



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

First Session

Number 54

---

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

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Wednesday

6 November 1985

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

o o o

MR. J. CARTER:  
A point of privilege.

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

MR. J. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, yesterday you ruled on a point of privilege concerning the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) and his use of office stationery with the initials of his Party on it and you quite properly ruled that this was an improper use of government facilities. On CBC Radio this morning, the member for Menihek - I heard him myself but I do not know if it was live or whether it was a rebroadcast of last night's interview - said that this was a petty ruling. Mr. Speaker, Your Honour is not petty and your rulings are not petty. If anyone wishes to challenge the rulings of the Speaker, it is laid out here in Beausheune on page 38, rule 117, which in part reads, "Reflections upon the character or actions of the Speaker may be punished as breaches of privilege. His actions cannot be criticize incidentally in debate or upon any form of proceeding except by way of a substantive motion." Now, Mr. Speaker, this House cannot work if Your Honour is not respected. I think it is most unfortunate that the hon. gentleman chooses to use a roundabout way of criticizing Your Honour's ruling and I think he should be brought to order.

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To the point of privilege, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker, without the transcript I cannot remember the exact words. I did not criticize your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I said that the issue was a petty issue raised by the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), but I made no comment on your ruling itself.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of privilege, I will deal with that matter at a later date.

#### Statements by Ministers

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, I wish today to announce the appointment of three new members to the Fisheries Loan Board. These appointments, Mr. Speaker, have been made in accordance with the Fisheries Loan Act, and they are as follows: Mr. Max Ryan of La Scie, White Bay, who is a successful longliner fisherman and who has served as a member of the Federal Fisheries Sealing Advisory Committee and Mrs. Judy Symonds of Carbonear, a highly respected and active community leader in that Town.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that Mrs. Symonds is the first woman in the history of the Fisheries Loan Board ever to be appointed to that Board and it is certainly in accordance with government's



policy of appointing equal numbers of men and women to Boards. We are very pleased to appoint Mrs. Symonds as the first woman ever appointed to the Fisheries Loan Board.

The third appointment, Mr. Speaker, is Mr. Max Batten of Foxtrap, Conception Bay, who is a successful trap boat fisherman and who has served as the Chairman of the Fisherman's Committee in his area for the past number of years.

Mr. Speaker, these appointments are effective immediately and these people join the following board members who were appointed on July 1, 1985, to serve with the Board Chairperson, Mr. Fred Pike.

The other members are Mr. Dave Aylward, Regional Manager of Fishermen's Assistance Plan, Department of Fisheries and Oceans; Mr. Kevin Carroll, an official with the Newfoundland Fishermen's Union; Captain William Ennis, Head of the Navigation Department, Institute of Marine Technology and Sciences; Mr. Harold Murphy, Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Fisheries; and Mr. Eric Wells, Deputy Chairman, Fisheries Loan Board.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that we welcome the appointment of all of those people, but particularly this particular kind of individual to the Fisheries Loan Board. We welcome, of course, the appointment of longliner fishermen, trap boat fishermen and

community leaders because they are where the action is. Finally, we would hope and we believe that perhaps we may be getting our message through to the government that it is time to start listening to the concerns of people out there in putting people in positions where they can influence decisions.

In regard to Mrs. Judy Symonds of Carbonear, we welcome her appointment as well. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to see the first woman, I understood the minister to say, on the loan board. We would hope, Mr. Speaker, that she is not a token appointment as far as the government is concerned but that indeed the minister would work towards creating equal numbers of women in key positions in this Province.

As to the other people, all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that we welcome them. We realize that the minister has to bring in those list of appointments that he makes because he somehow thinks that appointments create the feeling that there is action within his department. I would remind him that while this is a certain form of action, the kind of action that we need is issue oriented action and not just appointments to boards.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any prepared statement but I would like to make a very brief announcement this afternoon. It deals with the Grand Falls water

supply. I think the House should be made aware of the fact, since it has been a province-wide issue, that the order restricting the use of water in Grand Falls by residents in that area has today been lifted. The Department of Health has lifted the boil order and residents can now use the water supply in that area. I want to make the House aware as well, Mr. Speaker, that proposals are being looked at right now to look at the requirements for future treatment of the Grand Falls water supply.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to the minister's statement. I want to say that I know there will be a great sense of relief in Windsor, Grand Falls and Bishop's Falls today with the notification to the general public that the boil order has been lifted.

I want to thank my colleague from Gander (Mr. Baker) who normally would have replied to this ministerial statement. But I want to tell the minister of the great sense of satisfaction and sense of relief that is in Grand Falls, Windsor, and Bishop's Falls today as a result of his statement. They will now be looking to the minister to make sure that there will never again have to be a boil order issued in Grand Falls, Windsor and Bishop's Falls, a boil order that will mean no decent drinking water for in excess of

three months. I am sure they are satisfied, I am sure they are pleased, but now they want the minister's assurance that there will never be another boil order required.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that the Department of Public Works and Services is in a position to respond favourably to a request from the Department of Social Services to provide temporary accommodation for the Goodwill Centre, whose headquarter's building was destroyed by fire last week.

Mr. Speaker, we are mindful of the importance of this operation as an essential social service in the City of St. John's. We are aware that the Goodwill Centre employs as many as 40 people, many of whom might otherwise have to depend on social assistance.

The Department of Public Works and Services will make available, on a temporary basis, a number of rooms in the downstairs section of the temporary building adjacent to the old Fisheries College on Parade Street. While this accommodation may not be ideal, it is the only vacant space available at the present time and it is felt that it will be suitable as a temporary headquarters.

It is understood that the Goodwill Centre will, in a relatively short time, obtain a new headquarter's building to carry on and extend their worthwhile program of social

rehabilitation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for  
Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

It is my responsibility, in the absence of my colleague for Port de Grace (Mr. Efford), to respond to the statement by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young). I want to congratulate him and his department for responding so quickly to what unquestionably is a legitimate need. We all heard with some sadness the loss by fire of the Goodwill Centre and, as I say, we congratulate him on responding so quickly in this matter.

The Goodwill Centre and the Salvation Army both provide very worthwhile and much needed services in this particular area and perhaps the time is right, I say to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), for the government to sit down with the agencies concerned to review this whole range of services and see if there is some duplication. These kinds of concerns have been expressed to me. It is not that the services are not needed but there may be a much more efficient way to provide those services because, as the minister will know, a large number of government dollars are involved in both the agencies that I have mentioned, the Goodwill Centre, with its three or four outlets, and the Salvation Army, with its Family Thrift Store.

So the one suggestion I make, Mr. Speaker, in responding to the statement, is that perhaps the time has come to do an overview of this service with a view not to eliminating or downgrading at all, but with a view to getting our money's worth without undue duplication.

### Oral Questions

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). It relates to some strong rumors that have been circulating that the decision on factory freezer trawlers has already been made, that decision being to allow National Sea's application for factory freezer trawlers to go ahead. The Premier himself, I think, was on local media last night expressing his feeling that he had heard the rumors and that he was somewhat distraught about it.

I would ask the minister if he takes the silence of the federal MPs - Mr. Crosbie, Mr. McGrath and Mr. Johnson - as the pointer, as the final clue that the decision has already been made by the acting federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Nielsen) in Ottawa? Perhaps he can tell us while he is up if the decision has been made. If it has not, has there been a date established and does he know when that date is as to when the decision is going to be made, whether it is positive or negative?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, there have been rumors circulating to the effect and I guess we have all heard them. I do not know who started them but the hon. gentleman's colleague, I think, the member for Humber - Port au Port (Mr. Tobin), certainly added fuel to the rumors when he was here with the Fisheries Committee, added fuel to the fire by indicating that the decision had been taken. We have not been informed, Mr. Speaker, that a decision has been taken on National Sea's application for a factory freezer trawler, so I do not propose to waste my time chasing around rumors.

In terms of the other part of the question, Mr. Speaker, as to the perceived silence of Newfoundland Members of Parliament on the issue, as I said publicly only a day or so ago, I do not care how the Newfoundland members do their work, do their lobbying, whether they do it through the public or they do in caucus or they do it in Cabinet. The important thing, from our perspective, is that they know and understand the Newfoundland position and that they represent the Newfoundland interests, and I have every reason to believe that that certainly is the case.

Mr. Price, the member of the South Coast area, has certainly made his position clear on factory freezer trawlers and we appreciate his doing it publicly. But if other members do not want to do it publicly, as I said the other night, they will have to answer for that themselves. I cannot very well answer for it.

I would also like to remind the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP representative, or one of the NDP representatives on the Committee is very strong in his views that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland, through the Opposition in this House, has done a lot of damage to the Newfoundland case in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:

Let me point out to the Minister of Fisheries that I do not believe he is deliberately misleading this House but he certainly is misleading the House and the public of Newfoundland. Let me lay out to him now that we were on this subject long enough, everybody in Newfoundland knows where we stand, and there is absolutely no point in him standing in his place, Mr. Speaker, and trying to blackmail the Opposition into shining the shoes of the Premier of this Province when, in fact, Mr. Speaker, he cannot even get his own Tory buddies, MPs from Newfoundland in Ottawa, to come out publicly and support his position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, methinks the hon. gentleman protesteth too much. We have cut close to the bone. I have not said anything, Mr. Speaker. I have just repeated an observation made to a Standing Committee of the House of Commons by a member of Parliament that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador, to quote him, 'was dumb.' It was the hon. gentleman who said they were dumb. I have not said it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! To that point of order, there is no point of order. It is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. TULK:  
Let me ask the minister, in view of his attempts to try and lay the problem at somebody's else doorstep, maybe the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador, does he not find it disturbing, as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) in Newfoundland, that neither Mr. McGrath, who was a former Federal Fisheries Minister, Mr. Johnson, who represents a fishing district, and Mr. Crosbie, who is Newfoundland's representative in the Federal Cabinet, who has never been known

to keep quiet on anything that he felt very strong on, does he not find it somewhat disturbing that those people who supposedly represent the PC Party in Ottawa have not made their position public, have not made it clear as to what is going on? Does that not lend some support to the rumour that perhaps the decision has already been made in favour of National Sea? Are we witnessing a charade and a con game being played by the Newfoundland Government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, the charade and the con game that they we are witnessing here in Newfoundland and Labrador, in our own midst, has been played by hon. gentleman opposite. Sure, I can find it disturbing that those people that he refers to have not said anything publicly. But I find it equally disturbing and I find it equally distasteful that the official Opposition, represented by the Liberal Party in this Province, will say one thing out of one corner of their mouth, but when the time comes to stand on their feet in this House and support Newfoundland and Labrador they cannot do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:



A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Let me remind the hon. gentleman again that he cannot blackmail the Opposition into trying to say something that he wants it to say when our position has been clear. Let me also point out to him, Mr. Speaker, that when the Liberal Party of Newfoundland speaks, at least it speaks.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Now let me ask him a question, Mr. Speaker, since I presume that is going to be the direction from the Chair. There has been no answer from the government, there has been no answer from the Federal MPs in Newfoundland. I take it that is the case from the games the minister is playing, he does not know whether they support him or not. Let me ask him now what efforts he has made, how strongly has he pushed those Federal Tory MPs in Ottawa to support Newfoundland's position, to support the people of Newfoundland, the inshore fishing industry, that this party has stood for for months and for years? Let me ask him that question. What efforts has he made to get their support?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The hon. gentleman now, Mr. Speaker, can squirm and do all he likes. The fact of the matter is he says their position is clear. Well, I say to the hon. gentleman

their position is as clear as mud. That is exactly what it is, as clear as mud. You cannot say out of one side of your mouth that you are for something and, when the opportunity presents itself to stand on your feet and show that you are for something, then not have the backbone to do it, and that is where the hon. gentlemen are, Mr. Speaker. Let me say to the hon. gentleman in response to his question that my colleague, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) and I have briefed and sought support not only of the members of the government caucus from Newfoundland, but also of government members from all the rest of Atlantic Canada, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. gentleman that he can brief who he likes, but the question and the point is that this Spring the Newfoundland public were told - I want to ask him if he is living up to that commitment - that if you elect a PC government in Newfoundland with a PC Government in Ottawa everything will be well. And now we have the same minister sitting in his seat, Mr. Speaker, and he cannot inform this House as to whether or not he has the commitment of those people to support his position.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I did not hear any question.

MR. TULK:

Let me ask him a very specific question, Mr. Speaker. If he cannot get the support of the Tory MPs, his Tory brothers in Ottawa, then how does he expect Eric Nielsen to rule in any fashion for Newfoundland other than in a negative sense? Is it not conceivable that, if they are not supporting us at the federal level, then Mr. Nielsen will indeed approve the application for National Sea?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. gentleman that this party and this government will not stand idly by, no matter what the political stripe of a government is in Ottawa, when they are about to take decisions that are detrimental to Newfoundland and Labrador, unlike the hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

And, Mr. Speaker, if it means taking off the gloves with our political buddies, we will take off the gloves, Mr. Speaker, not like the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador, when the three destroyers, Lalonde and all the rest of them, were crucifying Newfoundland and Labrador, aided and abetted by the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

In view of the lack of public commitment by the Federal Tory MPs, the result is we may have a decision that is detrimental to Newfoundland. Let me be as good as I can and as clear cut as I can to the minister. In this House last week we proposed - it is obvious no action is coming from the government - an all-party Select Committee go to Ottawa to press our case. Will he now use his influence in his own Cabinet, with his own Premier, to get him to change his mind and to see that at least some action is taken by way of an all-party Select Committee of this House?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, what an inconsistency! How can the hon. gentleman have the gall and brazen face to ask to be part of a Select Committee when only last week he stood and voted against Newfoundland and Labrador on factory freezer trawlers?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the acting Premier. When the Premier is out of the House. I think the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), the hon.

