until I hear further argument. I am anxious to hear what the member for St. George's (Mr. Dawe) has to say about it and what other members who represent rural Newfoundland say. At this moment, with the way the hon. gentleman introduced the bill, I am not convinced but before the day is over maybe they can convince me that this is the best piece of legislation that we have ever had in this House for rural Newfoundland.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to be able to speak on this particular amendment to the Livestock Act. I am not sure whether I can convince the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to come down one side or the other because it seems to be a problem that he has of never being able to make up his mind one way or the other so I doubt if anything I will have to say, as legitimate as it will be, will eventually convince him.

Mr. Speaker, this particular piece of legislation, as brought forward, I am pleased to say I had what I think is a great deal to do with it. It was a result of a number of meetings that I have had right throughout my district, which is recognized as being one of the largest farming areas in the Province and perhaps has some of the largest potential for additional farming and increased

farming in Newfoundland. There is something I guess that a lot of people do not realize, that the good, arable soil, the good agricultural soil in this Province is as extensive as the agricultural soils of Prince Edward Island and we in fact have as much arable soil and good agricultural potential in this Province as does Prince Edward Island. We have a number of geographic limitations, placed on us in that the good soil is not concentrated in any one place and is distributed right throughout the Province. But we do have specific areas where agriculture has taken hold and has become not only a traditional way of life but has become a very viable business in a lot of places in this Province, particularly in the areas such as Codroy Valley and through the Robinsons area which have that agricultural potential. There has been a change in farming in this Province as there has been a change in farming elsewhere in the country in that farms are traditionally becoming larger and the demands on the farm family and the farm business to maintain their property through capital expenses and through ongoing maintenance is becoming more onerous. What has essentially happened to the farming communities in this Province is there has been a transition from people who were more traditionally part-time farmers and the people who are into farming as a full-time way of life. The farmers in particular who made representation to me outline their particular problem in this way: They have large sums of money invested in land and livestock. Because the technology in agriculture has changed - traditionally cattle were allowed to roam and graze in this Province

which has a fairly extensive land base but still a limited one - what we have is a situation where it is more economical, more efficient and better if the farmer keeps his livestock in a more confined area and uses what was traditionally grazing land as hay land to grow silage, to grow grain and to grow other things and, essentially, instead of bringing the animals to grazing land, they bring the feed off that land, which is the more productive method, to the animals. That has been taking place over a large period of time. What this means is that a farmer who has 200 or 300 head of cattle, either dairy cattle, beef cattle or a combination of cattle and sheep and so on, will have these animals in a fairly confined grazing area, for exercise and so on, and will have a great number of acres, up to 200 or 300 acres in some cases, into hay and silage and other fodder for the animals. To have that farmer go to the expense of fencing those vast acres of land that he has in hay, in growing grain and other fodder for his animals, would be very, very expensive, be very, very labour intensive and just about impossible for him to do. People who have smaller numbers of animals, or perhaps are involved in something else or do not pay the same kind of care or attention to their farm operations, will allow their various livestock to roam freely, and that livestock will go in on the large tracts of land that another farmer is trying to grow hay and silage and various other fodder on and destroy the crop. So it is an economic necessity for that farmer and for the larger farmers, the dairy farmers through Robinsons, Wilson Chaffey, Gerard Cormier in Codroy Valley and Gordon Ludee and so on,

to have assurance that that property is protected from people who allow their animals to roam. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) indicated there are very few animals roaming anywhere in this Province at the present time. Speaking of the district I represent, there are very, very few roaming animals. The majority of farmers, the majority of people who have livestock adhere to what is a current principle of raising livestock, that you find livestock in a fairly concentrated area for exercise purposes and you bring the food to the animals as opposed to letting the animals roam. That is the way that we have changed over. In fact, it is not, as the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) indicated, trying to impose urban values on rural Newfoundland. It is, in fact, a way of assisting the farmers in rural Newfoundland to into making sure that their particular operation is a viable one based on sound farming principles.

The community pasture programme, now that is an area, Mr. Speaker, that I have mixed feelings on. I think there are a number of real advantages to having community pastures established around this Province. One of the real overriding problems, and a problem that was created in days gone by which is still with us is that there was not enough attention paid to, number one, where the community pastures were placed around the Province. There was a lot of money and a lot of expense put into areas where it just was not possible. I indicated that we do have lots of good arable soil in this Province, but the problem with some of the locations of community pastures around this Province is they were put in the worst possible spot as it relates

to the ability of the soil to generate hay and grass and other things for pasture purposes.

The other problem with it was the mentality that spread around through this Province by a former administration that perhaps someone from outside knew more than we did ourselves. There was a programme of reclamation of bog land. There were rules and regulations put in place whereby where there were community pastures established, at least half of that property, or a large percentage of that particular acreage had to be reclaimed bog land. Instead of going to what the farmers in my particular area refer to as mineral soil or good dry topsoil areas and establishing pastures that could be easily maintained with traditional kinds of equipment, so that traditional kinds of fertilizers and growing procedures could be used, they were forced into a very different kind of operation that proved to be ineffective and expensive both in terms of having to put proper nutrients into the reclaimed bog land to grow the necessary hay and silage, and also in the kinds of specialized equipment that had to be placed on this bog land in order to be able to spread the lime and take the hay off it and so on.

Also, Mr. Speaker, in some instances it was found that cattle which foraged on such particular property either were having some problems associated with the dampness of the ground and terrain. So it was a poorly conceived although well-intentioned programme.

We have in this Province right now a situation where we have community pastures that are

primarily used by people who may be considered part-time farmers as opposed to full-time farmers. We have a situation where a number of people with small numbers of animals can place these animals in a community pasture situation. There is some considerable money expended by the Province and these individuals themselves, and by Canada Community Works Projects to maintain these community pastures and, in that sense, Mr. Speaker, that is all well and good. But there is a negative side to the community pasture programme which affects the full-time farmer who has too many cattle in sheer number to place on a community pasture situation and has to provide the land for grazing, the land for feed, and the effort put into making sure that his farm is viable. We have this kind of a competing mechanism going on. I think there is an opportunity where the land base is there, where the numbers are there, to accommodate both. But I think it is something, Mr. Speaker, that should be addressed in the future and should be looked at very carefully. I make that recommendation to my colleague, the minister responsible for Agriculture (Mr. Goudie).

Mr. Speaker, from all of the comments that I have heard, from statements that have been made to me, I would certainly support this particular piece of legislation. And I am very pleased that my colleague has brought this amendment before the House. I think it is a very positive step forward for the farmers in this Province. It is a very positive step for rural Newfoundland.

Anyway, I would like to make one suggestion to my colleague, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down. I can

see that this particular piece of legislation may present some immediate problems when it is brought in. As the member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) indicated, it is a complete switch from how it was before, and now you yourself have to confine and be responsible for your livestock yourself. This is a very positive step forward, however, it presents a problem. There are fewer each day, but there are still a number of people in this Province who allow their animals and livestock to roam. I would not want to see a situation imposed upon these people whereby when this particular piece of legislation is enacted they would be responsible in two days time or two weeks time for making sure that their animals were fenced in. What I would like to see, if I could make a suggestion to the minister, is for him to take it back and see if a phase in stage cannot be implemented; that after this piece of legislation is enacted, people be allowed a time frame, whether it be six months or twelve months, to adjust to the change and to make the necessary arrangements, particularly small farming and livestock operations, to address themselves to this bill over a period of time that will legitimately allow them to take the necessary steps to keep their animals enclosed and to make arrangements for grazing and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I support this particular bill and I am pleased to support it. I am glad that the minister has brought it in and I think it will be very beneficial for my district and for many other districts around the Province. I would like for the minister to address the concern that I just expressed, to phase the legislation in over a reasonable period of time to allow farmers

and individuals in this Province who do not take advantage of community pastures and do not confine their own animals to do so.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will be very definitely supporting this particular piece of legislation.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) really started off the debate because the minister stood in his place and said it was a minor amendment, there was nothing to it. I can appreciate many of the things that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) said and there is absolutely no doubt that some of the points that he made are well taken. What I want to point out to the Minister of Transportation, and indeed to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), is that there are certain sections of this Province that are different than the Codroy Valley, different than the minister's district and from the area that he represents. The Minister of Transportation is talking about a situation where you have farmers who are full time and have large tracts of land. There is absolutely no doubt that that is so in his area and he is representing it in the way perhaps that he should. But in the area that I come from that has been a tradition that the law speaks the reverse of what the minister is trying to do now, that rather than have somebody fence their animals in it was your problem as a property owner to fence them out. The former Minister of Municipal

Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) knows a great deal about this because she had a great many problems with roaming horses and so on in my area, where by law and tradition you are allowed to let your animals roam and it is up to the property owner to fence that property so the animals did not get in. I am afraid that what this piece of legislation does - and I am not against the legislation itself but I do want to find out about some of the problems that are going to be created - is change that tradition, put the onus on the livestock owner - it may be one horse, one cow or whatever - to see that his animal is fenced in rather than allowed to roam. Let me give you a very practical problem. It is fair, but if you live in certain areas of this Province where people have small tracts of land as opposed to the large tracts of land that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is talking about, and they use that piece of land in the Summer to grow their Winter's livestock feed, what happens? If you are forced then to keep you animal fenced in on that piece of land in the Summer, you end up in the Fall of the year with no feed for the Winter. That is the very real problem. And some people do not even have enough land to keep their animals on. That is a very real problem for them. Now, they are a minority and getting more and more of a minority. I recognize the fact, too, that we are moving towards a society that is moving towards more urban values. But what has to happen in the Province, and this is what I used to tell the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook), is that before you implement a rule that says you have to bar in your animals, then

surely we owe something to those people to help them establish the kind of community pastures that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) was talking about. I suggest to him that deferring this bill is a good idea, but the time span he is talking about is not long enough, and it will take a great deal more time than that period presently being proposed by the Minister of Transportation. What I would like to say, on the other hand, is that those people who do not have animals and who have to live with roaming animals, have a legitimate right as well.

Now the Minister of Transportation talked about the failure of community pastures. He spoke about the location and the type of land that was used to build community pastures, and there is absolutely no doubt that many of those community pastures were probably put in the wrong locations, but you cannot use that as an excuse for doing nothing. You cannot use the mistakes that were made with community pastures to maintain we are going to get out of them, are not going to have anything else to do with them.

MR. DAWE:

There are a lot of community pastures expanding very extensively.

MR. TULK:

There are a lot of them, but not enough to take care of the kind of problem at the present time that you are now going to find in certain parts of this Province.

MR. DAWE:

There are some places where there is not going to be enough land to start them.

MR. TULK:

Yes, there will. But you have not taken care of the places where the land is there. And we are not talking about wide-open fields. You do not need that for Summer grazing. There are hundreds of areas of wild grass that grow in Newfoundland, particularly in the area that I come from -

MR. DAWE:

Yes, that will starve the animals to death.

MR. TULK:

No, no. No, it will not. It will not. I have seen the implementation of a couple in the last year that were forced on the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) that are functioning very well. It is just a wild area that has been fenced in and animals that come off that pasture are certainly not in bad shape.

MR. NEARY:

You can recover a lot of land, you know.

MR. TULK:

Of course we can recover a lot of land. So for the Minister of Transportation to stand and say the location was bad in many cases, and the type of land was bad in many cases, is an excuse for the government to get out from under what is really part of their responsibility. If you are going to destroy a tradition in Newfoundland, then surely you have to help those people affected.

MR. NEARY:

Replace it with something else.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, that is one of the points that I wanted to make, that I am not against this bill, but I think what we have to do is to say

all right, -

MR. DAWE:

What kind of costs are attributed when it comes to implementing protection for somebody who owns one sheep or one horse?

MR. TULK:

The point is that if you had community pastures in rural Newfoundland, particularly in a district like my own, many of those people would not have just one animal. I do not know whether the minister is aware of this or not, but there is a movement back to that kind of living in outport Newfoundland. That is happening.

MR. DAWE:

They are recognizing the efficiencies of growing feed and bringing it to the animal rather than allowing the animal to graze unattended.

MR. TULK:

No.

MR. DAWE:

Yes.

MR. TULK:

You do not have to do that. In certain areas of this Province you do not have to do that because there are certain wild grassland areas. These are not the fields that the minister is talking about like you find in his district, not at all, but there are certain wild areas in this Province that can be fenced and animals can be kept out of the way of other people and at the same time not only encourage what is happening now in Newfoundland where you have a person with one animal, two animals or whatever, but encourage the development of that type of very healthy outdoor activity that can go on. And the Minister of

Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) by getting out of that, and the government by getting out of that -

MR. DAWE:

We are not getting out of it.

MR. TULK:

Yes, he is trying to get rid of community pastures. Did you see the ads in the papers?

MR. DAWE:

Yes, and the people who have taken over the community pastures, farmers co-ops, pasture committees, are doing an excellent job and expanding them.

MR. TULK:

You are talking about farmers. I am talking to you about a different type of society than your full-time farmer.

MR. DAWE:

No, I am talking about the kind of part-time people -

MR. TULK:

No.

MR. DAWE:

You do not have full-time farmers using community pastures.

MR. TULK:

No. We are not necessarily talking about part-time farmers either. It could be just an ordinary householder in this Province who has an animal that he wants to keep either as a pet or to provide part of his income. Government, by bringing in this type of legislation and by getting out of the community pastures type of operation, are restricting such individuals and not taking them into account.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

Just a few bring words on this bill. I represent a farming area, although my district could be considered urban, there are rural parts and there is quite a very active farming area. There has been some mention made here of pasture lands, and I know since the farmer groups in our way have taken over the Cochrane Pond pasture land, it is working better. They are doing okay. What I would suggest to the hon. member - and his district, I know, is as different from mine as chalk and cheese, because he might have smaller operator with one or two animals - is there programmes now sponsored by the provincial and federal governments under which if a group of those people in your area get together to develop a pasture land they can apply for Canada Works or Community Development projects.

The Community Development projects in my district this year have benefitted pasture land and regular farmers who are developing land through rock picking and land clearing activity. So there are programmes available that can be availed of rather than letting their animals roam at large.

Now there was a comment also made that this bill makes a person fence in his animals rather than let them go free. The bill, as I read it, makes a person responsible for damages caused by his animal which roam free, but I cannot see that there could be a complaint about that.

MR. TULK:

Well the point is now that I no longer have to fence a piece of property in outport Newfoundland because if you own a horse or a cow you are not allowed to let that animal roam. If you have an animal and you let it roam, you are responsible, so you have to fence it in.

MR. AYLWARD:

I cannot see anything unreasonable about a person being responsible for his own property. That is all it is.

MR. TULK:

But you have to give them time to adjust.

MR. AYLWARD:

I will give you an instance now of what could happen. In my own area, in Kilbride, when I built my home ten or eleven years ago up on Old Petty Harbour Road, there were not as many people living there, there was more open space and this existed where a person could let his animals roam free.

MR. TULK:

That is not right either.

MR. AYLWARD:

Now the farmers, who had quite an investment in their cattle, would not let them roam free. We had an instance of a neighbour of ours up the road a little ways, when the Trotting Park was starting up, brought two race horses. These animals are not like farm animals, they are not like farm horses or working horses, they are skittish not stable type horses. He let them roam free, and the problem was that he was allowed to do this, yet our children were in danger. Because the children would assume, growing up in a farming area, that you could go over and pat them down like old

farm horses and it would not make any difference. That would continue grazing. The children assume that they would do the same with these more high-strung animals, but it was dangerous for them. There was one injury, there was one youngster hurt. This was a problem.

But this new bill, besides the benefit of protecting property, has a safety feature. I mean, people are responsible. Any animal, young bulls at a certain age if they are allowed to roam free, can be dangerous to children. I mean smaller children do not know the difference, so there is a safety aspect to this bill. People should not only be responsible for their animals, but should have to fence them in anyway. People who cannot afford pasture should get together and develop other lands.

MR. TULK:

It is not a matter of affording or not affording. What is required is that there be more time than is presently available so that the kinds of programmes that the member is talking about can be carried out and put in place.

MR. AYLWARD:

There is one other aspect of this bill I want to discuss. If the minister cannot answer right off the top of his head, maybe he will check and answer it at some future time. In Section 1 (3), I believe it says, "Nothing in this section affects the liability of an owner of livestock where the livestock is involved in a collision with a motor vehicle." As I understand it now, if I have a collision with some animal on the highway, roaming free or not, and the owner can be identified, I am responsible for that animal. I am

liable. Now what I think this bill might be creating, and I am not sure, the owner is liable for the damages by the animal, so indirectly he should have it fenced in. If the animal is roaming free and somebody has a collision with it, does this make it cloudy? Does the person who collides with the animal have the responsibility or does the animal owner, who should have it fenced up, have the responsibility? Now this seems to me to be a kind of contradiction in the bill. I do support this bill. I think it is very important.

