



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 46

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Thursday

24 October 1985

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young). I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works is it the policy of government now to systematically reduce the area of Pippy Park? And if so, would the minister indicate which parts of the park are to be excluded from the present area? And would the minister indicate the area that has already been excluded by the Order in Council gazetted in August of this year of which the land mentioned yesterday constitutes about 25.57 acres?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

The answer to the first question is, no, Mr. Speaker. On the other question concerning the park, in 1981, I think it was, the boundary of the park was extended to the control area. When the survey results came in, five acres over and above the size of the control area were included when we extended the boundaries. That is why there is a difference of five acres.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Is the minister saying that it is only that 25 acres that was over and beyond what was needed by Pippy Park? Do I understand the minister correctly? Is it just that twenty-five acres that was over and beyond what was needed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it was twenty-five acres or ten acres but there was a certain area. When the boundaries of the park were extended to include the control area, the survey made to get it gazetted showed an area over and above the boundaries of the park.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, were there any requests or representations made to the Pippy Park Commission to have this portion of land excluded from the Pippy Park area? And if so, would the minister indicate who made these requests? Were there, for example, any law firms making these requests? Will the minister commit to table any correspondence, any minutes of meetings of the Pippy Park Commission, correspondence to or from the Commission regarding this and including documents relating to the exclusion of this twenty-five acres? Will the minister undertake to table this correspondence, these minutes, and the original plan and anything relating to a decision to change the master plan of Pippy Park?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. gentleman is getting the twenty-five acres. I do not know if it is twenty-five acres, five acres or two acres. For the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), Mr. Speaker, Pippy Park is an autonomous body. I do not see that correspondence. Anything that Pippy Park ask for they requested through me, and that is all I can tell him. As for correspondence or who they do business with, I have no authority whatsoever to go into books.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Is the minister aware that in order for that area to be excluded from Pippy Park there had to be a decision of Cabinet? Yesterday I tabled the Order in Council that was gazetted. Now would the minister indicate whether there was any communication from Pippy Park requesting this? Was there any reason given? Did the minister make any enquiries? And if not, will the minister make enquiries and will the minister at the same time enquire whether the same consideration is to be given to those residents up there, those long term residents who are being told they cannot build, whose sons and daughters have had to go out and buy land because they cannot build on the land of their mothers and fathers, who are being ordered to demolish houses and are being taken to court to have houses

demolished if they do build? Will the minister investigate this matter and find out what is going on at Pippy Park?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition not to shout at me and not squint his eyes at me. Go and get a pair of glasses and throw away your contact lenses.

Mr. Speaker, I told the hon. gentleman that I have nothing to do with it. They are an autonomous body consisting of a representative from Memorial University, the Pippy family, the city of St. John's, and so many members of the board come from the city at large. I do not have any correspondence. I do not see their correspondence. They do their own thing. Mr. Speaker, they requested that changes be made to the boundaries of Pippy Park and that is all I know. They asked to go through me for them to have the boundaries of Pippy Park redefined. When the boundaries were then defined, before it was gazetted there had to be a survey, because there were five or six or eight or ten pieces of land involved. When the boundaries were defined - you say it is twenty-five acres; I do not know if it is twenty-five acres or 250 acres, but there are 4,000 acres up there - apparently there was land included that they wanted excluded from the park. I brought it before my Cabinet colleagues and I presume it was approved.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, a supplementary.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a document of which the Premier has received notice. He was not in the House yesterday, but I tabled a document which was a mortgage document indicating some involvement by the law firm of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) in a land transaction relating to Pippy Park. Since then I have received other information which I would like to table. This is a copy of the share list which is filed at the Registry of Companies for the company Fairview Investments Limited, which appears to be, as far as I know, the current owner of the land which was excluded from the Pippy Park Commission.

MR. WINDSOR:

All of the land?

MR. BARRY:

No, part of the land, twenty-five acres of the land that was excluded, Mr. Speaker. Other land that appears to be excluded appears to be land which is being used for the cloverleaf by the Department of Transportation for the access road. There may be other privately owned land which is excluded, but we will have to, hopefully, see some statement from government on that as to who the other property owners might be whose land is excluded.

