



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

First Session

Number 60

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Friday

15 November 1985

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

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

DR. TWOMEY:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:  
As most hon. members are aware, NATO forces have been conducting low level training flights over Labrador since 1979. NATO is currently actively considering Goose Bay as a potential site for its Tactical Weapons Training Centre. If NATO should decide in favour of Goose Bay, this should result in a considerable increase in military training activity over Labrador. It will also be a significant economic boost to this area. Naturally the Province is very interested in the NATO proposal.

At the same time, we are aware that the Native people in Labrador have expressed concern about potential health problems resulting from these low level flying exercises. As a government, we are sensitive to these concerns and will take every reasonable measure that can be taken to ensure that the health of the people of Labrador is not adversely affected by this activity.

In June of this year government announced that, although internal investigations have not revealed

any evidence of damage to health as the result of low level flying, the Province would initiate a health study using an independent agent.

I am pleased to announce to day that government will be contracting with the Canadian Public Health Association to undertake an independent an objective study in the Labrador area of potential and actual effects of low level flying activity on the health of the residents of Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, as most people know, the Canadian Public Health Association is a highly reputable and respected association in Canada which has an international reputation for expertise in the public health field. That Association has undertaken a number of studies and conducted research into major public health issues. Indeed, members of this House may remember that the Canadian Public Health Association, some years ago, conducted a study at the request of government into matters relating to the Phosphorus Plant at Long Harbour. The Canadian Public Health Association consists of 2,500 multi-disciplinary members representing a broad base of support from the public health system in Canada.

I am pleased that the Canadian Public Health Association has agreed to undertake this important study on the health effects of low level flying in Labrador. There will be full opportunity for public input from interested individuals, associations and agencies, via written and verbal presentations. In particular, those most concerned with this activity - the Native peoples -

will have full opportunity for input.

The terms of reference for the study will be finalized after interested groups and individuals have had an opportunity for dialogue with the Canadian Public Health Association. The Association has already appointed a task force of members who will be visiting Labrador in the near future to begin dialogue with the people. We anticipate that the study will take about one year to complete.

Mr. Speaker, we are appointing this respected agency to undertake this study because we are genuinely interested in finding out as much information as possible concerning any possible health effects which might result from low level flying in Labrador. If there are problems, we want to be able to take the right approach and the right steps in dealing with them.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that this information will reassure the people of Labrador of the concern of Government to take every reasonable step to measure any possible health effects of low level flying and to deal with those matters in an affective and reasonable manner. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I want, first of all, to thank the hon. Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) for the courtesy of giving me a copy of

his statement well in advance of reading it here this morning. We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, welcome the announcement. In fact in light of the complaints that have come from the area since 1979 we are sort of at a loss to understand why such a study was not undertaken before. In fact we think it is long overdue.

While we appreciate, Mr. Speaker, and support the benefits that will accrue to the area from the presence of NATO, and especially now with their extended activities, we are conscious of the fact that people in the area must be given every consideration. The Native peoples must be given every chance to have a meaningful input into the study that was just announced by the minister. We would certainly want that to happen, Mr. Speaker. We commend the minister for having selected the Canadian Public Health Association to undertake the study. That is a very worthwhile and renowned association.

The minister makes reference in his statement to a similar study that was taken some years ago with respect to the phosphorus plant at Long Harbour. That is a case, Mr. Speaker, where maybe that study was done a little to late because we all know the ramifications of the plant in that area. We know the story of the red herring, the dead fish and the effect on the ecology and possibly on the people who live within a certain radius of that plant. Mr. Speaker, we do support this announcement. We welcome it. Again we stress to the minister and to the House the importance of giving the Native peoples every possible opportunity to have an input into, first of

all, establishing the guidelines and setting up the mandate for the study and, having done that, give them every possible chance to have an input into the study itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a statement today on behalf of the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward). For the information of the House, it is my pleasure today to announce that the provincial and federal governments have agreed to contribute \$90,000 towards the cost of commercial -

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Are we to take it, Mr. Speaker - just a point of clarification, really, from Your Honour - that Parliamentary Assistants, Executive Assistants -

MR. MATTHEWS:

Not Executive Assistants.

MR. TULK:

Whatever they are, Mr. Speaker, they have some titles over there that, I suppose, enables them to do certain things. Are we to take it that Parliamentary Assistants

are going to be making Ministerial Statements in this House? If so, are we abiding by the Standing Orders here? Are we going to hold those people accountable in the same manner as they do everywhere else? Just what is the situation? Just a point of clarification, that is all.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that it has been recognized that Parliamentary Secretaries answer questions on behalf of ministers and that, in the absence of ministers, would also be in a position to make statements on behalf of ministers in their capacity as Parliamentary Secretaries. Our Standing Orders are silent on it, and our practice is, of course, where the Standing Orders are silent we go by our own practice and practice in the House of Commons. Our own practice is consistent and certainly the practice in the House of Commons is consistent.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I may be wrong but I recall there was some discussion on this matter some time ago. I think it was before I was in the Chair. It was agreed, at that time, that Parliamentary Secretaries would answer questions but not make Ministerial Statements. What I would suggest is that the hon. member would read his statement by leave, if that is agreeable.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we can appreciate what the Government House Leader is saying and we do not want to unduly impede the operation of government and the operation of this House. But we are into, I think, a fairly significant change in practice here and it is not something that we would take lightly or have it understood that we are expected to give leave when this occurs. So, as a very exceptional situation, until there has been an opportunity to have this researched and checked out, we would abide by Your Honour's suggestion here.

MR. SPEAKER:

Thank you.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Without going into the rules or into precedents here or in the House of Commons, I do not think government intends to make this a practice. What has happened today primarily is this that the minister responsible is absent, but an agreement had been reached earlier, a number of weeks ago for a joint statement to go forward today from the federal government and from the provincial government at the same time. As we understand it, the statement is going forward from the federal government now and that is why the Parliamentary Secretary is giving the statement today. So it is under those circumstances, the minister happens to be absent and yet there is a joint statement being issued by both governments.

MR. SPEAKER:

Thank you.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to follow on, Mr. Speaker. When I consider and look back in terms of what the practice has been, the practice has been, Mr. Speaker, for the Premier to make a statement on behalf of a minister when the minister has been absent. We object to the use that has been made of these Executive Assistants, where there are large expenditures of government dollars involved in having executive assistants travel to various parts of this Province in order to help give that member some political prestige or status otherwise lacking, Mr. Speaker, and we think that the same thing is occurring now. We would ask and we would suggest that if this is necessary that the Premier should deliver the statement on behalf of the minister. That will get the job done, Mr. Speaker, so we do not give leave to the member. We would give leave if it is necessary, but I do not think it is necessary, to have the Premier give the statement.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly agreeable that the Premier would now make the Ministerial Statement. But I would request and suggest, and I think it is the

case, that Your Honour should reserve a ruling on it so that necessary consideration can be given.

There are two things that are clear: This particular point may not have ever had a direct precedent, but Parliamentary Assistants have answered questions on behalf of ministers.

MR. TULK:  
In this House?

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Yes, in this House. I specifically recall that from my own memory in the Chair. It is not just my memory: The record will show that Parliamentary assistants have answered questions on behalf of ministers, and in the Thursday afternoon adjournment debate procedure have answered on behalf of ministers, and Parliamentary Assistants to the Premier have made Ministerial Statements on behalf of the Premier. What I am suggesting is that the logical conclusion of the application of all of these precedents would be that a Parliamentary Assistant to any minister would therefore be entitled to make a Ministerial Statement on behalf of that minister. So I am submitting that for consideration; not for a ruling now, but for consideration. In other words, the government does not wish to appear to have agreed that a Parliamentary Assistant does not have the right to make such a statement, but we will leave the matter in abeyance now, the Premier will make the statement on behalf of the minister, but the substantive point will be ruled on by the Chair when the Chair has an opportunity to review whatever needs to be reviewed.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, the other point, of course, is that rather than be picky about the rules the hon. member, the Parliamentary Secretary, does represent Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, it is my pleasure today to announce that -

MR. TULK:  
That does not give him the right to make a presentation.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
On behalf of government he does. There are hairs and then there are splitting hairs and then there are technicalities.

For the information of the House, it is my pleasure today to announce that the provincial and federal governments have agreed to contribute \$90,000 towards the cost of the commercial caribou harvest which will be undertaken by the Labrador Inuit Development Corporation in the Spring of 1986.

Based on the successful harvest and marketing of caribou in last years' pilot project, the hon. Pat Carney, acting on behalf of the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion (Mr. Stevens), and the minister are sufficiently impressed with the market prospects for this development that we are committing these funds to assist the Labrador Inuit Development Corporation in launching a full-scale advertising and promotional campaign. These funds will also be used to help defray the high costs of transporting the caribou product from Northern Labrador via an air charter.

It is also the intention of the Labrador Inuit Development Corporation to begin marketing this high quality product to the Island of Newfoundland early next Summer. Once these markets are successfully established, the product will be shipped in later years via coastal boat from Nain to avoid the excessively high costs of air transportation and bring the product to markets at reduced prices. This will eliminate the requirement for further transport subsidies.

This project is but one example where both governments are working with local people in Northern Labrador to promote economic and social development from locally available resources. When the project is successful the Labrador Inuit Development Corporation plans to put in place the appropriate infrastructure in Nain to allow for a year round commercial caribou harvest and marketing venture.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of the initiative taken by the people of Northern Labrador in this important venture. We are also pleased that both orders of government, through the Canada/Newfoundland Community Development Subsidiary Agreement for Coastal Labrador, have been able to collaborate in providing support for this important development on a cost-shared (50/50) basis .

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the member for Torngat Mountains, the Parliamentary Secretary to the minister as well as the minister, for being able to pursue this matter through the agreement and to see it to fruition today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make a comment. It is usual to thank the minister or in this case, I guess, his Parliamentary Secretary, for providing a copy of the statement in a reasonable time in advance so that the particular critic assigned to that department could have a chance to look it over. Generally the situation is with the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development that the statement is provided in a reasonable time. However, perhaps because of his absence, his Parliamentary Secretary has not developed that level of courtesy that would provide it at least a few minutes before we met in the Assembly. Nevertheless, because of my twenty years in the region, I am fairly familiar with this and other subjects relating to it.

I was very attuned to the pilot projects last year and I thought the results were very encouraging. I have spent quite a number of years in the North besides my present location and I have known the Inuit to be a very resourceful people that live off the land and can live off the land. Now they have the opportunity, with government funding and support, to develop a resource. It has been available to residents of that region of our Province but, unfortunately, it has not been available to Newfoundlanders, our fellow citizens of the Province, in their

marketplace, which I think is unfortunate. This will do something in that regard.

I would also like to recommend very strongly to the government, in relation to this sort of an activity that, they would have a very close look and perhaps enter into some kind of study activity with respect to developing an experimental farming project for the domestication of the caribou, which has been done with similar animals in other parts of the world quite successfully. I would like to make that strong recommendation. Based on some comments also in the House -

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

MR. KELLAND:  
May I just make a final comment, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No. No.

MR. KELLAND:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
At this stage I would like to welcome to the galleries fifty Grade IX students from Presentation School, St. John's, with their teachers, Mrs. Nina Beresford, Noreen Lewis and Carmel Strong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

#### Oral Questions

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. I wonder if the Premier can indicate to the House whether he is proud of the fact that his government now stands indicted internationally by no less than the International Labour Organization which accuses his government of having unfair, unjust and discriminatory labour laws in this Province? I wonder can the Premier indicate whether he sees this as one of the highlights of his career? If not, what does he plan to do about it? To paraphrase his favourite poem, when does he plan to dole out equal laws to a troubled race?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I am very proud, Mr. Speaker, that over the last number of months that we have been able to conclude a number of agreements in the Public Service with various public service unions including the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, including the hospital support workers. I am very proud of the efforts that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) has made over the last forty-eight hours to be perhaps the chief spark plug to get the brewery strike settled. I am very proud of those things. Obviously the ILO has a role to play internationally and was requested to do a review of labour legislation in various provinces of Canada. I think they have made some comments about Ontario and



other places. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that we do from time to time in our own jurisdiction we do things which we think are necessary and appropriate. If there are other organizations around the world who have a difference of opinion with us on those appropriate initiatives that we have taken, well, they are entitled to their opinion.

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Speaker, I do not think the ILO is referring to the successful negotiation of contracts. Mr. Speaker, they were referring to the unequal and the unjust laws that we have in this Province, particularly laws which remove the right to strike by thousands of public servants in this Province. Again I ask the Premier to direct his answer to that question: In view of this decision by the International Labour Organization, Mr. Speaker, an unprecedented decision in the Western World, that we should be accused of having unfair and unjust labour laws - and many of these unfair and unjust labour laws were created by the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) - when does his government plan to look at reforming and correcting these unfair and unjust labour laws now it has been determined that we have them?