MR. TULK:

Under this bill I would think the owner of the animal would be responsible.

MR. AYLWARD:

A part of this bill it says just the opposite of that. If the minister can find the answer sometime he could tell me, maybe even in private. I do support the bill. I think it is important, it is important all over the place.

MR. TULK:

Would you agree that it should be phased in, though?

MR. AYLWARD:

I would say you could take some time. It is a change from what is the practice now. I remember when I was working on the Northern Peninsula I noticed that a lot of people up there farm open pieces of bog land or peat right on the side of the road without fences. And I did see a couple of times that there were a couple of animals roaming free and they got into these part-time farmers vegetables on the side of the road and damaged them, and there was nothing that the owner could do. He could, I guess, fence the

animal out if he wanted to, but he would have to fence five or six little patches of vegetables here, there and everywhere. This is probably a necessity for some people. With that comment on liability for a collision with a motor vehicle, I support the bill. I think it is a step forward.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Communications.

MRS NEWHOOK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the bill, not to belabour debate on it or anything like that, but just to take a minute to express the concerns that I have had because we have not had this kind of legislation in place. During my four years as the Minister of Municipal Affairs I received many, many complaints from people in small communities, in communities where they did not have a town council and, of course, no by-laws against roaming animals. I would get groups coming into my office representing the small communities in which they lived, I would get individuals, and there were just hundreds and hundreds of letters that came into our office about roaming and stray animals. Also we had complaints that where there was a nearby municipality that had the by-laws, that the animals were kind of ushered outside of the community. Small communities with no administration, not incorporated in any way, said that all of these animals come in and they roam around that particular community. So the complaints that I received were not from the people owning the animals but the people whose property was being

molested by these roaming animals. I am saying that the people who own the animals should fence them in. Surely they could take them somewhere where there is a nice grassy field and secure them, they could tie them on so they would not be roaming over other people's properties. When they came to my department we would have to say to these people, well, if you become incorporated as a municipality then your community can have these by-laws, they can have these regulations. But that was not the answer for them, they did not want to be in a regular municipality. They would ask me then, 'What about a local service district? Can we become incorporated as a local service district and be able to take care of this problem?' Of course I had to say to them that as a local service district you would have no authority to make by-laws or regulations. Then I would take their complaints to the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development and they would say, 'Well, we cannot help them.' So, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I do support this piece of legislation and this amendment and I am quite sure that the department will be very considerate in putting it into effect.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief, just a couple of minutes.

I believe that the minister has been a little bit hasty in bringing in this bill. I have to

agree with my colleagues that it could probably be phased in over a period of time. What I am most concerned about is saying that the owner is liable for damage of property. What is damage of property? Is it just eating the crops that the farmer is growing? I think the minister should define what 'damage of property' would be. Does it mean that a person, out in Lethbridge for example, when someone else's sheep or someone else's cow walks across the land - and because this guy is out to get this individual who owns that particular animal - just because that cow walked across the land, can that guy press charges against the owner? What is 'damage of property'? Because the print of the cow's hoof is on his land, is that damage to property? Does it apply whether the cow knocks down a small shed or just eats the vegetables? The minister should be more specific. Because there are people in this Province in the various bays and inlets that if they know that the minister got this kind of a bill brought in, the first time an animal walks across their land or the first time the animal is out there grazing on their piece of land, then the guy is going to say, 'There is a law into effect now and this animal is causing damage to my property', maybe the animal is eating more grass than the animal is supposed to eat on his land. So the minister is very, very loose in saying 'damage to property'. He does specify, 'shall not be liable for damage caused to crops within three feet of the fence', he is specifying crops in that one instance there. Is that the only damage the minister is talking about? What other damage is the minister talking about on an individual's private property? What the

minister is doing now is trying to amend a major mistake, a catastrophe he was responsible for two years ago when the minister decided to get rid of community pastures. He is trying to amend a mistake that this government made when they decided to eliminate community pastures. At that time the minister was warned by this side that he was making a mistake. In fact we voted against getting rid of the community pastures. We said to the minister at the time the day will come when that minister will realize that he has made a mistake. Now, Mr. Speaker, how many community pastures are on the Coast of Labrador? I should advise the hon. minister - I think we will call him the high school minister, or the university minister, whichever title is given to him, or the career minister and so on - that there are absolutely no community pastures in my district. The people in my district, Mr. Speaker, have to rely on the government of the Province to make sure that their roast beef, pork, and chicken are brought in there and sold in the government stores at a higher price than anywhere else in the Province. That is what the people in my district have to rely on. Now, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the mistake that the minister made, the mistake that this government back some two years ago when it decided to get rid of community pastures, he was warned then, he was warned by farmers on the Burin Peninsula by people in Victoria-Carbonear and from everywhere else, look, you cannot do that to us. But the minister, because he has to toe the line of the Premier, when the Premier says get rid of this, he gets rid of it without any consultation. And therefore we got rid of the

community pastures and what we have now is the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) saying we made a mistake, so what we will do now, seeing we got the farmers away from the community pastures, we will tell the farmers to make sure you fence your land in, you keep your cow in, you keep your sheep in, and not let them roam about.' Talk about tradition, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), in response to a question from the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), said the reason Social Services considers the husband the breadwinner in the family is because of tradition. The reason we follow this is because of tradition. Now what the minister is doing now is destroying a particular tradition in this Province where the cow, the sheep, the goat, the lamb, whatever you mind to say, was free to roam at large.

MR. PEACH:

Is the bull or the cow the breadwinner? Tell us.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) just asked a very serious question. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, come March month on the Labrador Coast, many of the people in Nain will really appreciate having a fresh cut from a cow, from a sheep, from a goat, or for that matter from any animal. Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Career Minister (Mr. Power), I have to refer to him as the Career Minister, come January I have to invite the minister to make his first trip to the Coast of Labrador, because I am sure the minister will open his eyes and realize there is another part to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador other than the community

of Ferryland. Sure the minister has never been up past Goose Bay, I do not think. If he was, Mr. Speaker, he must have been on a fishing trip because surely he was not up there on business, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker who is in the Chair now, the last speaker who spoke, was concerned about damage in a vehicle collision. I probably would ask the minister to clarify Section 3. Mr. Speaker, I might be off course a little bit now, but I think with so many moose being killed on the highways by cars and trucks, that the individual unfortunate to have an accident involving an animal - his insurance will go up, if he has insurance - should at least be given the spoils as a reward, given the meat from the particular animal.

MR. SIMMS:

The person who kills the animal should get the meat.

MR. WARREN:

Exactly. Why not? It was not his fault he killed the animal, the animal ran in front of the car.

MR. SIMMS:

What is wrong with giving the meat to charitable organizations?

MR. WARREN:

There is nothing wrong with it at all. At least there should be some compensation for the individual since it will probably cost him \$2,000 to repair his car.

So, Mr. Speaker, are we going to have signs on the Trans-Canada 'Moose Crossing - beware of the moose.'? Thanks to the minister, now we are going to have, 'Beware! Cows crossing the road.' 'Beware! Sheep down the road.' and,

'Beware: You are entering goat territory,' and all this kind of thing.

MR. SIMMS:

They cannot read the signs.

MR. WARREN:

Well, this is a fact, Mr. Speaker, they cannot read the signs. Therefore the driver of a vehicle should be at least given some compensation if an accident occurs with any particular animal.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

If the hon. minister speaks now he will close the debate.

