



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XI

First Session

Number 56

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

8 November 1985

[Preliminary Transcript]

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement concerning an announcement made half an hour ago by the federal government through the Minister of Justice, Attorney General for Canada and Newfoundland's minister in the federal cabinet (Mr. Crosbie) concerning factory freezer trawlers.

As a prelude to my statement on this important issue I want to read an excerpt from a statement I made to this hon. House in December of 1979, shortly after I became Premier.

At that time, the Government of Canada had, for a short period, approved the licensing of factory freezer trawlers. Here is an excerpt of what I said at that time.

"Indeed, the single most important issue which faces this Province today is whether these communities will be protected from the onslaught of a new distant water trawler fleet. This time the trawlers will come not from Russia, Germany or Poland, but from Mainland Canada. The results, however, will be disasterously the same. That is the essence of the Northern cod

issue."

In recent months the proposed introduction of a factory freezer trawler has been publicly debated. Today the federal government has indicated it has bowed to pressure, and announced it has changed its policy and removed the existing prohibition on factory freezer trawlers. The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has vigorously opposed this change. This is not a position we have adopted lightly. Indeed, it has been our consistent position since 1977, when Canada extended its fisheries zone to 200 miles. This policy of prohibiting Canadian factory freezer trawlers was adopted by the Clark Government in 1979 after a vigorous debate. More importantly, it was confirmed by a solemn agreement between the Government of Canada and Newfoundland and Labrador in 1983, an agreement, which at the time, was described by the Government of Canada as the most important Federal/Provincial Agreement it had entered into with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador since Confederation.

Our opposition is not based on self-interest or greed. It is premised on well-researched arguments as to how a viable Atlantic fishery can be developed and preserved in the best interests of Canadian society. These arguments were recently presented in our discussion paper Appropriate Offshore Fish Harvesting Technology: An Assessment of the Detrimental Effects of the Use of Factory Freezer Trawlers, arguments which the federal government has clearly chosen to ignore.

We wish to repeat these arguments

and show that they have not been rebutted. We continue to be opposed to factory freezer trawlers on principle and I am confident that in time our position will be vindicated. I would now like to review very briefly our reasons for this consistent position.

First and foremost, the deployment of factory freezer trawlers against Northern cod would be a serious breach of an important federal - provincial agreement. Clause 12 of the Canada/Newfoundland Fisheries Restructuring Agreement of September 26, 1983, stated very clearly that: "Factory trawlers will not be permitted to harvest Northern cod." Unless the new policy is changed to expressly exclude Northern cod, just as it excludes fishing in the Gulf of St. Lawrence - in their new statement - it will be a clear breach of the unambiguous meaning of Clause 12 in that Agreement.

Clause 12 was included in the Restructuring Agreement to specifically address our concern that Northern cod should not be harvested using factory freezer trawlers. It was an important part of the restructuring agreement, and was a fundamental precondition of the participation of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in that agreement. If this clause can be breached against the firm objections of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador what, we must ask, are Federal/Provincial agreements worth? Federal/Provincial agreements have become an integral instrument of government in the Canadian federation. The violation of Clause 12 is a serious breach of that trust. It casts into doubt the security of

all agreements, thereby creating a serious precedent with implications for all Provinces in Canada.

Second, the announcement today by the Federal Government confirms the position the Government of Newfoundland has taken from the beginning on the quality issue; namely, factory freezer trawlers are not required to produce premium quality products. This, notwithstanding the fact that the quality argument was the principal basis on which National Sea based its application for a factory freezer trawler.

Third, one of the most important reasons we had argued for continuing the policy is that processing fish at sea must seriously affect processing jobs onshore. The introduction of factory freezer trawlers will certainly cast doubt on the economic security of many communities which are crucially dependent on the industry. The federal government has seriously underestimated the cost in jobs of this change in policy. Our analysis shows that three factory freezer trawlers will eliminate up to 900 person-years of shore-based employment in the Atlantic fishing industry.

These costs in jobs will be unacceptably high. The Government of Canada may be aiding and abetting a disaster of monumental proportions. Many rural communities in Newfoundland and indeed, all of Eastern Canada, already face a precarious future. This threat to their economic survival is particularly unnecessary because it comes from the introduction of an aging distant water fishing technology. Canada does not require expensive

distant water fishing technology given our proximity to the resource.

This leads to the fourth reason we have presented for rejecting factory freezer trawlers, which is in many ways the most fundamental. The new policy denies and undermines Canada's most important comparative advantage: proximity to the natural resource. This policy would have Canadians invest in expensive distant water technology which is clearly unnecessary. Factory freezer trawlers will be harvesting and processing fish within easy sailing distance of under-utilized processing facilities, which can be used in a more efficient manner. If Canada chooses to harvest that resource from some more distant part of Canada, it is forced to use an uneconomic and, therefore, inefficient technology.

The Northeast coast of Newfoundland and Labrador is next door to 93 per cent of the resources which National Sea proposes to harvest under its factory freezer fishing plan. Cod, redfish, flounder and other species are all located sufficiently close to Newfoundland to undermine any argument that a factory freezer trawler is necessary to harvest and process these resources. The existing overcapacity in Newfoundland plants, coupled with our high levels of unemployment, justifies the landing of as much fish in these plants as possible. It is rather ironic that the same interests, including the federal government, who have long criticized excess processing capacity levels in the Atlantic fishery, are now supporting the duplication of such capacity at

sea. This duplication will seriously erode any prospects of certain inshore plants from having sufficient resource to become viable.

The fifth reason for maintaining the current prohibition of factory freezer trawlers concerns the Le Bretagne dispute. We are still of the opinion that the new policy does not address this concern at all.

The sixth argument which we had made against this technology is the danger it poses to the enterprise allocation system. This system was put in place to allow the offshore fleets to better plan their harvesting operations, to promote better quality and to allow a more market-driven approach. These expensive factory freezer trawlers will simply require more and more fish. This will undermine the overall stability provided by the enterprise allocation system; will lead to an abandonment of market-driven operations for a supply-driven operation; and, will bring additional pressures to bear on the requirements of other fleet sectors.

Finally, we have questioned the entire economic viability of factory freezer trawlers. If they are viable, it will only be in the short-term, and providing used trawlers can be obtained cheaply. After that, down the road a few years, the replacement costs will be enormous, and the demands for more fishery resource to sustain these costs, unavoidable.

Having reiterated our policy position on the factory freezer trawler issue, I would like to turn my attention to the federal policy reversal on the specific

conditions which have been attached to the approval extended to National Sea Products, and let us be clear that this approval is for National Sea Products only. No other companies have asked for a license, and the provision for two more licenses is only a smoke screen to portray falsely an industry-wide interest. The federal decision is to license a maximum of three factory freezer trawlers within a five year introductory period, with one dedicated to National Sea, one reserved for use by FPI, if they so wish, and one available to another Canadian company or consortium thereof.

MR. FUREY:

Did FPI ask for one?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No. They wrote and said, "No".

We are curious as to why the Federal Government believes it can withstand pressures to license more than three factory freezer trawlers during this period when one was applied for and they approved three. How are they going to stop now for five years and not approve anymore? The Province has always believed that once this process starts there will be no stopping it. As well, we are left with a very uncertain view as to what the situation will be after five years. Will there be a wholesale licensing of more factory trawlers with extra allocations, and will new replacement factory vessels require more Northern cod in order to be viable?

Here are the conditions for the hon. members of the House. We worked through the night to ensure that we had this here today because we wanted to fully inform

all members of the House on each one of the conditions that are in the statement given by the federal government so that you will have it as quickly as was humanly possible.

We have had three or four people working all through the night and right up until ten o'clock this morning to do it. We will have copies for every member as soon as they come off the copying machine. They are on the way now. I did give a copy to the Opposition House Leader and to the member for Menihek. We can get them distributed now. I am on page four. Can we have all the Pages work to get them to the members because this is a very important issue. Give them to the people that are here and do the vacant seats afterwards.

On page four are the conditions as we found them out overnight and this morning. We did not find out all of them until this morning because there were some that we had heard about and others we did not.

Condition 1

The licence will require that at least 50 per cent of the catch consist of previously underutilized enterprise allocations.

Here is our answer to that as best we can give it at the present moment: The licence will require at least 50 per cent of the catch consist of previously underutilized enterprise allocations:

The current "underutilized allocations" in National Sea's case consist primarily of redfish and, to a lesser extent, turbot;

off - where? - Newfoundland's East Coast. Further catches of these species in the absence of new markets will serve to depress the limited markets for these species on which other plants and/or vessels are dependent, including those in the Gulf region.

The reason all these species have not been caught is because there has not been a sufficient market to do so. Those areas which are now into redfish and into turbot to the extent that they can be, to the extent that the market will allow them to be, are now going to be under pressure because the condition forces them to take 50 per cent of their catch from the underutilized species. They have to as a condition of the licence. So what pressure will that put on existing capacity?

Galtois is into redfish, and Turbot goes into St. Anthony and other places during various times of the year. Now, if we have a factory freezer trawler out there - three of them perhaps - catching this redfish, and catching this turbot, what pressure will that bring to bear on existing plants which are into this turbot and redfish and are trying to market it?

Condition 2. There could be more said about this condition over time, and no doubt all members and the public at large will have something to say about it, but we are giving the response as we think of it, as we get the information.

Condition 2

The licence will stipulate that no more than 6,000 tons of a Company's Northern Cod Allocation will be caught by a Factory

Freezer Trawler in any one year.

The licencing of three factory trawlers will require access, therefore, because each one is 6,000, to 18,000 tons of Northern Cod which will displace some 400 onshore processing jobs in Eastern Canada.

MR. TULK:

In Newfoundland.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is right.

Let there be no misunderstanding, the economic viability of these vessels depends on access to Northern Cod. In our view, an allocation of 6,000 tons per vessel is not adequate, anyway, to ensure an economically viable operation. We are in fact creating an enormous appetite. This is the great insidious thing here, because anybody worth their salt knows that this is not going to be sufficient. What it will do then, when they suddenly find out it is not sufficient, and they already know that, they will have to allocate more, of course, Northern cod with attendant consequences for the resource and the jobs of hundreds of plant workers.

So to try to specifically just say it is 6,000 tons and that is it, and everything is going to be hunky-dory is blindfolding the devil in the dark. Because from our point of view, from everything we have been told, that is not going to be sufficient and then they are going to start encroaching on more and more tons of fish.

How about the next one, Condition 3? This is a lovely one.

Condition 3

The vessels will be prohibited from operating in the Gulf of St. Lawrence or the Bay of Fundy.

This particular condition addressed the Not In My Back Yard (NIMBY) syndrome. The Provinces of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec have raised objections about factory freezer access to resources adjacent to them, and so these vessels will be prohibited from operating in the Gulf, and Newfoundland is left to bear the cost alone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame, shame!

MR. FUREY:

They are your buddies.

MR. CALLAN:

A friend in need is a friend indeed.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Like anybody in this House, I appreciate your partisan comment but all I will do is just respond to it by saying back three or four years ago, when our own MP was Minister of Fisheries (Mr. McGrath), we had to oppose it because this party stands for Newfoundland first even if they are our political allies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Condition 4

The company receiving an FFT licence will be required as a condition thereof to retire or convert equivalent length or capacity from its present fleet.

Now here is the real catch.

It is again difficult to understand the intent of this clause in that it is the enterprise allocations which limits the amount of fishing, not the catching capacity. The Province is of course concerned that if existing wet fish trawlers are displaced, it will negatively affect lands and hence employment, at many plants.

In other words, if they are going to get a factory freezer trawler, however much that capacity is, you have to take that much out from the existing fleet. So that is two stern trawlers. Say there is a consortium involved, say FPI is forced in there, they can only take that FFT if they take a corresponding amount of capacity out of their wet fish fleet, so two stern trawlers go from wherever, Catalina, Gaultois, Harbour Breton, or Ramea, and then there goes the jobs because the fish will not come in there then.