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, it has been determined by an organization outside of Canada; the Government of Newfoundland will be subject to the desires and wishes of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and not people from other jurisdictions. I think the courts of Canada upheld our legislation. Whilst the ILO can make comment from time to time on various other programmes and policies in other jurisdictions, obviously they have no constitutional or legal power to ensure that their point of view is upheld in that other foreign jurisdiction. All I say, Mr. Speaker, is that from time to time this government, as well as other governments in Canada and around the world, initiate legislation which we think is in the best interest of the people whom we serve. We will continue to perform that task and that role and that obligation and responsibility. I think we would be very remiss if we did not. There are various aspects of our health care system, for example, which, over the last number of years before the present legislation was in place, led to some tragic circumstances in our health care system. We could not sit idly by and watch these tragedies occur in the system that we were responsible for under the constitution.

So whilst we appreciate and respect the right of the ILO or any other organization in the world to pass its opinion upon various laws in Newfoundland, we are not necessarily going to abide by their opinion. We will do what we think is in the best interest of all the people in Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, the Premier has the same respect for international law as he has for his Conflict of Interest Guidelines. I would like to refer the Premier to sections of the Human Rights Commission. I would like to ask the Premier whether, in light of Section 3 of the Newfoundland Human Rights Code, which says 'That the prohibitions contained herein apply to and bind Her Majesty in right of the Province in every agency of Her Majesty in right of the Province, in light of the fact that the Chairman is paid by Cabinet, the salary is fixed by Cabinet, and in light of the fact that the Chairman has responsibilities under Section 16 of the Human Rights Code to make recommendations to Cabinet as to when an enquiry is necessary, an enquiry which could apply to a government agency, in light of this I would like to ask whether the Premier considers that the Human Rights Commissioner, who is supposed to be a watchdog over government as well as over other bodies in this Province in protecting human rights, can that Chairperson do his or her job if there is a relationship with a member of the Cabinet of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
It is interesting to note now that in the last two days the Leader of

the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has left the factory freezer trawler issue and is trying to camouflage now other questions so that the Liberal Party will not be condemned forever in the history of Newfoundland as being about the only organization that supported factory freezer trawlers being introduced in Newfoundland. I note now that the Leader of the Opposition is taking a new tack in his questions to try and cover up the embarrassment that they must feel for supporting factory freezer trawlers coming into Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I will take the hon. Leader of the Opposition's question under advisement, consider the ideas that he has put forward and get back to him later on.

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

MR. BARRY:  
This is becoming ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. The current Chairperson of the Human Rights Commission, by the way, I want to make clear I have a lot of respect for as a lawyer and as a person. She is a fine lawyer, a fine person, and I want to underline that. What we are talking about here, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of principle.

I would like to ask the Premier has he determined whether the salary or per diems, whichever, paid to the present Chairperson of the Human Rights Commission, goes into the law firm of which she is a member and of which the Government House Leader, Deputy Premier, President of the Executive Council (Mr. Marshall), is also a member? Does this money go into the minister's law firm?

Has the Premier determined whether the minister shares in that revenue?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I have not got a clue, Mr. Speaker. I have not a clue in the world. I honestly do not know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I have not got a clue but I will check it out for the Leader of the Opposition. I do not go snooping around on these things as Premier of the Province, Mr. Speaker. It seems to be a lot more important for the Leader of the Opposition than to talk about the fishery and the forestry and the agriculture and the economy of this Province. We have not heard a question from the Leader of the Opposition on unemployment. You know why, Mr. Speaker? Because our unemployment rate has been going down. Our youth unemployment is down 7 per cent. Some other unemployment numbers are down 4 per cent and 5 per cent, the largest decrease of any province of Canada. But, of course, the Leader of the Opposition just wants to try to suggest innuendo and all the rest of it.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The Premier may have already answered this question but when I got up this morning I was thinking -

MR. PECKFORD:

Is this a supplementary?

MR. BARRY:

Yes. Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the Premier confirm whether, as I think he already has - we have all seen the little statue of the three monkeys, you know, 'Hear no evil,' 'See no evil,' 'Speak no evil.' Now I think that the Premier has confirmed that he is the one who says, "I see no evil." I wonder would he confirm, in that troika of monkeys, is the the 'See no evil,' Mr. Speaker? The Premier is not going to answer that question, I see.

We have: Answer one, I will take it under advisement; Answer two, I do not have a clue; Answer three, silence. Now would the Premier indicate, Mr. Speaker, whether the Government House Leader specifically excluded himself in writing from the decision to appoint the current Chairperson of the Human Rights Commission? Would the Premier indicate who referred the current Chairperson' name to the Premier and Cabinet for appointment?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, how foolish! How silly! How foolish the Leader of the Opposition is becoming, I wonder! Leo Neary!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, no more interested in the affairs of this Province, no more interested in the fishery, no more interested in the economy of this Province. All he can get up and do is to try to split hairs

and raise technicalities about this one or that one and to try to smear somebody's character. Obviously the recommendation for the position was recommended by the Minister of Justice, the Attorney General (Ms. Verge). As I have indicated to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), yesterday and many other days, in every case where there was any chance of a conflict of interest the President of Council, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), has excluded himself.

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Speaker, this whole matter of conflict of interest is very, very serious, so the Premier should not attempt to slough it off by suggesting that it is an attempt to smear the hon. the House Leader. It is a matter of whether the conflict of interest rules, drafted in the main by the hon. the Government House Leader, are being followed. That is the important thing. That is the essence. Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is to what extent could the Premier tolerate the involvement and the participation of other Cabinet members in outside activities to the extent that he tolerates the hon. the Government House Leader, the President of the Council, the Deputy Premier? To what extent could he tolerate this? Could it be four or five Cabinet ministers in view of the fact that they would have to absent themselves? Because in terms of the number of companies that the Government House Leader is involved in, I am

sure if he were in school terms he could be accused of truancy. So, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering to what extent the Premier would be happy, would be contented, to tolerate the involvement of other Cabinet ministers, or are these rules just being made for window dressing, simply for cosmetic purposes?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I have answered that question in other ways over the last number of days and I do not intend to engage in it any further. I have answered the question. It is not the same as being involved in a company and the hon. member knows that. It is not the same as being involved in a company. All I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, is that there is no conflict of interest, I have found no conflict of interest. The President of Council on every occasion, and every other minister when something comes before Cabinet with which they might have even the remotest involvement - and in the case of the President of Council many times it is very remote involvement; some junior solicitor in his firm doing some work for a company - the President of Council has excluded himself from any decision so that no conflict of interest actually existed. That is the truth of the matter, and it happens for all ministers.

MR. LUSH:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier, a very serious question. Will the Premier indicate to the House whether his Cabinet could operate effectively and efficiently in the way that a Cabinet should operate in the Western world, without influence, without coercion, without persuasion on decision-making, if he had in Cabinet another six or seven Cabinet ministers involved in outside activities, in company activities in the way the present Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is a very hypothetical question and one, therefore, that is out of order here in question period.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought I would put a question here based on what has been asked and what the Premier so far has refused to answer. He suggested a lot of hypothetical questions are being put. But let me ask the Premier to express an opinion: If we have two law firms equal in all abilities, equal in every way, one has no direct government connection-

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! That seems to be developing into a very hypothetical question.

MR. KELLAND:

Well if you would let me finish, Mr. Speaker, you might be able to decide on that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. KELLAND:

I would ask the Premier to comment on this: If one firm has no government connections and the other has a senior partner who is a minister of the government, does he believe that progress and the rate of development for both firms will be equal at the end, say, of ten or fifteen years?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Exactly, Mr. Speaker. A fairy tale. I am not going to make comments upon it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier called that a fairy tale. Is that why he jumped to his feet so quickly to make that statement? Does the Premier, then, believe that the people of this Province would believe that progress for both these firms, hypothetical though they might be, would be at an equal rate?

MR. SPEAKER:

Again, that is a hypothetical question.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, a ridiculous, hypothetical question. Here is the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) all waiting for questions from the other side, and all they are trying to do is waste question period primarily because they do not have any questions on all the policies that government has because they have no criticism of it. All they want to do is camouflage their bumbling over the factory freezer trawlers. That is what they are trying to do. Trying to camouflage.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. I noticed when he talked about the employment figures he never mentioned Western Newfoundland and Labrador, where they jumped by 3 percentage points.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Have you got a question?

MR. FUREY:

On October 23, the hon. the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) said in this House, 'My practice has been to go to the Clerk of the Council and I would say, 'Record the fact that I am out, 'and I would walk out of that place.' Is this not a self admission by the hon. House Leader that he has broken Guideline 14?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It has been answered a hundred times, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, Guideline 14 says, 'The minister shall notify the Premier in writing.' In that same answer on October 23, the hon. the House Leader said, 'I would completely absent myself.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

Would the hon. member, please, pose his question? This is a supplementary.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, will the Premier reply? The hon. House Leader said, 'I absent myself completely and nobody would even know.' Well, if nobody even knew, how would Guideline 14 be upheld?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that has been answered. In every case the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) informed me and informed

the Clerk of the Council and other people of any involvements that he might have had and, therefore, have absented himself and, therefore, there was no conflict of interest.

MR. FUREY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Would the Premier table where the hon. the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has informed him in writing?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I have answered the question a hundred times in the last few days.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, all that we have heard today in answers is, "I have already answered that, I have already answered that. I wonder if the Premier would answer this. The Premier has already admitted that the Government House Leader does not follow Guideline 14, as previously mentioned by my friend, of the Conflict of Interest Guidelines. The Government House Leader has admitted he does not follow Guideline 14 of the Conflict of Interest Guidelines. Therefore, the Conflict of Interest Guidelines have been broken.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member please pose

his question? The hon. member is beginning to make a speech.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier can talk about factory freezer trawlers and everything else when it comes to answering a question about the Conflict of Interest Guidelines. I had a very short preamble, which I felt I was allowed, and now I will get on to the question.

My question to the Premier is what does the Premier plan to do about this? It is obvious that he has gone along with the breaking of Guideline 14, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has broken it, so what does he plan to do about it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there has been no conflict of interest.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, the answer does not relate to my question. I am not asking if there is a conflict of interest. I am asking what he is going to do about an obvious and admitted breaking of the Guidelines? What are these Guidelines worth? The Premier did them up, the Government House Leader brought them in, and there has been and now an obvious breaking of one of those Guidelines. Obviously the Premier is not serious about Guideline

14. Is there any section of this that he is serious about or is it not worth the paper it is written on?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there has been no conflict of interest in this administration since I became leader. We have made sure of that. I would stake our reputation as an honest administration against any jurisdiction in North America.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon member for Gander on a final supplementary.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about specific examples of conflict of interest, I am talking about the actual breaking of the Premier's own Guidelines. Now what are we to do with this? Are we to assume that other ministers can break that Guideline at will without any retribution from the Premier at all? Is everybody free to break those Conflict of Interest Guidelines with the Premier's blessing?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is a repeat of the same question, Mr. Speaker. There has been no conflict of interest in this government.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Placentia on a point of order.

MR. PATTERSON:

I have listened this past weeks to allegations made against the hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

MR. FLIGHT:

They are all true.

MR. PATTERSON:

They are not all true. If they are true I would challenge you to go outside this House and make a statement. Go out there and do it and see how quick you would be whisked into court. You are cowards. You are hiding behind the immunity of the House. Go outside, smear artists.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

That is a good point that the member for Placentia raises, but the wrong interpretation of what is happening. If the member would identify what he would like me to say outside this House that was said inside, I will be glad to do it, and I am sure all members on this side will be happy to do the same thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

If the member would state what he would like me to say outside, I will be happy to say it.



MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

To that point of order, there is difference of opinion between two hon. members. There is no point of order.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:  
My question is also the Premier. Guideline 14 states, Mr. Speaker, "A Minister shall notify the Premier in writing of any matter in respect of which he has disqualified himself from acting." My question is: Did the Premier receive specific and actual notification of the Government House Leader's (Mr. Marshall) abstention in the matter of Fairview Investments? A very simple question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no evidence, not one shred of evidence, that there has been any conflict of interest involving the President of the Council, the member for St. John's East, absolutely not. In every case where a potential conflict of interest arose the member informed me and absented himself from any decision on any matter that came before Cabinet in which he might have been involved, every case.