The hon. Minister of Rural Agriculture and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE:

Mr. Speaker, if I understand all of the remarks that were made in the debate yesterday afternoon and today no one disagrees with this bill. No one disagrees with it. The movements spearheaded by my colleague, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) for a phase in period, I am certainly prepared to look at that. I do not know how long it is going to be. The gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) says a year and a half, two years, I think. The gentleman for St. George's (Mr. Dawe) six months to twelve months. I will certainly have a look at it. I suppose when you talk about regionalism and regional concerns, as the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) did, the member for St. George's (Mr. Dawe) did, and so on, I guess to get right down to it I should not be bringing in the bill. I have no animals in Labrador other than wild animals, husky dogs and a few things like

that. I mean, I really do not have the knowledge to do it. Nevertheless, the problem, Mr. Speaker, that brought all of this to a head several years ago, and I will explain it as briefly as I can, did not involve community pastures, which I will address in a moment, but the problem referred to by my colleague, the Minister of Communications and Consumer Affairs (Mrs. Newhook). There are quite a number of communities around this Province, and every Spring, we receive phone calls and letters and I have to issue permits to residents of these communities to try to control the animals that are brought in or driven in or dumped in or otherwise gotten into the community by non-residents of that community. These animals are streaming all over the place.

MR. TULK:

That is wrong.

MR. GOUDIE:

Well, I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that. I was getting the feeling for a minute that no one agreed with that even, that they should be allowed to roam at large and break down fences.

MR. SIMMS:

That is what they were saying.

MR. TULK:

That is wrong.

MR. GOUDIE:

Well, that is one of the main problems, Mr. Speaker, we are trying to address by bringing in this particular piece of legislation.

Several members have referred to community pastures and the fact that a great Liberal tradition that had begun several years ago

has now been destroyed and a way of life has been destroyed, etc., etc., etc.

Mr. Speaker, we were responsible, through my department, for thirty-odd pastures over the years and these were turned over to the private sector with funding every year. There is funding from government through my department, X number of dollars per animal unit. The Pasture Committees that I have had meetings with have been doing an excellent job of managing those particular facilities and expansions have been allowed to take place through funding from Canada Works, from development associations, etc. So it is certainly not on the decline; in my opinion, it seems to be enlarging to accommodate more animals be they privately owned or otherwise owned in various regions of the Province.

Just for the information of the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, the community pasture programme, when government footed the bill the whole operation was in excess of \$1 million a year, a very expensive programme to accommodate privately owned animals in this Province when this government feels that animal owners, if they own one or two or three animals, should assume some responsibility for them. That, in our opinion, is a good rationale for establishing this type of programme.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, there was one other matter raised that I cannot fully address, and I am a little embarrassed to admit that, but Section 3 dealing with 'Nothing in this section affects the liability of an owner of livestock where the livestock is involved in a collision with a

motor vehicle.' I do not have the entire act in front of me and I cannot refer to that other particular section having to do with liability. But the intent was - and I will undertake to get further clarification for this and perhaps table it in the House so that all hon. members can be fully aware of what the exact intent of subsection 3 deals with - if an animal roaming at large, once this piece of legislation comes into effect, is in collision with a motor vehicle, then someone has to assume some responsibility for damages, deaths, perhaps, incurred as a result and that is all that it is intended to do. Now, as I said, I give an undertaking to clarify it further and table the information so that everyone is fully aware. Mr. Speaker, I also indicate that we will look at a phase-in approach and try to identify a suitable period of time to phase in the legislation. Education will be a part of it.

I move second reading.

On Motion, "An Act To Amend The Livestock Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 4).

MR. SIMMS:

Order 21, Bill No. 39.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Establishment And Operation Of The Institute Of Fisheries And Marine Technology". (Bill No. 39).

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. POWER:

I am glad to see such enthusiasm, Mr. Speaker, for my first official duty in the Legislature as Minister responsible for Career Development and Advanced Studies.

Twenty years ago, Mr. Speaker, there was an act passed that established a College of Fisheries and Navigation Marine Engineering and Electronics which established as we know it the College of Fisheries. Today, twenty years later, we are now introducing a new act to establish the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this act that we are doing today, and certainly the institute itself, is probably one of the two or three most significant things that has happened to education in this Province. I guess, if you go back, Memorial University, when it was originally established, was one of the major, if not the most major thing that happened to education in this Province outside of the regular school system. And certainly I think what we tried to do a few years back, the establishment of Grade XII is also a very significant factor in the education of the young students of this Province. And certainly the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology is now going to be a centerpiece not only for this Province but for all this country as it relates to training for the modern times, if you want, the information technology era that we are into and that we are certainly going to get more and more into as the next decade moves along.

The Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology and the building itself is a \$42 million complex that is being built, I guess, less than a half a mile or so from

here. It should be ready to be opened in September of 1985 and to accommodate students by that time. But I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, for us to, I guess, backtrack a little bit and see exactly what we want to do with the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology. You take the three words in the act itself, I think they may be listed in order or priority if you want, but certainly fisheries is still the functional, most important part of that institute that we have.

The old College of Fisheries, which has been recognized around the world as a tremendous training centre for anyone involved in marine activities. Whether you be a deck hand or an officer, whether you are a navigational person or on the engineering side of the marine technology, then certainly the old College of Fisheries could do just about anything that had to do with the sea as it relates to training and that could be the technical fields, as I just mentioned, from navigation to engineering. And if you wanted to learn how to make a cod trap, then the College of Fisheries also had a capability to go out and teach fishermen in many parts of Newfoundland and I know at least a couple of my constituents have been travelling around this Province pretty well for the last ten years teaching fishermen how to mend nets, how to make traps, and how to do other things relating to the day to day operation of their fishing livelihood, if you want.

So the old College of Fisheries is one of four or five institutes like that in Canada, and probably our new institute here is the most comprehensive of all and offers more courses than any other

institute in Canada.

The new Fisheries and Marine Technology building, about which we are about to pass an act that will govern or control its operation and its development, is probably going to be the only one of its type in Canada. It will be a centre of excellence, which is a new concept that we are trying to establish in all of our post-secondary institutes, that we make certain of our training institutes very specific and very professional in how they train people, so that we are recognized around the world as being a place where you can send people, where you can send persons to do research, where you can send persons to get educated, and certainly in the Institutes of Fisheries and Marine Technology that is the concept that we are beginning.

The \$42 million building that we are going to be opening, I guess in September of 1985 if we stay on schedule, is going to have an awful lot to do with the post-secondary training of people in this Province. As we all know, our post-secondary institutes - the university, the trades and vocational school system and the College of Fisheries itself - have at least in certain parts not kept up with the times. We do have problems with vocational training where many times our students are being trained and retrained and retrained again when it comes to persons going in and doing an auto-body course and cannot get a job, they go back to trade school or vocational school and do a plumbing course and they cannot get a job and then they go back and get trained as a welder and they still might not be able to get a job. So in this Fisheries and Marine Institute that we are

establishing, we are going to try and make sure that training is in touch with the job market that is going to become available. With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, then certainly the second aspect, the marine portion of the act is very, very important. As the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) has often cited, we have over 2,000 people working in the offshore now and the oil and gas industry is certainly going to be increased over the years. No matter what people may think about Mobil's development plan, there is going to be an awful lot of people in the offshore industry, the petroleum industry itself. And we are certainly going to make sure that Newfoundlanders are trained so that if and when an opportunity does come up there is a Newfoundlander trained to do that job. So, Mr. Speaker, it is very, very important what this institute intends to accomplish, to make sure that the job opportunities as they arrive are matched by Newfoundlanders who have skills in that job category, and that certainly would not be the case today. If there was some magic wand you could wave today and begin the development of our offshore resources,, then certainly our people are not as fully trained as they should be to take those job opportunities. Certainly this institute, as I say, is going to be one of the two or three most significant things that has happened in education in this Province and we certainly intend, Mr. Speaker, to make the institute work, to make it responsive to the job needs of our people.

Also in line with this institute, there is a new flume tank which is going to be built there at a cost of about \$6 million which will be

the only one of its kind in North America and one of only two or three that exist in the world. It will be a major site for fisheries, I guess if not new methods of fisheries catching and new kinds of equipment that we will use, then certainly it will be a way for us to advance our fishing techniques so that we can improve our capability for catching and our capability for doing quality work in the fishing industry. So the flume tank, which is one of the only ones of its kind in North America, is going to be very, very important in fisheries research.

MR. NEARY:

What was that?

MR. POWER:

The flume tank that is going to be built along with the Fisheries College itself.

Then, Mr. Speaker, you must take into account the fact all our other training institutes are close together. As you may remember, there was a very significant discussion in Newfoundland a year or eighteen months ago as to where the Fisheries College should be established and there were many communities in Newfoundland which thought they had the right location for a Fisheries College.

MR. TULK:

Corner Brook should have got the Fisheries College when it lost Bowater.