This share list, Mr. Speaker, shows that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is registered as a shareholder of this company and also as a director of this company. I wonder if the Premier would undertake to investigate under the Conflict of Interest Guidelines -

MR. PATTERSON:

You will never do it that way,

boy! Give it up!

MR. BARRY:

- whether, Mr. Speaker, this constitutes any conflict of interest in light of the fact that that land was excluded by a decision of Cabinet from the boundaries of Pippy Park? And, in light of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Conflict of Interest Guidelines set out - if I could just have a moment - Guideline No. 5 says: "Subject to Section 16" - and Section 16 deals with the power of the Premier to decide whether or not a particular situation constitutes a conflict - "Subject to Section 16, a minister shall not own shares in a company or have an interest in a partnership or other association" - it refers to oil companies, first of all, and then says - "whose primary purpose in business involves land speculation or land development in the Province, and shall not" -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

This is a supplementary question. Perhaps the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would pose his question.

MR. BARRY:

It is a new question, Mr. Speaker, my first question directed to the Premier. I am asking if the Premier, in light of the fact that this document shows that the minister is a shareholder - and a director, not just a shareholder. And again, unless there is an amendment or something that we cannot find, this does not appear to be listed on the minister's Conflict of Interest statement. I wonder if the Premier would indicate whether he has been informed and whether he has given permission to the minister to be

involved in this company? I think the document is already tabled.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, under the appropriate heading of the House today, after calling of Statements by Ministers, Oral Questions and so on, under (e) Answers to questions for which notice has been given, I will deal with the two allegations that have already been made against the President of the Council. Now if the Leader of the Opposition has another allegation and another document, then I will take that document and reply to the Leader of the Opposition at the earliest opportunity. I will reply to the leader's two allegations that are outstanding. If he has another allegation that he wishes to put forward at this time, I will take that and respond to him as quickly as I can. I will be responding to the two allegations that he has already made.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition now has taken up half of the question period and I think it is only-

MR. BARRY:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, if you do not mind, is going to take up the entire question period, if I have the floor and if I am entitled to speak in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! Would you please

sit down?

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, as I understand the rules of the House, I will sit when the Speaker stands. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition now has spoken for about fifteen minutes of the half hour of question period. I do not think it is fair. I see the hon. the member for Menihek (Menihek) has regularly gotten up, obviously to speak, and I think it is time that I give him the opportunity of asking his question. I am now calling on the hon. the member for Menihek.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the practice in the House is that when a member rises and is recognized for a question there are a couple of supplementaries. I would submit to Your Honour that, if I was out of order, it was on beginning my question to the Premier. That was the appropriate time to act, not to bar supplementaries on that question. I wonder if Your Honour would like a ruling on that point?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, the Standing Orders

say very clearly that the recognition of hon. members, whether for questions or to take part in debate, is at the discretion of the Speaker. Also, the Speaker may allow supplementaries, but it is discretionary the number that he may allow any one person. Obviously, the Leader of the Opposition has a certain position but he is not God among all of the hon. gentlemen who sit opposite. If his colleagues do not want to ask questions that is their business, but the hon. member for Menihek has rights as a member of this House.

MR. TULK:

There is also such a thing as tradition.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

The hon. gentleman now is speaking about tradition but I do not know what tradition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, I was very conscious of the fact that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was taking up a very considerable amount of the time for question period and that the hon. the member for Menihek was getting up regularly. Now if he wants to ask a question, I think that he should have an opportunity, if nobody else wants to get up in that period. My opinion is that he should be heard now and that is my ruling.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn). Earlier this week, I think on Monday, there was an announcement

for my district that 175 miners of the Iron Ore Company of Canada will be laid off on December 18, one week before Christmas.

What I would like to ask the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) is has he had previous knowledge of this particular layoff? Are any actions contemplated, on either the short-term or the long-term, to address this continuing situation?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. Obviously it is one of grave concern to him. What the hon. member states is factual. I have some information with respect to the layoff. Basically the story surrounding the layoff is that last year about this time the Iron Company of Canada put out its production schedule for 1985. Subsequent to that the Iron Ore Company of Canada had some other orders, outside of its shareholders' list, and as a result of that it hired back approximately 160 people.