Government House Leader is acting Premier. Mr. Speaker, the question is concerning Premier Lougheed's package. We know that Premier Lougheed is being paid \$40,000 but that is all we know. Is there any support staff cost? Is there any research staff cost? Has his travel allowance been estimated? Is there a contract and will the minister table the contract? How much is the Lougheed package going to cost Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I would not have stood up to the first one, the acting Premier. The pretend Premier, the putative Premier, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is not here. Mr. Speaker, the smallness of the mind of the hon. gentleman is only exceeded by the smallness of his own political allegiance. The fact of the matter is this Province is going to be exceptionally well served by having a distinguished, knowledgeable Canadian like Peter Lougheed to advise us on such critical matters as the fiscal regime, negotiations that we are presently entered into.

Now if the hon. gentleman wants to get up and try to colour that the way he does, the typical negative way the hon. gentleman get, like what did they say to us first, Mr. Speaker? "Well, boys, there is no point. Sign up like Nova Scotia. You are not going to get any jurisdiction."

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Government House Leader has now gone off into his usual tirade that will probably take four to five minutes and I would suggest that he is totally out of order in his present remarks.

MR. SIMMONS:

Relevancy, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

The point, Mr. Speaker, is it hurts.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen do not like to hear what I am going to say, but if I am asked a question I will respond to it.

MR. SPEAKER:

I think the point of order is well taken. The hon. the President of the Council was straying somewhat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I shall try to keep within the rules of relevancy, but the hon. gentlemen, on these issues, incite us. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, and this is very relevant, that we were able to negotiate the same revenues as if the resource were located on land and, Mr. Speaker, we are presently negotiating those revenues now with the oil



companies and we are very happy to have the expertise of Mr. Loughheed to assist us.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, The question that the hon. gentleman asked was very obvious, to give the details of the Loughheed contract. Now we do not need to hear him talk about the revenues that he is going to get the same as if on land. We have heard that ad nauseam.

MR. SPEAKER:

Again, the point of order is well taken. I do not think the hon. the President of the Council was answering the question.

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the quality of the answer can only follow the quality of the question, and the quality of the question coming from the hon-

MR. FLIGHT:

A lot of people want to answer to that question.

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, a lot of people with the small minds of the hon. gentlemen opposite would. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier gave the details of the engagement of the former Premier of Alberta and that is before the House.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier gave no details he simply said it was going to cost \$40,000. We want the answer to the question I just asked. It was a legitimate question and we will keep asking it. But as supplementary, I want to ask the minister if he thinks there might not be a competition of interest here.

MR. SIMMS:

A conflict of interest, you mean.

MR. FLIGHT:

I do not mean a conflict of interest as such, I mean a competition. Premier Loughheed has stated many times, much to the chagrin of the rest of this country, Mr. Speaker, that he is Alberta First, capital "A", capital "F", Alberta First. Now whether we like it or not, this Province, Newfoundland, is going to be competing with Alberta for exploration dollars.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member should pose his question, please.

MR. FLIGHT:

I am coming to the question, Mr. Speaker. He can take five minutes to answer my one minute question. Now Mr. Speaker, is it a legitimate concern of the people of this Province that there may be a competition of interest? Where will Premier Loughheed come down in the event that he has to choose between Alberta's interest and Newfoundland's interest? Is there a competition of interest in this situation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I thought that I had made it quite plain that since the House reconvened that I know nothing about competitions of interest that the hon. gentleman referred to.

MR. FLIGHT:

You know lots about conflict, though.

MR. MARSHALL:

Look, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. gentleman that when the hon. gentlemen were in the back pocket of Marc Lalonde and Jean Chretien, when they were trying to denude this Province-

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

Does he want me to answer the question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order.

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman does not need to talk about Marc Lalonde or anybody else to answer the question. Will he answer the question?

MR. MARSHALL:

I am answering the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

In his own way.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I think we will have to give the hon. gentleman some time develop his answer.

MR. MARSHALL:

He has asked whether there is a competition of interest. When the

hon. gentlemen were in the back pocket of Chretien and Lalonde, when they were trying to rob and denude this Province from their birth-right, it was Premier Lougheed who stood loud and clear with us-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

-and was one of the voices from across the Gulf who was for us. So I feel very comfortable with him, Mr. Speaker, just as I would feel equally uncomfortable with Mr. Chretien or Mr. Lalonde or any of the quislings and traitors who supported him within this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

He was also that man, we are told, who said, 'Let them freeze in the dark,' and he was talking about us. What will his attitude be now, Mr. Speaker, if he had to chose between Alberta and Newfoundland? Can the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) assure Newfoundland that the ex-Premier Lougheed is not acting in a similar capacity on behalf of any other provincial government, particularly Alberta, or any other institution?

MR. BAKER:

He or his law firm.

MR. FLIGHT:

Is he or his law firm acting for any other institution, Mr.

Speaker, in the same capacity? Would the minister answer that question, whether or not he is aware that Premier Lougheed will be acting in the same capacity for any other provincial government or any other institution particularly one that is Alberta based?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The former Premier of Alberta, Mr. Lougheed, will not be acting in any conflict of interest and he will serve us very well, he will serve us extremely well. Now I know it galls the hon. gentlemen. They cannot get it through their minds that we have the right to assess revenues as if they are on land. That means we have the right to assess royalties. It does not mean that Ottawa is going to take it all away and dole it out to us by way of dole, so we are negotiating with the companies with respect to this development in Hibernia that is going to provide hundreds of jobs, thousands of jobs for Newfoundlanders. We are involved in that to get Hibernia going and to get revenues. We are very delighted that we have a gentleman like Mr. Lougheed to assist us in it. The hon. gentlemen should be glad as well, instead of getting on with his cheap little, ignorant, small minded types of questions that so characterize him and his fellows in the Opposition on energy matters.

MR. FLIGHT:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I will assure the minister that we welcome Mr. Lougheed. This government needs all the help they can get with regard to energy matters, they need somebody who may know something about them. But now, Mr. Speaker, the final supplementary: Will the minister table the contract, if one exists, and will the minister in tabling it tell the Province of Newfoundland, the people out there and this House, how much is the Lougheed package going to cost this Province? We welcome Mr. Lougheed's expertise and we say again that we know, having watched this hon. crowd perform in energy, how badly they need his expertise but we are entitled to know how much it is going to cost us.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

He welcomes Mr. Lougheed! In the unlikely event that the Liberals get in in 2000 we will make him Minister of Tourism, if that is the way he is going to greet visitors to the Province, by questioning the man's integrity. The contract, the engagement has been detailed by the Premier and the contract or the engagement is exactly as the Premier has said, Mr. Lougheed is going to get \$40,000. I can tell the hon. gentlemen, so they will bleed in the dark over the weekend, that Mr. Lougheed is coming down on Friday, he is going to meet with the negotiating team with respect to the fiscal regime on Saturday, and we are getting right into securing the optimum return for the people of Newfoundland for the resource they brought into Confederation, the same resource that the hon. gentleman there

opposite supported their Federal Liberal buddies in trying to take away from us.

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:  
I have a question for the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms). I am generally concerned, and I guess most Newfoundlanders are, over the confusion and contradictions in the government's understanding of the Federal Job Creation Strategy. The minister responsible (Mr. Power) said in his response to my colleague, the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), that no applications will be refused simply because the training element is not there and that the programme had all of the flexibility it needed.

On the same day that the minister gave his answer another minister, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, was pleading with a Parliamentary Committee for a vastly increased flexibility. The headline says, 'Simms calls for flexibility in federal job creation programme.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
You cannot read from newspapers.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:  
I will table it, Sir.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the question on behalf of the unemployed of this Province and the thousands who will be looking for support from this programme,

can we clarify once and for all how much of the programme is exempt from the training qualifications?

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, his question, I think, was how much of the programme was exempt, is that what he is saying?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Yes.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was at the public hearings when I spoke there a couple of days ago, and I would have thought that he would have listened clearly to everything I said.

What my colleague, the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power), was saying was really not relevant to what I was saying, because I put the caveat on my comments by saying that the Minister of Career Development and I were discussing the matter in an attempt to try to resolve it. The problem we have specifically with respect to forestry is that some of the funds in that job creation programme are meant and directed towards forestry projects specifically. The problem we have in dealing with that, because of the training component in the criteria is we have silviculture workers now whom we have trained ourselves under our own FESP programme in the last five years who will be laid off in the planting season. Therefore, it does not seem right to us as a department to have to hire new

silviculture workers when you have 1,000 or 2,000 silviculture workers on layoff. So that is the point that we specifically have a problem with with respect to forestry.

The Minister of Career Development and I are trying to negotiate with the federal authorities to try to obtain some flexibility with respect to our particular programme. If he has a question with respect to the overall jobs strategy programme, then obviously he should direct it to the Minister of Career Development who is the most appropriate minister to answer the question.

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:  
I do not care who answers the question over there but I will address it to the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Simms). We have heard the Premier say that the local economy is not strong enough to support the provincial job creation programme and we would like for someone to give us an assurance that the job training element in this programme does not discriminate against Newfoundlanders. Now, someone over there should answer it. Maybe you would, Mr. Minister.

MR. SIMMS:  
Just for clarification, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GILBERT:  
The Minister of Forestry said I should direct my question to the Minister of Career Development, (Mr. Power) if I had further

questions, but he is not here. So in that case I said I would ask the Minister of Forestry. My question was: We have heard the Premier say the local economy is not strong enough to support the provincial job creation programme.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:  
Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously, the member knows the question should be properly directed to the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power). I am not the Minister of Career Development, so I will take it under advisement for my colleague and pass it on to him. Perhaps he can give an answer under Answers to Questions at some appropriate time in the future.

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

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was telling a minister about an upcoming anniversary in Come By Chance next year, the 50th Anniversary of the cottage hospital. Next year, also, in March - the long, cold, hungry month of March - will mark the tenth year that the Come By Chance refinery has been shut down.

Let me ask the Vice-Premier a question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

Vice, V-i-c-e in parenthesis.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Vice-Premier a question regarding that. Two weeks ago, when the Premier answered a question of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) regarding ongoing talks and so on, what was happening with the ongoing talks, the Premier, in his answer, said, 'We are assessing the various bids.' Now, Mr. Speaker, as I understood it, back in the first week in July we were told that there were only two bids left, one to shut down -

MR. SIMMS:

That is various.

MR. CALLAN:

That is not various.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

Maybe the hon. the member would pose a question.

MR. CALLAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Let me ask the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate, is this Newfoundland Government involved in ongoing talks regarding the bid to reactivate the refinery? Is the Newfoundland Government involved in any way?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I think, quite obviously, and it must be as obvious to the hon. gentleman, who is a very intelligent-looking gentleman and is an extremely intelligent gentleman, that this government has been involved. I mean, the fact of the matter is,

having represented that district, he will realize that that refinery was to have been scrapped a few years ago, and it was through the intervention of this government that the refinery is still standing out there and is mothballed. So we are very concerned about the outcome of the refinery. It is primarily, of course, the responsibility of the federal government, but we are in constant contact with the federal government with respect to matters, which is very refreshing change from what it was a few years ago. We are in contact and, yes, we are involved, but we are involved within the context which the Premier has recounted to the House.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the minister then would explain what the Petro-Canada officials meant when they said, in television interviews during the first week in July, "No comment!" when they were asked whether federal - provincial politicians had any involvement in the talks or the assessing of the bids by Petro-Canada officials? What did the Petro-Canada official mean when he said that there was no involvement? He said, "We inform the Newfoundland Government once we have made a decision." Would the minister explain what the Petro-Canada official meant? Would the minister also agree to table any correspondence that has been going back and forth between Petro-Canada officials and this government?



MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, what does the hon. member mean? He got up and first of all said that the Petro-Canada official said, "No comment." Then he went on to give what the Petro-Canada official allegedly said. So I do not know what the hon. gentleman means. First of all he gets up and he says the Petro-Canada officials said, "No comment." Then he gets up and makes another statement. I mean, do not try to find flies on the wall when flies are not there. The fact of the matter is that everybody is striving to see what they can do to keep that refinery open and we will continue to strive to see what we can do to keep the refinery open. It has been closed for a long period of time, as the hon. gentleman knows, and it was going to be dismantled on at least one or two occasions and we saved it. The reason it is out there now is as a direct result of the Peckford Administration and the reason it will stay and get operative will be because, if it is at all possible, of the further actions by the Peckford Administration in co-operation with the federal Tory Government in Ottawa.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Well, let me ask the minister then, Mr. Speaker, can the minister inform this House when we can expect a decision on the future of the refinery from

Petro-Canada officials? How long is this latest delay going to last? Can the minister tell us that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I cannot respond to that at the present time. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is the minister who has been dealing with that. I understand that the minister has been in contact recently with Petro-Canada on an ongoing basis. As soon as possible, that is the only answer that I can give to the hon. gentleman. I can also tell the hon. gentleman that this government will do everything it possibly can, as it has in the past, is now and will in the future and ever shall be, to reactivate the refinery.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett). The Child Care Advocacy Association has indicated in reports they have put out over the last year or two that there is a drastic shortage of approved day care spaces in Newfoundland and Labrador and that, as a matter of fact, we are probably the worst off in the country in comparison to other provinces. I note that the budget had a small number of incentives for increasing them. My question to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) is if it is not possible to have enough adequate

day care spaces, and we seem to be short something in excess of 10,000 spaces, what are people supposed to do with their children when they cannot find these kinds of approved day care and they have to go to work?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, that is a very, very difficult question to answer. I have to acknowledge that there are not enough day care spaces in the Province, but I believe the hon. member will also acknowledge that we have made some rapid strides in the last few years. But to ask me what people should do with their children if there are no day care spaces, I do not know. I really do not. It is extremely difficult to answer. I would hope that they would find some alternate accommodations but I have nothing specific, I am sure. I would suggest that probably some people would get baby sitters, some people put their children out with relatives, and I suppose all kinds of things are happening. But while I acknowledge there is a shortage of day care spaces, I hope the hon. member would also recognize that it was not that many years ago that there were none at all. Even this year we increased our grants to the centres, we introduced grants for materials within the centre, and it is an ongoing thing. I am proud of what we have done in the last few years.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is just time for a very

short question and answer.