MR. POWER:

Corner Brook should have lost the Fisheries College. The Fisheries College should no more be in Corner Brook than the Forestry Institute should be in St. John's. They simply are not

compatible.

MR. NEARY:

Federal or provincial?

MR. POWER:

Federal or provincial. The federal and provincial Forestry Centers should be in Corner Brook. They should be nowhere else with the exception, Mr. Speaker, that the Forestry Institute could easily have been in Grand Fall or Stephenville, but it certainly should have been in a part of the Province where the forest industry is based. Because the Forest Center moved from Corner Brook to St. John's, it was only fitting and proper, considering the economy of Corner Brook, that the Forestry Research Center go back to Corner Brook. Now it really did not make any difference if Brian Tobin and John Roberts lied to the people of Corner Brook and lied to the people of the Province when they told us that they were going to put their institute in Corner Brook.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

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

MR. BARRY:

I know that the hon. member is a gentleman and would not want to take unfair advantage of people who are not here to defend themselves, so maybe the hon. member would reconsider the intemperate language that he is using. I realize it is in the heat of debate.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

What the hon. gentleman said has nothing to do with comments made about members of this House of Assembly and therefore is not at all unparliamentary. The point raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is merely to try to divert attention away from what the hon. minister was saying, which was the absolute truth. The fact that the member for Corner Brook, Mr. Tobin, was unable to deliver on his promise in the two years after he made it is obviously what the minister was referring to. But what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) raises as a point of order is obviously not a point of order and I am sure he realizes it.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. member for Fogo to that point of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition in no way said that the language used by the member was unparliamentary. But in the sense of being fair and in the sense that that minister has usually operated in this House, he asked him to remain the gentleman that he has been. And in regard to the promises, as to whether Mr. Tobin could deliver on his promises or not, I would suggest to the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Simms) that his own Prime Minister and his own buddy, his own Forestry Minister (Mr. Merithew) in Ottawa, made a commitment in August of this year to the people of Corner Brook. The former Minister of

Forestry (Mr. Power) knows that and I have no doubt that if he were still in his office he would not have been in Ottawa saying, 'Well, now, I am not going to take this sitting down. The people of Corner Brook have to get the federal forestry center.' So, Mr. Speaker, to the point of order he is just asking the minister to be a gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

To that point of order. The hon. Minister of Career Development.

MR. POWER:

I think I can save you the trouble of ruling, Mr. Speaker. It may not be unparliamentary to say that some one lied who has something to do with this House, but certainly, I guess, it may be ungentlemanly and I would be more than glad to withdraw that comment so we can get on with the process we are doing here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! To that point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) rose on a point of order but did not make a point of order. He just requested the minister to consider what he was saying. There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, comments such as that obviously may be harsh when the other person is not here to defend himself. Personally having been very much involved in the move of our personnel to Corner Brook, which caused a lot of, I guess, emotional reaction from our

provincial staff and a lot of concern and apprehension on their and their families behalf, it was very hurtful to me personally that the federal government did not at the time move their people to Corner Brook. It does touch an emotional cord in me.

MR. BARRY:

I wonder would the minister permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

A question by leave by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Would the minister consider it a betrayal on the part of the federal government if they did not move it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology but I do not mind answering the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). I think there was a betrayal and to a certain point a deliberate deceiving of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador by the federal government when the federal Liberal government announced it through Mr. Tobin and Mr. Roberts in Corner Brook. The history, the facts can prove themselves out and no one can deny that they went to Corner Brook and they said that they were looking for a site for a Forestry Research Center for this Province, which this Province badly needed and still needs, and they said that if the provincial government was to move their people to Corner Brook then they would go hand in glove. Because of the economic situation

in Corner Brook, Mr. Speaker, we responded to that need, we moved our people, and the federal Liberal government reneged on what was a very direct commitment to the people of Corner Brook. That is what happened. Our people are in Corner Brook, we lived up to our commitment. I am not here to answer for either the past or present federal government as to what they do.

But in my case, as I mentioned earlier, when the location problem came up about the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology, the question was where is the institute going to be established? My argument in the Corner Brook area was that the institute should be established in a fishing part of this Province. Now anyone who thinks that St. John's is not a fishing community does not understand the history of St. John's. There is a very large fisheries contingent in St. John's. It could have been easily established in Bonavista, the Southern Shore, Lewisporte, Fogo, but it should not have been established in Corner Brook. Therefore I did not mind saying that and the member did not mind telling the people of Corner Brook that, somewhat to her own chagrin as a politician. But certainly, Mr. Speaker, the institute should be established here in St. John's if you take into account the close geographic proximity of the other institutes in St. John's that are involved in education and involved in research and development. Memorial University is right alongside, the College of Trades and Technology, the National Research Council's Arctic Vessel Marine Research Institute, the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Center, C-Core, NORDCO, the Marine Sciences Research Laboratory, the

Petroleum Directorate and other private companies that are doing some research in the field. So the place for the Fisheries College is in St. John's where it is and where it should be and where next Fall we will have it open. But, Mr. Speaker, much more important than the actual location of the institute is the effect that that institute will have on the education of our young people. As I mentioned earlier, we have a tremendous problem in education in this Province. We have a very large contingent of our population that is dropping out of school before Grade IX, 46 per cent or so, and we have tremendous problems with some of our people who are getting into post-secondary institutes and not being able to do very well. Through this new act establishing this new Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology, we hope to be able to solve in a very direct way on one hand the educational needs of many of our young people, and, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the employment needs of many of those people as well.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I perform my first official duty in this Legislature as minister responsible for Career Development and Advanced Studies, to introduce this act which will implement the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology. I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that we have the support of all members of this Legislature when it comes to trying to satisfy the employment and educational needs of the young people of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition will support this bill which will see a very important facility being provided to the people of this Province to ensure that the pre-eminence which Newfoundlanders have always had in the area of marine technology will continue. And I must say one of the most rewarding examples of this was the occasion when, you may recall, this mini-submarine was in difficulty off the Coast of Ireland, I believe it was, there seven or eight years ago, between 1975 and 1979, I forget the exact period, and all of the technology in the world was brought to bear in making sure that these two -

MR. TULK:

What about the Norma and Gladys?

MR. BARRY:

It is unfortunate the government could not seem to keep the Norma and Gladys afloat, but that is not an example of our pre-eminence in marine technology, Mr. Speaker, the sad tale of the Norma and Gladys.

But with respect to this submarine rescue, Your Honour might recall cries went out all around the world for assistance in rescuing this mini-submarine with its crew of two, I believe, and they tried all of the latest in modern technology and it was a Canadian Coast Guard vessel, I believe it was, crewed to a large extent primarily by Newfoundlanders, that ended up given the very, very sensitive and difficult job of winching in this submarine, retrieving this submarine from the seabed and bringing it to the surface. It was a very, very delicate operation when the hours were passing quickly the amount of oxygen available to these two unfortunate souls who had found

themselves caught on the seabed at a very great depth, the hours were running quickly and it was only a matter of hours before they were going to run out of oxygen when the successful rescue was accomplished. Now it was only weeks afterwards that I found out that the Newfoundland crewmen on this vessel had played a very important role and they had deliberately been given the function they were given because of their acknowledged seamanship and knowledge of things relating to marine technology.