Now at the end of this year that production that the 150 to 160 people were hired back for is completed. So they are back to their normal production requirement, that is, the production requirement of their shareholders. So unless and until orders are received by the Iron Ore Company of Canada over and above what they have scheduled for in 1986, unless they get something over and above that then they will be at the basic staff level that they will be at as of the December 18.

So we are hopeful that as they did last year when the company got some outside orders, they will do that again this year. But that is about all the information we have at this point in time. I am hopeful that some more information will come to me. I spoke to the senior Vice-President of the Iron Ore Company of Canada and I received the information that basically the hon. member has and some of the background behind it. I had already informed the hon. member of the information that I had. But I was hoping before I made a statement in the House or did anything further, I could wait until November 18 meeting of mines managers in the Province in Labrador City, and at that time I hope to get a further update as to what the prospects are for 1986.

MR. FENWICK:

One supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

At the conference that was held in Buchans back on June 19 - 21, to which members opposite were invited but none of them showed up, the Deputy Minister of Mines informed the conference on single industry towns -

MR. TULK:

The Mines Minister did not show up?

MR. FENWICK:

The Mines Minister, among others. I am not trying to be offensive, it is just that you were not there so you would not have access to the information. But at that time the Mines Deputy Minister, Mr. McKillop, outlined the programme in Manitoba in which 3 per cent of the royalties that are received by

the province are put into a special sinking fund to even out the kinds of fluctuations that we see in the mining industry and to be used to help alleviate difficulties like that.

I quote from the report: 'At the conference there was a discussion of the possibility of establishing a national fund for such a purpose.' This was the conference last June. 'The subject will come up again at a conference of Provincial Mines Ministers scheduled for Charlottetown in September.' Since we are beyond September, my question to the minister is at that conference was the question of a national sinking fund to alleviate difficulties in single industry towns discussed? And could you give us some information on either the plans on a national fund or any action on a provincial level to alleviate these kinds of problem?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, at the Charlottetown Conference of Mines Ministers that was one of the topics that was fairly high on the agenda. What we have done is that a federal - provincial committee has been set up made up of - I will have to check the exact detail of this - a federal representative, and representatives from Saskatchewan, Newfoundland and several other provinces that have interest in this area. They will be looking at a report that was presented to the conference and making recommendations to the federal and provincial ministers and hopefully something can be done between now and, say, next year.

It is one of concern to us. It was brought to our attention at that conference, because it was not just a ministers' conference. It was one where the Canadian Mining Association had some input to the meeting. It was a one day session for different groups to have their input to the provincial mines ministers and the federal minister, so they had their input. There was a brief presented on single industry towns and the decision that was taken at the time was to set up this committee to investigate what has been done in Saskatchewan and what should be done with respect to that particular topic throughout the country, whether it be a federal programme or a federal - provincial programme.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Barry), I would like to welcome to the House today a Committee on Science and Technology from the Western European Union. The Committee members are Sir John Osborn, Chairman, Adolph Spies von Bullesheim, Edward Garrett, Robert Parry and Mrs. Parry, Wilfried Bohm and Rene Hengel.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Premier. Yesterday the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate and Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) indicated that at no time had he disqualified himself in writing from matters which came up in Cabinet in which he might be

involved in a private capacity. I wonder if the Premier would indicate whether the minister was given an exemption from Guideline 14 of the Conflict of Interest Minister's Guidelines, 1982? Did the Premier indicate that the minister could be excused from following this requirement that he so disqualify himself in writing?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think when I give the information under the appropriate heading a few minutes or several minutes from now, under Answers to Questions for Which Notice has been Given, I wish to table information regarding the allegations that the Leader of the Opposition has made and then I think it will become abundantly clear that his question is irrelevant and redundant.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, would the Premier in addition to the information which apparently he believes he will be able to supply to answer the facts that have been laid before this House - the Premier may twist and turn what he wants, Mr. Speaker, but the people of this Province want certain answers now - indicate whether he would be prepared to constitute a select committee of this House to investigate the operation of the Pippy Park Commission and the manner in which decisions are taken at the commission level and the manner in which dealings with

respect to land in Pippy Park are dealt with by the commission?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as it will become clear in a few minutes, the request by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) for such a select committee is totally groundless. The commission is handling its affairs in an appropriate and efficient manner under the guidelines and legislation given to them by this House.