MR. FENWICK:

I expected that answer or something similar to it, the obvious answer at this point, that individuals in their homes are looking after children. My question to the Minister of Social Services -

MR. SIMMS:

There is nothing wrong with it.

MR. FENWICK:

There is nothing wrong with it. What I would like to ask the minister to do is we have been informed by the Chairman of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation that they now have a blanket policy, for all 6,000 subsidized units, that they will not allow any women in those units to take in children, even if it is one, in order to look after them under any kind of day care programme. If the minister responsible for the Corporation wishes to answer it, I would be quite happy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

The case in point that the hon. member wrote the Chairman of the Housing Corporation about was where a lady had some children whom she was looking after during the day. Obviously, as part of the lease, we could not allow businesses to be operated in houses, number one. You know, we would have responsibility for anything that may have happened in that house as a result of an accident to children who were



being looked after in those apartments. The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) will be, in the next few months, outlining what some of the requirements will be for those smaller units.

MR. BRETT:

The houses do not meet the standards for day care.

MR. DINN:

The houses right now, as the minister outlines to us, do not quite meet the standards for day care and they were not built for day care. They were built for people who require subsidized housing. So we looked at it and, as a matter of fact, we were attempting to give the lady the benefit of the doubt because it does seem as though there was not too much that would be invalid about it. But the fact of the matter is that we had to look at the Corporation from the point of view of a person who is renting to a tenant and what the liability would be on the Corporation in the event that there was a fire, or something of that nature, where children were injured. So we looked at it very closely and it took some time for us to get back to the hon. member, but we feel that it is the only decision that could be made under the circumstances.

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for Oral Questions has now expired.

MR. SIMMONS:

On a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage on a matter of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege, and I will need a minute of two to lay out the case, if I may be given that. The Question Period today, Mr. Speaker, was a travesty and a flagrant breach of the rules and it was a breach of my privileges as a member of this House. To make my case I need to draw a parallel. Nearly twenty years ago, in 1966, this House dealt with the Churchill Falls issue and it was such a euphoric matter at the time that even men of the ilk of the gentleman from Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) in silence voted for the legislation at that time.

Now we have a parallel situation today where the euphoria is such about Mr. Loughheed and about offshore that it is almost unmotherly, almost unpatriotic, to ask some questions. But we give notice that we are going to ask questions such as the gentleman for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) asked today. Here is the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. They were legitimate questions asking about what will it cost the taxpayers to have Mr. Loughheed and did the minister, from his vantage point, see any possible competition of interest? Now these are fair questions. And the government's response was to turn the Question Period into an unadulterated circus, to refuse to answer, to wave arms, to call names and shout, 'Traitor' and so on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we might as well wipe out the Question Period. I am sent here as a member of this House to get information on behalf of the people of Newfoundland. I cannot do it if, on the one hand, Mr. Speaker, government ministers, who have an obligation to supply information, choose to obfuscate,

to do anything except answer the questions. I cannot do it. It makes it all the more difficult, Mr. Speaker, if the Chair even passively - I do not say deliberately - allows that to go on. I salute what the Chair did today a couple of times in pointing out to the minister that he indeed was straying from the point. I just use the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to appeal to the Chair to allow the Question Period - and appeal, more importantly, not to the Chair but to the government ministers - to serve its intended function, to supply some information to the Opposition.

If we ask questions that the people of Newfoundland judge us for, that is fair ball. But we decide, deliberately, what questions we are going to ask and I would hope, equally deliberately, the government would decide, at least, to give answers instead of all this obfuscation and this amateur approach at turning it into a circus. It is not serving the process well and, in the process, my privileges and the privileges of everybody else in this House are being abused, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council to that point of privilege.

MR. MARSHALL:

The questions that were asked by the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) were responded to, I gave a complete, full and, I think, sufficient response to them.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the hon.

gentlemen are prickly on matters with respect to the offshore, and I can understand why they can be testy and sensitive with respect to it because of their lack of support for this Province's position in the past. But I am going to tell them they can ask the questions they want to, they will get responded to, but every time they will be reminded of their role in the offshore issues of this Province and their attempts to take away the birthright of the people of this Province.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, further to that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have already heard the hon. member, and I must rule that there is no prima facie case of privilege and I would like to direct the hon. member's attention to our own Standing Orders and Standing Order Number 31, subsection (e), "A Minister may in his discretion decline to answer any question." There is no point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I have another point of privilege now because I can construe from what was just said that the process of obfuscation was aided and abetted by the Chair, as I said in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) just now talked about our role. I for one, and I believe every member on this

side of the House, is proud of our role. We are not the people who sold away our refining capacity to Ontario and Quebec. We are proud of our role in this whole offshore business, very proud, and we will hold our head high long after you guys are hanging yours in shame because of selling out to Ontario, knuckling under to Mulroney, selling out to Ontario and Quebec.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, on my point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I would just ask the hon. member if he would get to his point of privilege and just state what it is.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege is that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) again misled the House in the past three or four minutes when he said that he had -

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
I have not said a word in the past three or four minutes.

MR. SIMMONS:  
My God, he is awake! He is actually awake. The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is actually awake.

Mr. Speaker, to my point of privilege, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs three or four minutes ago said to the House he has given full answers to the questions. The gentleman for Windsor-Buchans asked specifically how much would the Loughheed

package cost, he never answered that question. Now let him be a man and stand up and answer that question. How much are you paying Loughheed altogether, travel expenses, everything? How much? That is the question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Again I rule there is no prima facie case of a breach of privilege.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of privilege, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
I do not want to prolong this. But the hon. gentleman got up and he made his comments. As he does from time to time, or appears to anyway, when he has a ruling that does not please him, he uses words to the effect that the Chair deliberately - I think it was 'blatantly' - abetted this side of the House in obsfucation. So the hon. gentleman is casting aspersions on the impartiality of the Chair and he is out of order. Really, you know, no matter how exercised he might get about something, I think he should be asked to withdraw a statement like that which impinges on the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of privilege, I could not quite pick up the comments that the hon. the President of the Council referred to, but I will check with Hansard and I will bring the matter up at a later date.

### Notices of Motion

MR. DOYLE:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DOYLE:  
I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting the Assessment Of Property For The Purpose Of The Imposition Of Real Property Tax By Councils Of Municipalities And School Taxes By School Tax Authorities."

### Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:  
This being Private Members' Day, we continue debate on the motion in the name of the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). The motion was adjourned a week ago by the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West.

The hon. member for Burin - Placentia West.

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

How much time do I have left? Ten minutes? I think I have about ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member has four minutes.

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker, in that case then, as I was speaking in this debate the other day I made reference to the fact of how astounded I was by the actions of the members opposite whereby they were standing in

their places and not taking any position as it relates to unemployment insurance for fishermen. When the resolution presented by my colleague requested that the fishermen in this Province be treated equally as it relates to unemployment insurance, the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, stood in their places and at no time did they lend any support to that cause.

I was exceptionally disappointed, Mr. Speaker, by the actions of the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) who represents a strong fishing district. As I said then and I will say now I look forward to the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), Mr. Speaker, defying the instructions of his leader and stand up in this House and to enter into a debate that deals with the fishing industry and the fishermen in this Province.

As well, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) so ably pointed out today, the actions of the Opposition is nothing short of despicable as it relates to the resolution that was put forth in this House relating to factory freezer trawlers.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution put forth by the Premier asked for this House to go on record as being in opposition to the application by National Sea Products for factory freezer trawlers.

Mr. Speaker, we saw what happened. They stood to a person, in a recorded vote, and voted against a resolution that condemns factory freezer trawlers in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Shame.

MR. TOBIN:

Now I cannot, Mr. Speaker, draw any other conclusion than the members opposite were willing to sell out the fishing industry in this Province, willing to sell down the tube the fishermen and fish plant workers in this Province, for a jaunt to Ottawa. That, Mr. Speaker, is despicable.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that that type of action does not do any good for Newfoundland or Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

You stood here in this House to a person on a recorded vote and voted against a resolution that was asking Newfoundland to be unanimous and this Legislature to show unanimity as it relates to the factory freezer trawlers.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. TOBIN:

By leave, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

MR. TULK:

A point of order, or a point of procedure, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

I would like to point out why I am saying what I am going to propose and that is, the question as put forward by the member for Torngat

Mountains (Mr. Warren) is a question of unemployment insurance for fishermen. It is a resolution that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador has never questioned. As a matter of fact, we have always supported it whole-heartedly, with no problem in the world. The reason for using our report the other day is that we want to point out to the government and to the people of Newfoundland that indeed we do support that kind of resolution. It was one of the things that was contained in that report.

The point of order or the point of procedure that I want to clarify with the other side is this; this is an case where we can have unanimous support for a resolution in this House. This side is prepared to vote for it to a man. We can have the unanimous support. We have unanimous support, but, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to enter into any more debate because it is time for action. It is time for this government to move. I would urge the Premier, my friend for Gander (Mr. Baker), for example, has a resolution which would normally follow next.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ha, ha, ha!

MR. TULK:

Never mind, ha, ha! If you want the support, you have got it. You are going to get it because it is good for the fishermen of Newfoundland. So I would move, Mr. Speaker, that the motion be now put and that we pass the hon. members and move on to some more important things for Newfoundland.

MR. TOBIN:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that in the debate last week we have showed up the Opposition as a group of individuals who are uncaring as it relates to the plight of the fishermen in this Province who need unemployment insurance. I think, Mr. Speaker, as we have now seen, they were led down the garden path, they were blindfolded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) in showing them, in asking them, demanding them, to vote against the resolution that would ban factory freezer trawlers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member is softening up. I would suggest that today is Private Members' Day and we do have two days to debate the resolution put forth by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and I submit that we carry on with the resolution as put forth by the member as we feel on this side of the House that that resolution is indeed important enough to get a full hearing and be thoroughly debated. We hope the opposition will join us.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order.

MR. TULK:

Let me point out to the hon. gentleman that while we believe this resolution is a sincere resolution and is not put forward to play games, that is the reason why we are -

MR. WARREN:

You played games last week.

MR. TULK:

We have not played games with you, we are just using a method to tell your government that what is required are not pious words from you on that side, what is required from you is to get the resolutions on paper, get unanimous consent of this House, and then go to Ottawa and do your job. Take some action. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, we will say to the hon. gentleman now that we are giving you unanimous support and I would move, as I said before, that the motion be now put and that the vote be taken. Let us have some action here.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, there are rules in our Standing Orders that are clear-cut and dry. It allows for two days of debate and two days of debate only on a private member's motion.

Mr. Speaker, I know for a fact there are members in this hon. House who wish to express their opinion and views on this particular resolution. I know that the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) introduced the resolution to get points of view from members of this hon. House and if the hon. members opposite do not wish to participate in the debate and do not wish to support this resolution, then that is their problem and their business. But I do not think the hon. member should try to direct to the Chair



that the rules should be changed for the benefit of them so they can get on with another resolution with which they hope to create some controversy.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order.

MR. TULK:

The hon. member was a Speaker in this House and he should know that we are not trying to change any rules. Wake up boy! We are just saying that if the government wants to move on, wants to create some action in the sphere that is very important to fishermen in this Province, then let us get it over and done with and move on to something else. We know that we can do anything by unanimous consent in this House. Do not be so silly, changing the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have heard enough. There is no point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

The resolution as presented, even though the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) said at the outset that he wished to remove the very last phrase, "Be it further resolved that this House of Assembly make representation to the federal government that fishermen qualify to draw such benefits until first earnings,"

and what he wished to remove was, "or July 1, whichever comes earlier." Mr. Speaker, my query is this: Was this not really an amendment? In other words, to delete part of the main motion is an amendment and if it is an amendment, then we have all been speaking to the amendment and once that is passed or disposed of, then there is the main motion to be looked at.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I asked for unanimous consent to have that changed and it was not given so we are speaking to the main motion.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I have a few points I would like to make. If you are going to have unemployment insurance for fishermen -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member has already spoken.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that another parliamentarian labelled the Liberal opposition and the Liberal Party in this Province as dumb? Is there any wonder?

MR. WARREN:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Is that what he said?

MR. RIDEOUT:

He told him plain to his face that the Liberal Party was dumb.

MR. SIMMS:

Very perceptive!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Very perceptive, Mr. Speaker. Two Wednesdays in a row -

MR. TULK:

He was not a Tory, I suppose.

MR. RIDEOUT:

No, he was not a Tory. You cannot blame it on a Tory. Two Wednesdays in a row, two weeks in a row, on an issue that every fisherman feels so strongly about in Newfoundland and Labrador and you cannot get a word out of the official Opposition. Mr. Speaker, it is despicable conduct.

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

MR. BAKER:

On a very technical point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Fisheries has just said something that is not the truth and if we check back through Hansard of last Wednesday, we will see that what he is saying is not true. If we check back on Hansard that will come out on today's proceedings so far, we will see that what he said is not true, and, in fact, you have heard from members from this side.