So I would take issue with the senior Minister of Education when he refers to the fact that there is a new concept of having a centre of excellence. The centre of excellence is not new as far as the people of Newfoundland are concerned, it is a concept that has always been here. Newfoundlanders have always believed in showing that they can excel. They have always believed in supporting their children and ensuring that their children are better educated than they themselves were, as their parents did for them. They in turn believe, Mr. Speaker, that every new generation must receive support from the parent but also from government, from society to ensure that every new generation of Newfoundlanders can remain in tune with the changing world, can remain on top of changing technology. What we see here, Mr. Speaker, with this bill is a worthwhile continuation of that very honourable tradition, that very praiseworthy tradition that we have had in Newfoundland for some time, that we must continue to ensure that our children, the new generation of Newfoundlanders, remain in tune with the changing world, remain on top of changing

technology and continue, Mr. Speaker, the tradition of excellence, particularly in the marine field, which Newfoundlanders have shown for many, many years. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that this concept of a center of excellence has not continued into government and into Cabinet. I mean, there are a few stars like the senior minister opposite, who received very worthy recognition in his new job and we wish him well. We hope that he will be given the resources by Scrooge, who is just coming into the House, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), to do the job because we know that the minister can do the job if he is given the facilities and given the resources. We will do all that we can to help to ensure that this new department obtains resources and that it does not just become another example of the lip service which members opposite all too often provide to areas that are very important to the Newfoundland people, to the Newfoundland society generally. So we want to make sure that there will be more coming from this new department of Career Development than just lip service. Mr. Speaker, we want to make sure that the minister with respect to the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology will have the support of the members of government to ensure that this facility does not become a mediocre institute, does not become a center of ineptitude and mediocrity as opposed to the concept of the center of excellence. We support and we urge, in fact we insist that if we are going to do this we do it properly and that we give our fishermen, our offshore workers, our shipyard workers, other people involved in marine technology, the many crewmen who sail on ships all

around the world out of Newfoundland, we owe it to them to make sure that they are given the grounding, the foundation, the basics for the job that they will have to do. Remember, Mr. Speaker, in many cases what we are talking about here is not just a matter of another routine assignment. In many cases when we have men and women involved with the sea, we are talking about life and death situations where proper training and proper skills will make the difference between a successful rescue attempt or an unsuccessful rescue attempt, between a man or a woman being injured during work at sea or a man or woman escaping injury because they are properly prepared, properly knowledgeable, properly skilled in the way their jobs should be performed. It is a great pleasure to me when I see the way in which Newfoundlanders still, Mr. Speaker, are relied upon for difficult tasks when it comes to the area of marine technology. I referred a moment ago to the rescue mission of the lost submarine, I refer now to the involvement that Newfoundlanders continue to have in opening up the Arctic, and, Mr. Speaker, indeed even the Antarctic. We still see vessels leaving ports in Newfoundland to carry scientific expeditions to the Arctic. We had a vessel, I know of at least one last year, go to the Antarctic supporting a scientific mission out of the country of India. They brought the team of scientists to the Antarctic on a very successful mission and brought them back again. We saw just a couple of days ago a vessel leaving I think in this case it was for the Arctic, I am not sure, it might again be the Antarctic, but I think it should be recognized that Newfoundlanders have, because of

the fact that we have been so close to the sea, because of the fact that we have obtained our livelihood from the sea for centuries, we have skills that all too often, I regret to say, we take for granted and we put down, we do not recognize that they are worthwhile or worthy of recognition, or needed and, in fact, can be in many cases supplied on a very profitable basis to people from other parts of the world.

We have, Mr. Speaker, an opportunity here with respect to the fishing industry, if we can ever get our act together, our political act. It is not the skills of our fishermen that are lacking, sad to say, but the skills of our politicians. I would ask the minister to consider, as part of the curriculum in this Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology, that maybe there should be a course there for politicians and every member who comes into this House should have to spend a few weeks over in the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology to familiarize him with what is happening in that institute and maybe to get him better attuned to matters of fisheries policy than we unfortunately see the present government being involved with. We do not see the present government taking the initiatives with respect to fisheries policy that they should be, Mr. Speaker. Particularly the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), who comes from one of the most important fishing districts in this Province, that particular member should spend, I would suggest, a double semester in this particular course getting a basic grounding in the understanding of the way in which politicians can

frustrate our fishermen from showing the tremendous skills that they have. And what is happening now in this Province, Mr. Speaker, is a classic case, a supreme case of the politician impeding rather than promoting the development of our fishing industry. We have had a situation where the policy of members opposite, the entire fisheries policy of members opposite consisted of fighting with the federal government. We had a situation where the members opposite took the position, Mr. Speaker - and it is on the record; the member can go and check out Hansard, it is on the record - and we had the Premier of this Province, the Fisheries Minister getting up and saying there was nothing we can do for the Newfoundland fishery until we get control of Northern cod, that that is the secret to control of the fishing industry, we must have control of the Northern cod.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how much have we heard about that? Your Honour has been in the House regularly during this session and, Your Honour, how many times have we heard members opposite stand up since the Tory Government has been elected in Ottawa and say, "Mr. Speaker, the Government in Ottawa has to pay attention and has to give us control over the Northern cod"? The Premier says that he sent up a briefing document, with respect to the most important issues of the day in this Province, to the new Prime Minister. Has this document been tabled, Mr. Speaker? Has it been revealed to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador? No, Mr. Speaker, we have the same gag order in place here in this government as has been imposed in Ottawa. Now, we understand that the new Prime Minister is going to take certain measures with respect

to unmuzzling the Cabinet in Ottawa, and we hope that members opposite will be unmuzzled as well, Mr. Speaker. We hope that the Premier will throw open the doors of his government and respond to the public's right to know in the same way as Mr. Mulroney did. I have to give Mr. Mulroney credit, he has had a month and he has realized already he has made a mistake with respect to the first point, and that was, make sure you watch the first impression you give, the first image. That is point number one of ten points to ensure re-election that they have identified in the federal government. Mr. Mulroney's point number one was avoid making early mistakes, watch your image and that is based upon an analysis of why the Clark government failed in nine months and based upon why Mr. Diefenbaker got into trouble so early. Mr. Mulroney is trying to learn from the mistakes of those previous Tory governments and, to give him his due, I have not heard what he has had to say yet today but indications are that he is coming out with a statement that there has been too high a degree of secrecy set up in government. The cloak of secrecy is now apparently going to be changed from a heavy robe to a see-through blouse. We are going to see, Mr. Speaker, this cloak of secrecy, if it is not totally rent asunder, changed to a see-through material. Mr. Speaker, we will have to wait and see what Mr. Mulroney says today but I hope that the Premier and members opposite look carefully at his example because, Mr. Speaker, there are certain things which the people of this Province are entitled to know, there are certain things which it is necessary for the people to know

in order to have good government. We have a list, Mr. Speaker, of items which members opposite have been keeping from the people of this Province. The most recent example, today we heard refusals by the minister to indicate the position with respect to Winter drilling. The Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) refused to indicate what the impact on Hibernia revenues would be if this 25 per cent back-in would be removed. We had the Premier refuse, up to this point in time, although he said he would take it into consideration, to table this document with respect to the most important issues of the day between the Province of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada. Now I hope that one of the issues that has been designated is the issue of fisheries policy. It will be very interesting to the people of this Province to see whether the Premier and members opposite continue to take the approach that the only way they can do anything for the Newfoundland fishery is if they have control with respect to the allocation of Northern cod. We want to see and the people of this Province want to see whether that has been set out in that document. The Premier cannot continue to hide that document. As a matter of fact, I would like ask Mr. Beauchesne Tulk here whether we might make an application under the Freedom Of Information Act, if he would remind me to see if we can get that document out of the Premier. That Freedom Of Information Act is going to be a very useful device and it looks as though that is going to be the only way that we are going to get the information that will permit proper informed debate on matters of fisheries policy as well as other areas of

interest.

Now an Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology will only become a centre of excellence if we have a government that has a proper fisheries policy in place and a proper policy with respect to marine technology in place. We have to have an idea as to the direction in which this Province should be moving with respect to the fishery, a better idea than we have now where, apart from centering all upon control of fish stocks, the other attempt, and it seems to be the only other effort on the part of members opposite to develop a proper fisheries policy, is to take a minority interest in Fishery Products International. And we had a very interesting statement by the Premier, and I think it was the first time it was mentioned in the House a couple of days ago where the Premier said that they were forced into that agreement. The Premier said that they had no choice, they were forced -

MR. TULK:

Last Fall it was supposed to be the greatest agreement since Confederation.

MR. BARRY:

The greatest agreement since Confederation when the Premier entered into it last year. Magnificent and great strides forward, this was the way it was put. But now we have the Premier saying, well, really they were forced into it. Now the fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that members opposite find themselves in a position where they have given up. They have passed over responsibility of the fishing industry to the Government of Canada.

MR. TULK:

And now maybe to foreign interests.

MR. BARRY:

That was the great battle to get control of our own destiny. How many times in how many political brochures have we heard that statement that we must get control of our own destiny? Just picture this, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the offshore and the marine technology relating thereto, just picture how we have gotten control of our own destiny there. We have the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) and the Premier in a position where having lost the offshore case they have had to throw themselves on the good will of Mr. Mulroney, and Ms. Carney, and there is the control of our destiny. In the hands of the Premier, in the hands of Mr. Marshall, Mr. Speaker? And what has happened with respect to the fishing industry?