MR. EFFORD:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A supplementary, the hon. the

member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:  
Very simply, again, to the Premier: Did you receive specific and actual notification of the Government House Leader's abstention in the matter of Universal Helicopters?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
In every single case, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:  
It is very simple not to answer a question. The third question I again ask the Premier: Did he receive specific and actual notification of the Government House Leader's abstention in the matter of Petro-Canada?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, in every single case.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:  
Number four, Mr. Speaker. Did he receive specific and actual notification of the Government House Leader's abstention in the matter of the Bell Island ferry?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I already answered, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the  
Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, earlier today -

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Since all these questions are  
originating from one source,  
namely, Mr. Rex Murphy, why do we  
not, by leave, allow him into the  
House to ask them himself?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of  
order, he is going to be in the  
House after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the  
member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I took care of the  
question asked by my friend here.  
I saw that Mr. Murphy did not get  
into the House of Assembly in  
spite of the efforts by the Leader  
of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, there is no point of  
order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the  
Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to ask the Premier,

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

MR. BARRY:

They will try anything to throw us  
off the track, Mr. Speaker. The  
Premier and the Acting Government  
House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer)  
indicated earlier this morning, as  
is the case, that when our rules  
are silent, Mr. Speaker, the  
federal rules apply, we go back to  
the rules and practices of the  
House of Parliament.

MR. SIMMS:

Our own first.

MR. BARRY:

Our own first, yes, but I said  
where they are silent. I would  
like to ask the Premier does the  
same apply in this Province with  
respect to conflict of interest  
rules? Do we have the same  
standards, as high a standard as  
the Federal Parliament, or does  
the Premier intend to enforce  
lower standards in this House?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is a very subjective kind of thing. One would have to go and do a full assessment not only upon the federal guidelines but upon other guidelines in other provinces, so it is an extremely subjective thing to try to determine. I think that we have demonstrated to the Newfoundland people since 1979 that we run an honest, and an efficient administration, that we are very, very proud of that, and we will continue to operate that kind of an administration as long as we are here forming the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. We do not have to take a back seat to anybody in Canada or anywhere else in the world.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear the Premier say that. The Premier said the same thing when he introduced the conflict of interest guidelines, that the objective was to set the highest standards of ethical conduct in the administration of government in this Province. Now I would like to ask the Premier, I would like to issue this challenge to the Premier: Will he agree that the standards that he applies in this Province will be as high as the standards that are applied in the House of Commons in Ottawa?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, we are going to apply the standards as we have announced them, as they are in the

guidelines and we are going to continue to abide by them and we will ensure that there will be no conflict of interest with people who serve in the Cabinet of Newfoundland.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask is the Premier saying to us that he will apply a lower standard than the House of Parliament would apply or the Prime Minister of Canada would apply to members of his Cabinet? Will the Premier commit to this House and to the people of this Province to see that the standards applied with respect to conflict of interest in this Province are as high here as they are anywhere in Canada?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I think that is already true and will continue to be true.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

#### Orders of the Day

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

Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
Order, please!

Shall the resolution carry?

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Yesterday, towards the end of the day, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) made some comments in the House. He particularly remarked on the fact that I was not in the House at the time and he was quite accurate in that. He remarked on the fact that this is a Supplementary Supply Bill and I should have been present in the House and I agree with that, I should have been present in the House. However, I was not. I was not very far away. I guess if I have an excuse to offer it was that I really did not expect to get any sensible questions from the Opposition on the bill because we have been at this now for two weeks or something and, to date, there have not been any sensible questions or comments. So I was somewhat taken aback when the hon. the member did ask a few. I do apologize to the House for being outside. I was not very far away. If I recall correctly, I did go out to make a phone call or two and I had a cup of coffee at the same time.

However, I have a record of what the hon. member asked so I just want to answer the questions. The first question he asked had to do, if I remember correctly, with the borrowing last year. He wanted an

update on that. I can give the Committee an update on it. On October 15, 1984 we borrowed \$100 million Canadian in the Canadian domestic market at an interest rate of 13.5 per cent. Ten days later, October 25, 1984 we borrowed \$7 billion Japanese yen, equivalent to \$37.5 million Canadian dollars, at an interest rate of 8.1 per cent. On March 7 of this year, but of course this would be in the last fiscal year, we borrowed in Europe \$75 million American dollars, Euro - U.S. dollars, equivalent to \$99.7 million Canadian at an interest rate of eleven and three-eighths per cent.

In addition to those borrowings in the capital markets, we also borrowed \$47.1 million from the CPP, Canadian Pension Fund, as all provinces are permitted to do in proportion to the contributions into the fund from that particular Province. That is over a twenty-year term for those borrowings and the rate varies. The rates varied from 12.08 per cent up to 14.06 per cent.

The hon. member also asked, in the Supply Bill, how much was current and how much was capital. The total amount was just over \$56 million, \$56,361,600. Of that amount, capital was \$37,229,000 and current was \$19,132,600. That was the breakdown - a bit more capital than current.

The other main question that the hon. member asked, and he was incorrect here actually. He said that in the Department of Development there were Special Warrants to the total of \$3.4 million. The hon. member said that I did account for \$2.5 million, which was capital funding for the Labrador Development

Corporation and \$90,000 which was to meet the obligations of one of our agreements with the federal government. That \$90,000 is not correct. It is \$900,000. Now I have not had a chance to go back and read the previous Hansard.

MR. SIMMONS:

According to Hansard you said \$90,000.

DR. COLLINS:

All right. Actually it was \$900,000. If the hon. member wants a breakdown of that \$900,000.

MR. SIMMONS:

(Inaudible).

DR. COLLINS:

All right. So those were, I think, the three questions that were asked.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I thank the hon. minister for his responses.

I was specifically asking, in relation to the borrowing activity, whether he thought it might be helpful to the Committee to have in effect an updated version of the table that appears as Statement 1 in his estimates for the year. He will be aware that in a month or so the House will have it anyway, because when the Public Accounts are tabled by the Auditor General this is one of the tables that he will update. He will give us a final statement of borrowing requirements and sources of funds. So I would expect that now it being the

middle of November, that that table has already been generated by his department in collaboration with the Auditor General's Office.

I was wondering is it possible to have the statement in Committee so that we could see an updated picture? He is aware of the table now I am making reference to.

DR. COLLINS:

Statement 1?

MR. SIMMONS:

Statement 1, yes. I am just asking in effect if the borrowings that he just informed the Committee of, if these could be incorporated so that we would have a final summary of borrowing requirements in respect of that fiscal year? That was the brunt of my first question. Otherwise I thank him for his responses.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, there is still a couple of points that should be made in Committee. I am very pleased that this debate is able to be fairly wide-ranging. I am sorry to see that the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) is not in his seat, although I imagine he is in earshot, so perhaps I could make a few comments about Gander and the International Airport. I did want to discuss that. I am also sorry that the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is not in his seat because I did want to discuss Come By Chance. We could have had a very good debate because the hon. member is a gentleman, not like the member who sits next to him

who has the manners of a pig. However, I will let that go.

MR. FLIGHT:

He should retract that.

MR. J. CARTER:

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I retract that. He has not got the manners of a pig.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is brilliant John! You have been reading Duplessis, have you not?

MR. J. CARTER:

Anyway I would like to discuss the Gander situation seriously, Mr. Chairman. I think it is only fair that Gander should share the international flights with St. John's. I am quoting not my own sources.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

On a point of order, the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, in keeping with your well known fairness in this instance, I ask my colleagues here to keep quiet. I am trying with bated breath to hear every last word that my dear friend from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is saying. I always sit in rapt attention when he speaks because what he says is absolutely unique. I would ask you to prevail on these people to just shut up for a while until hear what this profound mind has to say, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for the interruption because the train of thought is at its usual level and I want to hear every last word.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I will ask all members to be silent while the hon. member for St. John's North is speaking in this debate.

MR. J. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As I was saying earlier I think it is only fair that Gander should share its international flight status with St. John's. Bearing in mind, that something like 80 per cent of the passengers on those international flights from Gander originate in St. John's or in the St. John's area. I am not suggesting that Gander should give up its international status for one moment. I think Gander has a very bright future. But I do not think it is a service to Gander to try and encourage feather-bedding, which is what the hon. gentleman and his apologists are trying to do.

MR. SIMMONS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. J. CARTER:

I agree it is a shame. It is a great shame to try and encourage feather-bedding.

MR. SIMMONS:

Move it! Move it!

MR. J. CARTER:

The real future for Gander I think is a 'Crossroads of the World' now that aircraft are becoming more and more long range, especially in regards to freighters.

MR. FLIGHT:

What about the construction of concrete platforms? Does Gander qualify for that.

MR. J. CARTER:

I will get to that, Mr. Chairman,

but it makes good sense for Gander to be a refueling centre because more and more of the world's goods are being shipped by air because of high interest rates businesses do not want to have high inventories and, therefore, it is easier to keep a low inventory if you can get resupplied quickly. Of course anything can be shipped anywhere in the world within forty-eight hours by air. So I think Gander certainly has a bright future as a crossroads of the world in that regard and also, of course, possibly the idea of a free port might be worthwhile resurrecting. With the offshore development, Gander will certainly play a large role. There is no question about that.

The weather is marginally better in Gander and helicopters might very well wish to have a second string to their bow and be able to -

AN HON. MEMBER:

The weather is much better.

MR. J. CARTER:

It is probably a little bit better, certainly. It is inland and has an inland climate as opposed to a coastal climate and helicopters might very well like to operate out of Gander as well.

MR. BAKER:

Would the member permit a question?

MR. J. CARTER:

Yes, certainly.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

I was just wondering if the attitude represents government policy or do you know if it is a general attitude amongst members

opposite?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Well, it makes such good sense. It is such a common sense approach that I would think that most sensible administrations would look upon it charitably. I agree that there are some bugs to be ironed out of it but still as a general approach I think it is worth stating.

I think that the feather-bedding aspect and the dog in the manager attitude of trying to keep all the international flights in Gander is wrong-headed and it just does not make good sense. It is retrogressive. The member wishes to turn back the clock.

I understand that cars are allowed to drive through Gander, perhaps he would rather see horses and buggies and bring back the coaching days. That would certainly increase the employment. We could have stables in Gander and have changes of horses there. But this is not realistic and neither is the hon. gentleman's attitude.

So without taking any more time of the House I would be very interested in having a realistic debate with the hon. gentleman, the member for Gander (Mr. Baker). I will take my seat and let him hold the fort if he wishes.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN

The hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Chairman, Bill 26 and we have already heard that you can have far ranging and wide reaching debate. I think it just reached some sort of a low with the hon. member as he just finished in his few words. But anyhow I will let my colleague from Gander answer him a little later on.

I was listening to the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) when he stood up yesterday and talked about the level of debate. I have a copy of Hansard here this morning and I wondered if he had said anything which rose the level. He talked about my colleague from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) and he admonished him for talking about the offshore agreement and how everything he said was totally untrue, and totally incorrect, and totally inaccurate, and totally spurious, and totally foolish, and totally silly and every other adjective you can put to it. We have really reached a high level of debate.

We are debating Bill 26. In this debate we have talked about relationships between members opposite and the government with Ottawa, including the previous federal government. In the debate the finance minister said yesterday when the Mulroney Government went into Ottawa there was a fresh breeze to federal/provincial relationships as though it were incredible. "The gloom and the suspicion and the cynicism was so changed to one of assistance and help and accommodation and understanding that it was absolutely and totally incredible."

When I see that I somehow feel that the cynicism and gloom that

that hon. minister refers to was on the side of members opposite when the previous government was in Ottawa. I submit to you now, Mr. Chairman, that maybe this cynicism and gloom is coming from their friends in Ottawa.

We have just seen a pretty classic example of this great relationship which they have developed with Ottawa over the last thirteen or fourteen months, since the Mulroney government has been in Ottawa. We have just seen an example where the Government of Newfoundland was totally ignored on their requests to have factory freezer trawlers banned from operations for Northern cod and off the Grand Banks of Newfoundland. If we are to believe what the hon. Premier and members opposite have told us, we must believe that they did put on a spirited fight with their colleagues in Ottawa. They claim that they were outmanoeuvred, and the most powerful lobby ever known to mankind was put up against them.

To me it seems a little odd, if this sort of a lobby was mounted by business and government, the federal MPs, and the Maritimes, that we here were outmanoeuvred. First of all, I guess, we were going with pop guns again because our MPS, if you remember, were notably silent on factory freezer trawlers when this lobby was undertaken by the bad people from the Maritimes, as members opposite refer to them - the other provincial government. When this lobby was undertaken the one thing that we noticed, and noticed for sure, that everybody was out. The figure that was quoted to me by one of the Tory MPs in Ottawa was there were twenty-one against four. I corrected him, and I told



him that the three Liberal MPs who were there has been out and spoken very strongly against factory freezer trawlers right at the inset when National Sea made the request. But the four MPs from Newfoundland were very silent so obviously the support that the hon. minister was talking about, this fresh breeze of federal/provincial relations, became a little bit becalmed when it came to factory freezer trawlers and even died out as a matter of fact.