It has been indicated that there is unanimous support on this side and that if hon. members on the other side want to say something about it, let them say something

about it. If they want to talk, Mr. Speaker and use up the next couple of hours on an issue that everybody agrees on then, fine, let them do it.

But I object, Mr. Speaker, very strongly to the Minister of Fisheries saying something that is so obviously not true.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the hon. gentleman of what he said. In Hansard of last Wednesday, "MR. BAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to refer to the Premier, the Cabinet and members opposite, as well as the people of the Province, to the Liberal caucus report on the inshore fishery which contains an indefinite amount of wisdom in comparison of what we just heard. Thank you, Mr. Speaker." Fifty-one words, Mr. Speaker. Fifty-one words! The hon. gentleman should be ashamed to stand in the House.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. BAKER:

That, Mr. Speaker, makes my point. The hon. member was just after saying that he had not heard a single word and now he is admitting that he heard fifty-one words.

MR. SPEAKER:



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

MR. RIDEOUT:

The hon. gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, has the gall to get up and say that they support the resolution. There is nothing in there saying they support the resolution. Not a word in there in support of the resolution, Mr. Speaker. The Liberal Party, the official opposition, the people who want to be holding themselves out as the the alternate government, on an issue that is so vitally important to fisherman in this Province, Mr. Speaker, can only say fifty-one words and not one word of that is a word in support of the resolution.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

A point of order. Can you get the hon. gentleman to control himself and sit down?

Let me tell him that he should read and not be afraid of a bit of red.

MR. RIDEOUT:

You are supposed to be speaking to a point of order.

MR. TULK:

The point of order is Mr. Speaker, that the minister is giving false information to this House. Let me tell him that he should not be afraid to read that red document. That he should read that document and in that he will see exactly what the member for Gander said.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I do not understand the hon. members point of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I want to keep the minister straight and let him keep his cool.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Of course, Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order. There is a point of discourtesy, a point of wasting time.

MR. BAKER:

Bring on the resolution and do not waste the time of the house.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the House what the official critic for the Opposition had to say about this resolution.

MR. SIMMS:

Who is he?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Well, I do not know there are three or four critics over there, Mr. Speaker. But let me remind the House what the official critic, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), Mr. Speaker, a man who touts himself as an alternate Minister of Fisheries around Newfoundland and Labrador, let me remind the fishermen in his district what he had to say: "Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution I would like to refer hon. members opposite to the Liberal caucus report on the inshore fishery. It addresses the

question quite well." Twenty-nine words, Mr. Speaker. Twenty-nine words from the official critic for the Opposition. Here he goes again, Mr. Speaker. He is certainly hurting today.

MR. TULK:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

No, Mr. Speaker, I am not hurting at all, I just do not want the Minister for Fisheries to get carried away, to get upset about something, to try to pretend that something is there that is not there. Let us not have him do that. He has been trying to pretend now for the last three or four days that the federal Tory M.P.'s are not in Ottawa. Lets not have him try to pretend that something is not there. The support for the resolution is unanimously contained in the report. He should read it and all I need to do is to refer him to that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. These points of order, one after the other, are just taking up the time of the hon. member who is trying to speak and are completely out of order.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the defence of the Opposition for every one of the hon. gentlemen that I referred to

is that our caucus report outlines it all and says it all and gives full support to it. Let us see what the caucus report that they talk about says about UIC regulations, Mr. Speaker. Let us see what it says.

Here is what it says: "In case of demonstrated need the revision or relaxation of all pertinent UIC regulations for the coming Fall and Winter." Now that is what their caucus report says, Mr. Speaker, on this resolution and they stand up and say that they are fully supportive of the resolution.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:

The minister is misleading this House. I do not think he is doing it deliberately. I think he is doing it out of ignorance.

The point of order is this, Mr. Speaker, if he would turn the page or a couple of pages he might see where the support from the Liberal Party lies for the discriminatory actions that exist in the unemployment insurance regulations and we said do away with those discriminatory regulations.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Number one, that is not a point of

order. Obviously it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, this House is becoming a real circus because points of order are being made and every time they have no semblance to a point of order at all.

I would say for the proper running of this House that the Opposition should refer to the Standing Orders or refer to Beauchesne if they are going to get up on points of order, otherwise they are just trying to interrupt somebody who is speaking.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order. If a continuous stream of points of order are taken up, they actually interfere with the privileges of the House.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, there is nobody misleading the House. What is happening here, Mr. Speaker, is the Opposition are misleading the fishermen of this Province. That is what is happening, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
I say it again. I know the Opposition do not like it, but I say, 'Tough!.' It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that a mainland Member of Parliament referred to this Opposition and to this party in Newfoundland as 'dumb'. This is two weeks in a row that they have had an opportunity to debate an issue that is vitally important to thousands of fishermen in

Newfoundland and Labrador. Two weeks in a row, Mr. Speaker, they have had the opportunity to do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman cannot take the heat let him get out of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I would ask hon. members if they would allow the hon. member to speak in silence.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
So, Mr. Speaker, this is the big issue. The Opposition then will have the nerve, Mr. Speaker, to get up and ask questions in Question Period and say that they are on the side of fishermen and say that they are on the side of plant workers and when an opportunity presents itself for a debate on fishery related matters in this House, they do not open their mouths other than to say, "Look at our caucus document."

When an opportunity comes, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and be counted on an issue that is to vital to Newfoundland and Labrador, like an application for a factory freezer trawler, they will get up and out of one side of their mouths say, "We are against it," but when they have to stand on their feet and vote where it counts, Mr. Speaker, they stand up and they vote, to a man, against it.

Then they ask today in Question

Period, "Will you reconsider and appoint a Select Committee and give us a trip to Ottawa?" Mr. Speaker, it is amazing!

MR. SIMMS:

And they are against it.

MR. RIDEOUT:

And they are against it. That is the crowd to send to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, to articulate your case! That would make a lot of sense, Mr. Speaker, sending that hon. tribe to Ottawa to articulate your case against FFTs when they stand on their feet in the people's House and vote against the resolution.

Then, Mr. Speaker, they talk about this particular resolution which asks for unanimous support of the House to make representation to Ottawa on top of the representation that we have made year after year on this whole area of unemployment insurance regulations for fishermen. Mr. Speaker, this is not a new issue, an issue that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador have not taken a stand on at anytime in the past. We worked ourselves blue in the face trying to convince a previous administration that those regulations were unfair. Worked ourselves blue in the face trying to do it and we were not able to do it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the present government has appointed a Royal Commission to review all UIC regulations, including unemployment insurance regulations for fishermen. We fully intend, Mr. Speaker, to take advantage of that process to be able again to rearticulate our case to Ottawa, to be able again to say to them that some how or another because you are a fisherman living -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:

Why do you not, what?

MR. GILBERT:

Why do you not introduce legislation?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman he had an overdozed of stunned pills today. Why did we not introduce the legislation? I say to the hon. gentleman, why does he not have the backbone to get up and support the resolution and support some of his fishermen?

MR. GILBERT:

I did support the resolution.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Why did we not introduce the legislation?

Mr. Speaker, what has jurisdiction has jurisdictional competency have over unemployment insurance? Is it some how or another the Town Council of Bellevue, or the Legislature of Newfoundland, or the Legislature of P.E.I.? It is the House of Commons of Canada, Mr. Speaker. Why do we not introduce the legislation?

It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, again I must point out -

MR. SIMMS:

It is no wonder they are not speaking on the resolution.

MR. RIDEOUT:

It is no wonder they are not speaking on the resolution, Mr. Speaker. Again I must point out there is no wonder that a Mainland MP came down here and called the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador dumb, because that is the

dumbest comment I have heard in ages - why did we not introduce the legislation?

MR. FLIGHT:

What do you call the four Tory MPs who do nothing for you?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, at least this present government have put in place a procedure that will allow us to have an opportunity through the Royal Commission on Unemployment Insurance to have an opportunity to have some input. This government, through the Department of Fisheries, through Intergovernmental Affairs, in co-operation with the union, Mr. Speaker - we are already working on it - will be presenting a document to that commission again trying to point out that a Newfoundland Canadian, who just happens to live in Nain or live anywhere along the Coast of Labrador or anywhere around the Island part of Newfoundland, who catches fish and brings it into a fish plant, that the other worker who processes that fish can draw UIC for up to forty-eight or fifty weeks or whatever it is, but the fisherman who was the primary producer of the other job, the supplier of the resource that created the other job, some how or another he is different. Some how or another he is not as equal as the person who processes the fish in the fish plant. Some how or another he can only draw UIC from the 15 November until the 15 May. That is particularly disgusting, Mr. Speaker, for a fisherman that happens to live in Northern Labrador or in Southern Labrador for that matter. It is bad enough, it is wrong -

MR. GILBERT:

(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:

Is there anything in Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, that can be used to either choke or quieten the hon. gentleman?

Mr. Speaker, it is bad enough that it applies to fishermen on the Island where the season is such that you might be able to get fishing around the last of May or the first part of June. That is wrong. We have opposed it and we will continue to oppose it.

But it is worse, Mr. Speaker, that in the full light of day, that in the full light of all the facts available to you as a Government of Canada, you allow Island fishermen to go down to Labrador and fish and get part of their stamps by fishing in Labrador and they come home and they can draw UIC until the 15 May, but the fisherman who lives and resides and fishes in Labrador, the odds are he is not going to get fishing until the middle of July. Perhaps, some years later. This year certainly they never got fishing in most cases until the 22 day of July.

So it is wrong anyway, but it becomes worse, Mr. Speaker, when you have two classes of fishermen in this Province. One is the class that happened to live on the Island, and the other people are the class that happen to live on the Mainland part of the Province in Labrador. The geography and the climate is such that in a normal year they are not going to get fishing until sometime in July. So that is what this resolution, Mr. Speaker, tries to address and the hon. gentleman knows, and everybody who is thinking knows that this government, time after time after time, has begged federal

administrations to change those regulations to make them more equitable, to make them fairer. But this resolution is asking for the House of Assembly to support what we have been trying to accomplish and you cannot get an hon. gentleman over there to go beyond fifty-one words. You cannot get an hon. gentleman over there to go beyond twenty-nine words. They are stuck, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Here they go, Mr. Speaker, here they go again. They cannot take it.

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have to rise on the same point of order that I rose on before.

MR. RIDEOUT:

You said it was not a point of order. In this case, sit down.

MR. BAKER:

We have indicated our total support for this resolution and it disturbs me that the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) continues to say things that are not true, he continues to say we do not support this resolution when, in fact, we support it 100 per cent, unanimously.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the leader over there in number of words spoken is an hon. gentleman who does not represent the fishermen as far as I know. The hon. gentleman for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) he spoke sixty-seven words, Mr. Speaker, that is the leader over there. The leader in defending and articulating the cause of fishermen who are discriminated again because of UIC regulations. The leader is the hon. gentleman from Buchans.

MR. FUREY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) continues to babble on and on and on. The point of the matter is that we respect and support this resolution. What do you expect us to do, rent a bus and start a crusade for prosperity? Is that what you want us to do? That is what your leader did. And now you have the same colour in Ottawa -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have already ruled on that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I understand that my time is just about gone but what I



do expect, Mr. Speaker, from the Opposition that represents fishermen and fish plant workers in this Province is I expect consistency. I do not expect them to do what they did here last week to get up on their feet and say, "Yes, I am for it and then vote against it."

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo on a point of order.

MR. TULK:

The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) is now trying to say that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador is not consistent in relation to the unemployment insurance regulations that exist in Ottawa. Let me tell him that there is only one party in Newfoundland that is not consistent and that is his Federal Minister in Ottawa who, two years ago, had a petition with 20,000 names on it. Now he hides in the dark and tries to get away from his responsibilities to get those discriminatory regulations changed.

Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this: The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) cannot continue to mislead this House either out of ignorance or knowingly, he just cannot do it. The truth has to come out in this House and the truth is simple. We support the resolution and regardless of whether he likes it or not at six o'clock we are going to vote for the member for Torngat Mountains' (Mr. Warren) resolution because it strikes us right here in the heart and that is exactly what we are doing. So you can have it

whichever way you like Thomas, the truth is you are going to get our support.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

You can then go to Ottawa and see John and do something about it.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. There is no point of order. The hon. minister has just about one minute left.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Okay, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

Let me say to the hon. gentleman, in his point of order he refers to a 20,000 name petition two years ago, well I ask him, who was running the affairs of Canada two years ago? His buddies, Mr. Speaker. We are doing something about it and we will get changes to the UIC regulations, but we will do it with no support from the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Let me tell the hon. gentleman that again he is trying to mislead this House, not trying, I do not believe he would do that, I think he is doing it out of ignorance. He is inadvertently misleading this House because the truth of the matter is that regardless of who is in Ottawa or who was in Ottawa this party has always said that those unemployment insurance

regulations are discriminatory and, as I told him before, he can stand up there and wave his arms all he like and go for the next hour and a half, we see no need to debate the matter further. Let us have action with John in Ottawa. Let us have it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Again, to that point of order, there is no point of order. It is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. minister's time has now elapsed.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a few comments on what is transpiring. I was out of the House last week and in my district, as I advised Your Honour, and I would like to make a couple of observations or whatever.

For example, reading in Hansard and the original resolution by my Labrador colleague, I guess we can call him that, from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), it was strongly noted by me - and by his own admission, of course, and well-documented - that he originated his thoughts as a Liberal. There is absolutely no question on that issue at all. He has no choice, in my view, but to continue that Liberal line of thought, even though now he is a

defected Liberal and on the Tory side for, I would say, pretty obvious reasons, for the traditional thirty pieces of silver and nothing more than that.