Condition 5

The licensed company will be required to submit for government approval a plan to minimize any possible adverse socio-economic/community impact.

Put simply, this condition is tantamount to giving someone permission to start a war on the condition they ensure that there are an adequate number of hospitals available to look after the casualties. We find it ironic that the federal government purports to be concerned about the socio-economic impacts of this decision, yet it has not appropriately addressed the negative impacts which have been quantified in Newfoundland's

discussion paper. Indeed, it appears not to have addressed the job displacement projections in its own discussion paper.

Condition 6

The vessels must be registered as Canadian; and the vessels must be crewed entirely by Canadians within a two year period; the percentage of non-Canadians crewing a vessel in the first two years must be approved by the government.

From our perspective these conditions are nothing more than window dressing. The real question is the net loss of jobs for Canadians. Also, most of the onshore jobs lost are likely to be jobs currently held by women.

Condition 7

There will be prohibition of fishing for species where an economically efficient fishery has already been developed.

The policy change renders this condition meaningless. The current wetfish trawler fishery for Northern Cod operating from Newfoundland trawler ports is already economic. So, what is all this about? They should not be allowed to fish Northern cod because we already have an economic fishery. Unless the new policy is changed to expressly exclude Northern cod, this condition cannot be complied with. Their own condition cannot be complied with because they are already excluding an economic fishery. And finally:

Finally, Condition 8

All information associated with the operation of the factory

freezer trawlers during the introductory period must be made available to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

We feel confident that any information that is provided in this regard will substantiate the arguments of the Province if - if - viewed objectively.

Therefore, it is our position that the conditions announced by the federal government as part of the license approval do not address, in any substantial way, the legitimate objections raised by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Factory freezer technology is not new technology: Newfoundlanders hardly need reminding that it was the factory freezer trawlers of foreign fleets which destroyed many of our best fish stocks in the 50's and 60's. They also very nearly destroyed the rural economy of this Province. We argued for and achieved, as a nation, our rights in the Law of the Sea Convention over the 200 mile limit. Nevertheless, the federal government has since 1977, allowed the foreign vessels of West Germany, the U.S.S.R., Poland, and Japan and other countries to fish within our zone, within the 200 mile limit. The West German factory trawler catch last Spring of at least 18,000 tonnes more than their allocation is only the most recent and flagrant example of a long pattern of overfishing.

Factory freezer technology is distant water technology: we are not distant from our resources. Newfoundland and Labrador is the factory freezer trawler for the North Atlantic. There is an opportunity for Canadians here to earn export dollars through

value-added fish products, putting the maximum number of Canadians to work in a region of economic disparity. The introduction of a domestic fleet of factory freezer trawlers further deprives Canadians of the chance to avail of this opportunity and to demonstrate the advantage of our natural location to harvest, process and sell top-quality products from our fishery resources.

Right today, besides the overfishing, the amount that the foreigners are allocated to catch of Northern cod, within the 200 mile limit, is 15,500 tonnes. Why the federal government, as part of this, would not say that the LTA will not be renewed next year, and start using some of that 15,500 tonnes, rather than take it from what is left for Newfoundland and Labrador, is beyond me.

We believe the decision by the federal government to now allow Canadians to use this technology is wrong and we will continue to oppose it. What is particularly troublesome is that it is clearly contrary to a formal Federal/Provincial Agreement.

Of course this leads to broader concerns with respect to other basic tenants of established federal fisheries policies. What can we look forward to with respect to additional changes which may be detrimental to Newfoundland's position?

If they will do this when there was an agreement in place, what about all the other federal fisheries policies which impact upon Newfoundland that they can change from time to time without even having to worry about there being a federal/provincial

agreement or whatever?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Including the offshore?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Or even that, for that matter. But even in the fisheries area, now, what changes will we get there? Will we lose the Resource Short Plant programme and so on?

To ensure that there is no misunderstanding of where we stand, I want to again go on record with respect to these basic policy positions, so that the federal government and everybody in Newfoundland clearly understands where we are coming from, although it does not seem to make any difference as it relates to this statement:

1) The Northern cod must continue to be reserved primarily for the inshore fleet based in Northeast Newfoundland and Labrador, managed as an allowance. Are they suddenly going to start changing that to some kind of a quota, for example? This is why we are making this statement today. We want it clearly understood we have not changed our position and we are very adamant on that.

2) There must continue to be a Resource Short Plant programme which delivers Northern cod to seasonal plants adjacent to the resource;

3) The sector management policy must continue to restrict the fishery for vessels under sixty-five feet to communities adjacent to the resource;

4) There must be an orderly development of a fleet of middle distance vessels with a dedicated resource allocation to further

supply the onshore industry in Northeastern Newfoundland and Labrador;

5) The offshore fleet's Enterprise Allocations for vessels not landing in Newfoundland ports must be frozen at their existing numbers; and

6) There must be no allocation of Northern cod to foreign fleets.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a sad day for the people of this Province. We have again seen a vivid demonstration of the lack of understanding by the federal government of the fundamental importance of this particular cod resource to improving our fishing industry and the way of life it supports. It is a clear justification for the continuation of our long stated policy that this Province must have a larger jurisdictional role in the management of our most important resource, which we have always argued for.

We have witnessed the federal government breaking a federal/provincial agreement that was described at the time as the most significant agreement since Confederation. How shall we approach such agreements in the future? We have seen the start of a policy direction in the fishery which, in our view, has the potential to wreak economic and social havoc on the very fabric of our way of life. For the sake of our people, I hope we are wrong, but I do not think so. We have seen this policy reversal in the fishery, based, not on an objective assessment of all the

facts, but rather, on the force of a political lobby effort in Ottawa, the like of which we have not witnessed before.

We find the federal government's decision in this matter unacceptable. We will be monitoring the situation as it develops in the coming weeks and months, and what other actions we, as a government, can take. The fishermen and plant workers and all the people of this Province can be assured we will continue our efforts to have the impact of this dangerous policy negated, the policy itself modified, and the other improvements recommended above, realized.

In the statements this morning, just received, there is finally a letter from Mr. Nielsen. He talked about consultation. The only consultation there was, was efforts by us to try to consult, not by them. We must refute statements made by the acting Minister of Fisheries and others. There was no consultation on this issue as they purport there was.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would put out a suggestion to the Opposition for their consideration that perhaps the best way to approach this - and I just put this out as a suggestion for you to consider - is that later on this morning an all-party committee, like we did before, get together to draft a resolution to have unanimous support in the House to oppose this decision by the federal government.

This is not a select committee. This is just a committee to draft a resolution of opposition to the decision that came down today, not a committee to go here, there or somewhere else. I am putting in

out in the spirit of unanimity and the spirit of all members of this House and all Newfoundlanders who have looked at this issue believe that we should all go on record together in opposition to it.

I put it out as a suggestion to you as a way to show our total and absolute abhorrence to this policy that has been announced this morning.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Premier as a politician in Newfoundland and a Newfoundlander, I stand here this morning more out of sadness and sorrow for the people of Newfoundland than, I suspect, I will ever stand in this House again. I want to say to him that this is indeed a sad day for the people of this Province.

One part of statement, the last couple of paragraphs, is exactly true, and I want to read the Premier's statement again into the record, "We have again seen a vivid demonstration of the lack of understanding by the federal government of the fundamental importance of this particular cod resource to improving our fishing industry and the way of life it supports. It is a clear justification for the continuation of our long-stated policy that this Province must have a larger jurisdictional role in the management of our most important

resource."

Mr. Speaker, there is nobody in Newfoundland, as we have said before, who disagrees with the Premier on this whole matter. I find it somewhat ironic though, Mr. Speaker, that while this Province happens to be a shareholder in FPI, we were told, we were led to believe in Newfoundland that there was going to be one license for National Sea. This morning we find our differently. I do not know when the Premier found out but I suspect sometime last night or early this morning. Mr. Speaker, I find that action on behalf of the Government of Canada despicable! And to think that FPI is a creation of the federal government and the provincial government. It shows quite clearly they are arrogant towards us. It shows quite clearly that there is no sympathy in this Tory government in Ottawa for Newfoundland. It is the same as we have seen in the past. Mr. Speaker, it is shameful of that government in Ottawa.

Mr. Nielsen, for example, does not talk about quality. He says quality is not a problem, that is not the reason he is approving the FPI application. Well, as the Premier said, that was the basis on National Sea's application. Why is he approving the application? You have to ask yourself that question. The answer is very simple. Mr. Nielsen is being influence more by his central Canadian mentality and that of the people around him than he is by the wellbeing of the regions of this country, which Mulroney, and nobody else, said was the basis of confederation, the Premier has also said the same thing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me remind people in this House, to be a little bit partisan at this time, that it was a Liberal government in Ottawa that prohibited FFTs, that a government of the opposite political stripe to the party in power in this Province prohibited FFTs.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Clark Government did, too.

MR. TULK:

In the beginning the Clark government tried to do it but they backed off under pressure. The federal Liberal government in Ottawa said no factory freezer trawlers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Trudeau and LaLonde and Chretien and LeBlanc they were suppose to be the most insensitive people in the world to Newfoundland.

MR. CARTER:

They were.

MR. TULK:

If they were suppose to be the most insensitive people in the world to Newfoundland, who are the most insensitive people in the world to Newfoundland today? Is it a Liberal Government? Is it Chretien? Is it LeBlanc? Who is it? No, it is Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Erik Nielsen, and they are of the same political stripe as this party that sits in government in this Province.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is irrelevant.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, it is not irrelevant. As bad as the FFT

decision is, what we are seeing here this morning is something that is far worse, because we are back this morning in this Province to where we were in 1980, 1981, 1982 and 1983, and again we are seeing the breakdown of federal/provincial relations. We are due for more provincial/federal wars in the Province, but the difference this time will be that the Premier has now got to make up his mind to fight his own party. That is what he has to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has not indicated to us, on this side of the House, in any way, shape or form that he is willing to take on that government in Ottawa. He is monitoring the situation.

MR. BAIRD:

Go sit down, boy!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

That is what he is doing. He is monitoring the situation this morning. Well, just how long is he going to monitor the situation, or is he going to take them on?

Let me ask the Premier, the government and the people of this Province another important question. The Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate, the Government House Leader stands in this House and tells us that the Atlantic Accord is the greatest thing since sliced bread, the greatest thing that ever happened to Newfoundland.

MR. FLIGHT:

How do we know?

MR. TULK:

We have heard that. We heard all about great agreements. The Premier himself, when the restructuring agreement was signed, said it was the greatest agreement since the agreement for Confederation. Let me ask the Government of this Province a very important question. They had a written agreement on FFTs. That is broken. The key question for Newfoundlanders this morning is what assurance does Newfoundland and Labrador have that the Mulroney government, their government, will not break the Atlantic Accord whenever it suits them? It is very obvious, and I say this to the hon. gentlemen in sympathy, that for that crowd in Ottawa, and that is all I can call them, the wheels are coming off the prosperity crusade.

It is high time the Newfoundland people to see, and I think they are seeing it this morning, the Premier get off this political nonsense that the Premier propagated last Spring. He must be this morning a very sorrowful man as he sits there. He was the person who went across this Province with a prosperity crusade. He was the person in last Spring's election said, "Put a P.C. government in Newfoundland because there is a P.C. government in Ottawa."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier may accuse me of being partisan, but let me say this to him. He shared in the glory days and he has, either intentionally or unintentionally, allowed the Mulroney government to ignore Newfoundland and to mislead the people of this Province. He has to

sit there now and accept the responsibility for his actions of the past two or three years, his actions of breaking down federal - provincial relations when there was a Liberal government in Ottawa purely for politics and his actions this morning of sitting there and the best that we can get from the Premier of this Province is that he is going to monitor the situation. Well, if this were two years ago!