I would like to submit to this hon. House, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier has tried to perpetrate a sham and a charade on the people of Newfoundland by trying to say that we in the Liberal Opposition were for factory freezer trawlers when when the opposite is well known by the people of Newfoundland.

Who were the people that were out this Summer talking to the inshore fishermen? It was the Liberal Caucus. We found out where there were problems. We went out and talked to the people that were really involved, the people who knew. The inshore fishermen in Newfoundland were the ones who knew. And immediately, upon National Sea making a request to the federal government, I am sure the people of Newfoundland are aware that immediately after this request was made, it was the Liberal Opposition who put out a release condemning National Sea and supporting the banning of factory freezer trawlers. People are aware of this. It is documented.

I myself, in my own district, issued a press release on September 6 which said that we were opposed from day one.

Immediately after National Sea came out, we made a statement which said that we were opposed to factory freezer trawlers. The hon. Premier had to wait and study it, the same as he had to wait and study the budget when it came down in May. Every other Premier in Atlantic Canada responded immediately but our Premier had to wait for six weeks before he made a statement on it, to find out that it was going to take \$200 million out of Newfoundland on an annual basis. Now, that to me seems to be an odd sort of deal. He had to do the same thing with factory freezer trawlers.

I have a feeling, and a lot of people in Newfoundland have this same feeling, that the Premier was told, "listen, you are not going to win this one. Factory freezer trawlers are a fait accompli and you might as well not oppose it. If you want to perpetrate a sham on the people of Newfoundland, you get out and start your fight in the House of Assembly in Newfoundland," which he did. When he brought a motion here for unanimous support against factory freezer trawlers. We on this side, through our leader, said "we support you but we do not want a paper war anymore. We do not want to be involved in a paper tiger. We want a real tiger! If you want our support, add this amendment." The Premier agreed in principle across the House to the amendment we put in, Mr. Chairman. Our amendment said "Let us go to Ottawa. Send a Select Committee of this House to Ottawa and sit down in front of the Prime Minister and say here is the story. We are opposed to factory freezer trawlers."

I heard the hon. member talk about a free trip. Now free trips are

something that, on this side, we are not at all familiar with. We said that we would pay our own way to Ottawa. As a matter of fact, we went one step further. We sent a telex to Mr. Nielsen and asked could he meet us. We would have went. The hon. minister there is talking about free trips. I would not talk too loud about free trips. Why does he not answer the questions on the Order Paper about your free trips and where you are spending your money? We have no worries about it. We were prepared to pay our own way to Ottawa. We had no problem about it at all. We were quite happy to go and then afterwards, when the Premier turned down our motion, refused our motion, we took the initiative and we sent a telex to Mr. Nielsen, the acting Minister of Fisheries, and asked him could we come and present our case? We got a telex back yesterday saying that the telex was now there and Mr. Nielsen was aware of our request and would certainly be looking into it some time.

When we got the telex, it was the same as what happened here in the House concerning factory freezer trawlers and what happened outside the House concerning factory freezer trawlers. The whole deal was cooked up and when the announcement was made here a week ago this Friday - a black Friday for Newfoundland - the Premier knew about it. He knew about it. He said his staff was up all night preparing the statement that he had to come back with.

I have the feeling that he knew about it ten days previous to that when he brought this motion in to send some more paper to Ottawa saying we were against it. The Premier did not have to bring anything into the House to say we,

in Newfoundland, were against it. Newfoundlanders were against factory freezer trawlers. He knew everybody in Newfoundland was against factory freezer trawlers.

He had the development associations in Newfoundland. He had the municipalities. He had the members of this side of the House. He had the members over there. Everybody was against factory freezer trawlers. Why bring it into the House unless he was going to do something about it? He did not have to send a telex saying that we were against factory freezer trawlers. All he had to do was pick up the paper. Everybody knew what was wrong with factory freezer trawlers.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Why did you not stand up and be counted?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

We stood up to be counted. The people of Newfoundland are going to count on us. They know where we are and they knew that we were not going to sit back and let this sham that was being staged here in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time is up.

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I guess if you cannot beat them, you may as well join them. The hon. member is continuing what the hon. members opposite have been doing for the last two weeks. They are talking on every other subject except the bill. I suppose I may as well join them and do the same thing.

About the factory freezer trawler thing, the hon. member is giving the wrong impression. It is a totally wrong impression. I do not know if he knows he is giving the wrong impression, but he is giving the totally wrong impression. The impression he is giving is that National Sea made an application to the federal government some time in late September or early October, whenever it was and they made a very strong bid to the federal government. The Newfoundland Government made a very weak response to it and therefore, the federal government gave the license to National Sea. That is so naive. I mean it is incredibly naive.

National Sea has been working on this thing for at least the last six months and I suspect for the last year. You only have to read the Canadian newspapers, read the editorials, the letters, the columns in the Canadian newspapers and you can see there has been a whole orientation for factory freezer trawlers for months. Speak to any number of people in Ottawa, or indeed in the provincial capitals, and for months and months and months it was planted in their mind that factory freezer trawlers are sensible and they should be brought into Canada and Newfoundland is being outmoded in its thinking, it is being greedy and it is being a dog in the

manager. This has been a campaign going on for months and months and months and if we were outmanoeuvred, it was because there was a clandestine campaign going on for months and months and months. With the resources available to us, with the forces we can mount which are fairly small - there were what is it? Two per cent of the Canadian population. What is our representation in the House of Commons? I forget what it is now but anywhere seven out of whatever it is, a very small number - we put together a hard, hard campaign, but we could not hope to overcome what was a hidden, clandestine campaign going on for months and months and months, planting wrong information, misinterpreted information, playing on emotions, playing on misconceptions and all that sort of thing, in the minds of many people throughout Canada, in editorial minds, in reporters minds, in columnists minds, in provincial politicians minds, federal politicians minds, in the federal bureaucracy itself and in the federal government itself. I mean for the hon. member to think that all National Sea had to do was write a letter, "Please let me have a factory freezer trawler," and then we lay down and played dead, I mean that is so far from the truth it is incredible.

I suspect that the hon. member has not meant to give that impression, but that is the impression that he is leaving. The impression that we were out manoeuvred because of laxity or because of non-caring is so far from the truth it is ludicrous.

Now about this trip business. I think that the hon. members opposite should have made a trip.

I believe that. I think they should have made a trip, but not to Ottawa. They should have made a trip to Halifax. Why in Halifax? I will tell you why in Halifax. At the time there was a Liberal convention going on in Halifax, a so-called reform convention, a very dull affair. There was the Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada (Mr. Turner) in Halifax. The Liberal Party of Canada and the Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada hardly opened his peeper on the factory freezer trawler thing. The Liberal Opposition should have gotten in touch with the hundreds of their colleagues in Halifax who gave no support whatsoever, the Liberal Party officially, unofficially, anyway you want to call it, except for the words of our friends opposite. They should have made a trip, yes, they should have made it to Halifax, and this is before the decision was announced by the federal government, they should have persuaded their leader, "Look, come and make a strong case on behalf of the Newfoundland people and if you do not care about the Newfoundland people, at least make a strong case on behalf of your colleagues in the Liberal Party of Newfoundland." They did not do that. They mounted no campaign whatever to get the official Opposition party in Canada to make some assessment of the situation and come down on the basis of what they considered the facts to be. I agree with the hon. the member opposite, I think it was an absolutely shameful thing for the Liberal Party to side step this whole issue and not come out one way or the other and support the people of this Province.

I remember there was one comment, and I have just forgotten the

substance of the comment now, but it was totally off the issue. It was something like, "Mr. Nielsen should not make a decision. He does not know anything about the fishery," that sort of foolish comment that came out of Mr. Turner. Whereas, in actual fact, who was to make the decision? Mr. Nielsen is the acting Minister of Fisheries. So for him to say that he should not make the decision, it was so silly it was hardly worth commenting on.

As far as I recall that is the only time the Liberal Party in Canada officially opened its mouth on this whole issue. I think it was an absolute disgrace and I think that our friends opposite let down this Province by not making a trip. The trip should not have been to Ottawa, which was only a little political gambit from their point of view. The meaningful trip they should have made would have been to Halifax to try to persuade -

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

I would ask the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) to please get out of the line of sight between myself and the hon. the Minister of Finance. I would love to look at him while he is talking.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, you have ruled on that but I do have to say this, that I have no hesitation about being the shadow of the hon. the Minister for Forest Resources and Lands. If there is any man I would like to be in the shadow of it is the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

Anyway, just to get back to the point, the hon. members opposite clearly, if they had it in mind to support this issue to the maximum degree possible, they would have supported the motion put forward that there be a unanimous resolution go forth from this House, which we have done many, many times over the years and with very good effects. But they did not do that. They wanted to make a little bit of political hay out of it and go up there to Ottawa knowing that the federal government - you know they are humans after all - a P.C. Government would not want to be put into an awkward position by having an Opposition Party coming up to visit with them on a subject like this.

What should have been done should have been done in the House of Commons up there. The Liberal Party in the House of Commons up there should have tackled the federal government on, 'Why are you doing this thing which is against the best interests of the Newfoundland people? Why are you doing that?' That should have come from the Liberal Opposition in the House of Commons where it would have gotten a lot of coverage. They should have been encouraged to do it by the Liberal members opposite and they did not do it. They let down the side, the Liberal members opposite, when they did not get their colleagues

in the House of Commons to take a strong stand on this factory freezer trawler issue.

I am sure that the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) knows how effective the Opposition can be in the House of Commons in Question Period and in speeches and so on and so forth. They catch the National press and so on. There would have been a new focus put on this whole controversy if the Liberal Party in Ottawa, encouraged by the Liberal Party in Newfoundland, had done what it was supposed to do and helped to defend the rights of the people of this Province. But it did not happen and I think it is a disgraceful thing that it did not happen and I think that -

MR. W. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I do not think the minister should be allowed to extend the big lie theory that has been used on that side of the House with respect to our position on the factory freezer trawlers. The hon. minister knows full well, as we all know, that the Liberal Opposition in the House of Commons, the Newfoundland members, in the Opposition in the House of Commons did stand in their place on many occasions in opposition to factory freezer trawlers being licensed to fish off our shores. He must know that. If he does not, Mr. Chairman, then I think he has the responsibility to find out. To get up in the House and allow to go on public record that kind of a statement, Mr. Chairman, is being totally irresponsible.

Again, it is just extending the big lie theory that is being practiced by members on that side concerning our position on National Sea's application.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that the hon. member, in rising on a point of order - it is not a point of order clearly - but I mean he rises in his place and he gets into debate. I do not think he should be allowed to do that and, therefore, I have to counter what he is doing.

I made the point that the official Opposition in the House of Commons, through their leader, Mr. Turner - Mr. Tobin is not the leader, perhaps the hon. member does not know this - the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons is Mr. Turner and he is the main carrier of the policy position of the Liberal Opposition. It is not Mr. Tobin, it is not Mr. Baker or whoever, it is Mr. Turner. That is what I am saying. The hon. members opposite did not prevail upon Mr. Turner, the official stater of policy for the federal Liberal Party, they did not prevail on him to take a stand in the House of Commons to defend the rights of his people.

The other points that the hon. member made -

MR. FUREY:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS:

Is this a point of privilege?

MR. FUREY:

A point of order.

DR. COLLINS:

I am responding to the point of order.

The other point that the hon. member brought up in his point of order was that it is well known because something is said where we stand. We were through all of that on the offshore question. The Liberal Opposition in this House any number of times said, "oh, we are in favour of Newfoundland getting full ownership offshore." But they never did anything about it. They supported the federal government who was trying to take it away from us. So they were trying to have it both ways. They were using empty words to give the impression that they were in favour of the stand of this government, but they were acting in consort with the federal government who is trying to take it away. Which speaks louder, actions or words? I say that actions do.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS:

Is this a point of order?

MR. BAKER:

No, your time is expired.

I would like to address a number of items brought up by the hon. minister. First of all, I would like to point out to him that I do want to speak specifically to the bill in the sense that I want to refer to an expenditure of money. Before I do that, I would like to put his mind at rest about the attitude of Liberals across the country with regards to the Newfoundland fishery.

It was the Liberals who eventually got the 200 mile limit that was so necessary for our fishery and that started, hopefully, the exclusion of a lot of the foreign fishing. It was the federal Liberals who agreed that factory freezer trawlers, and put it in an agreement, that the factory freezer trawlers would not fish the Northern cod stock and so on.