If he did not continue to speak as a Liberal and try to pretend he is still in Opposition, while he is now a higher paid Tory member, the people in Torngat Mountains would send him down the tubes. There is no question whatsoever about that. Do not forget, I live in Labrador, too. In fact, I am the only member from Labrador who lives in his district; keep that in mind.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, if I may make this comment, I see absolutely no point in continuing to consume the valuable time of this House, as the popinjay antics of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) just indicated. We totally - and it has been said many times - support the resolution as put forward by the member for Torngat Mountains. We will give the Premier the unanimous support on this resolution that he frequently seeks in this House, there is no question about it. Why can we not simply allow the member for Torngat Mountains, in his typically incoherent manner, to get up and wrap up the matter, put the question, and have done with it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Now, go out and count the words.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):



The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There is a real problem with members of the Opposition which has been obvious here today. What members on this side have been saying with reference to the resolution put forward by our colleague from -

MR. DECKER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

If I may, before the hon. member continues.

As I understand debate, two opposing sides are presented. One side says this is the case and the other says that is the case. Now, we have here a case where both sides of this hon. House agree.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

It is like if I am saying, 'It is raining', and the other side is saying, 'It is raining.' Mr. Speaker, this is silly! We are trying to expedite the business of this Province. We are trying to speed it up so that we are not called a bunch of clowns by the people out there! For goodness sake, Mr. Speaker!

My point of order is let us recognize that we are helping this House. It is an important motion, we agree with it, we have said we agree with it. Let us put the

question so we can move on to other business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

I think the rules are very clear in this House if anybody would care to read the Standing Orders. Every member in this House has a right to be heard. Private Members' Day consists of two Wednesdays, and as long as any member of this House wants to speak, the Opposition or nobody else can prevent him in their own little way, their devious way, I might say, this afternoon, with points of order. They deliberately attempted to interrupt the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) because what he was saying was hurting to the core. I think the points of order are nothing but spurious and an attempt by the Opposition to disrupt the proceedings of this House.

MR. FUREY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. DAWE:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), was simply defining debate for the hon. the member for Humber West. So I refer the hon. the member for Humber West to Webster.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) for sort of proving what I was about to say. They made a very strategic error last week during debate on this very important motion put forward by the member for Torngat Mountains. The mistake they made, of course, Mr. Speaker, was in fact, that no one on the other side supported the resolution. There was not one single word of support for the resolution. Each member in turn got up, as is the wont of some people who are classified in a puppet category. When their string was pulled, they got on their feet and they said to the House, "We refer you to the Liberal caucus manifesto," and sat down.

Mr. Speaker, there was not one single word of support. They obviously saw that when the day was over they had made a mistake. What reinforced the obvious mistake was later when they refused to stand and support a resolution dealing with factory freezer trawlers in this Province. Mr. Speaker, I rest my case.

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the hon. minister has not read the report. If he or anyone can suggest that this party does not support this motion, it is obvious that they did not read or cannot read or refuse to read this report. If the hon. member would read the report he would see that we have not only said it, we have written it and we do support this motion. I appeal to this House once again, Mr. Speaker, to let us put the vote, get it out of the way, so we will not be seen as a bunch of clowns wasting time. It is a good motion. Let us put it and get unanimous consent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

It is obvious now that the hon. members opposite have been getting burned for the last two weeks on fisheries issues, losing ground every day. Their tactic here today is so evident and so obvious it is not even funny. They cannot hold their weight on this particular resolution so their tactic or their ploy is to, let us get rid of this resolution, boys, get on to the next one, which will probably create a bit more controversy prior to a municipal election and things like this. That is what they have in their mind.

So the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle makes an appeal. Mr. Speaker, I make an appeal too to the hon. members opposite, let the members over on this side have their say on this very important resolution. It is important to the fishermen of the Province, especially the Coast of Labrador, and let us get on with the debate. When the debate is over we will put the resolution to a vote and then they can vote. But do not get up and interrupt every speaker by raising spurious points of order ten or fifteen times. It is so obvious, you are using up the member's time and it is just so unfair, Mr. Speaker. I appeal for your support in this particular issue.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, every time hon. gentlemen opposite get to their feet they only reinforce what I have been saying, what the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands has been saying, that they have been caught short. They are faced with a situation where the people of this Province, supporters of their own party, are saying to them, 'What, in the name of heavens, are you doing? What have you done to the grass root support of this party? You are not even speaking out on behalf of the fishermen of this Province.'

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman for the Straits of Belle Isle says that this is a debate and there are two sides to a debate.

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

I am not going to stay in this hon. House and have him call it the Straits of Belle Isle. It is the Strait of Belle Isle, Mr. Speaker, and let him get that into his head. It is the Strait of Belle Isle, I told him before.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I wish to remind the hon. the Minister of Transportation it is the Strait of Belle Isle not the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. DAWE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand corrected.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

I would just like to point out to the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle that this is not a debate or a debating society or a debating forum, this is a Parliament where one speaks. The word 'Parliament' indicates that a person is supposed to speak. If, in the process of speaking, one were to only get up and say, 'On this particular issue I would like to refer the hon. House to Disraeli or Mark Twain,' and quote the various passages or indicate the various passages in articles that have been written from time to time, then that would be very easy to do. Members would sit around and research different topics and try to come up with

quotes from other people that indicated their particular views on the subject and that is all it would be. But this is not a debating society, Mr. Speaker, this is a Parliament where one is supposed to speak.

Members on this side of the House are taking the opportunity to speak on a very important issue dealing with the fishermen of this Province and it affects, Mr. Speaker, all parts of the Province in different ways. That is why, Mr. Speaker, this resolution was put forward by my colleague from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). It is important to each and every member to stand up on his feet in this House in a recorded forum, in a forum that goes out in a public way to the people of this Province indicating their personal views as it relates to issues. That is why it is a Parliament. That is why you are supposed to speak on the issues.

Mr. Speaker, in my particular district the issues referred to here are very relevant and they have been for some time because policies that have been set forward with regard to the fisheries in this Province are ones that -

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Fogo on a point of order.

MR. TULK:  
He seems to be trying to suggest again that people in this House are not speaking. Let me say to him that this issue has been spoken on. He may have been asleep, gone, or out of the world, I do not know where he was, but

let me point out to him again, that Liberals in this Province have spoken on this issue. What we are trying to get across to the government and to the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and to all of them over there, is that it is high time to stop speaking, to get to Ottawa, convince Sir John that the job needs to be done, convince Sir Brian in Ottawa that the job needs to be done, and let us get on with it. For God sake, our fishermen are suffering! Let us get on with it.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:  
I thank the hon. gentleman from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) again for just reinforcing what I have already said, they have been stung badly with the public reaction both inside and outside of the party that they have been receiving, and are taking the opportunity today, Mr. Speaker, on points of order to try and indicate to this legislature that they have somehow supported this resolution last week during debate or at any other given time. From what I have read of Hansard and the various quotes that are in there, that is not the case and members opposite have not, during last week, indicated support for this resolution. They just asked members on this side of the legislature, and others, to read a Liberal manifesto.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the place for that reading process. This is a place for people to stand on their feet and voice their various concerns about their own riding and the issues that are before

this House.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon member for Fogo on a point of order.

MR. TULK:

Support for this resolution will not come with the pious words of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). Support for this resolution will come in a vote to be taken in this House. We say to him, if he wants to put the vote now, at twenty minutes to five, let him put the vote and then we will see who supports the resolution, and then we will go on from there to see who takes the necessary action to see that resolution put into effect.

I say to him again the fishermen of Newfoundland are waiting for him to act as the government of this Province and not waiting for him to spit out pious words in this Legislature. Get on with it!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) seems to forget one little thing. The hon. member for Fogo thinks that his party is the only party that provides opposition in this legislature and is the only party that can decide whether or not we vote or speak on a resolution. I happen to know that my good friend, the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) also has an interest in this resolution. He represents a Labrador riding and

he wants to express his views and his opinions. So the member for Fogo should put his tail between his legs and get out through the back door because they are getting so burned they just want to get away from fisheries issues, they want to get off fisheries matters, Mr. Speaker, because they are embarrassed and trying to interrupt our members. That is the whole crux of the matter.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

I do not believe I have consulted with the hon. gentleman for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) on this, and I do not propose to speak for him, but if you want to go ten or twenty minutes and let the hon. gentleman for Menihek ensure us that his party is in support, sure, let us do it, but let us not waste the time of this legislature, let us not hide behind a smoke screen and let us get on with the job. You have dug the hole, you are in it and that is where you are going to stay. As far as the fishermen of this Province are concerned, you are in the hole now.

Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, again I would like to thank members opposite because

every time they do that - hopefully the reporting will indicate just what their action has been on this - they have proved the point that I have been making all afternoon, they are caught on the horns of a dilemma, the same horns, Mr. Speaker, that could go along with the tail referred to by my colleague the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms). Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to this hon. House -

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle on a point of order.

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister explain to me and this House what the horns of dilemma are?

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order there is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What is going by members opposite is a clear indication of their concern about this particular issue, Mr. Speaker, they are trying to make a joke of it.

Mr. Speaker lets just assume that the members opposite got their way. Yes, Mr. Speaker, yes members of the government, we will vote in favour of this particular resolution. We can only assume that Mr. Speaker because none of them and I will apologize, I say none of them, I did not hear the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr.

Kelland) speak so he perhaps did support it when you get to your feet. I am not sure. But members opposite have not supported it so they are saying now, as they are raising spurious points of order, that they will vote for this particular resolution when the times comes.

Mr. Speaker, in an honourable forum one would be expected to perhaps indicate that they would do that when the time came, but Mr. Speaker I would just like to indicate to the members opposite that since I have been in this legislature since 1979, I have not seen an occasion in this legislature where we could believe or trust what the hon. the members opposite said from any given time to what they would do five minutes hence because as the minister has already indicated, they have changed their minds like the weather, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member is asking me to do is get up and speak against a motion that I intend to vote for. Now what kind of an idiot would he have me to be? What he is suggesting is preposterous nonsense, Mr. Speaker. We are all going to say we are going to vote for it, "Yes, yes, yes!" Why waste the time of this House? Let us put the motion and get it out of the way because there is a good motion coming up which requires a lot of debate,



Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

What the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle is asking us, if I can get it correct, to speak for a resolution that they are going to vote for. What kind of idiots do we think they are? Well Mr. Speaker, here is the type of idiots they are, the same crowd a week ago voted against the resolution that they spoke in favour of, so what is the difference? The hon. members, as the Minister of Transportation has just said, cannot be trusted. They are obviously trying to take up the time when the hon. member is speaking. It is very interesting, just in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, to assist you in your ruling, if I may, if we can get the hon. crowd opposite to be quiet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Just to conclude, Mr. Speaker. The hon. members are trying to take the House on their back. They do not have a monopoly on speaking, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Greening)

The hon. the Minister for Forest Resources and Lands would like silence while he is speaking to a point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. member opposite, Mr.

Speaker, as I have said, are trying to do one thing only, that is to get out from being burned. But it is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note that here today they have all kinds of time in the world to get up on spurious points of order and speak on spurious points of order. Yet, they do not have time to speak on the resolution itself and give us the benefit of their view and I think that that is ridiculous and I think they should be told to sit down.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, I want to tell the Minister for Forest Resources and Lands that my friend from the Strait of Belle Isle is exactly right. What they would like for us to do is vote against this resolution, but we cannot do that, Mr. Speaker, because we support it.

I want to tell him something else too, we are not getting up on spurious points of order, we are getting -

MR. SIMMS:

Do you support FFTs?

MR. TULK:

Do I what? Where were you in July, my son, when I stated categorically -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

That FFTs should not be allowed in the Province while the Premier over there was studying the details.

Mr. Speaker, let me speak just one moment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo is speaking to a point of order and I would ask all other members to be silent, please!

MR. TULK:

I want to tell him that in speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that all we are trying to do is to say to him look, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) would you get educated? The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) would you get educated? Everybody in Newfoundland today supports this kind of resolution. We have another resolution and other resolutions on the Order Paper, let us get this one out of the way.

MR. SIMMS:

Why did you vote against the last one?

MR. FUREY:

Because you did not vote for the amendment.

MR. TULK:

We are not going to allow you to play your little games. Mr. Speaker, let us get it out of the way and let us move on and see the action of this government when implementing this with their Tory buddies in Ottawa. You cannot have it both ways.

MR. SPEAKER: (Greening)

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

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. TULK:

That is what you are trying to have.

MR. SIMMS:

No, you are.

MR. DAWE:

Unlike members opposite, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record as supporting this resolution put forward so ably by my colleague, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) as it relates to a change in the system of the application of unemployment insurance to fishermen around the Province and to support the principle put forward in the resolution relative to differences that the Province has and differences in flexibility within the system that it could be available to fishermen in my constituency, as well as in Labrador and other parts of the Province.

But it is important, Mr. Speaker, in the process of this particular legislative debate on this resolution to indicate it is important for each and every member to stand on his feet in this Legislature and support this resolution. This is the only way, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the Province can see for themselves just how their elected representatives have answered the questions raised in a particular resolution, whether they are for it or against it.

Mr. Speaker, members on this side of the House wish to speak on this resolution, wish to support it and

wish to make their comments known on behalf of their constituents and the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite would like to try and take the House on their backs, or try to make us believe that they would support a particular resolution when, as my colleague, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) has indicated, only last week they said they were going to vote for a resolution and when the time came for division, they voted against it.