I will be quite frank with you, my colleagues on this side of the House said to me yesterday evening, "How is the Premier going to react when he hears about FFTs?" I suspected that we would see the same vibrant warrior coming into this House to take on, once again, Central Canadians. What do we get from the Premier? We get a statement of his policy, and we get a statement of the conditions and his criticism of them. Let me say to the hon. gentleman that the conditions that are attached to this FFT Agreement, approval of application, that I read in them the same as he does. I will use the words that they are pure bluff on the part of the Mulroney government. If he is going to sit there and allow Mulroney and Erik Neilsen to use the kind of conditions that they have attached here, Mr. Speaker, he is once again letting Newfoundlanders down. It is not enough for him to sit there and monitor.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have a couple of minutes left. Let me say this to him. Let me sum up what is happening here. This statement says just one thing, that the Premier and his Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), who have stood here and made us believe that there was

consultation going on with the government in Ottawa of their own political stripe - they said it, both of them, in Question Period in this House - have shown either one of two things, either their total incompetence to run the fishery of this Province and to run the Province; or they have shown that on an issue - and there is no way out from under for them - that is so vital to rural Newfoundland and to Newfoundland generally, they have shown that they were willing, Mr. Speaker, to place politics above Newfoundland. They have done it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me address the Premier's statement. Let us try to salvage something out of this, Mr. Speaker. The Premier asks for a committee to draft a resolution. Mr. Speaker, on this very vital issue, yesterday we held a press conference and we said that we would support anything in the world - I will not get into it! I will excuse you for last Thursday and Friday to defer this action of the federal government, regardless of what it is. We stated from the beginning we would throw away partisan politics for the sake of Newfoundland, I say that to the Premier. I invite the Premier to pick four people from his side, two from this party, and the member for Menihek (Mr Fenwick), the member for the NDP, and for us to sit and see if there is anything that can be done to defer this drastic, deplorable action, by the federal PCs. If there is, then let us get on with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
I ask leave of the House to address this issue.

MR. SPEAKER:
Does the hon. member for Menihek have leave.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman asked leave to make a statement and as far as the government is concerned he has leave.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, we on this side would have no objection to the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) at least taking half the time that I took as the Opposition spokesman. Is that fair?

MR. FENWICK:
Fair enough.

THE SPEAKER:
The hon. member has half that time which is seven and a half minutes.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Fortune-Hemitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
I have no objection to leave in this particular instance but it should be understood that the gentleman from Menihek is like me and every other member in this House, he is one member, and there should be no precedent set here at all. It is leave just for this very extraordinary occasion. If this becomes a practice then I would hope that I would get leave to make my views known on various issues as well. So I would hope this is considered a very extraordinary situation and should be noted as such.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) speaks by leave.

The hon. member for Menihek.

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

I join with the previous two speakers in expressing my deep sorrow that the decision has been made by the federal government and has been even beyond the bounds of what we expected in looking at three factory freezer trawlers rather than one. I just want to repeat one or two points the previous speaker said. The question of an agreement has not been probed enough, in my opinion. If they break an agreement between two governments, I wonder what the redress is? I know if I have a contractual agreement with members opposite and one of us violates that contractual agreement, we have recourse to civil law in order to obtain redress. I would ask the Premier somewhere along the line if he could address that question. Is there actually some avenue that could be taken in this case? I do not want to belabour it but it is a point that occurred to me.

The only point I really wanted to make beyond the other comments that have been made is that there is a very human factor at work here. I have discussed with plant workers over the last couple of days at the Federation of Labour Convention this whole question of factory freezer trawlers and the plant workers themselves are very, very worried about the thing. As

most people who have visited many of the fish plants in this Province know, a lot of the work force are women. As a matter of fact, fish plants are probably one of the largest sources of employment for women in this Province, and I cannot conceive in my own mind of the majority of those women working on those factory freezer trawlers. Can you imagine the amount of cruelty and hardship that would be inflicted on their families, for children would not see their mothers for a month or two months at a time? Can you imagine the women going on them if it meant that kind of separation from their children and from their husbands? To me, it is an aspect that was not very well considered by the federal government or the fish companies themselves, because they are the ones, I think, who have a responsibility here.

It is a dehumanizing existence. I have talked to the trawlermen who have worked on trawlers for years and years, and it is an unusual kind of existence, even when you are gone for ten days and back for two or three, and here we are talking about ships that will be at sea for a month or two months at a time, yet our system does not really accommodate that.

I have talked to people who have seen these factory freezer trawlers coming from Europe, from Bulgaria and Eastern European countries, and they tell me that the work is considered so difficult that the employees of those ships are given two months paid holiday a year - they only work ten months of the year. In addition to that, they are given generous pensions so that they can retire at the age of fifty-five because it is considered to be a

hard life. Yet, very little of that will be built into these factory freezer trawlers and these kinds of benefits will not accrue to the people working on them.

So I say to you that there will be an extreme hardship not only on our communities but on the individuals who will be fortunate - and I do not even know if the word is fortunate - to get jobs on these particular ships. I hope that this experiment becomes a failure and that we end up getting rid of these ships as quickly as possible.

I am awfully tempted to make some partisan remarks here, but I will refrain because I think it is much too important an issue. I will only mention to the Premier that the next time he suggests we need a PC government in Ottawa and a PC government in Newfoundland, I will remind him of factory freezer trawlers then, when I think it is a more appropriate time. I do, however, agree with a joint committee to set up the resolution and will be glad to participate in it. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

At this stage I would like to welcome to the visitors' gallery thirty-three Grade IX students from St. Peter's School, Mount Pearl, with their teacher Mary Sullivan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I would also like to welcome to

the gallery forty Democracy students, Level II, and their teachers Tom Moore and Dan Hunt, from Roncalli School, Avondale.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order, in the sense of order. I have arranged for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and myself to brief the press at eleven o'clock, and Question Period is coming shortly. Now, if members of the Opposition want to question either myself or the Minister of Fisheries on the statement, if you would ask questions of other ministers on other matters for fifteen minutes of the thirty, beginning at eleven o'clock, if we want to set our own rules, later, when I come back into the House after briefing the press, we will then take the other fifteen minutes of the Question period to deal with the statement. We will be willing to do so.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
That, I think, would be somewhat out of the ordinary. I would remind the Premier that the press, while they are an important facet of the House, that is all they are, a facet of the House. They are not more important. I would say to him, if he wants to communicate something to the people of Newfoundland on this urgent matter, then why do we not take a recess for half an hour? Do you want to do that?

MR. TOBIN:

Grow up, boy.

MR. TULK:

Take a recess and we will go to Orders of the Day, go for a half an hour extra, one-thirty. Let us go for the half hour.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, all we want is to allow an opportunity for the Opposition to question the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and the Premier on this statement.

MR. SIMMS:

Where are the Premier and the minister going?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Just to a press conference.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Surely, Mr. Speaker, there is a fairly important principle here. I have seen governments here and federally being lambasted for going outside the House instead of answering to the House. But it seems to me the ultimate insult to the Parliamentary tradition is to say to its face, to the House's face, "Look, we have got some more important business to do. Instead of talking to you, the elected members, we want to go outside and talk to the press instead." The press is here, Mr. Speaker, and it seems to me the Premier's and the minister's first obligation is to give answer in the House for their actions in this horrendous affair. Then if they want to supplement that with some comment

to the press after, so be it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of privilege, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

All deals are off.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of privilege, there is no prima facie case. As I understand it, the hon. the Premier and the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) were trying to negotiate a particular change and it was not acceptable to the House.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Let it be known if the Premier is touchy this morning we will not agree to anything. If he wants to play partisan politics with this we will not agree to anything. Let it be known, as the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) has said, that the Premier has just left his seat, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) has just left his seat when the next item on the Order Paper is questions that should, of course, relate to this agreement. Both of them have left to talk to the press rather than to the House where they belong.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member has not stated any point of order. There is no point of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

This issue is of vital importance to the people of Newfoundland. It is of vital importance to this House. Let it now show -

MR. PATTERSON:

Where is your Leader?

MR. FLIGHT:

Why? Why?

MR. TULK:

Because the importance of this House is right here.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

I am making a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member was making a speech. If he has a point of order I would like to hear it.

MR. TULK:

Let it be clearly stated that, unless the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries are in their chairs when the Speaker calls Question Period, that the Opposition will not be sitting in their seats, we will leave this House in protest.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Oral Questions

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I know we will be getting back to the question of factory freezer trawlers, so I will lay off that now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, will the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) indicate to the House whether the Premier is going to be here for question period or is he boycotting the question period? Is the Premier boycotting the question period? He knows it takes place at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That is not a point of order.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). It is also in his capacity as being responsible for the Workers' Compensation Commission. My question, Mr. Speaker, is in the past year I have received a very inordinately large number of complaints concerning the Workers' Compensation Commission. I notice in the annual report of the Ombudsman there is also a considerable number of complaints as well, a large number of which have been withdrawn, but a large number. The complaints I have received range from administrative inefficiency, where people have made long distance calls to it and then left on hold for ten or fifteen minutes at a time; arbitrary cutting off of benefits with no explanation given to the claimants whatsoever; reduction of benefits, in some cases when a claimant is deemed capable of working at a lower paid job, even though that job is not available.

Taken in total it appears that the Commission is now shirking its responsibility to support injured workers in the form of lowering insurance cost to employees. My question to the minister is this: Since these complaints have also been presented to me by other members I have talked to in the House, by the leaders of the Steelworkers Local in Labrador City and Wabush, by the executive of the Federation of Labour, they have been subject of resolutions in the Federation of Labour's recent convention, will the minister investigate these kinds of complaints and consider the setting up on an inquiry into the policies and the operations of this commission?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I have also received quite a number of complaints respecting Workers' Compensation and claimants with problems with the administration of the Workers' Compensation Act and regulations. It is nothing new, however, perhaps there have been more complaints over the past year or so than there has previously been. There is provision, Mr. Speaker, under the Workers' Compensation Act, I think it is section 114, for a review of the Act every five years, or at least once every five years. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is section 114, subsection 2, "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall, at least once in every five years, make provision for review of the Act" but it may go further than a review of just the Act "and the committee may make a report and recommendations to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council upon such matters respecting the Act and the regulation and the administration of the Act and regulation, as the committee deems fit." So, Mr. Speaker, that very matter is being considered I have had meetings with the Chairman of the Worker's Compensation Board and a decision on that matter will be forthcoming shortly.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I think you should recognize the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) because he did stand up.

MR. BAIRD:

Go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have recognized the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you. The next question is for the Minister of Transportation. Is he there or can he be brought back? My question to him, Mr. Speaker, is in permanent jobs that have to go through the Public Service Commission and have to be advertised in the Department of Transportation, are there restrictions on the geographical area that these applicants can apply from? In other words, if a job was offered, for example, in Corner Brook, are there instructions to the depot in the Corner Brook area that they only consider applicants from the Corner Brook area, or is it a policy that they will accept applications from all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister for Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I am not completely sure how to answer the question. My understanding is that it is part of the collective agreement process. As I understand it, if the permanent positions are advertised internally to the staff, there is an agreement, I believe, in place where it would take people from a specific unit category, or a geographic category, as a first opportunity. But there is nothing that would prevent, if an applicant was not found in that area, nothing that says you could not go beyond that. A number of public servants, not only in that department - I guess it applies right through the service - will ask for transfers,

and this sort of a thing if they find out a position is open, through the notice board and so on, in another area of the Province.

There are regulations, but I think in some instances it is flexible and they can go outside a geographic area. I would have to check on it because I think it is handled in that way through the collective agreement process, whatever the arrangements are. But I can certainly try to find out. I do not think the Transportation Department is any different than any of the others.