DR. COLLINS:

Do you think the Supreme Court judgement was a good one?

MR. BARRY:

No, I do not think the Supreme Court judgement was a good one, indeed I do not. But neither was it very smart on the part of the minister to advise the Premier to go to the Supreme Court of Canada when he did, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

So in your view the court denied us some of our rights.

MR. BARRY:

Rights are what the Supreme Court of Canada ended up saying you have in the legal sense, Mr. Speaker, and that is the problem that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has never been able to understand, that in the course of negotiating you are better off if you have

some legal rights that still remain there in the background that can help your case, that can give you some clout in the course of negotiating. Now with respect to the fishing industry, where is the control of our own destiny with respect to the fishing industry? For a very large part of it control of the fishing industry has been passed over to a corporation where the government of this Province was prepared to take a minority position.

MR. STEWART:

What choice did we have?

MR. BARRY:

The member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) says, 'What choice did we have?' You know, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with that question because that focuses the problem of members opposite better than anything I could have said. Because the entire point is that everything that members opposite have done since 1979 has been leading them to that point where they have very little choice. Every step that has been taken, Mr. Speaker, has been to lead them closer and closer to the precipice where they have no choice. And that is a sad commentary on members opposite, on their lack of judgement. It is the lack of judgement on the part of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), it is the lack of judgement of the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) who supports the people in the front benches here, it is lack of judgement by the Premier and by the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) and and by the former Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) that has got you to that point. It is the lack of judgement, Mr. Speaker, which through pure, utter incompetence

and bad judgement, Mr. Speaker, leads them to the point of having to say, as conceded by the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart), 'What choice do we have?' What a commentary on a government elected by the people for the people of the people. 'What choice do we have?' For heaven sake, if members opposite are going to take that approach, resign. I ask the member opposite to resign. If he has thrown up his hands like the Premier and says, 'What choice do we have?', resign. Admit to your constituents that you cannot do anything, that you have lost control, that you have made decisions which have brought you to the point where you have no control any longer. 'What choice do we have?' And, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Marshall) says, 'Why could we not get an agreement?' We should have had an agreement in 1981 and you would have had an agreement if you had listened to me; you would have had one in 1981.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR SPEAKER (Aylward):
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
You would not have had 44,000 unemployed, Mr. Speaker, waiting for another four years and being told now that they have to wait for another five or six months before they can find a job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I wish I could tell

all about the delay. I just started to say to the Senior Minister of Education how the lack of fishing policies is an example of politicians frustrating one industry. I say that the lack of an offshore agreement is an example of politicians frustrating another industry in the course of its development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:
You think everyone else is wrong except yourself.

MR. BARRY:
Well, Mr. Speaker, I would have to say most members opposite are wrong on this point. Now I have to confess that there are one of two ladies and gentlemen opposite who have -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Some ladies and gentlemen!

MR. BARRY:
Well, I just want to use the generalities. - expressed privately their reservations about the direction in which this Premier has taken the Province. We have seen, Mr. Speaker, in quiet private conversation the concerns being raised by members opposite. When they say to me, 'I wonder what is going to be the end of it all? I wonder where are we going? How long can we stay on this track of confrontation?' And now, Mr. Speaker, they are saying, 'I wonder how long we are going to be muzzled? I wonder how long are we going to have to do like the Minister of Forestry - not the old one. I admire that man for having the courage to say that there was betrayal by the new federal government in not moving that Forestry Centre to Corner Brook.

MR. TULK:

It takes courage. It takes courage.

MR. BARRY:

Unfortunately, the new Minister of Forestry (Mr. Simms) has decided to take what he sees as the safe track to the leadership.

Mr. Speaker, in any political campaign there is a slow track, a secure, safe track, and then there is the high risk track. Now I think that the Minister of Forestry has decided to take the safe track to the leadership of the party. But with his promotion as Senior Minister of Education (Mr. Power), we now have a new contender. The Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) may still be the front runner but I think it is a toss-up now between the Minister of Development and the Minister -

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to interrupt the hon. gentleman but he is being terribly irrelevant. This is an important piece of legislation. He is being terribly irrelevant. I do not know what he is on to now but it has nothing to do with the bill we are considering. Now he worked himself into this. Previously he was baiting my colleagues here and almost inciting them to disorder, he was practically out of order there, but now he is completely out of order because he is so irrelevant.

MR. NEARY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did not raise a valid point of order. It would seem to me that what he is trying to do is get the attention of my colleague because he is jealous that his name was not tossed in with the contenders. I am sure my colleague will deal with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in due course, but there is no valid point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest that if the hon. gentleman wants to put his name in contention he try some other kind of technique.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, I do find it hard to find the relevance of who might or who might not be leadership contenders for a certain political party it has to do with the Marine Fisheries Institute bill. I would remind the hon. member that we are discussing Bill No. 39.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I was trying to tie it in by showing, first of all, that there was a need for a new centre of excellence not just in the Fisheries College but also we need a new centre of excellence in the Cabinet benches of this Province. So, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to point out how important it is to have proper policy

direction within which our new Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology can fit. I was pointing out, Mr. Speaker, if I could just briefly summarize the relevance, that in the case of the fishing industry we have seen the politicians opposite, rather than helping, hindering the development of the fishing industry. In the case of offshore technology, again we have seen the politicians opposite, rather than helping in the development of that industry, hindering. And I was trying to be specific in terms of an example of a politician who has done more to hinder than to help and I was pointing straight directly over to the present Minister of Forestry (Mr. Simms) as an example of one who hinders rather than helps, whether it be the forestry centre, the forest industry, or whether it be in the advice that he gives on the fishing industry or on the offshore industry, because he does not want to put the federal minister on the spot. And without giving away any Cabinet secrets, I think we could infer if he is going to take that position with a federal Cabinet minister, that he does not want to put him on the spot, do you think, Mr. Speaker, that he would want to put the Premier on the spot?

MR. TULK:

No. He wants to slide up behind him and get his job.

MR. BARRY:

Do you think that in the inner sanctum of Cabinet, the Forestry minister, if he happened to disagree, as I am sure he does from time to time, with the direction in which the Premier is taking the Province in the fishing industry, in the offshore industry, that he would be prepared to put the Premier on the

spot?

MR. TOBIN:

No, no.

MR. BARRY:

The member for Burin - Placentia West says no, and I think the record should acknowledge that.

MR. TULK:

But the man he is sitting down by would.

MR. BARRY:

But we have seen the new senior Minister of Education, the previous Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power), there is a minister who is prepared to speak his mind -

MR. TULK:

With courage.

MR. BARRY:

- who has the courage to state his position. And there are one or two others over there, Mr. Speaker, both in and out of Cabinet, who are prepared to take a stand, who are prepared to help rather than hinder the development of policy. But, regrettably, there are not many, there are not enough over there to make it a centre of excellence in the political life of this country. This particular Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, will not be looked upon as a centre of excellence.

DR. COLLINS:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. BARRY:

Yes, surely, I will permit a question.

DR. COLLINS:

I wonder if the hon. member is actually going to deal with the substance of this thing? I think

that we would like to have unanimous agreement to this bill, and I would like, therefore, for the hon. member to lay out the reasons why he would agree, if he is going to agree.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent question. As a matter of fact, the next point I had ticked down here was just to point out that it was a great pleasure for me when I was Chairman of the Resource Policy Committee of Cabinet to initiate the visit of Cabinet - I think the minister came along - down to the old facilities. And the minister might recall, we went over to the Southside and we saw how the old fisheries college had spilled over - it could not be dealt with by the Parade Street facilities - and, Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that we had men and women working in facilities over on the Southside in which you would not put a dog. I am sure that they would not have been approved by Mr. Cardoulis if he knew that people were over there. I am sure they would not have met Department of Health standards. Mr. Speaker, I think in some cases they were former warehouses, twine lofts, and I am sure there were places where gurry and blubber barrels had been stored for centuries, Mr. Speaker, that we had people in trying to learn about the newest in technology - as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we were bringing Newfoundlanders in there from all parts of the Province, the Island and Labrador, to show them the newest in technology in the fishing industry. I can imagine what they must have thought when they came in from Torngat Mountains district or Eagle River or the Strait of Belle Isle or even the Burin Peninsula, coming