I can assure the minister that the Liberal Party nationally and locally have done our part and we intend to continue to look out and be very conscious of the Newfoundland fishery, as we have in the past, in contrast what we are finding now with the PC government that is in power in Ottawa. They are breaking agreements that were previously made that protected the Newfoundland fishery. Now we have to deal with that situation in the strongest manner possible. I think that a lot of the conversations that have gone on are kind of irrelevant because I think, Mr. Chairman, that is the crux of the matter.

I hope that straightens out some confusion in the minister's mind with regards to that particular position. The minister mentioned some confusion and he mentioned about the confusion of fact that was being spread across the

country and so on. I agree with the minister that it is really unfortunate that there has been a lot of false information spread, not only across this country, but across North America concerning Newfoundland and what is happening here.

I would like to point out to the minister that he is responsible for funding an organization that helps spread some of this false information. I would suggest to the minister, in relation to this bill, that funding not be given to this organization to spread false information as has been happening.

I would give the minister one example and refer him to Time magazine of October 7, 1985. In that particular magazine, Mr. Chairman, there was a special advertising section dealing with provinces of Canada. Each province was dealt with individually as to what they have to offer and what their main interests are and so on.

This was sponsored by APEC, the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council. In the Newfoundland section, Mr. Chairman, there was a picture and it was a beautiful picture. It was probably the Codroy Valley or somewhere like that. It is not a fishing area. It indicated that perhaps one of the major things in Newfoundland is a pastoral farming kind of setting that people could come and see.

It was not a fishing community. It was not people catching fish and so on. A great deal of information was provided there about our Province. They have named the Premier, the hon. A. Brian Peckford and the Minister

responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) and the Minister responsible for Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn) and the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett). No where in there do they mention the name of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), unfortunately. I am sure that he was very aware of this and the fact that his name is not mentioned. The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs name is not mentioned. No other ministers names were mentioned, so maybe this indicates where the power lies in the government.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, getting along to the misinformation - party standings in the House of Commons for Newfoundland ridings. This gets to the crux of the spreading of the misinformation, Mr. Chairman, Progressive Conservative - six; Liberal - two. Now, there are obvious mistakes. Number one, we do not have eight federal ridings, and number two, the wishful thinking that there were six Progressive Conservatives representing this Province in Ottawa is not true as well. It indicates a lack of knowledge.

The minister can smile at this and he can say, "Well, that is APEC, that is the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, that is Time Magazine. What do they know about Newfoundland? What more can you expect from those people? I took the trouble, Mr. Chairman, of phoning the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council and I pointed out to them the error of their ways because naturally I assume that this was an error by those Mainlanders up there. They do not know anything about Newfoundland. It is an error by these Mainlanders. I was assured that this was not very fair, that this

was the information that was passed along to them by that great institution, Newfoundland Information Services. This information came from Newfoundland Information Services, funded by the minister, a group that the minister is responsible for and the minister is asking for supplementary estimates to fund.

That seemed to be a bit strange. I got to thinking about Newfoundland Information Services and the fact that if in fact it were a Newfoundland information service that I would be a bit worried about it. But I realize, Mr. Chairman, that this really is a propaganda machine that has been developed by members opposite and controlled by members opposite and used by members opposite to get their message out to the newspapers and radio stations in the Province of Newfoundland, to get their press releases out, to get their propaganda out in the Province and, in this way, to attempt to control the press of the Province. As members opposite know, when you have a machine in a news outlet that continually churns out information day after day and many of our newspapers are under paid and under staffed, and when they are sitting there trying to decide what news to print, it is very easy to take half a dozen, 15, 20, 500 sheets from this little machine that is churning out this propaganda and stick it into their newspapers. Members opposite know that. It is a very good method of getting their one-sided message out to the people of Newfoundland. It is an attempt at brainwashing the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. So when you realize what specifically Newfoundland Information Services is then, I suppose, it is no surprise that this kind of



information is coming out.

One other oversight in this particular ad, it is only a one page thing, and I am not sure about the accuracy of a lot of the figures they put in there, because after noticing these two obvious mistakes, I did not even bother to check the figures. One other mistake is of great concern to me because of the district I represent.

There is a list of the principle urban centers in the Province and, to nobody's surprise, I suppose, Gander is not included as a major urban center in the Province. I do not know if this is an oversight or something that was deliberately done. I noticed they mentioned Port au Basques as a major urban center in the Province in this ad, but the population of Gander is much larger than the population of Port au Basques, as everybody realizes.

They have mentioned Grand Falls and again the population of Gander and the activity in Gander is far beyond the level of Grand Falls. The growth of Gander is far beyond the level of the growth of the town of Grand Falls. As much as I like the town of Grand Falls - I go there often. I have many relatives there, and I love Grand Falls. However, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see both communities, Gander and Grand Falls included. I would not dare suggest that they leave out Grand Falls. It is a major urban center of this Province, there is no doubt in my mind at all and an area where a lot of the wealth of this Province comes from. Corner Brook is mentioned here, where the wealth of this Province also comes from, thanks to the forests. I agree that these are major urban

centers. However, I think it was a gross oversight on the part of Newfoundland Information Services that the town of Gander, a very active, growing town was left out. It is the calibre of the kind of thing that you would expect coming from Newfoundland Information Services which is in reality a propaganda outlet for members opposite.

MR. SIMMS:

Did they say that (inaudible)?

MR. BAKER:

In the ad they simply say. "For more information, contact Newfoundland Information Services, Confederation Building, St. John's, Newfoundland AIC 5T7," and they give the phone number. However, I phoned APEC and they informed me that is where the information came from.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I will certainly look into that Gander question because I have a very warm feeling for Gander. I do not know if the hon. member knows this but I lived in Gander before he lived in Gander. I lived in Gander when they were just making the airport.

MR. BAKER:

So did I.

DR. COLLINS:

Well, I take that back. We both lived in Gander in early days so we have a bond of fellowship between us because we are both very much in favour of Gander. I will certainly try to get that changed.

Now, having said that about the hon. member opposite, I have to laugh at the rest of his remarks. His comments that the Liberal Party were protective of the Newfoundland Fishery is really hilarious. If anybody knows anything about how the Liberal Party, when they were in power, dealt with the Newfoundland Fishery, to look upon them, to portray them as guardians of the interests of the Newfoundland people and guardians of the fishery is absolutely ludicrous.

What are the facts? In the 1950s and early 1960s foreign nations came here with huge, big, vacuum cleaner-types of factory freezer trawlers, and the rest of it, and they just about ruined our fishery. Our poor old fishermen on the shore were on their knees begging and crying, and saying you are taking food out of my mouth, my grandmother's mouth, my children's mouths and they were being totally ignored. Now, while they were being totally ignored, Chile, of course, little, old, miserable Chile, down in the backwaters of South America, said, "I am not going to have all this, let us have a 200 mile limit." Little old Iceland sent out their trawlers to attack the British Navy.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Chile claimed only their Continental Shelf, not 200 miles.

DR. COLLINS:

Either the Continental Shelf or 200 miles, anyway it was a certain long distance offshore. Little old Iceland did the same thing. Our great Canadian government, in the clutches of the Liberal Party, sat back and let the Newfoundland people almost go into total destitution. Until what happened? Until the United States government, who has about .1 per cent of fishermen in the population, said, we are going to declare a 200 mile economic zone and within a week the Canadian government declared the same thing. They had to wait until Uncle Sam, who had as much interest in the fishery probably as Saskatchewan has, declared the zone. But, nevertheless, even they would not lie back and let that small proportion of the population suffer from the deprivations being carried out by foreign nations, whereas our Canadian Government, with the whole East Coast almost on its knees, lay back there until they were absolutely shamed into it. Now, those are the facts.

And for the hon. member to say that 'We, the Liberal Party, when we controlled the government were protective of the Newfoundland fishery' is laughable in the extreme. Then he says, 'Well, it was the Liberal Government which fought the factory freezer trawlers.' He forgot to mention that when they agreed - they could hardly do otherwise - to exclude factory freezer trawlers, they gave away large proportions of the cod fish stock on which this country, this Province of ours - it used to be a country one time - is very dependent. I forget the figure now, but I think something like 30,000 to 40,000 metric tons of our Northern cod stock are now going to other Canadian provinces.

MR. SIMMS:  
Forty point something tons.

DR. COLLINS:  
40,000 tons are now going to other  
Canadian provinces -

MR. BAKER:  
Will the hon. minister permit a  
question?

DR. COLLINS:  
I will in just a moment. Just let  
me make this point.

I think something like 15,000 or  
20,000 metric tons are going to  
foreign nations. So, I mean, this  
is the protection we were getting  
from the Liberal Administration in  
Ottawa. Sure they were shamed  
into - I mean, they could hardly  
do otherwise - excluding factory  
freezer trawlers, but, at the same  
time, they were dishing out the  
cods stocks, that our people were  
dependent on, hand over fist. So  
for the hon. member to portray the  
Liberal Party as protectors of the  
Newfoundland fishery is  
uproarious, if nothing else.

MR. BAKER:  
Is that it?

DR. COLLINS:  
You can have the floor now, I am  
finished.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BAKER:  
I simply have a question for the  
minister because I am really  
wondering about something he  
said. The period of time when the  
Northern cod stock was being given  
away and so on, is the minister  
confused here? Was this during

1979? Was this the fuss when the  
Minister of Fisheries was the hon.  
James McGrath? Is this what he is  
talking about?

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
He is trying to suck me in now, as  
the expression goes, because the  
hon. James McGrath was Minister of  
Fisheries for such a brief period  
of time that I do not think he can  
be held accountable for anything,  
certainly not to the extent that  
the Liberal Party can be, which  
was in power from, well, back in  
the '40s, I believe, except for  
very brief periods, a brief period  
during the Diefenbaker days, and a  
very brief period during the Clark  
days, for a very brief period,  
right back to the early '50s,  
anyway. If anyone was responsible  
for what happened to the fishery,  
to the detriment of the  
Newfoundland people, it must be  
laid at the door of the Liberal  
Party which was controlling the  
decisions during that total period  
of time.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Chairman, it will be  
interesting to read Hansard in  
about four or five years times, or  
maybe ten years time, if the hon.  
the Minister of Finance (Dr.  
Collins) is still in the House, to  
see how he can squirm out of the  
decision that was made recently by  
his federal friends in Ottawa to

give factory freezer trawler licences to National Sea. He is doing a very good job now of at least trying to again cloud the waters, and again he is adding a new dimension to the so-called big-lie theory. He talks about, for example, the government in Ottawa sitting back and waiting for the East Coast fishery to almost go down for the third time before taking any kind of action on the 200 mile limit, and he stated that the action taken by Canada was prompted by that which was taken by the United States at that time. I think the hon. minister knows differently from that.

He must realize that once the Americans, which is a world power, decided to declare a certain zone - I do not know whether it was 200 miles or not - then that certainly gave Canada the opening it needed to do likewise. I do not think Canada could have successfully declared and enforced a 200 mile limit on our Continental Shelf.

MR. SIMMS:  
Iceland did it.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Iceland could not enforce it and you will recall the cod war between Iceland and England. Iceland, in fact, did not have a 200 mile limit and still does not.

Mr. Chairman, it is pitiful, almost, to see the way they are squirming and trying to get out of the mistakes that were made trying to get out of the mistakes we are making and try to turn around public opinion that is obviously going against them.

The Minister of Finance yesterday I thought pulled a real beaut. He pulled a boner when he followed by

friend and colleague from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker). My friend made reference to Clause 54 in the Atlantic Accord and the fact that oil, if and when it flows from the oil wells on the Continental Shelf, will not be allowed to be brought into this Province for refining. Of course that is clearly stated, by the way, in Clause 54 of the Atlantic Accord. The minister must know that. If he does not he should.

Anyway, the minister rose in his place and proceeded to lecture my hon. friend. He said, and I am quoting from Hansard, "Mr. Chairman, we cannot let the hon. member make those statements. He is not the only who who has made such a statement, but if you allow something that is not correct to be said often enough, a proportion of the people will believe it. Even though something is totally untrue and totally incorrect and totally inaccurate and totally spurious and totally foolish and totally silly..." For the Minister of Finance, sitting on that side of the House, to make that kind of a statement, to call it hypocritical, Mr. Chairman, would be an understatement.