So, Mr. Speaker, how can we be expected on this side of the House to trust members opposite when they are saying that they will do something when, in fact, we know very well, from time to time, they have done a flip flop, whether it be on the issue of the provincial flag, on the issue of factory freezer trawlers or others, they have been noted as being the flip flop party in this Province and will continue, Mr. Speaker, I am sure, to do the same.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity, as I started to do at the beginning, to show examples in my own constituency where the present system has been unfair. But during the course of debate, members on this side have pointed out in their own constituencies the problems that are occurring in my own as they relate to the inadequacy and the inconsistencies in the present UI regulations.

I represent, Mr. Speaker, a constituency in this Province which, I suppose, epitomizes the traditional Newfoundland lifestyle, where people engaged in three facets of livelihood which made up their total livelihood in

fishing, farming and forestry. I see the lifestyle of people who have wanted to carry on that, particularly, in the Bay St. George area, eroded through various policies that have been specific to one of those occupations or another. I think it is to the detriment of us all that that has been allowed to occur, Mr. Speaker. It is part of the compounded reason, when we get into unemployment insurance problems, that they are not allowed to transfer their earnings from one occupation to another. It is creating some very extreme hardships, particularly, in areas of the Province where one cannot go from working at a service station to working in a store or working in some other line of work, where one has to rely on the resource-based industries and cannot transfer stamps, if you will, or UI benefits from one particular area to another.

So I would like to fully support the resolution put forward by my colleague for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

Mr. Speaker, perhaps since hon. members opposite have remained quiet over the past two or three minutes they are finally realizing that what we are saying is true. Perhaps, they will get to their feet in this speaking parliament and indicate to the people of this Province what their position is on this resolution. Unlike the bad feelings that are rampant right from coast to coast in the Province, relative to lack of support for the factory freezer trawler issue, maybe, they will take the opportunity, in the time that we have left in this debate today, to stand on their feet and support this very worthwhile and important resolution to the

fishermen of this Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I was listening to a lot of references to the horns of a dilemma in the previous speaker's comments and the speakers before that. It reminds me of a joke I once heard about that. Someone was comparing a speech to horns and said that, "It is just like the horns on an animal," he said, "you have a point here and a point there and a lot of bull in between." I thought we could have a little levity in this disputing.

Very few people know that we have tried to start an inshore fishery in my district. I mean most people do not think that it is possible but we had a few entrepreneurs who showed initiative and decided that they were going to start an inshore fishery in Wabush Lake. So they got themselves a few gill nets and they went out. Unfortunately, after two days of fishing - and they did extremely well, catching these beautiful lake fish - they were arrested by the park wardens and, I understand, they ended up with a \$2,000 fine. So that has been pretty well the end of our inshore fishery in my district but, having said that, I was hoping to lighten up the debate here a bit.

I would also like to say that I lived for fifteen years in Port au Port, which is very much dependent on the inshore fishery. From that point of view I can see the problems that the member for -

MR. GILBERT:

Turncoat Mountains.

MR. FENWICK:

The way you are dangling my district I should call it Turncoat Mountains but I am going to call it Torngat Mountains because I would not desecrate any part of Labrador willingly.

The one thing though I would like to point out in this debate is the very cavalier way we have been treating the problem. We have here a situation that is extremely important to a large number of inshore fishermen. We have a resolution that I do not think anybody in this House or anybody in the Province would be -

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. DECKER:

The hon. member is accusing us, and I assume he includes those of the Liberal Party as well, of treating this matter in a cavalier manner. Mr. Speaker, we are trying to expedite the passing of this motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member has twenty minutes to speak in this debate and there

is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Just to finish this, we are treating it cavalierly and I am not singling out the Liberal Party so there is no reason to get very sensitive about it. I am suggesting that we are treating it cavalierly because what we are doing is we are committing maybe four or five hours of debate to the particular problem and then, I guess, the resolution will be forwarded from here, if it passes, to the appropriate federal authorities and basically that will be the end of it.

I suggest that really, in my estimation, is not enough action on our part, on the part of either the Liberals or the part of the Conservative Government or on the part of myself. I think it indicates a lack or a failing that I perceive in our House here, especially after the last month or two when I had the privilege of going with the Select Committee on Accommodations and Benefits to see how other Houses operate.

What I suggest is that we do not really have a mechanism for coming to grips with problems as a House of Assembly. The government has their own methods. They have the Resource Policy Committee and the Social Policy Committee and so on, but there is nothing that is in a bi-partisan nature, everything becomes partisan. The government will come through with a policy and then the Opposition will pick holes in it and that will be it, but there is no bi-partisan way of examining problems and coming up collective solutions.

I thought that the experience I had on the Committee was so gratifying - we were able to come to a common approach to the problems - that we really should look at that in terms of a fishery problem and in terms of other problems in our House.

What I am suggesting is that for this House of Assembly not to have a standing committee on fisheries - and that is what I am proposing - is a travesty. There it is, the industry that created this country, and later this Province, and we do not have a standing committee to continually look at problems that arise.

I want to stand up today and say that I commend the Liberal Caucus' work on the inshore fishery and the hearings they had. Obviously, because it was only one particular party, it has not been well received by the government side, but it was an attempt to listen to what was going on out there, to identify problems, and to come up with solutions. Unfortunately, it has not been received very well. But on a bi-partisan basis, with representation from all parties, it could have been an excellent way of looking at our industry, deciding what is wrong with it, and what kind of substantial constructive changes would have to be made for it. I salute them for having done that. I think it was a positive step and I think, on behalf of the House of Assembly, we should be looking at those things. I am not saying it just for fisheries.

I think that also forestry, agriculture, mining and other industries should have standing committees where there could be a build up of a body of expertise outside of the Cabinet, for



individual backbenchers to be involved more with policy evaluation and policy creation and legislation in the future. I think that is one thing that we lack terribly.

We have the committees that are set up during the budget debate, but they are, sort of, ad hoc in the sense that they are set up and then really they do not do anything after the budget is passed. They sort of disappear into the woodwork. I would argue strongly that we should have a system like that.

MR. SIMMS:

Would the hon. member permit a question? Is that view one that is shared by the recent Select Committee on members benefits? Did they not make a recommendation about that?

MR. FENWICK:

They made one recommendation that we should examine the way in which we do business in the House and see if we can make it less partisan. This may be one of the solutions to it.

Okay, that is one of the comments I wanted to make, that we should really have a more permanent and non-partisan way of looking at the problems because it does not do us any good to fight on it. It does not do us any good to play games with it. We should have a collective approach, I think, in which the good of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, as a whole, is looked at.

MR. DECKER:

It is similar to the Russian system, is it not? When you are elected, you do not have to (inaudible).

MR. FENWICK:

It is similar, actually, to the system used in Ottawa, if you would call that a socialist system.

Getting more specific though, I think that there is a question that we should be raising about unemployment insurance even wider than the one we are approaching right here in terms of how it relates to the fishery, eligibility periods, the transferability of stamps and all the other list of problems that I think all of us have seen because our constituents have come up to us with them and we have had a hard time settling them.

I think we are going to have to realize that there is a desire on the part of the federal government to revise the unemployment insurance programme. Quite frankly, the thought of what they may come up with scares me. It scares me and I think it scares anybody who realizes how heavily dependent our society and our economy has become on unemployment insurance.

We have, as I understand it, close to 100,000 people a year in this Province who will draw unemployment insurance. That is fully half of our work force when you think of it. Now, not all at once, obviously, about half of them at once. About 100,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians in the course of a year will draw unemployment insurance.

Now we have a process of review going on by the federal government that will draw up new regulations for it, new standards. Can you imagine what would happen if instead of ten weeks to apply, it becomes fifteen or eighteen or twenty. Fifteen, of course, was a



recommendation that I saw in reports that were tabled just several years ago and it may be re-introduced.

So I think that this is a situation, since it impacts so heavily on virtually half the work-force in this Province at one time each year, that we have to really be very much concerned about these revisions. I think we have to make some valuable input, as a Legislature, into the committees that are making these revisions, that are examining the process so that they clearly understand the impact it would have by raising the number of weeks required to qualify or shortening the number of weeks that you can draw it or cutting down the percentage of income that you can draw or any one of a number of things.

This is a very worrisome thing to me. It is a serious thing. I think that we are going to have to approach it and have to lobby on it if we are going to make sure that the federal government understands our real concerns in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I really do not have a huge amount more to say. I had some comments to make in reply to comments that were made by other members but here it is a week after that I am trying to make this speech and I am really not in the position to do it.

Just to summarize the major points that I wanted to make. First, I feel that we are being a bit cavalier in the sense that this is an important issue. We should have a stronger approach than just debating it on two subsequent Wednesdays.

Secondly, I must commend the Liberal Party for their approach in going and listening to the inshore fishermen. I think it is a commendable one.

Thirdly, I think we, as a House, should be doing that with a standing committee on the fishery.

And fourthly, I honestly believe that we are going to have to make a serious impact on the unemployment insurance review panel that is going around the country to make sure that we do not end up with such major changes that they cause enormous hardship in large areas of our Province.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will sit down. I, by the way, support the resolution.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Representing a district that is totally dependent upon the fishery, I feel somewhat compelled to speak in what was a wide-ranging debate last Wednesday, and again today, on this very important resolution so ably put forth by my colleague, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). I think, Mr. Speaker, it is sort of healthy that we do have wide-ranging debate. For the two days debate has been highlighting problems with the fishery and issues within the fishery within our Province and within our country.

I would just like to draw attention to a couple of the Whereas in the resolution, Mr. Speaker, particularly the part of the resolution which says, 'Whereas fishermen living in some areas of Newfoundland and all of the Coast of Labrador are treated very unfairly by the present regulations.' It is obvious that all hon. members on this side and the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) agrees with this particular resolution because they have stood and supported it. I am sure that all hon. members who represent fishing districts, and a lot of them who do not represent fishing districts, realize the problems there are with the regulations as they pertain at present to UIC benefits for fishermen.

Since I was elected to this House of Assembly in 1982, one of the reoccurring problems to me as the representative of the thirteen communities in my district is the frustration of fishermen because of the present regulation pertaining to UIC. Because weather and lack of fish caused fishermen to stop fishing in my area much earlier in the Fall than in some other areas, they are without benefits until the prescribed date, which is somewhere around November 15. I do not think they qualify before then.

Of course, there is usually a long waiting period before then when fishermen do not have any income, consequently, they suffer great hardship. That is a very, very big issue my district and in most fishing districts of the Province. Fishermen, of course, have lobbied over the years to try and have this regulation changed. We on this side have worked

strenuously to have it changed. It is my understanding that the Fishermen's Union have lobbied to have it changed, and are in full agreement with the text of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I must say, as one member of fifty-two in this House of Assembly, that it is very discouraging to stand here and see members of the Official Opposition just stand and table a report and literally make no remarks about this particular resolution.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of any report compiled by whomever, a party, a person or a group, usually there is a debate which follows to substantiate the report.

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. SIMMONS:

This is a matter, we are told, which government members have a great deal of interest in. Why do we not have enough in here a quorum? I call for a quorum, Mr. Speaker.

#### Quorum

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

Three minutes have elapsed. We have a quorum.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to say, as has been said by a number of speakers from this side of the House who spoke previously, that what just happened is another attempt by the Opposition to try and waste the time of the House. Once again it demonstrates the priority that members of the Opposition place on fisheries issues in this Province.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman is trying to attribute motives to the Opposition which are not correct. We are not trying to waste the time of this House. As a matter of fact, we offered the government a way out to save some time in this House and to get on to other matters of importance.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order, it was a difference between two hon. gentlemen.

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We, on this side, Mr. Speaker know all too well about the Opposition when they offer this government ways out. The thing about it is that in the past their way out has not usually been in the best interest

of the people of this Province.

MR. TULK:

You are living in the present and the future, my son.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Of course, we do not intend to be guided in any way by members of the Opposition. All we are saying, I guess, is that it is important that members of the Opposition join with us in making representation to the federal government to have changes made to the UIC regulations so that the fishermen of Newfoundland and Labrador, regardless of where they live within this Province, can be, as the resolution says treated equally and fairly with other of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and with other Canadians. I do not think, Mr. Speaker that is too much to ask.

As I was saying at the time the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) interrupted me, because the Liberal Opposition has prepared a report, I do not think that should give them leave to just stand and table the report and then sit down. Any document which is of consequence and which anyone believes in, Mr. Speaker, if that document is valuable and is perceived to be valued by those who have compiled it, then the usual process is for them to stand and debate and try to push that document. All we have seen here, Mr. Speaker, is a case of them jumping up like puppets at the direction, of course, of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk), strict direction, to just get up, table the report, and sit down. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that fully demonstrates the

Opposition's interest in the fisheries issues in this Province and I think it is very, very disappointing. I think, as well as other speakers before me, that the word has gone out across this Province about about where the Opposition stands on factory freezer trawlers. Word has gone out across this Province about the stand the Opposition took on our all-plants-open policy. They were in agreement with putting plants down in this Province.

I think it is very ironic, Mr. Speaker, to stand here today and listen to the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage, particularly, accuse this government of buckling to Mulrooney - I think those are the words he used - when just a few short months ago, Mr. Speaker, he was a member of Parliament, in Ottawa, representing the riding of Burin - St. Georges, probably the largest fishing district in the Province as it pertains to the deep-sea fishery, and to whom did he buckle? He buckled to his own government and to Michael Kirby and was in agreement with putting plants down in the very district I now represent. I think it is very ironic, Mr. Speaker, how people fluctuate when they get into different positions within politics.

Mr. Speaker, when this House debated the resolution as put forward by the hon. the Premier on factory freezer trawlers a few short days ago, I think it was appalling to see once again the tack the Opposition took.