MR. BARRY

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would indicate whether the government contract for helicopter services has been let in the past year and to which company it was let? Is it correct that it is Universal Helicopters?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know off the top of my head. There was a tender called. I will have to take the matter under advisement and get the information from the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). Tenders were called and contracts were let in the normal fashion, so I will take the matter under advisement.

MR. BARRY:

Could the Premier have that for us tomorrow?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I will attempt to have the information for the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

If I could just go back to my previous question, the Premier has indicated that he will be supplying certain information with respect to matters that have come before the House. My question dealt with the general procedure of Cabinet and the general procedure whereby Cabinet ministers, any Cabinet minister, is disqualified from acting. Has the Premier granted approval to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), or any other member of Cabinet, to be disqualified from Cabinet decisions without notifying the Premier in writing pursuant to Guideline 14? This does not relate just to matters that have been tabled in this House. The Government House Leader yesterday indicated there were regular matters on which he would disqualify himself apart from matters that have already been brought to the attention of this House. The Premier's is giving information with respect to the matters that have been brought to the attention of this House will not deal with that general question. Does the Premier obtain letters in writing from his ministers when they disqualify themselves from involvement at the Cabinet level or does he not?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

When there is any indication by ministers that they are a part of some company, or a part of some arrangement which would involve them and which would involve a Cabinet decision arising out of that, for which they, therefore, could be in a conflict of interest, yes, they do inform me of it and I take it from there.

I do have from ministers, when they become members of Cabinet, information in writing about their involvement in various things.

Now, as it relates to the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), that will become clear when I give the information as it relates to the involvement or lack of involvement by the President of the Council.

Ministers do submit to me in writing anytime they are involved, which would therefore involve the conflict of interest situation for them.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
The Premier was not here yesterday, but the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) stated, as I think Hansard will show, when we asked him whether he would table the letters, that he did not make it a practice of preparing such letters to give to the Premier.

Now, would the Premier agree to table such letters from the Government House Leader, or from any other minister, that has been

received with respect to disqualification when matters come up, the matters referred to in the House or any other matters? Will the Premier table these letters if the Premier has them?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is on a wrong tack in trying to smear the character and reputation of one member of this House.

MR. BARRY:
That is not fair, now. That is not fair.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Yes. Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
That is the truth.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
That is what the Leader of the Opposition is trying to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I intend to show, when I am given the opportunity under Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given, because I undertook to get the information for the Leader of the Opposition the other day and I will respond to the Leader of the Opposition, and indicate categorically and undeniably that the President of the Council, in the two examples that the Leader of the Opposition has brought

forward, was not in a conflict of interest situation. And when I give that information, then we will hear from the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett). It became quite obvious during the past session of the House that we were trying very seriously to do something about the high cost of electricity and the high cost of fuel to consumers in this Province, but it is becoming quite apparent that nothing is being done about it. Now the Fall is on us again, and the high cost of fuel and electricity to the consumer is going to be a very serious problem.

I am wondering if the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) -

MR. PATTERSON:

If you do not know why the cost of electricity is so high you must be in the dark.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, if I could have silence on the other side, please.

My question is to the Minister of Social Services. A family of four is right now receiving approximately \$500 a month from the Department of Social Services. With the high cost of fuel to heat an average home costs about \$200 to \$225 a month. Allowing another \$100 a week for food, or \$400 a month, which will not leave room for much luxuries,

then add expenses for two children going to school, say a minimum cost of \$60 a month for clothing, would bring the total to \$814 a month, a figure about \$5,000 a year below the poverty line.

I ask the Minister of Social Services is there any plan set up for this Winter to help the families in that income bracket to help cover the cost of home heating and the expenses they incur in sending their children to school?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, over the past fiscal year, this department assisted literally thousands of people who ran into trouble with their light bills, fuel bills or whatever. I do not have the exact figures here, but I seem to recall that we spent well in excess of \$1 million last Winter, in this fiscal year, in assisting people with their light bills. We will continue to do that this year. Each case will be judged on its merit and if somebody in receipt of social assistance finds himself in a position where he just cannot pay his light bill, or if the electricity is going to be cut off, then I have no reason to doubt that these cases will be handled exactly as they were last year. I make no apologies to the hon. member. People who came to us were dealt with on a very fair basis.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

Notices of Motion

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Environment.