There is a government, Mr. Chairman, that is taking the whole factory freezer trawler issue and trying to twist it around to suit themselves. The minister's defense this morning of what happened, when he said that National Sea and the other twenty-one elected politicians in Eastern Canada, ganged up on poor little Newfoundland, and how well organized they were, and what a great and effective public relations campaign was mounted against Newfoundland, for the Minister of Finance to make that

kind of a statement to me is an admission that the government were completely at sea, did not have a clue as to how to go about blocking National Sea's application. Certainly introducing silly, political resolutions in the House of Assembly, after the decision had been made, is not the answer.

The minister made reference to the Liberal Convention that was held in Halifax a few days ago and he suggested that maybe we were at fault. Again, he was trying to lay the blame, trying to shift blame for what happened, that we were at fault for not going to that policy convention and not raising it on the floor and soliciting the help and the co-operation and support of other Liberals in attendance.

The minister, Mr. Chairman, must know that the decision to license factory freezer trawlers was made well in advance of the time when that meeting, to which he referred, took place. We all know that Newfoundland's minister in the federal Cabinet, on the Open Line show in St. John's at 10.32 on Monday morning, heard by thousands of Newfoundlanders, following the announcement that the factory freezer trawler applications would be approved, stated quite emphatically, without any equivocation whatever, that the government of this Province was well consulted and, in fact, he said that we asked the government to have an input into the type of qualifications or the type of restrictions that should be attached to the licenses.

That is not the kind of request, Mr. Chairman, that a federal minister or a federal government would make to a province the night

before they intended to make the big announcement. It is clearly obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the government opposite were well aware of what was happening. They were consulted. They can shake their heads all they like. They were consulted.

DR. COLLINS:

That is not true.

MR. W. CARTER:

Well if the hon. minister is calling the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General of Canada (Mr. Crosbie) a liar, let him do it. If he wants to call Newfoundland's representative in the federal Cabinet, who just happens to be Canada's Minister of Justice and Attorney General, if he is suggesting that that man is lying, well then I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the record should show that. His interpretation of consultation, Mr. Chairman, was quite implicit. He said, "we did consult. We asked the Government of Newfoundland to have an input into the decision-making process with respect to the conditions that were to be attached." Why would the minister, Mr. Chairman, request that there be an input by this government if the decision was not already made to grant the application?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Why would we have to put in conditions since we had opposed the application?

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, that is not for me to answer. I think, maybe, the hon. minister can answer that question certainly better than I can. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the decision was made well in advance of the time that the Premier and

the minister stated that they were made aware of it. There are so many inconsistencies, Mr. Chairman, in what the Premier has said. For example, he came in here last Friday morning, a week today at 10:00 o'clock with a well written, a well prepared document twelve pages long. I compliment the author of the document because it was a well-written, well researched, and thought out Ministerial Statement, twelve pages long. In the preamble to the statement the Premier said, I suppose again trying to create the right kind of an image, they were up all night writing it.

MR. SIMMS:  
They were.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Yes. But yet, Mr. Chairman, the Premier said that he was not aware. How could he have not been informed of that decision when the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General for Canada, Mr. Crosbie, did not go to his press conference until 9:30?

DR. COLLINS:  
Like everybody else, the day or two before we heard all the speculation about it.

MR. W. CARTER:  
But how were you aware of the conditions in order to be able to reply to them as accurately as you did? That is the question, Mr. Chairman?

DR. COLLINS:  
The conditions were well known.

MR. W. CARTER:  
The conditions were not well known, Mr. Chairman. The conditions that the hon. the Premier included in his press statement were verbatim. They

were taken from Mr. Crosbie's statement, they were dealt with, and quite a bit of research had to go into the rebuttals that were offered by the government.

So, Mr. Chairman, despite what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is saying, it is the old lie theory; if you say a lie often enough, preach it often enough, be convincing -

MR. SIMMS:  
Sure, you are misleading.

MR. W. CARTER:  
I am not, Mr. Chairman, the facts speak for themselves. The facts speak for themselves. Deny it as they will, Mr. Chairman, the facts are there. They speak for themselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please! The hon. member's time is up.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Chairman, I take the compliment thrown to me by the hon. member. I do not suppose there is any greater compliment than to emulate. I take the compliment as the hon. member gave me, that he used my argument, and I started it, I claim personal ownership of the argument about the big lie type of thing. But the hon. member now takes it over as his argument and I look upon that as a compliment. I thank you for emulating my type of debate.

Let us examine a few points that the hon. member made. He said I would like to see in five years

time how the Minister of Finance is going to squirm out of the decision made by the federal government? Well I can assure the hon. member we are not going to squirm out of it. We condemn the federal government for it. There is no squirming about this. We are not like the Liberal Party over there giving hallow words, we are fighting and working against this decision, even though, the decision is made. We are not squirming. If we are squirming it is because we are angry. We are not trying to get out of anything. Five years time we are not going to sort of say this was okay. Five years time we are going to say it was a lousy decision, if it is still in place.

We do not think it will be in place. We think it is going to fail. This is a wrong decision. The facts will prove it wrong. History will prove it wrong. Economics will prove it wrong. It just will not work. And why will it not work? Because we think it is wrong. It should not have been done. If we were just arguing for our own advantage, but really it was a good thing, we would be foolish because the facts will prove us wrong. We are convinced that factory freezer trawlers is wrong for the Canadian fishery. Now there is no squirming about that. That is a blanket statement. I will not have to make the statement again in five years time because the whole thing will be reversed by that time. So squirming, I do not know what the hon. member is talking about when he is talking about squirming.

Then he said there was no point in our going to Halifax, the decision was made. Well now just to be accurate, if the decision was

made, it was not announced. I do not suppose you can say a decision is made until someone passes on the word. I am quite willing to agree with the hon. member that the decision was made in the federal minds and it might have been late to go to Halifax. That does not excuse them for not going to Halifax, but it might have been late for them to go because the decision was made in the federal minds. But that only backs up what I was saying that the decision was fixed many, many months ago because of the powerful forces that had convinced many, many people, including many, many people in the federal government, that this was the right way to go. The voices were so strong that our voice got lost in the shouting. The only way our voice would have gotten through is if we had big guns shouting on our side. That is where the hon. member opposite did not use a big gun that we could have well done with and that was the big gun of Mr. Turner's mouth. If Mr. Turner's mouth had been up there - it is not a very big gun but it is a sizable gun, let us put it that way, it is a good size water pistol anyway - we could have used the good size water pistol of Mr. Turner's mouth but we were denied it because we could not very well on this side persuade him. He had to be persuaded by his friends and his friends let down the show by not even approaching him to say, "Stand up for the rights of the Newfoundland people who are dependent on the fishery, who have been dependent on it for centuries, whose whole way of life is related to it. They are in a tough, tough time. For gosh sakes, stand up for the people of Newfoundland." The friends of Mr. Turner opposite just did not do that.

Then we come down to this argument, you are calling Mr. Crosbie a liar because we knew about the conditions. Again, for the sake of accuracy, let us be clear on the timing. The hon. the Premier said Mr. Crosbie called him a day or so before the official decision was made and dropped a very strong hint, a day or so before. He did not announce the decision. It was not his to announce. He dropped a very strong hint that the decision was going to be made very shortly and we would not be very happy about it. He said, "If that is the case, is there anything we can retrieve from it. Can you give me some ammunition to put into arguments against it." Such as, how about this, such as how about that, such as how about the other thing. Of course our comment at that time was, "look, we are against the decision. We are not interested in conditions or pre-conditions or whatever. We are against the decision. That is our stand."

He talks about, how can the hon. the Premier make the statement the next morning at ten o'clock when Mr. Crosbie only made his statement at nine-thirty. The reason why is that Mr. Crosbie did not make up the statement at the time. It was written on paper and it was written the evening before. Before Mr. Crosbie even made his statement, we arranged to get a copy of his statement so that we could see the details in it and the hon. the Premier then would be in a position to make some cogent, factual, counter arguments against what was in it.

To portray all this as our knowing something and hiding it from the Newfoundland people is ridiculous. If we knew about it

beforehand you can be assured we would be out there beating the drum. We would have been arranging a very vigorous protest the minute we heard about it, which we did and I think the hon. the Premier's statement on that morning is a marvellous example of reacting quickly, making very intelligent arguments in a very quick fashion and doing a very good job of it. To suggest that we knew ten days before and we were just stupid enough not to make such arguments at the time we knew it, is ridiculous.

This argument could go on forever, but we are not going to allow the Leader of the Opposition and his party opposite to climb off the difficult wagon they are on. That is, they are saying hollow words about taking up the cudgels for the Newfoundland fishery when, in actual fact, their actions were weak as water and they did not do what they should have done to protect the Newfoundland fishermen.

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here in this House quietly for days on end listening to members opposite sabre rattling, prattling and prating about the factory freezer trawlers. Mr. Chairman, this issue, this particular incident has to be the most embarrassing issue that ever this provincial government dealt with, the most embarrassing, Mr. Chairman, the most embarrassing



issue that has ever come on the floor of this hon. House. It is proven, Mr. Chairman, a couple of things. Again, it has demonstrated unequivocally the inability of this government, particularly the inability of the Premier, to negotiate with other governments. It has proven that beyond a shadow of a doubt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

It has also, Mr. Chairman, shown to the people of Newfoundland what a hoax this big campaign to have two governments of the same political stripe is. Never again in the history of Canada, in our living time will we see two Tory governments anywhere in Canada. It is proven, Mr. Chairman. We have seen their definition of the infliction of prosperity. The people of this Province have seen it, the people of Canada have seen it, and not only will we never again see a provincial and a federal Tory government, we will never see two provincial Tory governments in Canada. The people are fed up with it, fed up to the teeth. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is what these factory freezer trawlers has proven.

This government is so desperate, Mr. Chairman, that they are grasping for straws. No wonder they wanted to fight their federal counterpart. Things are so desperate they were looking for an issue to make believe that they are still the great fighters that they have been known for, Mr. Chairman. Who would not fight against factory freezer trawlers, a motherhood issue? What nonsense to try and demonstrate to Newfoundlanders that we are against factory freezer trawlers.

Let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, that there is one thing that they did not want, they did not want the support of the Opposition. That is one thing that they did not want. They knew they were behind the eight ball in this one because they knew that this party had made its position known weeks before on factory freezer trawlers. They knew it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. CARTER:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening)

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Just a simple question, no strings attached, is the hon. gentleman in favour or against factory freezer trawlers?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

That will come out in due course, Mr. Chairman.

But I know the tactics, Mr. Chairman, of the hon. member opposite, whenever we are getting close to the truth, whenever we are getting close to the bone, he rises on a point of order or on a point of privilege.

Mr. Chairman, the point is that the hon. members opposite never wanted the support of the Opposition. I have been sitting in this House long enough to know when they have come out with these parochial, narrow nationalistic issues that they never wanted the support of the Opposition. The Premier proved that beyond the

shadow of a doubt, he proved that point positively when he said that the Opposition was outmanoeuvred in the House, Mr. Chairman. This is what this government has reduced itself to, playing political games when they should be governing this Province and trying to create jobs, trying to create employment for the thousands of people who are going to be starving this Winter, people who cannot clothe themselves and people living in inadequate shelter.

Mr. Chairman, here we are playing political games, using the convoluted logic, because we did not support the resolution that we were for factory freezer trawlers. The same kind of logic, Mr. Chairman, we could apply by telling some poor Newfoundlander that he is not going to Manpower looking for a job because he does not want one, the same convoluted logic when the person is so desperate, so discouraged he knows that it is a matter of futility to go to Canada Manpower to look for a job. That is the same convoluted logic that they have used.

Mr. Chairman, using the same logic, we could say that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) did not run for the leadership of the Tory Party because he did not want to be Premier. We all know he wants to be Premier, we all know he wants to be, why did he not run? Not because he did not want it. That is the same convoluted logic, Mr. Chairman, distorted logic. Stunned as quilts they are, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, they had to do something to demonstrate to the Newfoundland people that they were concerned about these factory freezer trawlers. What was the

most politically advantageous thing to do? They had not opened their mouths about the situation. They had not opened their mouths about the desperation that the inshore fishermen were facing this Summer. We were out working, going from community to community, working on these things and received presentation after presentation from fishermen saying they did not want the factory freezer trawlers. We made our point known. We did not need to stand up here to play political games.

But what did we want to do? We wanted to amend the resolution to give it teeth. We were not concerned with cosmetics. We were not concerned with form. We were concerned with content. We wanted to do something, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Why is it that right throughout this Province, starting around April, maybe a little earlier, that we had delegation after delegation of municipal councils coming in here to meet with the Minister of Municipal Affairs? Why are they coming? They have submitted their requests for capital funding but they want to follow this up with on-the-spot dialogue, on-the-spot discussion.