MR. BAIRD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms). Some time ago, at least two years ago, Corner Brook was promised by the federal government that the federal Forestry Center would be moved from its present location to Corner Brook. It was deferred at that time, which was a year ago. I would like to ask the Minister of Forestry has there been any change in that situation? The promise was made and I intend to pursue and keep at it until it does move. I would like to ask the minister, is there anything new on that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the member for Humber

West, for a very, very good question, a very important one and, of course, one that is of primary interest to the people of the West Coast, as well as to the people of the East Coast for that matter. It gives me an opportunity, as well, to say that quite recently, when the House of Commons Committee on Fishery and Forestry were here and had some briefs presented, I did have the same question posed to me by a member of that Committee, a federal member, who happens to be Mr. Tobin. I told him it would be more appropriate for him to ask the question of my federal counterpart because it is a federal government decision.

At the same time, I understand, during those proceedings, the Opposition critic, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) also made some insinuation that we had not been supporting or fighting that particular issue in support of Corner Brook. Of course, that is absolute hogwash. Everybody with any sense at all - that would probably eliminate the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir - but, in any event, most anybody else would know that we have fought long and hard and that indeed we have supported it and shown our support by moving our own provincial forestry staff into Corner Brook a year and a half ago in response to a challenge issued by Mr. Tobin. He had then been the MP since November of 1982. Surprisingly enough, it was not until May of 1984, on the eve of a federal election, over a year and a half later, that Mr. Tobin made some strange kind of commitment that they would then move the Forestry Center from St. John's to Corner Brook. I do not know what happened in that year and a half while he

was a federal MP and a member of the government, why he was not able to deliver on that particular commitment, but in any event he has not been able to.

So it is inaccurate for the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) to make the charge that he did make, that the government was not in support of it. It is also unfair of Mr. Tobin to ask me the question when, in fact, it is a federal government decision and he sits in the House of Commons. Indeed, he is the Federal Forestry critic, I gather, and has yet to ask the Forestry Minister a question.

So my response to summarize is that, yes, we do support that position. But there is nothing new on it from my point of view. I have been talking to Mr. Merithew on numerous occasions. He has told me there is no change from the federal government's point of view on that particular issue, just yet, than is all ready known.

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). It may seem curious to members on this side and members of the public that since I sit directly behind the hon. gentleman and am able to ask him any question I like in private, why I should bother to address such a question to him. But the point is that the value in this question period is that you get the minister and the ministry to make

a public response. This is an important question, although it is not an urgent question, so I have refrained from trying to inject myself into the question period when the Opposition is present.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Question! Question!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER:
At the present time we are on Standard Newfoundland Time, we have moved our clocks back an hour. It has been suggested by Newfoundland Hydro, that if we were to advance our clocks earlier in the Spring, say around the same period in relation to the equinox as we move our clocks back, there would be considerable savings of money. In other words, there would be no greater inconvenience -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I think the hon. member is making a speech. Maybe he can pose his question.

MR. J. CARTER:
No, no. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I would like for the minister to answer this.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
It is rather difficult answering such a question. I will speak in the microphone, but the person I am talking to is behind me.

MR. J. CARTER:

I can hear you quite well.

MR. MARSHALL:
Now I wonder whether the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) would like to lie himself out and table himself on the Table of the House then I could address him from my usual vantage point.

Mr. Speaker, you know, that is a good question and it is a serious question, and one that I think should be looked at. It has been brought up from time to time in the House and I can remember used to be brought up on a regular basis by your predecessor, the member for St. John's Centre, Mr. Ank Murphy, when he was a member of the House.

There are certainly advantages to it, but insofar as there would be energy conservation, it would seem to be that once there is a change, people would appreciate having a longer period of daylight in their working time, but then, as against that, the problem always comes in making changes of that nature is that the practice has been so adopted for such a period of time the change is difficult.

But I thank the hon. member for his question because, I think, it is something that perhaps could be resurrected. As I said, the former member for St. John's Center brought it up from time to time but in recent years we have been concerned with the amount of energy that is being consumed in this Province, people being concerned with high bills and what have you, and it certainly is something that I think merits looking in to, and we can take a look at it.

MR. J. CARTER:

A supplementray, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I thank the hon. minister for his response, but will he undertake to detail someone in his department, or in the department that reports to him, to try and put some numbers to this proposal? In other words, what amount of money could be saved? How many barrels of oil less could be burned at Holyrood if this practice were to be put in place? I think if we had some numbers on this proposal, then it could be very seriously looked at, but obviously it is not worth our while if it is only a matter of a few cents. But if it is a matter of some thousands of dollars or some thousands of barrels of oil, then I think it would inject a note of urgency into this debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I do not include the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) in this, because he asked quality questions, but it shows what quality questions comes from our own built-in opposition, as it were, behind us. So, Mr. Speaker, I would be quite happy to do that, and I think it merits looking into. That is not to say it is going to happen next year but certainly an imaginative proposal like that deserves looking into and I will see that appropriate people in fact look into it and make the necessary feasibility and economic assessment of it.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I actually has a supplementary for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) but he is not in so I will leave it for now because it looks like I might get a few more in.

I want to ask a question of the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall). In my district of Mehihek there is a organization called Wabush Mines which is now deliberating on how to construct a manganese leaching plant in order to extract the manganese from the iron ore that is mined there. It is my understanding from talking to people in the area that one of the major costs in a manganese leaching plant is electricity and the decision to locate the plant either in Labrador West, in Wabush, or in Pointe Noir, in Seven Islands, will be partially decided because of the cost of electricity. My question to the minister: Is there anything his department can do, or his officials can do, to enter negotiations with Wabush Mines to see if we can offer a reasonable deal on electricity in order to secure what I believe is in excess of 100 jobs for Labrador West, instead of allowing them to go to Quebec, where they might go if they make a better deal than we do?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I will refer it to my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn), because the possiblity of the entry of that firm into Wabush is more directly his responsibility. The fact of the matter, obviously, is that

Hydro comes within my responsibility as well. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to apprise me of this question a few days ago. As I told him, I am having it looked into very carefully by the Chairman of Hydro, working in conjunction with the officials at the Department of Mines and Energy. So, certainly, we will do everything we possibly can from the point of view of electrical energy to enhance the possibility of any industry coming into the area, as we always do. When you get into questions of subsidy, that is something we have to look at as well. I know that the hon. minister would have even more details if the hon. member for Menihek would like him to address it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, as a result of first indications that Wabush Mines was getting into a manganese extraction program, we had a committee set up, made up of Mines and Hydro and Development, to look at the situation with respect to the possibility of getting Wabush Mines to put its manganese extraction plant in Wabush. The results of that, I say that with all respect to the hon. member, are just about finished and the indications are that the costs of putting the manganese plant in Wabush, over and above what it would cost the company to it in Pointe Noir, is something in the order of \$100 million. From the point of view of government becoming involved in supplying the difference, some \$100 million, for about fifty-seven jobs in Wabush is fairly prohibitive. We are delighted, of course, that Wabush

Mines is talking about getting into manganese extraction because it will stabilize the industry itself in Labrador West in that their product line will be more diversified and, as a result, they will not only sell the manganese, and the manganese-free pellets but they will also have the pellets with manganese in them so it will stabilize Wabush Mines. Up to this point in time it does not look as though the government will be able to provide \$100 million in the difference for those fifty-seven jobs, but I do say to the hon. member that the complete study is not done. So I understand it right now, there is a decision that is imminent with respect to whether the project will go ahead or not, and they are talking about putting a pilot plant in Pointe Noir. Some of the problems that are involved, if the House will permit - I realize this is question period

MR. MORGAN:

If you want to talk, go ahead.

MR. DINN:

Well, I can sit down, if that satisfies the hon. member.

MR. FENWICK:

No, no. I want the information.

MR. DINN:

Well, some of the problems involved is the fact that, of course, the crushing facilities that they have in Wabush do not crush the material sufficiently. The concentrates going out are not fine enough for the manganese operation to be put in there without the plant being almost totally refurbished and changed. Along with that and the power, there is the problem of changing the railway cars themselves for transporting these finer grades of

concentrate out when the manganese is extracted. So all of these things were looked at by the committee and we came up with a requirement for a difference of about \$100 million - and I think the cost would go over that, as a matter of fact - but about \$100 million for the fifty-seven jobs, and we thought it was a little bit too much. But we are still looking at it.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

This report the minister is referring to, which is almost complete, will the minister agree to table that as soon as it is complete so we can have a look at it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if all of it can be complete. I think we can table of inform the hon. member of the results of the investigation if that is satisfactory.

MR. FENWICK:

A copy of the report?

MR. DINN:

Yes.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), a question to the hon. the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) or the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer). Some weeks ago the two levels of government announced a make-work programme for fishermen and plant workers. I have received numerous enquiries, from fishermen in particular, as to when they can expect to see the first projects commenced. To date there are no applications approved, no projects commenced. There is no income for fishermen. There is no unemployment insurance in their pockets right now, so it is a very desperate situation along the whole Northeast Coast of the Province.

Could someone indicate as to when they can expect to see the first announcements on some of these projects so they can get the fishermen and plant workers working?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the plan behind the programme was to eliminate red tape and time-consuming procedures to the extent possible, and it was expected that the first projects would be approved within a matter of weeks. So I would certainly think that within a two to three week period projects should be approved and work started. The whole philosophy behind it, as I understand it, and indeed, I think, as the minister said at the time, was to eliminate all unnecessary red tape and also, of

course, the selection or approval of various projects is a consultative process with the Fishermen's Union, which is involved as well. So I would certainly expect that within a couple of weeks there will be projects approved.

MR. MORGAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, maybe the hon. the minister could take the question under advisement and refer it to his colleague if the answer is unavailable today, but there is some confusion as well with regard to the application process. My understanding is the same applications that are being used for the Job Strategy Programme are now the same application forms being used for this special fishermen's programme. So there is some confusion on the part of the applicants as to how they should apply. They have already applied under the Job Strategy Programme for various projects, applications have gone in, the deadline is already past, and now with this new programme announced, their queries are along the lines as to whether they should now make a second application, or can they expect the application already filed under the Jobs Strategy Programme to be passed over to the new fisheries job creation programme? There is some confusion. So I think it is important to get it clarified for the benefit of all applicants around the Province as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of

Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the responsible government officials and the Committee of the Fishermen's Union are now examining various areas of the Province to see where the need is greatest. The Fishermen's Union has a very significant input there, that the criteria, of course, are relaxed, or are different, or are less stringent - I am trying to find a way of saying more liberal without having to say it - than under the technical Jobs Creation Programme.

So I would think, if the application form happens to be one for the other programme, that really will not make any difference because this programme is much more sensitive and responsive and less rigid and less bureaucratic and less confining. That is probably a pretty good synonym for more liberal. So I understand within a couple of weeks there should be applications approved.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

This question is something of a supplementary that I meant to ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) but he was not here the last time I got up. When I was referring to that previous problem, an individual who is a resident of Millertown - I will give you the specific example so you can look at it - has been on temporary recall in Labrador City, is working with the Iron Ore Company of Canada and is about to

be layed off on December 18 in the 174-man layoff that occurs at that time, this individual has applied for a publicly advertised job with the Department of Transportation as a welder in Grand Falls.

He has received a letter back that says: "Dear Sir: Your application for the above position has been carefully considered. However, due to the number of applicants from this immediate area it has been decided that a candidate will be selected from these applicants." Now clearly this letter - and I will table the letter from J. Bonia, Superintendent of Equipment from Grand Falls - indicates to this individual that even though he has put on his application that he is a permanent resident of Millertown he has now been told that he will not be allowed to compete.