MR. KELLAND:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, again I mention the fact that I am a rookie in the House and I really do not understand some of the things that members opposite go into, but would it not be much more expedient if the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) and his colleagues would stick to the actual resolution we are debating and not emulate the popinjay antics of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) we saw earlier? Why cannot the minister address himself directly to the resolution? We are totally in support of it, as I have already said. There is no question about it, we are really wasting time. We are consuming valuable time. We have other government business, other House business to discuss. Let the hon. member for Torngat Mountains clue it all up, put the question and get it over with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again, it another case where the hon. gentleman has been muzzled by his Leader and by the Opposition House Leader. He has been muzzled, he is not allowed to speak on the resolution. As much as he might want to, he is not permitted to speak on the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KELLAND:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Naskaupi on a point of order.

MR. KELLAND:

I think the hon. minister is misleading the House in that he said I would not speak on the resolution. I already have and I suppose the Minister of Fisheries, since he has nothing better to do, or is capable of doing nothing better, will give me a count on the words tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to all hon. members that this charade by the Opposition that we have witnessed today has been led by the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), under the direction of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I guess. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. the member for Fogo has been bitten by the Leader of the Opposition? Because it seems to me that he is certainly displaying two prominent characteristics of the Leader of the Opposition today, those of instability and lunacy. It seems to be a trend, something that is spreading over there, the contraction of some weird thing that is making them behave rather strangely. Speaker, I think instability, for sure, is starting to be the prime characteristic now to get up and

speak in the House of Assembly if you are a member of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, as I alluded to earlier, on the issue of the factory freezer trawlers for which we had hoped to get unanimous support in this House and be able to take that unanimous position to Ottawa, the position taken by the Opposition was, again, very disappointing. All we have heard from members of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, is that they want a select committee or a joint committee to go to Ottawa.

MR. TULK:

Led by the Premier.

MR. MATTHEWS:

It does not matter who leads the committee or the group. Back where I grew up, on the Burin Peninsula, it was almost a tradition that on Sundays a lot of families would go for a Sunday ride. That is what the members of the Opposition remind me of, they look forward so much to a trip to Ottawa. It amazes me! Of course, when we went for a Sunday ride, it was quite a delight if we happened to stop into one of the local stores to get an ice cream or something.

As I said to one of the members of the Opposition on Friday, it seems that they want to get to Ottawa for this great trip.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

The Minister for Culture, Recreation and Youth, or soccer balls, is misleading this House.

I suppose it is unintentional. Again it is ignorance probably, and I do not mean ignorance in a mannerly way, I mean ignorance, a lack of knowledge.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
We did not want a trip to Ottawa. As a matter of fact, we offered to pay our way to Ottawa and make the Premier the guy who led the delegation.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I was listening carefully to the hon. minister and, in my opinion, he was not misleading the House.

MR. TULK:  
He was, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Are you questioning the Speaker's ruling?

MR. SPEAKER:  
There seems to be an attempt to stop hon. members from speaking for their twenty minutes and that will not be allowed by the Chair.

MR. TULK:  
No, Mr. Speaker. That is not true.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Please, Sir, on a point of privilege. What has this become, some kind of a kangaroo court or something?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. Who is doing the stopping? Tell me, who is doing the stopping?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Who is doing the stopping?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Would the hon. member please wait until he is recognized.

MR. SIMMONS:  
On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much for recognizing me. Your impartiality I salute, Sir, and in that context, Sir, I ask you, when you allege that somebody is obstructing, making an effort, an attempt to obstruct debate, would you be so specific as to name who is doing that obstructing?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
All of you.

MR. SIMMONS:  
We have listened, Mr. Speaker, and we have watched from here as that clown from Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) goes on about all kinds of irrelevancies and you sit there and nod at every word he says. And you talk about us being obstructionists! Check your dictionary. Who is doing the obstructing? Who is doing the obstructing, I ask you?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:



To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, there is certainly no reason to speak at any length on this matter. It is quite obvious that the impartiality of the Chair has been called into question and the Chair subjected to a lecture and a chastisement. Indeed, I do not see, really, how the Chair or this House can allow that to go without being withdrawn.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I would, and, of course, I know Your Honour will if it is so required check Hansard, and you will find that my hon. friend for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) used no words to question the Chair. As a matter of fact, he asked Your Honour to do one specific thing and that was to name who was doing the obstructing. The points of order, Your Honour, which have been raised in this House this afternoon have been raised when government members on the other side have attempted, either out of ignorance or otherwise, to mislead this House. Those are legitimate points of order for His Honour to rule on whichever way he chooses to rule. Mr. Speaker, as long as government members are going to state facts which are not true or which are careless with the truth, we have to have the privilege in

this House of getting up and correcting that type of information, and that is what the points of order have been about.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, I will review the matter and report at a later date.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

I appreciate the fact that the Speaker has undertaken to review the -

MR. J. CARTER:

How far are you going to push the Speaker?

MR. SIMMONS:

Who is obstructing now, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that you will take under advisement the matter that you have just indicated you would. I believe the other matter that I raised requires no time lapse. I submit that the Chair either knew or did not know, and I submit the former. I submit the Chair knew who was doing the obstructing or he would not have made the allegation, and I submit, therefore, that that is not a matter that requires any contemplation and I would ask the Speaker to indicate who is doing the obstructing, if it is I or if it is another member here. Or maybe Mr. Speaker is referring to the constant harassment that we have been getting today from the other side when we have been trying to make our points. Would

the Speaker indicate to the House who is doing the obstructing?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Minister of Culture Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will try to get back to the point in the debate and the resolution, Mr. Speaker, where I was so rudely interrupted by the hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), the ten day wonder, the ten day gigolo of Ottawa who is now back in the Province. I can understand why he is smarting, Mr. Speaker. We have one MP in Ottawa today who is speaking out on the factory freezer trawler issue and that is Joe Price. And I am very proud of that, Mr. Speaker, because I was somewhat instrumental in having Mr. Price elected, and, of course, 'Mr. Simmons defeated'. I am sure that is why he is smarting.

I would just like to go on to say, Mr. Speaker, what a change there is from the present federal representation in Burin - St. George's to what we saw before last September, when the then member of Parliament wanted to shut down plants in his own riding. What a change! Yet he is so sanctimonious as to come into this House and call someone else a clown, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has now elapsed.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, just let me have a couple of words to say before, obviously, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) closes debate on this resolution. Back during the Summer when a number of fisheries issues arose in the Province, and a number of other employment or unemployment issues arose, we heard from the Opposition at that time, 'Why does not the Premier open the House so that we can debate these issues?' One thing the House of Assembly is, is a place for members to debate various issues which are of concern to them and to the people of Newfoundland as they perceive them to be. Now we saw last Wednesday, which is Private Members' Day, and again this Wednesday, an attempt by the opposition not to debate a resolution put before the House by a private member. They have not debated the issue of unemployment insurance for fishermen which is related to this resolution here, and, Mr. Speaker, one has to question that.

I mean, if you look at the fishery over the last number of years and you look at the Liberal Party, we had a restructuring agreement which the Liberal Party was prepared to go along with which would have seen the close-down of plants in Ramea, Gaultois, Harbour Breton, Grand Bank and Burin.

MR. TULK:

Not true. Not true.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I saw the documents. They had been approved and the Liberal Party in Newfoundland were going to go along with them. Here was

the way they handled the fishery at that point in time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this past week, we had a resolution on factory freezer trawlers and we wanted the Opposition's support for the government's position. I mean, the Opposition act as if we do not have the majority of members on our side of the House. We are the government, we have been elected to serve as the government, and we wanted the Opposition to support us on a resolution opposing factory freezer trawlers. What did they do? You can see that they put their politics before their Province and before the best interests of the Province. Just because the government did not see any wisdom in having a select committee on factory freezer trawlers, which is a decision by the federal government, they would not allow the Premier of the Province, or the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and others to be able to argue with the federal government that we have unanimous support on that resolution.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:

If the Premier is going to outline a process, then we also include in that process the fact that he came and leaned over this desk and originally supported a select committee, then he went back to his caucus and came back and said, 'No, I cannot support it,' because he thought it was not good politics for him.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I was up on a previous point of order earlier today, an hour and a half ago. Every single point of order that the Opposition have raised today has not been legitimized, it has not been a point of order, and once again we see this point of order which is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now, Mr. Speaker, they were willing to sacrifice giving support against factory freezer trawlers over a technicality of whether it should be a select committee transmit the information as opposed to the government transmitting the information. Now, how important, how concerned can people be when they are willing to allow a technicality of transmission to overrule their concern for the fishery, for the principle? They have completely violated it. Now, I can see what the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) did. I can understand that. He thought from his vantage point as a member of the Opposition that a Select Committee would be a good idea because quite likely he would be on it, and so on. From his perspective, I can see it. But I do have to give the hon. the member for Menihek full marks for, on the one hand,

supporting the amendment. And when it was defeated in a democratic vote in this Legislature, he was not going to be so petty as to allow how the message was going to be transmitted override his concern for the future of the fishing industry of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
And that is the difference. You have a small-minded, politically orientated group of people who call themselves the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador.

There are two Wednesdays allocated to debating resolutions, Mr. Speaker, and in almost every case the Opposition historically, this session, last Spring, last year, going back five or six years, have taken up the two Wednesdays on issues just as important as this or less important than this, and wanted to debate those issues for the two Wednesdays. Now, suddenly, we are faced with a resolution on trying to get some greater equity into how unemployment insurance applies to the fishermen of the Province, which surely is an issue most members in the House are familiar with, and now, what do we see the Opposition doing? Because they have a resolution on the Order Paper which comes up next and which has to do with municipal elections, they are prepared to sacrifice debating UIC for fishermen so that they can try to make a political point on a Private Member's resolution before the municipal election occurs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They are more concerned with making a political point on the municipal election than they are on debating whether UIC for fishermen should be more equitable in Newfoundland and Labrador. Now, that is the story on what the Liberal Opposition has done over the last two Wednesdays, when historically, they have no evidence, they have no basis of argument for sitting there in silence. There is no basis of it. Because they are the people who demand that the House be open. What for? To debate issues, fisheries issues, unemployment insurance issues, and now, when the House is open and their day, the Private Members' Day, comes up on Wednesday, they refuse to debate, based upon a political technicality of trying to get a resolution on municipal elections on the floor of the House before Election Day, next Tuesday. They are willing to sacrifice debating UIC for fishermen for a political technicality, political one-upmanship. That is the kind of frivolous, Junior Red Cross mentality which governs the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador. And why, Mr. Speaker? There is wisdom in the crowd, Mr. Speaker. And that is why, since 1972, the Liberal Party have found themselves in the political wilderness of Newfoundland politics. And anybody worth half his salt knows, when you go around this Province, that the people know what is going on. They are not so stupid as to think that they are going to give full marks to the Liberal Opposition for political one-upmanship. That is not what they are interested in. They are interested in seeing the various members stand in their place and present a reasoned

argument for the resolution or against the resolution, or putting up a reasoned argument on an amendment to a resolution because they believe in that amendment and it will be voted for or against, or whatever. That is what this Legislature is all about. It is a debating forum on different things, especially Private Members' Day. It is, by definition, a debating forum and not to debate means you are not doing what this day was established for in the first place, Mr. Speaker. They are not doing their jobs. They are shirking their responsibilities and obligations to stand up and indicate how they would approach this particular resolution. It is 'Neary' politics all over again.

MR. TULK:  
Who?

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
It is Neary politics all over again. And I know, for example, that if one of the former leaders of the Opposition, who now resides in Swift Current, a former member in the Federal Cabinet and a former MP, was leader of that party today, he would not stand for it. It was when that gentleman was Leader of the Liberal Party that we got the changes made in the rules of the House for estimates committees and other things, and having these two days for private members' resolutions and all the rest of it. He would not stand for it, because he knows it is flaunting the rules of the House.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

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

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier is not debating this resolution, he is taking the opportunity to do what other hon. members opposite have done, stay away from the topic of the resolution and simply play petty politics with some other issue. I would invite the Premier to give us his evaluation of the substance of the resolution.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Every time we are discussing a subject matter in this hon. House the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) and all hon. members opposite want as much leeway as they can get in debating, whether it is a fisheries issue, or telling what the Liberal Party's position on the fishery has been. The hon. member for Gander and every member here knows that we have agreed by almost silent consensus to allow a fair amount of latitude when one is debating a resolution of this sort. That is not a valid point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, a certain amount of latitude is allowed and I must rule that there is no point of order.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, before the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren)



gets up to close the debate I want to go on record as saying, as it relates to the charade that we have seen, that it is extremely unfortunate that after all the calls for the House to be open to debate the issues of the day, to have all the people of the Province hear from their elected representatives as legislators, as debaters on issues facing the Province, that we see a Liberal Opposition which continues to try to play cheap political points, so cheap, Mr. Speaker, that they lower the dignity, they lower the esteem with which Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and Canadians, generally, hold legislatures and houses of parliament and legislators themselves. The public attitude toward politicians and toward legislators will never be any different than it is now as long as this sort of thing continues..

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am speaking now and there is supposed to be silence, yet there are three or four members opposite speaking up. You will never be able to improve how people view us in our occupations as long as we continue to play these petty games that the Liberal Opposition have played over the last two or three weeks, especially on this resolution and on the resolution dealing with the factory freezer trawler issue. Mr. Speaker, this is a sound and reasonable resolution that all members should be able to get up and speak on.