The Chinese say a picture is worth a thousand words. We believe that we were giving teeth to this resolution by asking for an all party Committee, so that we could go there. But this is where the playing came in. This is where the politics of it came in. They did not want to present the resolution because they knew where the Liberal Party stood. They

knew that they would support this resolution. They did not need to support it because they told the people of Newfoundland where they stand. They did not know how to get ahead. The minute we introduced this resolution to give it strength, the Premier, unwittingly agreed with it. Then, all of a sudden, some of his really Tory cronies said we cannot do this. Let us see if we can irritate them a little. If we do not support this they are not likely to go along with the resolution and then we can tell the people of Newfoundland that they were against this resolution. We are not against the resolution because not voting of it does not say that. Silence does not say you are against it. But not against the resolution but against factory freezer trawlers. What convoluted logic, Mr. Chairman! Let us put it to rest. Let the people of Newfoundland decide who was on their side. Let the people of Newfoundland decide and let us give up this nonsense.

Let us talk about this government. Let us tell them what they should be doing. One of the most inept, one of the most inefficient, one of the most ineffective, one of the most arrogant government's this Province has ever known, let us talk about that, Mr. Chairman, for a moment. Let us talk about the legislation. Let us talk about the policies that are now coming before this House to create jobs for the thousands of unemployment people in this Province. Let us talk about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member's time is up.

MR. LUSH:

I will get back to it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is good to see the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) come alive. I guess we could safely say that he is out of his doldrums over there. It is always pleasing to hear an eloquent speech from the hon. member. I am not one to get up in the House and try to make a shambles of what I say and what I do. That is the record, I think, that we can establish as far as the Liberal Party is concerned on the other side of this House, where they can say one thing out of one side of their mouths, and turn right around and do something else with the other side. We saw it demonstrated.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A quorum call.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

Call in the members, please.

We can proceed.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

One of the things that we have witnessed in this House of Assembly is an utter sham. It has been perpetrated by the members on the other side of the House ever since this session opened, back a

little while ago. All we have seen is an utter sham. They have dug themselves into a very deep hole as far as the FFT issue is concerned, and they have been using up the valuable time of this House to try to get out of that hole, and the more they talk about it, the more they try to defend their position, the greater the hole becomes.

Sometime ago I spent some time on the Labrador. At that time a polar bear had come to land and it tried to cross a peninsula. It got into heavy snow and the more it battled the bigger the hole became. Eventually, the polar bear died of exhaustion, it had dug such a great hole trying to find its way out.

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR., CHAIRMAN (Greening):

A point of order, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, I just want something clarified, because I do not want the hon. member to be inadvertently giving false information. The hon. member said that he was on the Labrador and then he continued to talk about the Northern Peninsula. Now, if he could just clarify that, because the Northern Peninsula is not part of Labrador.

MR. MITCHELL:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

If hon. members on the other side

would listen to what is being said in this House of Assembly they would probably be able to get out of the hole. I never mentioned the Northern Peninsula, I mentioned Labrador. I would like to inform the hon. member that I am quite familiar with the Northern Peninsula, it is my birthplace. I was born there, in Englee, and I have a considerable knowledge of the Northern Peninsula, as I have a considerable knowledge of the Coast of Labrador, because I lived there also.

MR. DECKER:

To that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, I thought I heard the hon. member say the Northern Peninsula. Obviously I made a mistake for which I apologize without any qualification, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is no point of order. The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman, I sat here today and I listened to the debate coming from the other side. I did not rise on any spurious points of order, and I would like to be afforded the same courtesy.

I think some points have been raised on this issue today which definitely need clarification. One of the points which struck me so vehemently was when the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) was making his speech and

he was defending his party's position on the FFTs. Just before that debate in the House of Assembly we were debating the UIC Act, Mr. Chairman, and during that debate we were talking about bringing in a resolution requesting that unemployment insurance regulations affecting fishermen be brought into line with unemployment insurance regulations all across Canada. In other words, to benefit all fishermen across this Province.

I would like to inform the hon. member that in another week the UIC benefits for fishermen on the South Coast and the Southwest Coast of Newfoundland will be terminated and I do not hear any debate coming from that member, or his party, asking government to do something about that. Hon. members opposite sat and read their newspapers, they showed that they were nonchalant, they did not care.

Mr. Chairman, let us go back to the FFT issue. In the report that was commissioned this Summer by the Liberal Party they say, 'The caucus has spoken out with great clarity on the matter, we do not want any furor over the factory freezer trawlers.' It says, 'There is a consensus on this issue.' Well, Mr. Chairman, if there was a consensus on this particular issue of FFTs, why did they not stand up in the House of Assembly and be counted? Why did they not show where they stood on this particular issue? If they wanted an all-party committee to go to Ottawa to fight for the FFT situation in this Province, I am sure they could have had the co-operation of this government. But they wanted to try to make some political points, Mr. Chairman, and they were

unsuccessful in doing so.

It has been suggested, Mr. Chairman, that they wanted a free trip to Ottawa. Well let me say I think they went on a trip, Mr. Chairman. They did not go bodily but they went mentally. I think that they should have been in the House of Assembly in Nova Scotia and voted along with the members over there for the licensing of the FFT trawlers. That is where they were, Mr. Chairman. They should have stood up in this House of Assembly and been counted like every other organization, like every other individual in Newfoundland and Labrador who stood up and were counted on this particular issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman, we have heard the sabre rattling and we are not trying to convince the Newfoundland people of our stand. It is the Liberal Party of this Province, Mr. Chairman, who are trying to defend the stand that they took in relation to that particular issue of the factory freezer trawlers.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. MITCHELL:

By leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I am sorry, leave is not granted.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for

Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, I know there are other members who want to speak but I have a couple of things here I want to talk about.

One concerns the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). I am glad is in his chair now. It concerns a letter that was sent to the Minister of Health, signed by David Sparkes, Lieutenant in the Salvation Army, Acting Secretary of the Ministerial Association in the Channel-Port aux Basques area. It concerns the need for cronic care facilities in that area. In the Captain's letter he mentions the fact, Mr. Chairman, that there are no nursing homes anywhere between Rose Blanche and South Branch. He goes on to say that there is a hospital there, the Dr. Charles LeGrow Health Center, I think it is called, where there are so many beds that are not being used. There is a wing to that hospital that is not being put in use and the people from the area are anxious that the Department of Health allow the use of those beds for cronic care people.

I wonder if the minister could tell the House, first of all, if he has had a chance to read those letters? Both are addressed to him. If so, what action does he intend to take on it?

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I have received these letters and

I have acknowledged them. Furthermore, we have sent a team from the Department of Health to visit Dr. Charles LeGrow Hospital this week and assess the bed situation in that particular area. I presume that by next week I will have a report on that situation and if I have a report completed I have no objection in giving the report to this House or to you as an individual.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I am sorry, by the way, that the member in his speech on this bill, did not make any reference at all to the need for these facilities.

Will the minister tell the House, Mr. Chairman, if things are as they are reported to be in these letters that have been sent to him by people in the area and that he will then accede to their requests? I repeat, if the situation is as serious as reported to be in the letters, will he then, having received this study, accede to the requests of the people concerned in the area?

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As I did say a few moments ago, after I get this report I have no objection to presenting it to this House, or to you, as my shadow in the Opposition. After I have

received that report, I will be in a better position to make a statement of fact.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

Seeing it is a wide-ranging debate, Mr. Chairman, I have a few words to say, particularly to some comments were made yesterday by the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) to begin with. I believe yesterday in Hansard it is reported that the hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) mentioned something about the member for Naskaupi owning a particular paper in Labrador. I think he probably did own it, he does not own it any longer, but I think there is quite a connection between the paper and the member for Naskaupi.

It was interesting to see an editorial in The Labradorian last week, Mr. Chairman, making accusations against former members of the Town Council of Happy Valley - Goose Bay on their absence from council meetings. I would be very interested in comparing the absences of those members from town council meetings with those of the hon. member for Naskaupi from the House of Assembly. I understand he has not been very punctual in his attendance in the House of Assembly in the past.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to all hon. members opposite, should they want to hear something substantial to listen to

Provincial Affairs on Saturday night because I am going to be on. Mr. Chairman, there were two questions asked to me on Provincial Affairs, and one was could I tell the general public what was the official Opposition's position on getting fishermen UIC regulations changed to benefit all fishermen in Newfoundland and Labrador? Mr. Chairman, I will leave the answer to hon. members opposite.

Now perhaps I should go further, Mr. Chairman, seeing the hon. Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) is leaving the House, but I am sure he will hear what I am going to say. This morning, as you know, the hon. Opposition House Leader and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) would not grant leave for me to present a Ministerial Statement on behalf of the minister.

Now I can only assume, Mr. Chairman, there has to be one reason only behind that refusal, and that is I would not take the bait that was offered to me before February 8. There was bait offered to me on February 8 and I would not accept it. Well, February 8 I made a fantastic decision, a decision that I had been contemplating for a long time, but I had to wait for one particular member to move from this side over there before I could make the move. Subsequently, when I was in the process of making the move, I received not one, not two, not three, not four, but five telephone calls from five individuals offering me a substantial reward if I would stay over there.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would not accept. So, you can see, Mr.

Chairman, why their blood is boiling.

MR. FUREY:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! If the hon. member wishes to speak, I would like him to speak from his own seat.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

A good ruling, Mr. Chairman.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), is incurring that somebody on this side offered him a substantial amount.

MR. DECKER:

Why? Why?

MR. FUREY:

Is he implying that somebody on that side offered him more than a substantial amount?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Chairman, I believe it would shock hon. members opposite if I were to disclose the names or the substantial amounts offered. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) to go back and ask his federal colleague he

was special assistant -

MR. FUREY:

He thinks I am the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, does he? My district is St. Barbe.

MR. WARREN:

The member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) - okay, I am sorry - and ask him did he make a telephone call to this member? You ask him did he make a telephone call to this member?

I also suggest some other member ask the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey) whether he called this member, Mr. Chairman. And this is the reason why the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) would not let me make a statement in the best interests of Newfoundland and Labrador. That is what is so upsetting to them, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIMMS:

How big was the bribe?

MR. WARREN:

I am sorry, I say to the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), I will not disclose the amount that was offered, but it was much more than I would normally get if I stayed over there. Mr. Chairman, it is very, very interesting.

The hon. Opposition House Leader got me off track, but I should go back to Provincial Affairs on Saturday night coming. Another question asked me by the interviewer was, "Mr. Warren, what do you think of the Liberal's position on voting against the resolution that was brought into the House for unanimous support on factory freezer trawlers?" They



asked me that question, now what could I say? What could I say, Mr. Chairman? I had to respond. In fact, I read a quotation from Mr. Skelly, the federal NDP member from BC, and he said it was a dumb thing to do, he said it was a shame, and he also said it is high time for politicians in Newfoundland and Labrador to put aside political differences and vote for things that would help Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, which that side there failed to do. You have dug the hole, gentlemen, and I have to tell you you are going to be in there a long, long time.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) was upset because pictures of particular ministers were appearing in ads in newspapers. The second last speaker who spoke just now said a picture is worth a thousand words. I just heard an hon. member on the other side saying a picture is worth a thousand words. Mr. Chairman, if a picture is worth a thousand words, surely goodness we are saving taxpayers' money by putting a picture in there instead of a thousand words.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Chairman, what do the hon. gentlemen opposite want? They cannot be very bright and they are hard to please. Mr. Chairman, I would venture to say that the business the family of the hon. gentleman for Naskaupi is associated with is doing fairly well with government ads. There is no doubt about that. It is doing fairly well with government ads, and so are other newspapers throughout Newfoundland and

Labrador. But government has decided to save a thousand words and insert pictures of very, very valuable ministers in those ads. Mr. Chairman, as you go through Newfoundland and Labrador, all of a sudden an announcement is made, an ad is in the paper and people see a picture of the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) or the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), automatically they realize that this ad is very, very beneficial and is going to help this Province to survive and is going to work for the benefit of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. SIMMS:

When is your picture going in?

MR. WARREN:

In due course that will happen. When the Parliamentary Secretary is allowed to make a Ministerial Statement, I suppose. I would think so.

However, I want to make sure the record is straight and everybody is in tune, and the names of the individuals on the opposite side - as quoted in Hansard No. 51, page 2755 - those people who voted against a unanimous resolution on FFTs in this House were Mr. Tulk, Mr. Callan, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Efford and Mr. Furey.

Thank you.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, certainly for my own part I will undertake to tell every one of my colleagues on this

side and any I meet from the other side what they have missed this morning. To think that anybody would absent himself or herself from this session of such marvellous, marvellous total enjoyment is beyond me. I am glad I am here. I am delighted to hear the gentleman for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). Having missed Disraeli, Gladstone and Churchill I am just delighted I have not missed him, Mr. Chairman, just absolutely delighted I have not missed him.