I have further a back-up letter from the individual in which he indicates that he has called again and again to find out why. My question: Is there a policy of restricting people who can compete for jobs to the immediate geographical area, and is it, therefore, very difficult for layed-off miners in my district to compete for these Department of Transportation jobs in places like Grand Falls?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, there certainly is not any such policy that I am aware of but I would be very pleased to take the letter, and any other information that you have, and check it through and get any additional information that I can on the issue. We can deal

with it either in here or outside the House, if you want.

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH:

I just have a brief question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle). Owing to the fact that Tuesday is elections day in the Province for municipalities, I am aware that many of our councils will have new members on them. One of the great concerns of councils over the past several years has been the reduction in grants to those municipalities. I just wonder if the minister and his department are considering reviewing and revising and having a second look at the whole grant system with regards to possibly increasing the level of funding through those various grants?

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

I thank the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, for his question. That particular issue has been of major concern to my department for the last couple of years and also of major concern as well to the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities in the Province. We are always concerned about any cutbacks that government has been forced to make with respect to municipal funding. The issue is always under review.

It is a little bit difficult at this point in time, Mr. Speaker,

to say whether or not there will be any increases in municipal funding this year because, obviously, it is a budgetary measure. But some of the cutbacks, of course, the government has had to make to municipalities during the last few years hopefully will be only short-term cutbacks. The level of funding to municipalities will be increased as time goes on.

However, of course, you have to take it in its proper context, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not there has been all that many cutbacks, in 1972 the level of funding to municipalities, insofar as operating grants are concerned, was in the neighbourhood of \$11 million. Today, in 1985, those operating grants are up to \$78 million, which is an increase of about 600 to 700 per cent. But, Mr. Speaker, we do realize that it is difficult for any municipality today to operate the way they would like to operate. And as a result of course, we are quite concerned and the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities is concerned as well. Hopefully, as time goes on the level of funding to those municipality bodies will be increased.

MR. BAIRD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:
Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). It is realized that we do have a CAT scanner located on the East Coast. I think the number is one CAT scanner per every 500,000 people. It seems to be a rule of thumb. Because of

the distance and the scarcity of population on the West Coast, and I realize the cost is somewhere in the vicinity of \$800,000, I would ask the minister if within the next couple of years at least, he would make provision for acquiring one for the West Coast?

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. TWOMEY:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I wish to inform the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) that we have given consideration to a CAT scanner. I am not going to say it is going to happen immediately, but we have looked into the future and explored many avenues as to how we could bring CAT scanners to various parts of the rural areas of Newfoundland, including the Northern Peninsula, the West Coast and the Central area.

Now it is possible to put a CAT scanner on wheels and to move it from hospital to hospital, and sometimes to bring the technicians and all the necessary support services with it. It means that you can possibly leave, say, one area like Gander, after spending a period of time there and doing all of the necessary work, then on to Grand Falls, then on to Corner Brook and then on to St. Anthony. These are possibilities, these are concepts, and I think we have some information on that particular type of CAT scanner in our department.

MR. SIMMS:
Hear, hear! Good answer!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No! Shame! Shame! By leave. By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave, no leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table an answer to a question asked by the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) pertaining to funds allocated to the Sustaining Grants Programme for the past two years, and to groups to whom money has been allocated. I have the answer for the hon. gentleman to the question asked October 30, 1985.

Petitions

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity this morning to present a petition on behalf of

some 2,600 people of the community of St. Lawrence and surrounding area; the communities of Point May, Lamaline, Point au Gaul, Lords Cove, Lawn, St. Lawrence and Little St. Lawrence.

The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is out of concern for the cottage hospital within the town of St. Lawrence and the prayer of the petition is such: "That the U.S. Memorial Hospital was presented to the people of St. Lawrence and Lawn as a living memorial to the 204 officers and men of the United States Navy who lost their lives in the USS Truxton and USS Pollux disaster, February 18, 1942, and is a vital reminder of the inherent courage of mankind, and

THAT this historic facility, born from courage and bravery, is recognized as an integral part of the history of Newfoundland, and

THAT this hospital has provided quality health care to our people within the area since its official opening."

The prayer, Mr. Speaker, is, "THAT our hospital should continue to play a contributory role in servicing the health care needs of the residents, from Point May to Little St. Lawrence, and

THAT the U.S. Memorial Hospital working in conjunction with the Burin Peninsula Regional Hospital," which is now under construction and will be open within a year and a half or so - "maintain its present role of providing convalescent and out-patient services to our people."

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition asks, as well, "THAT a

chronic care facility be constructed adjacent to the U.S. Memorial Hospital to better service our people, because of the primary need for an additional facility on the Burin Peninsula, and, secondly, to improve the economic base of the communities from Point May to Little St. Lawrence."

Mr. Speaker, there is a wide range of concern in the area because of the significance and the purpose of why the hospital was put there in the first place, out of the heroics of the people of St. Lawrence and Lawn, whereby they did carry out some courageous and heroic undertakings in the disaster that occurred there with the two American destroyers.

Mr. Speaker, of course, another very important consideration and thrust is the very fatal and the high number of deaths and sickness and illnesses that have been contributed to the mining activity in St. Lawrence where there are still a number of miners who are presently suffering very seriousness illness. I guess some of them are within their last number of days and months because of the illness of silicosis. More cases are being identified weekly among people that did work there. This, of course, is another reason why the people of the area would certainly like to see their facility maintained so that these people can be treated with dignity in their own community.

I take great pleasure in presenting this petition, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of approximately 2600 people of the St. Lawrence area.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in supporting the motion so ably presented by the minister, the member for that district. I think the people of St. Lawrence and that are, like people in most parts of Newfoundland, especially where we have industry, are anxious that there be medical facilities provided. In the case of the St. Lawrence people, of course, they are anxious that the existing facility be maintained and hopefully, if necessary, upgraded.

I have some personal knowledge of the need for that kind of facility. In the district that I have pleasure to represent, Twillingate, has a hospital. I can tell you now, Mr. Speaker, that it is a Godsend for the people of Twillingate as, I am sure, it is a Godsend for the people of St. Lawrence.

People today, Mr. Speaker, expect to be able to get decent medical attention. Not only do people living in the big urban centers, like St. John's, Corner Brook, Grand Falls and Gander, expect to get good attention, but people in other and more remote parts of the Province as well, need and, indeed, deserve proper medical attention.

I would strongly support the petition and ask that the Minister of Health and his colleagues in government give it very serious consideration and acced to the request contained therein.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear! Hear!

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker.

o o o

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

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in sympathizing and understanding the prayer of that petition presented by 2,600 people who are on the catchment area of the St. Lawrence hospital.

I can also understand and agree with the hon. member for Twillingate. He presented an excellent reply in support of this petition. As he realizes, times have changed and, they are monuments to the health and courage of the people in that particular area, a monument which was given freely by the American government to thank them in a very special way for their heroism during the terrible tragedy at sea. At that time it was a modern hospital. Now we have moved into the twentieth century and times have changed and medical care has changed. I would take the same pride as the minister and the member for Twillingate has taken in his hospital. It is a new and modern complex. It has got specialists on its staff. It has modern and new technology.

At the same time, we are building a new hospital in Salt Pond. That hospital will be a hospital of the twentieth century and beyond and it will have modern technology and the specialists that will be required to look after the large number of people in that area.

I support and I give my sympathy and my sentiments to the petition that have been presented.

Thank you, very much.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I want to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 23. This morning we have seen a breakdown and I want to make my points so that I will be clearly understood by Your Honour as to why I am moving this amendment and what it is all about. I want to explain the subject, if I can, as to why I am moving, under Standing Order 23, the adjournment of the House.

This morning we saw the worst disaster that could happen to Newfoundland, and I am not talking about FFTs in particular. I am talking about the overall concept of federal/provincial relations, that, as we saw this morning have been severely injured, if I could use that word, hampered and eroded. We saw a disgraceful, as far as I am concerned, a dishonourable treatment of the provincial government of Newfoundland, regardless of their party stripe, by a federal government, regardless of their stripe.

In this case we saw the breakdown of what we were promised was going to be a new era for Newfoundland, a new era of co-operation. Mr. Speaker, that effects everything that is going to happen in Newfoundland for the next three to four years.

Therefore, it is of urgent public importance that we discuss this whole issue. So, Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to

move the adjournment of the House. I will read the motion into the paper and I will give one to Your Honour so he can rule on it.

"For the purpose of debating a matter of urgent public importance, namely the gross violation of faith represented by the Premier Minister, Mr. Mulroney, and his government's decision to license three factory freezer trawlers, and the Premier and his government's inability to negate, defer, or effect that decision and the effect that has on upon provincial/federal relations, I move adjournment."

Mr. Speaker, I would submit to Your Honour that there is not a place on the Order Paper at present to discuss that issue of federal/provincial relations. It is not there and I would also submit to Your Honour that it fulfills all of the requirements that you will find in our Standing Orders to move the adjournment of the House.

So I ask leave of Your Honour to move the adjournment of the House.

MR. MARSHALL:

I would like to address that Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I hardly need quote the rules which are well known, I know, to Your Honour with respect to the adjournment of the House on a matter of urgent public importance. Urgency is defined on Page 91 and 92 of Beauchesne and I have to say it has not just to be the urgency of the matter itself but it must mean urgency of

debate. I am reading from Beauchesne Page 92, paragraph 287. " 'Urgency' within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but means 'urgency of debate', when the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the House do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately."

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would point out that we have on the Order Paper fiscal bills that we have been discussing all week, Supplementary Supply. We are talking about debate now and he has the opportunity to debate it there, the Address in Reply is on the Order Paper.

I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, again, that in essence the matter is one that had been raised before, a motion that had been brought to this House and had been passed by this House in essence.

I quote Standing Order 23 (f), (3), but furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I also want to point out as well, and to make quite clear, the reason why we are resisting this, and we resist it under the rules, but we resist it also for a substantive reason. This is a very serious matter and the Premier, in a very forthright matter, got up and made a statement today in this House, which the hon. gentlemen on the other side responded to. The Premier dealt with the matter at that particular time, he offered a joint committee which could not be done. He made his statements here in this House and the hon. gentleman heard exactly what he said, to put an all-party committee to determine -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is playing, unfortunately, once again, his political games with a very serious issue in this Province, that has been dealt with in a substantive way by the Leader of the Government in this Province, both in the House and outside.

So, for all of those reasons, Mr. Speaker, but especially because of Beauchesne and what is on the Order Paper, the matter, while it maybe an urgent matter - obviously, it is a matter of concern to all of the Province, and to the government and everybody in this House, - it is not a matter of urgency of debate. There is quite ample opportunity for the hon. gentlemen to debate it.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:

Sit down! Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I submit the resolution is quite in order, both in terms of the urgency and in terms of the lack of another opportunity to debate the urgent issue.

It is true that there is a

Supplementary Supply bill before the House, but from a check of the heads in that bill you will note that Fisheries is not included in the heads. The Loan Guarantee bill has not been called and we have no indication it will be called this day. Further, Mr. Speaker, we wanted to raise this issue in Question Period, but the Premier thought it more important and more suited to his political purposes to talk to the press, rather than face some real scrutiny here in the House, so he boycotted the Question Period.

So, in the absence of an opportunity in Question Period to question the minister and the Premier, in the absence of any other item on the Order Paper today that would give us that opportunity between now and 1:00 p.m., I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is not only urgency in the subject, as the Premier himself has indicated, there is also no other opportunity this day under which we can discuss it. I would make a plea to the Chair to allow us to go forward with the resolution now.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MARSHALL:

I would point out to the hon. gentleman, and I know the hon. gentleman and this House know full-well, that when we are discussing a bill on Supply the widest possible range of debate is allowed. And, you know, it is a period of time, like the Throne Speech, which is on the Order Paper, but I just do not quote the

Throne Speech because I have no intention of calling it today.