What does the Opposition sometimes say when a resolution comes up? How come you have not spoken on it? How come someone from the government side has not spoken on

it? When are you going to speak on it? Now they are hoisted on their own petard. The very people who were always accusing the government of not speaking up on their resolutions are doing the very same thing. I mean, they cannot have it both ways. They want to hear from us. They say, 'Get up and debate it. Where is the minister to debate this resolution? How come more government members are not getting up to debate this?' Yet, here they are now doing the same thing themselves.

Mr. Speaker, they have been consistently inconsistent, is the best you can say for the Liberal Opposition in the last couple of weeks. They have made a charade of this Legislature and have done very, very little to elevate its reputation in the eyes of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. On an issue this basic to rural Newfoundland, you would think every single member of the Opposition would be up to say a few words on it and support it, or perhaps they would like to make an amendment to it or something, but they have refused to do so. We will vote for this resolution. We have spoken on it and we will vote for it, but we will not play petty little games and be so juvenile about it as members opposite are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, this motion would 'resolve that representation be made to the federal government that fishermen qualify to draw such benefits.' This



representation could have been made one and one half hours ago. We were prepared to call the vote then. Members opposite decided to delay. They are a yesterday's news party, Mr. Speaker. This is what happened in July. In July we in this party were signing out that there was a problem with the inshore fishery. We were asking for action then.

MR. FLIGHT:  
What happened?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. DECKER:  
What happened? It was too late, so we saw \$9 million pumped into the fishery. It is too late, Mr. Speaker. There is no time to put a programme in place for the poor fishery because the members opposite delayed, Mr. Speaker. We tried to speed this motion up but we were not allowed. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to delay it another single second. Let us call this motion. Let us get the representation made to Ottawa. I support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Perhaps the hon. member would like to withdraw that comment he made just at the end.

MR. DECKER:  
What comment? I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, but if I offended or stepped outside the bounds, I will gladly withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member has withdrawn.

MR. TULK:  
Withdrawn what?

MR. SPEAKER:  
I do not repeat that word.

MR. TULK:  
I am serious. I did not hear anything.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Well, I heard.

MR. TULK:  
What was the comment, Mr. Speaker?

MR. DAWE:  
He withdrew his remark and the Speaker accepted it and that is it.

MR. TULK:  
What remark?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister for Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. KELLAND:  
Would the Speaker clarify for this side of the House exactly what you are referring to, Your Honour? If I recall correctly, the last remark my colleague from the Strait of Belle Isle made was, 'I support the resolution.' Is that what you are referring to?

MR. SPEAKER:  
No.

MR. TULK:  
To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

If I am going to function in this House, then I have to know what language is unparliamentary and what language is not unparliamentary. Now Your Honour has asked the member for the Strait of Belle Isle to withdraw and the member's comment was, 'I withdraw anything I said that was unparliamentary.' If Your Honour can tell me what it was that was unparliamentary, it would be good for the future. I have a right as a member of this House to know exactly what the words were that the member for the Strait of Belle Isle used. I am serious when I say to you that I did not hear him use words that were unparliamentary, and I would like for Your Honour to tell me what they were.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I think the point is well taken. The remark that I understood I heard is on page 105 of Beauchesne, and it is the second word from the end.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

The second word from the bottom of page 105?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes.

MR. TULK:

I would like for Your Honour to check the tapes to see if indeed he heard my hon. friend from the Strait of Belle Isle use that word. I do not recall hearing him use the word. I believe Your Honour must have misheard him, and

if so, the hon. member deserves an apology.

MR. DECKER:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. DECKER:

I am disappointed that it would be suggested. It is not my style, to use that kind of language, Mr. Speaker. I did not use that word, I can assure you.

MR. TULK:

Check the tapes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am quite prepared to accept the word of the hon. member. I felt that I heard that word. And if the hon. member says that he did not say it, I am quite prepared to accept that. I am sorry about that, I would like to assure the hon. member, but I understood that he used that word and that was the only reason I asked him to withdraw. But if he did not - I will check Hansard - I can tell you I apologize to the hon. member.

MR. TULK:

That is a wise move that Your Honour has made. But for the sake of my hon. friend, so that in no way his reputation as a parliamentarian in this House is scarred in any way, I would like for Your Honour to check Hansard -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I have already said that I am

going to check Hansard.

MR. TULK:

- to see if he really did use that word and, if not, point out to this House that he did not.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of privilege, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

I wish to thank Mr. Speaker for his apology. I did not make that remark.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It is now twenty minutes to six, and I call on the hon. member for Torngat Mountains to conclude the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Before you recognize the hon. member, I just heard for the second time the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) or whatever district it is he represents, say that Your Honour is 'trigger happy'. Now, it has become intolerable, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman will not recognize Your Honour's

authority. He is breaking every possible rule that there is.

MR. DAWE:

He is drinking coffee in here, too.

MR. J. CARTER:

Well, I mean, that is a small matter. But the really large matter, Mr. Speaker, is that he is constantly opposing Your Honour's authority. I think he should be taken to task. You are not trigger happy, obviously.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order. I did not hear that comment, but again I will check the matter in Hansard and I will rule on it at a later date.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that last week when I brought this resolution into this House I brought it in because I am concerned about the fishermen in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

That is why I brought the resolution in, Mr. Speaker. I should maybe make a comment on some of the things that the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) said. He said, I brought it in because I still have some Liberal feelings in me. I would like to tell the hon. member for Naskaupi that I tried for the last six years to bring a similar resolution into this House but the Liberal Caucus put it too low on the totem pole. That is why it did not come in before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) came into the Legislature at the same time I did, in 1979. I have to say to him that that is misleading, that he did not attempt to get this resolution on and it was prevented by the Liberal Caucus. As a matter of fact, we had a great deal of trouble getting the member for Torngat Mountains to put resolutions on the Order Paper.

MR. FLIGHT:

To put anything on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I should say, Mr. Speaker, knowing what happened today and knowing what happened since this session started, that the rumours I have heard going around town must be true.

MR. SIMMONS:

On a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

On a matter of privilege, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

What is in the cup?

MR. SIMMONS:

Coffee. At least, I drink coffee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

On a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I am sure you heard the gentleman for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), as I did, say that the reason he did not bring in a similar resolution over the last five or six years was that he was effectively prevented from doing so by the Liberal Caucus. Is that the essence of what he said?

MR. TULK:

That is what he said.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, there is a well-established rule that if a person, a member of this House has had his course of action influenced by anybody outside the Chamber, including another member outside the Chamber, then he ought to report that because that is a violation of one of the most important parliamentary traditions. If he had not, Mr. Speaker, if he was being harrassed, if, as he alleges, that for five or six years he was being harassed and was prevented from doing something that he wanted to do as a member, then, Mr. Speaker, the question comes up as to how negligent he was in his duty not to report that to the House five or six years ago.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

There does not appear to the Chair to be prima facie case of a breach of privilege. The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, according to what we heard today from the points of order, and so on, from members opposite, the rumor that I have heard around town today must be true, that there is a Christmas Liberal doll for sale. There is a Christmas Liberal doll for sale in Newfoundland and Labrador and it is named after each member of the Liberal Opposition.

MR. KELLAND:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. KELLAND:

It would appear that the Christmas doll has already been purchased by the other side.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, maybe the hon. member is right, because the Christmas doll is named after each member of the Opposition and when you wind it up, it always puts its foot in its mouth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, last week five members on the Opposition side of this hon. House uttered a total of two hundred and six words, and, Mr. Speaker, any member can take this Hansard and go from cover to cover, not one of those members supported the resolution. Now, Mr. Speaker, today they come into the House and because The Evening Telegram and the CBC and other media have shown the people of Newfoundland and Labrador what kind of action the Liberal Party is taking, what are they doing? Mr. Speaker, they are getting up in this House and they are going around the Province and saying they are supporters of the fishermen, but, Mr. Speaker, the only time members of the Liberal Party are supporters of the fishermen is when they can get on the fishermen's backs for the sake of political advantage. That is the only time, Mr. Speaker. That is the only time.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman, as usual, is getting carried away with himself, and full of himself, but let me tell him that support will come whenever he chooses to sit down and stop being carried away with himself. We would request him to now get that government he joined, for action for his district, to get up to Ottawa and get real action for his district. Lets go, you have delayed long enough, 'Garf'.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to continue because there are a couple of other very, very vital and valuable things which have happened in the past two or three days that all the people in Newfoundland and Labrador should know. What about the federal committee which met here in St. John's on fisheries and forestry? It was a federal task force, a federal committee which met over at the great hall in Queen's College. The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) attended, and I listened to him. Now, I might have missed some words, but he never mentioned the fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What?

MR. WARREN:

No, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) attended and spoke and what was one of his concerns? Unemployment Insurance for fishermen. Mr. Richard Cashin spoke. What was his concern? Unemployment Insurance for fishermen, Mr. Speaker. The Opposition's fisheries critic, what did he say?

MR. TOBIN:

What one?

MR. WARREN:

Oh, I do not know, there are so many over there. The hon. member for Fogo, now what did he say concerning the factory freezer trawlers? And, Mr. Speaker, I will quote what Mr. Skelly said to

Mr. Tulk, 'My only suggestion is it was a dumb thing to do. Now, why would Mr. Skelly, an NDP member from British Columbia, say it was a dumb thing for the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) to do? Shame! Shame! Shame!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Hey, hey, hey, Mr. Speaker! Keep it going, Mr. Speaker! Let 'em thump, 'Garf', let 'em thump!

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

If the hon. member is going to come into this House and try to - no, 'try to' cannot be right, he is not trying to mislead it, but if he is going to mislead it - I withdraw that comment that he is trying to mislead it, because he is not - if he is going to mislead it, then let him quote the rest of it and let him tell what I told Mr. Skelly, that it is dumb; if he knew anything about Newfoundland politics, he would know that it is dumb to play the kinds of partisan games and the little bit of showmanship that the Premier of this Province was going on with over there. That is where the dumbness is. Get to Ottawa 'Garf' and get the action!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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



The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, what is most interesting, is that a Mr. Gerald Curnew, I think, a member from Nova Scotia, a province that is also looking for a freezer trawler - what did that member say? What did that member say to the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk)? Let us see what he said. I quote, Mr. Speaker: "I urge 'Tulk'" - I will use the name as printed - "'Tulk' and the Liberals to find a way for the Liberal Party to unify with the provincial government in opposing factory freezer trawlers."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does that mean?

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me get the hon. gentleman straightened out.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo on a point of order.

MR. TULK:

As soon as he can get the showman up here, who sits as the Premier of this Province, to agree to some real representation to Ottawa, then we will be cheek to cheek and bum to bum!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record as saying that if the Province of Newfoundland loses its case on the factory freezer trawlers then, I suggest, it is because the Liberal Party is not united with us in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Just a point of order. It may be purely technical. The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), one of the Labrador representatives, frequently uses the term 'the Province of Newfoundland' but, strangely enough, when he is in Torngat Mountains, he always emphasizes the other part. Why does he not do it consistently?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Does the hon. member have a point of order?

MR. KELLAND:

That was my point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That is the fourth time. Not too bad at all, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Speaker, maybe I should go to the Liberal bible that they are talking about.

I took it upon myself last week to call members in the Liberal Party and, out of curiosity more than anything else, find out what twenty-two communities they visited during the Summer.

MR. BAIRD:

What?

MR. WARREN:

I went to one person and he said, 'You have to go to someone else'; I went to someone else who said, 'Well, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is our spokesman, and only he will give you the information.' So far, I have gotten no information, so I cannot say which twenty-two communities they went to. Therefore, I took the liberty of reading this book, and I came up with four towns that were mentioned.

MR. DAWE:

Four!

MR. WARREN:

And then, they say, 'other communities'. Now, we do not know whether there were eighteen or sixteen or five or four, but I would say the attendance was so small - in fact, in the four communities there were only 450 people, including fishermen, fish

plant workers, their wives, and I would say, probably some babies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The twenty-two communities? As a matter of fact, if the hon. gentleman would like to come and sit down in a meeting instead of making sneaky little phone calls to secretaries, then writing little notes to the members, if he had the stuff to come over and sit down for a meeting, Mr. Speaker, I can inform him of perhaps forty-five or fifty communities and about 3,000 people. And the only baby that would have been there would have been if he was there.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

What a farce, Mr. Speaker, to come in with a book and only mention about four communities in the Province which they said they visited. What a shame, Mr. Speaker! I believe there are more than 480 fishermen in this Province. Another thing, Mr. Speaker, ask them if they went to Labrador. Did they go up and meet with the fishermen in Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. WARREN:

Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, they were all up along the Labrador Coast. I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that other than two members, they cannot even find Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, let me say, in concluding my remarks, that after the media got to the members opposite, after the media got to the Liberal Opposition, they came in today trying to tell us that they were supporting the resolution, but they are speaking from both sides of their mouth. You cannot do that, and you cannot use the fishermen of this Province for your political advantage.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move this resolution and I hope that we can send the necessary documents to Ottawa supporting the resolution which I presented in this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Is the House ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

All those in favour 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

Those against 'Nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Division. Division.

### Division

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the motion please rise:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms); the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey); the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn); the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell); the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer); the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young); the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews); the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe); the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle); the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard); the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. B. Aylward); the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett); Mr. Baird; Mr. Greening; Mr. Patterson; Mr. Reid; Mr. J. Carter; Mr. Tobin; Mr. Warren; Mr. Mitchell; Mr. Woodford; Mr. Flight; Mr. Tulk; the hon. Mr. Simmons; Mr. W. Carter; Mr. Gilbert; Mr. Baker; Mr. Furey; Mr. Kelland; Mr. Decker; Mr. Fenwick.

All those against the motion please rise:

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I declare the motion carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

It now being six o'clock, the  
House stands adjourned until 3:00  
p.m. tomorrow.