He talked about offers. Well, to the gentleman for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), who is new to the House and so he does not mind a little instruction from time to time, I say the answer to your question is almost axiomatic - you know, twenty-seven, twenty-eight, twenty-nine pieces, thirty pieces of silver. It was less than that, I tell him. The offers he got were something less. We do not know the amount but we know they were fewer than thirty pieces of silver because thirty pieces was the winning offer. That was the winning offer, you understand. That was the offer that was accepted. So any other amount was clearly less, fewer than thirty pieces of silver.

MR. FUREY:

Then he went out and hung himself.

MR. SIMMONS:

Oh, yes. He hung himself.

MR. J. CARTER:

Has the hon. member ever contemplated suicide?

MR. SIMMONS:

Only ever so briefly. When I look at the gentleman for St. John's North, then I realize that there is need for me to continue because

without me here he would have no cause at all.

Mr. Chairman, it seems every time I stand up the gentleman for St. John's South, the Minister of Finance, leaves the Chamber. But I am sure it is nothing personal. I was impressed, though, with his recall this morning and the manner in which he responded, in substance, to the points I raised yesterday. So I want to raise another one for him this morning. It relates to the present legislation governing the auditing of the public accounts.

Now, he will know that for a number of years, seven or eight years now, two successive Auditors General, first Mr. Howley and now Mr. McGrath, have made a good case for a stronger piece of legislation, a stronger Audit Act. Indeed we are only one of a couple of jurisdictions in the country that does not have such a piece of legislation.

The minister will also know that back in 1979, soon after the present Premier became Premier, he gave an undertaking in this respect. The minister will also know that subsequently there has been a fair amount of activity, both in Cabinet and between the Minister of Finance and the two Auditors General, successively, on this issue. Indeed, as late as a year or so ago, in May of last year, May, 1984, the present Auditor General, Mr. McGrath, sent to the Minister of Finance and to other senior government people a draft of an audit bill, a bill relating to the establishment of the office of the Auditor General, along with some documentation to support the request, to support the need for such a bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, almost six years have passed since the issue was first raised by Mr. David Howley, the former Auditor General. The need is still there. I will not take the minister through the argument because I believe he is quite familiar with it. It is a subject that the Public Accounts Committee dealt with at some length in the last year or so. Indeed, I believe the Auditor General prepared a document relating to this very subject, a document dated January 1985. So since the documentation is well on the record, I will not take the Committee or the minister through the detail of it. Suffice it to say at this particular time, that there is a need for an Audit Act. I would like the minister to indicate to the Committee why there is a delay on this? Is there some reticence on the part of the administration, are there some reasons the Committee should hear as to why this piece of legislation is not being promoted by the administration, why, indeed, such a bill is not already introduced into the House?

MR. J. CARTER:

So low!

MR. SIMMONS:

It is alright, Mr. Chairman, he will regain his composure in time. He has those frequent outbursts and you have to bear with him. The gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) needs all the understanding he can get from me, from the Chair, from everybody.

I would hope that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) might see fit to comment on this issue and tell the Committee what the present status of the proposed bill is, and whether it is the

intention of the administration to bring forward the legislation. I would urge that upon him. There is a need for it. I repeat, we are only one of a couple of jurisdictions in the country which has not had such a comprehensive Audit Act and I certainly see the need for it here.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, if the minister did wish to get up I will be glad to yield.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

I thank the hon. member.

Just to respond to the point brought up by the hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), I am sure he is aware that there is a lot going on in the government accounting field these days. I suppose, if one wanted to put a time on it, it has been going on forever, the activity there.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, could we have a quorum call?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Call in the members.

#### Quorum

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is a quorum present.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I suppose if one wanted to put a timing on it, and I cannot remember the gentleman's name, but there was a former Auditor General of Canada who brought in a new concept of auditing in terms of government accounts, and the concept included three main threads to it, economy, efficiency and effectiveness, and it went under the name of comprehensive auditing. Now, that was a great vogue for a short period of time. I am thinking back five or six years, that type of period, or perhaps a little longer than that. Anyway, it caught the imagination of accountants across the country and various jurisdictions did alter their acts and did alter them in line with this new comprehensive auditing which included, economy, efficiency and effectiveness of government operations.

Now, as time went along, it soon became clear that the economy aspects of accounting, sure, that was a good way of looking at government accounts, efficiency, this efficiency of utilization of public money, sure, that was a good way of looking at government accounts, but the effectiveness caused a lot of problems because effectiveness put the auditors into the policy area, an area where they really have no business, shall we say. It is for government to decide policy and it was causing problems. Now, we looked at our Act around the same time, but we were perhaps a little bit later than some of the other provinces, and by this time the difficulty with the effectiveness approach as part of the comprehensive auditing was troublesome. We discussed this

with the Auditor General and he seemed to be very insistent that he wanted to go the full shot and the issue essentially broke down over that. He was very hot on this effectiveness part, but we knew it was causing problems in other areas so that took it off the table at that point in time.

Now, we have kept the thing under review ourselves as a government, and when we feel that the time is ripe we will certainly bring forward the Auditor General's Act for review and revision.

There are other things now going on in the accounting field. As a matter of fact, there is a whole study now being done by the Association of Professional Accountants to perhaps present government accounts in a different way than we are used to, a different way that would be more understandable to the average Joe in the street. I think it would be only wise for us to wait to see how that exercise is concluded before we go into any radical revision of The Auditor General's Act.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a few comments on this very relevant phrase in view of what has been going on in this hon. House in the past few days on this whole question of conflict of interest. Conflict of interest, Mr. Chairman, is a subject which I find to be very, very fascinating, because I happen to believe the phrase that was spoken many years

ago by a man much wiser than I, "That no man can serve two masters".

That is reasonably familiar, is it not? And, you know, truer words were never spoken, because it is extremely difficult to serve two beings, two groups, or whatever, because you are going to favour one over the other. Now, it is extremely difficult to serve two masters, but how much more difficult is it to serve yourself when your interests come into conflict with someone else that you are supposed to serve?

Think of the difficulty here, Mr. Chairman, because of all the animals upon this planet, mankind is the most devious. We invented the word 'devious'. We are creators of the word 'devious' and no matter how good the intentions of our laws will be, Mr. Chairman, no matter how anxious we are to make something good, we animals will find a way to get around the best intentions because man is a devious animal.

Mr. Chairman, we know what it is to scheme, therefore, in our wisdom, which is also an attribute, a characteristic of mankind, we are wise, so when we come together in groups we set up rules. The Conflict of Interest Guidelines I understand, Mr. Chairman, were brought in in 1973, in the age when there was some reform going on in this Province, just after an administration had been put aside. Men of good will put those-

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are admitting they were brought in in 1973?

MR. DECKER:

Yes, I am admitting that. I am

not being political here. The statement of the Conflict of Interest Guidelines was a good statement. And further, they were given more teeth. In what? - 1981-82 or 1983, with our present Premier, more teeth were put into them. But we have seen, Mr. Chairman, in the last few days, a clear case where it would appear that the Conflict of Interest Guidelines have been swept aside. There have been documented cases put before this House where justice appears-

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Earlier today the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) said that either he or any of his members would be more than willing to repeat outside this House what they say inside this House. Now, I think it is highly improper for the member to be going on abusing the privileges of this House, talking about conflict of interest, unless he is prepared to step outside of this House and repeat the same charges. I challenge him.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to step outside.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is no point of order.

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

We have had documents presented in this hon. House which would make it appear that the Conflict of Interest Guidelines have been broken. We have seen in this hon. House the Premier get up and clearly give the indication to hon. members that in actual fact there have been no breach of The Conflict of Interest Guidelines. Now, on the one hand, we have a very stringent set of guidelines which I have already said I respect, which I have already said I believe are good, which I have already said that I believe people need. If we are going to carry on the affairs of government in this Province, when anyone offers himself for that position, he or she has to acknowledge that he is simply a human being, another one of the animals who is by no means perfect, therefore, we have to acknowledge that we need Conflict of Interest Guidelines. No one denies that, Mr. Chairman. Nobody disagrees that we need them because we are human beings and it is so easy to rationalize. When the individual, when I am put into conflict against the hon. the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt), for example, and I have to call the shots, how simple it would be for me to just favour myself a little tiny bit today, a little bit more tomorrow, Mr. Chairman, and eventually get to the point where I will completely favour myself to the exclusion of the hon. the Minister of the Environment. This can easily happen because we tend to rationalize when my wants and my wishes come into place as opposed to another persons.

Mr. Chairman, what we see in this

Province is a government which was elected to carry out the business of ruling this Province, of governing this Province. It is, Mr. Chairman, what I consider a very high calling indeed, to have that privilege to represent the people of this Province, to govern. Tools have been made available to help govern this Province. But when we see the where the deviousness of the human mind comes in and tries to break those guidelines, Mr. Chairman, to me it is a very sad state for this Province. But all this is far too subtle. This whole affair which we have been discussing in this House is just a little bit too subtle for my mind. I wish the hon. the Premier were here today so that he could explain to my mind, which is not subtle enough to understand, what is going on here.

On the one hand, Mr. Chairman, we have heard accusations, we have had questions put forward here which would suggest that the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) might be in a conflict of interest. We have seen the hon. the Premier get up in this House and say, on one occasion, that the President of the Council had given him a letter stating that there was indeed a conflict of interest. We have heard the President of the Council himself get up and say -

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

It has been troubling me for some time now as to what brought about this conflict of interest. I

wonder would this be on 'Mr. Barry's' part, the Leader of the Opposition, because Mr. Marshall's firm took away some business of Petro-Canada? I wonder would it be a personal ax that the Leader of the Opposition has to grind. If not, he should get on to the business of governing this country, because we have problems in the fishery, we have problems with a lot of unemployment in Newfoundland today, and the factory freezer trawlers which they voted for. I am just wondering if the Leader of the Opposition would inform me if that is the reason for keeping this conflict of legislation before the House.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I thank the hon. the member for that question. It is a good question. I am sorry that the member was not in the House when I answered this on an earlier occasion, when I pointed out that the reason our firm transferred the file back to Petro-Canada, we pointed out to Petro-Canada that there was a connection between a former member of our firm, who owned the land Petro-Canada wanted to buy, and that that gentleman was still down there as counsel to the firm. And because there was that slim, remote possibility of a conflict of interest, we said to Petro-Canada, "Please take this file and give it to another lawyer because we will have nothing to do with anything that could give rise to a potential conflict of interest.

MR. BAIRD:

Further to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Further to that point of order, the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would table a letter to that effect?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the matters that transpire between a lawyer and his client, as you know, are not within the power of a law firm to reveal. However, if the member wishes, he can check with Petro-Canada and I am sure Petro-Canada will give him whatever information the member wishes on this file.

MR. PATTERSON:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

I am just wondering if there would be a conflict of interest in the fact that -

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Placentia is speaking to a point of order.

MR. PATTERSON:

I would like to know if there is a conflict of interest in the fact that the firm the Leader of the

Opposition Leader of the  
Opposition (Mr. Barry) is  
associated with in 1982-83  
received \$84,053 worth of work  
from the federal government, in  
1983-1984 they made \$106,044.13,  
and in 1984-1985 \$56,769.38?  
Could there be a conflict of  
interest associated with this work?

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BARRY:  
That is an excellent question,  
too, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would never  
personally do work for the  
Government of Canada, because they  
did not pay enough.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
The Government of Canada files,  
Mr. Chairman, I think they had a  
going rate of about a half, or a  
third, or maybe even a quarter of  
what I was able to get from  
clients who appreciated the  
expertise that I could bring to  
bear.

On the comment made by the member  
for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews)  
dealing with inadequacy, you know,  
referring to my adequacy as a  
lawyer, I have to say that I  
confess there is nobody perfect.  
I must say I did have a nice  
active law practice, so somebody  
must have felt there was a degree  
of adequacy. But all I can say on  
that, Mr. Chairman, is that there  
are different areas in which  
individuals have to be adequate  
and you can picture the rooster in

the barnyard. Now, the test of  
that creature's adequacy is in one  
respect, right?

MR. TULK:  
That is right.

MR. BARRY:  
All I can say is, I guess in this  
life I would rather have certain  
adequacies in other areas, whether  
soccer balls or otherwise, than in  
the practice of law.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

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

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of  
Governmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker, I move that the House  
at rising do adjourn until  
tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 p.m.

On motion, the House at its rising  
adjourned until tomorrow, Monday,  
November 18, 1985, at 3:00 p.m.