I say we are going to call Supplementary Supply and the hon. gentleman can debate this on the wide-ranging nature, you do not have to have the items in the Supply bill itself.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I think I have heard enough on this matter. I am going to call a recess for a few moments and consult with the authorities.

Recess

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I have considered all of the arguments and consulted the authorities. I do not regard the motion made by the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) as being in order for the following reason: There is ample opportunity for members to debate the matter raised in the motion if the government calls Motion No. 1, as the government has so indicated. There is also ample opportunity under the order Address in Reply.

The motion is out of order.

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

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

MR. TULK:
It is a very serious question, and I want to confirm -

MR. BAIRD:

Your leader is still up there rubbing cheek to cheek with 'Iona'.

MR. FUREY:
Retract that. That is a serious sexist remark.

MR. TULK:
Do you need something to throw across there? I will pass you over a book or something to throw if that is what you need.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, it is a very important and urgent matter that I am bringing up and I am not raising anything else under Standing Order 23.

I understood the Premier, this morning - and he had agreement from this side of the House, because we consider this to be important, we consider it to be above partisan politics, unlike the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), who wanted to dodge out of Question Period so they would not have to answer some very crucial questions. But, Mr. Speaker, I understood the Premier, this morning, to say that there would be an all-party committee to draft a resolution to Ottawa. We were in agreement on it, both of us. I agreed on behalf of our side. We think it is a good idea because this has to be above partisan politics. But I also understood in a statement that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) made a few minutes afterwards, and I would ask him to consider very carefully because this is very important to rural Newfoundland and this Province, and I ask him to forget again his partisan politics. I hope that he will

stand up and say that that is not the case what I thought I heard him say, namely, that the all-party committee is now off. He may indeed stand up and do that. But I would ask him the question and urge him not to stand and say that because this is very important to Newfoundland, and I do not want his partisan politics to play any part in his answer.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Maybe the hon. gentleman may have misinterpreted me or maybe I said something that led to that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You were angry.

MR. TULK:

Well that is understandable if he was angry.

MR. BAIRD:

Your mad.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I was out if the Chamber for part of the debate that went on with respect to this. I know that the Premier had suggested an all-party committee.

MR. TULK:

And we agreed.

MR. MARSHALL:

And it was agreed. Then I heard afterwards, because of the nature of the partisan way the hon. gentlemen were, I assume, were treating it, that the hon. Premier, I did hear him say, all deals are off or whatever it was.

So I would have to consult with the Premier on that.

I know that the Premier would want an all-party committee. If an all-party committee can be put together to address this in a rational, reasonable, intelligent way and come up with a resolution. But, of course, it takes the people on this side of the House and all members of the House, all members of the committee to do that.

So this is too important a question to be playing tiny little politics with. As far as I am concerned the Premier can speak for himself obviously when he comes down here and I cannot conceive, unless there are other things that occurred when I was out of the House, that there was a change of mind.

MR. TULK:

On a further point of order, if I could clarify this to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

I understood the Premier did say all deals are off. But I would hope and I had thought that the Premier was talking about all deals are off on question period.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right on.

MR. TULK:

I would hope that is the case.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council, to that point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

My colleagues verify that. I was out of the House at the time, I was just listening on the intercom. So I assume, my colleagues confirmed that as well.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

It is my understanding that is was with respect to question period.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, my rejoinders are made at the utter disgust that the way in which the hon. gentleman have reacted towards this. When the Premier got up in a responsible way and made the position of the Province and the hon. gentleman is trying to colour it by bringing in resolutions and what have you. The same resolution that they voted against the other day.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, it does not appear to be a point of order. It seems to be a matter of clearing up an item that is a bit confused on both sides. It is a matter of getting unanimous consent to do so.

MR. TULK:

Well we have it, as far as I know.

Mr. Speaker, on another point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

This morning we saw the Premier try to manipulate this House for his own advantage. He wanted first, and he was forgetting-

MR. BAIRD:

Mr. Speaker, impugning motives.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, keep the hon. gentleman quiet. They are awful touchy over there about something.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier stormed out of the House. He obviously had set it up because the Premier had to know when he came in here at 10:00 o'clock how long his speech was going to be. He had to know how long it would take me to respond.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is your point?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Well I want to make a point here, Mr. Speaker, and I am giving the background. He had to know if we were going to give leave to the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), that would take so much time. The Premier did this morning, whether it was a mistake on his part or not, he did this morning made this morning, in my opinion, an unparliamentary move. He put the press, and while they are important, above the House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, he did not.

MR. TULK:

Oh, yes he did. He wanted to go out, he wanted to have a few minutes -

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not true. It is a lie.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

I have to put my back to the Speaker so I will not get the noise from the other side.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier this morning, as I said, tried to manipulate this House. The press could have waited for fifteen or twenty minutes. That was nonsense on his part. It was just an attempt by him to get out of this House and make his statements in public and not have to answer some very important questions in this House.

The point being, there are some important questions that should be answered immediately by the Premier of the Province and by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). With those two people out of the House there is very little point in asking them.

My request to the Government House Leader, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is would he agree, when the Premier comes back, to take whatever is left of this sitting -

MR. SIMMS:

He turned it down.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

No, no. The Premier was going to leave the Province. Would he agree to take the rest of this session for Question Period?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to respond to it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The Premier gave the Opposition an opportunity where they could conduct the Question Period. They refused and Question Period was held. The hon. gentlemen, in a purely childish fashion, walked out of the House. So we are on the ordinary routine of business now and I think it is Orders of the Day. We call Motion 1.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. The Government House Leader can squirm over there all he like. We know he is in an uncomfortable position. But the truth of the matter is that they tried this morning to put the press before the House of Assembly. There is no way out of it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have already ruled there was no point of order there.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of Supplementary Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

Shall the resolution carry?

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, since the Speaker has ruled that under this heading of Supplementary Supply we can debate this matter that we put forward this morning as being of urgent and public importance, I suppose we have to abide by the Speaker's ruling. I want to do that, of course, as a member of the House.

Mr. Chairman, we saw this morning and we are in the midst of, in Newfoundland today, a very, very sad situation. We now have reverted back to a state of war with the federal government that existed from 1979 to 1984. We were promised -

MR. MATTHEWS:

What are you going to do, boy, roll over?

MR. TULK:

I will tell you what the hon. gentleman should do if he had any principles and if he wanted to live up, Mr. Chairman, to his commitments to the people of this Province last April when the key theme in his campaign in Grand Bank was a P.C. Government in Newfoundland and a P.C. Government in Ottawa is good for Newfoundland. It is excellent and everything will be wonderful.

If he had any intestinal fortitude today he would urge the Premier of this Province to resign and resign himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Is he a man of no principle? That is exactly what he should do if he

wants to know what he should do. He should resign in protest that his government went across this Province on a prosperity crusade and pushed them and said, "You have to have Mulroney so we can have something in Newfoundland."

If he were a man of principle, Mr. Chairman, he would urge the Premier to resign in protest over this morning's actions concerning FFTs. But he is not, Mr. Speaker. He cannot be. Let us see his action. Let us see him take some concrete action now against a government in Ottawa that he is responsible for, as one of the members on that side, for putting in office, that he backed the Premier on, that he stood in this House and said, "When we can get rid of Trudeau, Lalonde and Chretien, everything will be beautiful in Newfoundland." Well, we saw how beautiful.

He should also resign because he signed the Atlantic Accord which, because that government in Ottawa breaks contracts, as they broke with the restructuring agreement - a contract is a contract - he should also resign in protest over that because he may not have what he thinks he has in the Atlantic Accord.

MR. MATTHEWS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Chairman, I feel compelled to rise on a point of order because the hon. member for Fogo, particularly, is trying to highlight the situation in Grand Bank. I would like to just make

clear to him and other members of the House that the Grand Bank plant is operating and will operate well into the future. The only time the plant was closed, Mr. Chairman, was when it was represented by a Liberal MHA in this House and by a Liberal MP in Ottawa. It was never closed before that or since that.

MR. W. CARTER:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, that kind of a statement, coming from a minister, makes a sham of all that the Premier said this morning in his statement. By the Premier's own admission, it is probably one of the saddest days in our history. The whole future of our Province could be jeopardized by what is happening and the minister has got the gall to get up in his place and to make such a partisan, foolish political statement. Like I said, it gives the sham to all the Premier has been saying, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, how much longer do I have?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Seven minutes.

MR. TULK:

Good. Mr. Chairman, let me say this to the hon. member, when the member of the House who now sits

for Fortune - Hermitage and when there was a Liberal government in Ottawa, when the hated, Trudeau, Chretien, Lalonde and Leblanc were there, there was restructuring agreement signed which at one time, the Premier of this Province came into the House and said it was the best agreement since Confederation and then on the public airway said he was forced into it. I do not know how he can have that both ways, but the Premier tries.

Let me tell him that his Premier said this morning and as he nodded his head in anguish and in sorrow. When was that restructuring agreement signed? When there was a Liberal government and what was one of the clauses? That no factory freezer trawlers would be used. His government and the people that he pushes, and every person on that side refuses to speak out against, you are the people who pushed a PC government in Newfoundland. You are the people who have condoned them by doing that and by being quiet on the issue. By the Premier coming in here this morning and saying he is going to monitor the situation. Well, what is he going to use to monitor? The member for Burin - Placentia West?

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

A point of order please the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, the Opposition House Leader knows full well that the Premier came into this House this

morning and laid the cards on the table. He would put Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders before any political party and the member opposite knows full well. If he do not want me to talk about last Thursday, he better let me know now. I will tell him, Mr. Chairman where his allegiance is to.

MR. TULK:

Go ahead. Get it off your chest because you are hurting.

MR. TOBIN:

The fact of the matter is the Premier has squarely laid our case on the table as it relates to it and you or nobody else can twist that. Mr. Chairman, further to that if there was ever a silent, mum bunch in this House of Assembly it was when the member for Fortune - Hermitage in conjunction with Mr. Chretien would not let the oil rigs into Mortier Bay and sent them on to Halifax. Get up, boy! Grow up and make some sense! Stand up for Newfoundlanders and do not get on with the trash you got on with the other day.

MR. FUREY:

To that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, what a convoluted argument just put forward by the member! If you believe everything that the Premier is saying, you will believe that the Premier said that there will be a new era of consultation and that everything would be great in Ottawa, if only we could get the same colour up there. Well you have got the same colour and look what happened this

morning. Is this what you meant by the Tory love-in.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, does the hon. gentleman for Burin - Placentia West realize that the Premier has put to lie what he just said? Does he realize that? No, he does not.

Does he realize the the Premier on public television on Tuesday night said he knew about the decision of FPI some two weeks ago? Yet, last Thursday, a week ago today, last Friday, he passed a resolution in this House opposing factory freezer trawlers when he already suspected, knew probably, that the decision was made. Does he not realize what a stupid game was being played in this House by his Party? Or is he going to hide? Where is he gone? Come back, boy! Is he going to hide like the rest of them are hiding over there? I suspect there are a couple of members who are not going to hide over there. But is he going to do it? Is the member for Humber West going to hide behind that little game that the Premier played here, last week?

MR. BAIRD:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

I would like to advise the hon. member for Fogo that this member

for Humber West will hide from nobody and what the Premier said that we certainly stand against the decision made by the federal government if we are not happy with it.

MR. TULK:
Not happy?

MR. BAIRD:
If we are not happy with it, that is what I said and I will repeat that, this government will do everything in its power and certainly we have made our position clear. The Premier made it clear two weeks ago and we will make it next week. I hide or walk away from nobody, sir, inside or outside this House.