into the great Fisheries College of this Province and they end up in a classroom or classrooms on the Southside. It must have been a little bit discouraging, a little dispiriting for them. I think it was symbolic at the time of how government was not really placing the importance upon the fishing industry that they should have. I think that the fishermen could see that very directly when they would come in and see the facilities in which they had to work. Now, Mr. Speaker, we had a debate on that before and discussed it and it was always put in terms of 'Yes, we really should have a new Fisheries College but where are we going to get the money?' It was not until members of the Cabinet themselves actually went and walked through those classrooms and saw the squalor in which the Fisheries College was trying to carry on, with very dedicated instructors, very dedicated administrative staff but with totally inadequate facilities that it became apparent to members opposite, many of whom were on that tour, that it was not just a matter of recognizing that the fishing industry and a new fisheries institute should be a priority, it was a matter of recognizing that it was a scandal, it was an embarrassment to continue to have our fishermen and fisherwomen and others involved in marine technology put into these facilities and be expected to have a positive attitude to new developments in the fishing industry. So, Mr. Speaker, it is a very positive thing that we have these new facilities going in place and I want to say that we support the provision of proper and adequate facilities. But I want to get back to the fact that we have to have more than tokenism, we have to have more

than rhetoric in terms of the development of fisheries policy if the fishing industry is going to progress. This new Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology in itself will not permit, Mr. Speaker, the progress that we should see and experience in the fishing industry in this Province. We will need enlightened politicians, we will need new improved government policies and programmes and we will need, Mr. Speaker, the acceptance of responsibility. First and foremost we will need members opposite, the government opposite to accept that it is their responsibility to do things for the fishermen of Newfoundland and Labrador and it is not the sole responsibility of the Government of Canada. Members opposite must take responsibility and they have not been prepared to do that to date. Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the best examples of how the Premier made a decision that he was going to treat matters relating to the fishery for political reasons was his appointment of the previous minister. Rather than have somebody who was going to tackle the problems of the fishing industry, the premier opted for somebody whom he felt could make good political mileage in the fishing industry. Now, I am not going to say any more about that because the former minister is not here and I would much prefer to save my ammunition for when members are in the House. But again, Mr. Speaker, we see an example of the importance and significance which members opposite and the government place on the fishing industry by the fact that at a time when the fishing industry has one of its gravest crisis ever facing it, do we have a Minister of Fisheries?

No, we have an Acting Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Goudie). Mr. Speaker, we have had the previous minister resign and rather than right away, immediately appointing one of the handful of people who might be able to make a little contribution -

MR. WARREN:

There is no one over there.

MR. BARRY:

There are a couple of them, but they are on the backbenches, not the front benches.

MR. WARREN:

That is the reason, there is no one over there.

MR. BARRY:

The member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) should be given an opportunity to show his stuff. The member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) has been kept on the backbenches a long time and he could be given his opportunity. The member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn), the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt), the member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett), are a few men, some new blood that I would like to see being given the opportunity. And there are, Mr. Speaker, I know serious concerns by these individuals in the backbenches as to why it is that we do not have a Minister of Fisheries. Why is it that the Premier has appointed an Acting Minister at a time when so much remains to be done, as a matter of fact so much remains to be started in dealing with the problems of the Newfoundland fishery? It is an example, Mr. Speaker, of the lack of concern, the lack of attention which members opposite are giving to the Newfoundland fishery when we do not even see a willingness to

appoint a full-time minister. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the fishermen of Newfoundland and Labrador deserve better than to have an Acting Minister pawned off on them. When we have the resignation of a full-time minister in our most important industry, we should have the appointment of a full-time minister immediately.

Now if members opposite are saying, "Oh, there are no problems in the fishing industry. It is status quo time. Everything is all right. Things are moving along fine. We do not need any new approaches," if that is what we are to believe from this approach by government then -

MR. TULK:

You did not suggest the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) to be a minister, did you?

MR. BARRY:

No, no, the member for Burin - Placentia West has not gotten his sea legs in the House yet. The member for Burin - Placentia West has not yet established a stature, Mr. Speaker, and is going to have to work on it. He has to understand that there is more than just to making cracks across the House to gain the respect of his colleagues.

MR. NEARY:

He has to be able to distinguish between a welcoming committee and a demonstration.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, that might have been an indication to the Premier that the member might not be quite ready yet for the hurly-burly of a Cabinet post. If the member is not able to distinguish when his own constituents are getting ready

to lynch him or to praise him, then, Mr. Speaker, what would we expect when the minister was called down to the steps of the Confederation Building for a demonstration as any minister regularly is? So, Mr. Speaker, I would say that it is a matter of making sure that the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) came to no harm. The Premier wanted to protect the member and did not want to have him shoved into the position of having to go down and respond to the demonstrations not knowing whether they were friendly or hostile. So the member opposite should sit back and listen a little bit. The member for St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas) is very good at that. When any member of this House gets up and speaks the member for St. John's Centre listens, and then he gets up and he makes these devastating comments. Unfortunately, the comments of the member for Burin - Placentia West are all too often lost in the fact that he is trying to put them out when somebody else is speaking. If he thought a little more and if he sized up the situation before rushing in, he would not be running into these hostile crowds with his arm raised waiting for the cheers. Mr. Speaker, it reminded me of the comic strip Hagar the Horrible where he is marching on this castle with thousands of men behind him and he is leading them on to battle and the guy inside the castle is on the top of the ramparts and he is looking down and he says, 'Oh, oh! I think we have a few problems here. I had better call up my lawyer.' Then, Mr. Speaker, Hagar stops his army and he is getting ready to launch an assault of this castle. The next thing you see is this little lawyer in his black robe with his scroll

under his arm marching out and standing in front of Hagar and his full army, and he unwinds the scroll and he reads out this long double Dutch Latin and broken English screed, and then puts it under his arm and as he turns around to walk back to the castle the thousand men behind Hagar roar, 'Guilty' and Hagar is like this. That is how the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) was. He reminded me of Hagar the Horrible, Mr. Speaker, when he got off the bus. But just think of the terrible position that he put the Premier in. The Premier thought it was a Newfoundland Telephone demonstration but the member for Burin - Placentia West said, 'No, no, it is the fishermen, they are out to welcome you. They are putting up a bow arch for you, Premier. They are getting ready to welcome you and they have the sealing guns out, Mr. Premier, to welcome you as you go through the bow arch.' As the member and the Premier got off the bus, the member for Burin - Placentia West indicated that his stature was not quite there yet in terms of appointment to a Cabinet position.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a few minutes before I wind up my few remarks and adjourn the debate. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to say that it was sad for me to see members opposite - the Premier, the Acting Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Goudie), the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) and other Newfoundlanders sit back on that side of the House and accept the statement by the hon. Mr. Fraser that the only way he was going to get any clout, the only way there would be any clout on the Board of Management of FPI, was if there were some appointments from Bay Street. I

wonder if he consulted with the Government House Leader, the Newfoundland Energy Minister (Mr. Marshall), before he made those comments? Is it the position of members opposite that it is only by the appointment of mainland members from Bay Street that we get the clout that we need on the FPI Board?

Now I admire and respect many of those people who were appointed who have proven themselves to be successful business people. I met a number of them in the course of various political and legal activities and I know they are capable people. But, Mr. Speaker, it is an awful insult to those many successful business people in this Province to have to listen to that statement that the only way clout can be added to the FPI Board is if there are appointments from Bay Street. Mr. Speaker, I want to hear the Senior Minister of Education comment on that point. I want his comments on that point as well as on the many others that have been made. I now move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

It has been noted that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) adjourned the debate.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, before we move the adjournment of the House, I would like to propose certain changes in the complement of government representatives on the various committees: The hon. the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) to

replace the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) on the Public Accounts Committee; the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid) to replace the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes on the Select Committee of Certified General Accountants And Corporations; the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening) to replace the hon. the member for Trinity North on the Social Services Estimates Committee; and, the hon. the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Collins) to replace the hon. the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey), now our illustrious Minister of Health, on the Government Services Estimates Committee. I have spoken to the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) and he concurs with me in making this motion at this time.

I do make that motion, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, the House accepted the changes of government representatives on the various committees, carried.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, before adjourning the House I should advise the House that we will start off on Monday with The Judicature Act.

MR. NEARY:
That is a lively one.

MR. MARSHALL:
I know, but the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) has a particular interest in it and we have advised him that

it is going to be and hopefully we will entice him back into the House for that purpose.

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, November 26, 1984, at 3:00 p.m.