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

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

MR. FUREY:
Well, you know we hear the hon. the member for Humber West saying he will not hide. Well during the election, your leader called that election on a mandate to create full-time and meaningful jobs for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

The statistics came out this morning, Western Newfoundland has gone from 19.3 per cent to 21.2 per cent unemployment. Is that what you mean by creating full-time and meaningful jobs? It puts the lie to the election in this Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
To that point of order there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Chairman, the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) is over there turning white in the face again. He got all upset again. He needs something to throw.

The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) who is always standing in this House and saying how much he stands for Newfoundland, does he realize the game that the Premier played last Friday? Does he realize that the Premier said that he knew two weeks ago what the decision was?

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

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:
The hon. House Leader (Mr Tulk) must have a face like a robber's horse. He must think that we are stupid. All of you Opposition members stood in your places last week and voted for factory freezer trawlers. You cannot deny that. You can twist it, you can turn it, but the Newfoundlanders out there are not as stupid as you people think they are. It is about time that you fellows realize what your position is and stand up for Newfoundland. Now, I am beginning to realize that not only do we have a rat pack in Ottawa but evidently, from what is coming from that side of the House the rat pack in Ottawa had a litter and now they are in the Opposition in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

As usual what an intellectual point the gentleman just made. We do not believe he is stupid, we believe he is stunned. We believe he was stunned enough to let the Premier fool around with something that he said that he knew the decision on two weeks ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

I am on a point of order of order 'boy', sit down. Do not be so stunned.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, there is no point of order, and the hon. member's time is up.

The hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

Now that the Opposition have proven themselves to be totally inadequate for the job, I would suggest that if they want to be of some service to Newfoundland, to their country, get a gill net, go out and look for their leader and bring him back.

MR. TULK:

Is that a point of order or a maiden speech?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is no point of order.

MR. TULK:

Was that a speech he made over

there because if it is I am allowed to stand again? If it is not, then one of my colleagues will have to stand.

Did he say a point of order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes.

MR. TULK:

I abide by your ruling.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, I think it is obvious why we wanted a special debate on this important issue because if one can judge from what is happening here this morning you would never say that the Premier made the statement that he made an hour and a half ago. There is no seriousness from the other side. They are making a big joke of it all and raising on points of order that are meaningless and unnecessary. The fact of the matter is that we were denied this morning the opportunity to have a Question Period on this very important matter.

MR. PATTERSON:

No, you were not.

MR. W. CARTER:

We were denied the opportunity this morning to have a regular Question Period. The Premier this morning refused to attend the Question Period. He came in the House at 10:00 o'clock with a statement that he knew would take him thirty or forty minutes to read. He knew that. He knew that my colleague would have to respond

for half that time, and very conveniently, Mr. Chairman, they gave the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) the opportunity to, almost unprecedented by the way, almost unprecedentedly he was given leave to speak to the Premier's statement. By making arrangements for that press conference at 11:00 o'clock, he knew that he would be denying this House the opportunity to question him and his Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) on this very issue. It is a disgrace, Mr. Speaker. It is a disgrace, I think, and an insult to the people of Newfoundland.

Mr. Chairman, the request by our House Leader (Mr. Tulk) that we have a question period when the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries came back, in my view, is quite legitimate, and, in fact, quite necessary.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A question period was offered but you had left the House.

MR. W. CARTER:

No, it was not. It was not offered. The Premier, Mr. Chairman, offered to have a fifteen minute question period. Very conveniently, I might add, so he could leave here then and go up to the press and react to the question that we put to him to the press. Put his own version on those questions and answers. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is nothing short of disgraceful. I think the people of Newfoundland will have to make note of this and be mindful of the fact that an issue, by the Premier's own admission, is probably the most serious issue ever brought to this House.

MR. SIMMS:

One that you did not support last week.

MR. W. CARTER:

I will not even dignify the author of that statement or the statement itself by trying to react to it. The minister, like a lot of his colleagues, are misleading the House. They are trying to mislead the people of our Province.

MR. SIMMS:

Do you or did you not vote against the resolution, or the charade, as you called it?

MR. W. CARTER:

We voted against it. Mr. Chairman, the Premier's statement and subsequent remarks made by the Premier on television after that debate proves exactly what we were saying, it was a sham. The Premier in his television presentation that night said that he was aware that all was not well and he knew that for two weeks prior to the calling of that debate.

We knew, Mr. Chairman, we had a feeling that he was set up by the Premier and by the government. They were laying a trap, we knew that, but we had to take our chances. But I think the people of Newfoundland know that it was a trap. A meaningless, shameful, petty, little exercise put on by the Premier and by his Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and by the government to try and make themselves look like heroes.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, and I have this from reasonably good authority, I will not quote my source, but I have it from good authority, that when this issue came to light, in Ottawa we had a minister, Mr. John Fraser. I think most Canadians, most Newfoundlanders, and I am sure the Premier, could sense in Mr. Fraser some sympathy for

Newfoundland's position. I would almost venture to say that if Mr. Fraser had been allowed to stay in that job, it might well be that announcement this morning by Crosbie would have been a little different. The Premier, of course, wanting to cash in on this issue, wanting to get some of the credit, in fact, maybe, all of the credit for having it set aside or, at least, having a decision made in favour of our Province, launched this great campaign to influence the Canadian people and the politicians in Ottawa and the government in Newfoundland's favour.

What the Premier did not make allowances for is that the horses were changed in midstream. Fraser was dumped from Cabinet. Then we had Nielsen appointed as the Acting Minister.

I happen to know Erik Nielsen reasonably well. I served with him the Commons for five or six years, in fact, seven years. I know exactly what the man is made of. He does not have one ounce of sympathy for Eastern Canada. He does not have one ounce of sympathy for or interest in or knowledge of the Newfoundland fishing industry. He is a cold-blooded, heartless person. Of course, that is why he has got the job he has got. He is the man now who is doing the slashing for the Prime Minister, doing the dirty work for the Prime Minister and for the government. I might add, he is doing a very good job of it.

Of course, the factory freezer episode is another example of just how callous and how cold and how heartless that minister is when it comes to dealing with this Province. Because, as the Premier

said, and I agree with him, and knowing what I know about the fishing industry, I believe the introduction of that kind of technology into the fishing in Eastern Canada will have a disastrous effect on the Newfoundland fishery.

Anyway getting back to my story, Mr. Chairman, the Premier did not make allowances for the subsequent events that took place in Ottawa. He ended up with Nielsen as the acting minister, Mac the Knife. He is the fellow who can put the knife in and not even draw blood. Then, of course, having launched this great campaign, hopefully to get credit for stopping the decision, at least, having a decision made in Newfoundland's favour, then Brother Nielsen came on the scene and things changed. Now the Premier and his ministers are trying to salvage themselves. They are trying to rescue themselves from what, obviously, has been a very bad situation.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, the Premier should have been here this morning with his minister, as important as the news media might be - I am not taking away from the news media, of course they are important - but the fact of the matter of the matter is that the members from the new media were not elected by the people of this Province. They were not elected to represent their interests in the House of Assembly. We were elected. It might be worth noting, Mr. Chairman, that on this side of the House I would say more than two-thirds of Newfoundland's fishing interests, fishing communities and fishermen, are represented.

Therefore, we have a responsibility and a duty to

question the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries on behalf of our constituents on this very grave matter. Today we have been denied that privilege or that opportunity, I should have said. We were denied it by the Premier and by the Minister of Fisheries and by his ministers.

The minister, whatever he is, the House Leader (Mr. Marshall), the downtown lawyer, Mr. Chairman, got up in his place, when my colleague introduced the motion that we have a special debate - I could not believe what I was hearing. A Newfoundlander who porports to be here in the interests of all that is good for Newfoundland, the White Knight, stood in his place today searching the Standing Orders, to try to find a technicality and to try to find some little clause.

MR. SIMMS:
Applying the rules.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, this House is the master of our own rules. I am sure the member knows that, he is a former Speaker. We can change the rules as we see fit. We control the rules of the House. We are the masters of the rules of this House. We could have waived certain things today to have allowed a debate on this very important issue.

MR. SIMMS:
That is right.

MR. W. CARTER:
Oh, no! But Mr. Clean, Mr. White Knight, stood in his place and searched out the Standing Orders to try to find a way, to try to find a legal technicality or some legitimate reason for -

MR. SIMMS:
Are you saying he should not have?

MR. W. CARTER:
No, no, I am not saying that.

MR. SIMMS:
That is what you are advocating, though.

MR. W. CARTER:
Special circumstances sometimes dictate that we make allowances, that we, maybe, broaden the rules or maybe waive the rules for a while.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, what a feeble effort by a parliamentarian whose parliamentary career has waned so much that today it is not even a blip on a radar screen. The hon. gentlemen talks about smut. What about the White Knight this! What about the White Knight that! What about the downtown lawyer! What is that, Mr. Chairman? I mean, you take what you get in this House, Mr. Chairman. If you cannot take it you have to get out.

Mr. Chairman, let me say a few things to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman gets up here for the last ten minutes this morning, in all of his sanctimonious stance, and talks about how the Opposition and the people of Newfoundland had their rights trampled on because the Premier

and the Minister of Fisheries and the government would not allow a Question Period. Mr. Chairman, you would not know but the hon. gentleman was the walking example of Beauchesne himself. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the Opposition and the Opposition House Leader agreed, in the first instance, to have a partial Question Period, as one alternative, immediately before we left the Chamber and finish it off as the overall part of the proposal when we came back. That was enunciated between the Premier and the House Leader for the Opposition. There seemed to me to be general agreement that we could go ahead and do that. But before that got a chance to float, Mr. Chairman, one of the hon. gentleman's colleagues stood on a point of privilege and got off on another tack about it being before the House and answering to the House and we cannot let this business about Question Period go, or something else. Then there was a suggestion that perhaps we could postpone the whole of Question Period until we came back here. That seemed to meet with some general understanding from the other side. Then, when they could not bring that off, Mr. Chairman, not because of any fault of anybody on this side but because of the fault of their own colleagues on that side, then they all walked out of the House. So you talk about babies!

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, Please!

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

MR. TULK:

I only want to make one point to the hon. gentleman, and that is that he and the Premier, or the Premier and somebody else, tried to set up this House so that the Premier could deliver his message to the public media without answering to this House. If he wants to talk about babies, I only saw two babies in this House this morning, the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), who wanted to scuttle out of this House and get down in front of the press without having to answer for their lack of action. That was his problem. Duck Question Period so we do not have to answer about the terrible judgement that we made with the Mulroney government, that is the only reason they wanted to get out of the House. That is what they tried to do this morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Chairman, there is no point of order, and the seventeen scuttlers are on that side of the House. Those are the people who scuttled out of the Chamber, those are the people who scuttled out through the doors, slithered off the floor because they never had the intestinal fortitude to stay here and be parliamentarians, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, I do not want the hon. gentleman to get carried away like that. I would instruct him to count the numbers over here. There are fifteen in the Official Opposition, and one down there is sixteen. He is upset about something, there cannot be seventeen over here.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is no point of order. The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Chairman, again, there is obviously no point of order. If it is anything, it is a point of discourtesy. Mr. Chairman. Let me also say to the hon. gentlemen that this Minister of Fisheries, this Premier, or any other minister on this side of the House, will never be scared to come into this House and face the Mouse Pack on the other side. We are not scared to come into the House, Mr. Chairman. I would go anywhere in Newfoundland and face the kind of opposition we have here. Because the kind of opposition that is over there, Mr. Chairman, will ensure that this government is over here until the grey hairs fall down to the floor, they are so inept, Mr. Chairman, as a group.

Mr. Chairman, all they do is whine and moan and complain. We were playing petty politics last week, we were setting them up last week in a charade. The Premier, and the Minister of Fisheries and the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), we all got together down in the Premier's Office this morning at about 5:30 or 5:45 and we connived, we used our weasle minds to try to set the Opposition up again today. They are paranoid, Mr. Chairman. The

Opposition has done such an incredible job of blowing it, Mr. Chairman - they blew it last week on this issue, they have blown it again today on this issue - that they deserve to be blown out of the water.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

Oh, all right, Sir. You go to somebody else, do you?

MR. CALLAN:

Are you finished?

MR. SIMMS:

There is a point of order.

MR. TULK:

I am on a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, let us not have the hon. gentleman get carried away about their own tactics which blew up in their faces this morning, let us have him stand up and explain to this House, if he can, if it is within him, how he can sit there and say he did not fail with the Mulroney Government. If he was a man of principle, he would pass in his resignation this morning in protest against his own Tory buddies in Ottawa. Let us hear him say that.

MR. SIMMS:

Do not be so discouraging, boy.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to finish up. I do not have much time left, but let me tell the hon. gentleman that I passed in one resignation on a point of principle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

That was more than anybody else over there did when there were other people scuttling this Province. That was more than anybody else over there did. Let me tell what is hurting the hon. gentlemen today. What is hurting the hon. gentlemen in the Opposition today is that this Party despite the political stripe of the government in Ottawa, will fight for Newfoundland and Labrador. That is what that party over there could not do when their buddies were in Ottawa. Mr. Chairman, that is the difference, that is what separates this side of the House from that side of the House.

MR. TULK:

Tell us how. Tell us how.

MR. RIDEOUT:

You see, Mr. Chairman, more discourtesy. That is a fact of life, Mr. Chairman. We will leave no stone unturned, as in the past, to ensure that the Newfoundland position is put forward. We will not hide behind party labels, Mr. Chairman. We are not that kind of people. We are not that kind of a government over here, that we would hide behind party labels or are afraid we will offend Mr.

Crosbie or Mr. Somebody Else.

MR. TULK:

I understood that the Chair has ruled on this point of order. Is he speaking or is he on a point of order?

MR. RIDEOUT:

No, I said that he had already ruled. I said there was no point of order.

MR. TULK:

That is right.

MR. FUREY:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries has said that he has tendered his resignation already once on a point of principle. Let him stand in his House today and show us his real principle and tender his resignation again, if he really believes in the principle of leading this party on personal principle. Will he resign today based on principle?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is no point of order.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, on a point or order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. W. CARTER:

I think, Mr. Chairman, the record should show that the hon. the Minister of Fisheries spoke for ten minutes. He devoted about thirty seconds, Mr. Chairman, of that speech to the matter at hand, talking about the fisheries. The first time he is back in the House since the Premier made that statement he devoted less than thirty seconds of his speech talking about the state of the Newfoundland fishery. I think the record should show that.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Chairman, to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. RIDEOUT:

If the Opposition never had to be so discourteous and so ungentlemanly and so dishonourable in their conduct I might have had another five minutes to talk about other items. They were the people who raised the points of order, Mr. Chairman, not me.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman, in speaking in debate on the Interim Supply Bill, it is obvious that this very topic of the factory freezer trawlers is dominating this debate. I want to comment further to yesterday when

I spoke on the same issue.

Yesterday, when I spoke in this Assembly, I was of the firm opinion that one license was going to be issued to National Sea with certain conditions attached. It was astounding to see a license issued to the Newfoundland company. That is where my concern is today, Mr. Chairman, as a member with two large plants in his district owned by Fishery Products International and both without an adequate supply of raw material. Right now they are both closed.

When I see a license issued by the Government of Canada or allocated for the use of FPI, I pose a question in my own mind. Why would the Government of Canada allocate a license to a company who apparently has not made an application for that license? I have not heard a word from Fishery Products International management. I thought it rather strange last week when the Standing Committee of the House of Commons was here in Newfoundland, all over the Atlantic Region, listening to and hearing briefs from all people involved in the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada, and not a word from almost the largest fish company in the world, not a word on the fishing industry. They did not bother to take the time to come forward to express their views. We have heard Mr. Young talking about the restructuring, the recent financing received in the company in some press conferences, but he did not come forward to have members of Parliament query him as to what he is doing with the money, why certain plants are being sold off, inshore plants and others kept.

I, in fact, was looking forward to members of Parliament being able to question the chief executive officer of that company and other managers of the company. They have to account to someone. What better place to account than to members of the House of Commons, the House of Parliament. I find it strange today that that company owned by the federal level of government, and indeed they are the largest shareholder - we are only a minority position in the company and the Bank of Nova Scotia, a minority position - why would the Government of Canada issue a license to that company unless some one - and I pose the question - did someone in Fishery Products International give the hint or indication, yes, they would like to have a factory freezer trawler as well. Why should National Sea get a license and go out and be competitive with them in Newfoundland and not us?

So I certainly hope today that is not the case, that the company getting all the taxpayer's monies, \$105 million just recently, that they also gave the hint or little indication to Ottawa that they would like a factory freezer trawler license as well. If that is the case, and if it is going to be the case next week - as I said in the House yesterday afternoon - Mr. Young, Mr. Wells, and Mr. Etchegary, who have got little or no concern for the inshore fishery of this Province - I know that after five years as minister, all three of them, they have been concerned for the inshore fishery - will they fight like the Premier is now doing and say to the federal shareholders, "No, as managers we will resign first before we put a factory freezer out there to take Bonavista, Charleston, Twillingate, the Burin

Peninsula plants, or others ahead of the system."

I am afraid it is going to come down to the point where the major shareholders say to Mr. Young, Mr. Wells and others, get your factory freezer trawler over here from West Germany, there is a bargain right now in West Germany. You can pick up a factory freezer vessel for approximately \$6 to \$7.5 million. National Sea is getting one, you have your license on your desk, why not go out and get it right now? That is when the principle will show, whether or not these gentlemen are in favour of onshore/inshore operations in Newfoundland. That is what is bothering me today. Out of the blue, unknown to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), unknown to the Premier, a license is issued to Newfoundland's company.

I would say that the battle is yet to come because as the member who was involved as a minister, intimately involved in the restructuring for months on end, in trying to ensure protection for the inshore fishery while I was there as a minister negotiating the restructuring, something smells to me, that Ottawa would say to FPI, here is your license, although you did not ask for it.

We know there it is big bone of contention in Newfoundland, everybody across Canada knows it is a bone of contention in Newfoundland, and suddenly they say to Mr. Young and others, "Here is your license."

I read Mr. Crosbie's statement this morning and I do not see any clear indication in Mr. Crosbie's document and in the copies of Mr. Nielsen's documents, I just

received, that Mr. Young or FPI did not apply or did not leave a hint in Ottawa that they want a license as well as National Sea. So I would like this morning, in the House of Assembly, to call upon - he cannot account to the House - but the senior executive officer of Fishery Products International or a spokesman for that company, who has remained so far quiet on this issue, let them account to Newfoundlanders, let them stand firmly and squarely, publicly behind the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) in this government and say, "No, we will never use that license. We will never use a factory freezer trawler to replace an onshore plant in Newfoundland." The silence is strange, the silence is indeed strange, and that is the whole thing that is going to hurt our fishing industry.

National Sea's application was the door opener. It is not going to adversely effect the inshore fishery because of the fact they are going to replace the wet fish trawlers or so they say. That was the opinion stressed over and over by National Sea and now a condition in the license. They had to replace the number of wet fish trawlers with one factory freezer trawler, which means their harvesting capacity is not going to be increased, it will be stabilized. So that, in itself, is not going to hurt the Newfoundland fishery but now what Ottawa has done is left not only ajar the door, they slammed it wide open. Along comes a consortium. I do not know too many Newfoundland companies today who financially can afford to form a consortium to buy a factory freezer trawler. But I know of one group in Nova Scotia all ready

with their financing almost in place to go to West Germany when National Sea finalize their deal over there. It will not be a Newfoundland consortium is going to get that other licence.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who is it?

MR. MORGAN:

So because Ottawa knew this they automatically had to come to FPI and put one in place through that mechanism. Their own company which they are the major shareholder in.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What a slippery move.

MR. MORGAN:

The hon. Mr. Chairman is aware of what I am talking about. Will it mean closing out Charleston? Will it mean closing out Bonavista, or part of Port Union - Catalina?

MR. W. CARTER:

Port de Grave, Harbour Grace?

MR. MORGAN:

Or will it mean the closing out of Gaultois and Harbour Breton on the South Coast or Trepassey on the Peninsula up here? A good question. But it is going to.

I have to say today it is a sad day and I have to say today it is not always that I have stood and agreed outside of government with my own government. Over the years I am noted for that, to be speaking against my own party. Today I have to say in sincerity I stand and commend the Premier in what he is doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

He is standing up for Newfoundland against his own party, knowing there are going to be repercussions. There is no question about that. There are going to be major fallout on this issue. Mr. Crosbie was this morning on Open Line, I got some of the transcripts of what he had to say, and the confrontation is almost as bad as what it was when Mr. LeBlanc was there as minister and I was Minister of Fisheries here in the Province. That was pretty bad.

Now I say it is a sad day. It is a sad day because what the Government of Canada has done is slap the face of this administration. They refused to listen to the views of this administration. To add insult to injury, and Mr. Crosbie did not address it, he addressed it very briefly, they have violated an agreement passed through this House of Assembly and made law. It is a piece of legislation, it is an act of this House of Assembly passed and what they have done is violate a section of that act, because it is now an act or agreement. If they can violate one agreement it poses a question, can other agreements also be broken and violated by the Government of Canada?

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. MORGAN:
By leave, in two minutes I will finish up?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

By leave.

MR. MORGAN:
That really bothers me. But the Premier is quite aware of the repercussions. I say it in sincerity. The Premier knows I do not always agree with him on certain issues, and I think in many cases he has respected me for standing on issues, on policies which I had some disagreement with. I am sure there are members on this side all in the same position. I now commend him for what he is doing because he is standing up for this Province on a issue that is vitally important to this Province and the rural economy in particular. He is realizing there is going to be major fallout from it because of federal/provincial relations.

I saw a little while ago that a statement he made was carried in *The Globe and Mail*, which is one of the national papers. The Premier's statement was to the effect that if the factory freezer trawler license was issued, it would substantially damaging to federal/provincial relations. I am saying today, I think the battle has just begun and down the road there are more battles.

I would like to see the Opposition spokesman on fisheries (Mr. Tulk) and others, in some kind of unanimous effort or movement, do something not merely in the form of a resolution. I saw resolutions before passed through this House. A piece of paper goes to Ottawa and is forgotten on somebody's desk. I think that a good idea is for a committee of the House to sit down over the weekend or early next week - it is a long weekend - and determine the strategy to take from here on behalf of the Province of

Newfoundland and a course of action to see if we can get Ottawa to change this most ridiculous and crazy policy which is going to hurt the rural economy of this Province.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:

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

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday at 3 p.m., and that this House do now adjourn. As hon. members are aware, Monday, Armistice Day, is a statutory holiday so, therefore, the next sitting will be Tuesday at 3 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before putting that motion, I would just like to remind all hon. members that we are having a small reception for some of our staff who have been here for a long time.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

November 8, 1985

ORDER PAPER # 48/85 - DATED: October 30, 1985

*Tabled by Hon.
Minister of Culture,
Recreation & Youth
8 Nov. '85*

Question: How much money has been allocated to the sustaining funds of Culture, Recreation and Youth in the last two years and to which groups has it been allotted?

Answer: \$240,000 has been allocated to the sustaining fund to assist professional theatrical companies in the last two years and the following groups have been funded:

CODCO Limited
Newfoundland Dance Theatre
Resource Centre for the Arts
Rising Tide Theatre
Sheila's Brush/Ambuscade Productions Ltd.
Stephenville Festival
Theatre Newfoundland and Labrador
Wonderbolt/Beni Malone
Newfoundland Symphony Orchestra
Atlantic Dance Theatre