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Environment Act".

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Management Accountants Act". I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Convey Certain Trusts And Properties In The Province From Crown Trust Company To Central Trust Company".

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Labour Standards Act." (Bill No. 101)

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to provide some answers to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and to this House on allegations that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition against the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) in his duties as a minister of the Crown.

I will deal with the Pippy Park situation first, then I will deal with the Petro-Canada situation. Latterly, in the next few days, I will deal with other allegations that the Leader of the Opposition wishes to make on matters of this sort.

I have checked the files with regard to the indenture and gazetted schedule tabled by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. Minute in Council 21-'85 orders that certain parcels of land in the areas of the Thomas and McKay farms be cleared for such development as the St. John's Municipal Council may approve, with the proviso that a certain portion of the Thomas farm be acquired by Pippy Park for the purposes of completing a golf course.

It is fair to say that land released from the park boundary would enjoy increased value due to developmental prospects. However, it is clear from the Cabinet submission resulting in MC 21-'85, as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) has already pointed out in this House, that the Pippy Park Commission was the instigator of the move to have a Cabinet

decision made on the lands in question.

These lands were in the difficult situation for their owners of not being purchased for park use because they were in an extended control area, and how much of that area was there was not even known at that time. It was more than they had originally thought was there. It was not in a the Pippy Park use area. It was in a control area which took in lands other than what they really wanted. So the owners of those lands got after Pippy Park and said, 'what are you doing? We have land here now which, because has been included in the park as opposed to just in the control area, you are not going to buy, you told us you are not going to buy, yet we cannot sell it or develop it.'

MR. BARRY:

Just as they told all the families up there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, now! Order, now!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

As a result the Pippy Park Commission indicated to government that it was willing to exclude these lands from the park's boundaries if government would approve purchase of sufficient land from the Thomas property to accommodate a golf course. I have seen no evidence of a conflict of interest on the part of the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). A decision to release the land in question was made by the government at the specific request of the Pippy Park Commission and nobody else.

The impression given by the Leader of the Opposition was there was

only one piece of land released. And, of course, this is untrue.

MR. BARRY:

(Inaudible) There is a map there.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

In this matter, as in all cases, the -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- President of the Council has carefully avoided any possible justifiable hint of conflict of interest. He has always absented himself in any interest, however remotely related to him, when it is discussed in Cabinet, not even indirectly, remotely, with really no connection with him.

It is very regrettable that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has seen fit to groundlessly attack the hon. gentleman's integrity. The request came from the Pippy Park Commission because they had taken in more land when the survey was done than they thought. Their interest was to see the golf course expanded. They requested that some of the land which they did not need be released and not be a part of the Pippy Park. That submission or request came from the Pippy Park Commission to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) who brought it to Cabinet and the matter was approved in line with the request from the Pippy Park Commission themselves. On the allegation with respect to Petro-Canada, I can report that, in substance, the President of the Council law firm does not even act for Petro-Canada Incorporated. It has acted for Petro-Canada Products Incorporated, a separate company and a division from

Petro-Canada Incorporated. That company deals only with retail gasoline sales. It does not deal with oil production or matters related to the offshore, which is dealt with by Petro-Canada Incorporated. The law firm with which the President of the Council is associated acts for Petro-Canada Products Incorporated, their retailers.

MR. BARRY:

What about (inaudible) the power of attorney that was filed?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The power of attorney, which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) tabled in the Legislature -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- constituted a partner of that firm to be the attorney for Petro-Canada Incorporated in one specific property acquisition for a retail gasoline outlet. The firm of the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) was asked to take over this matter during the term of the federal Liberal government from the Leader of the Opposition's firm.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBER:

Why! Why! Tell us why!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Why, Mr. Speaker, I do not know. I never had an opportunity to check into why Petro-Canada would switch from one law firm in St. John's to another law firm to do a minor land transaction.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is obvious. They were not adequate.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know. I honestly do not know. This was during the Liberal time now. Petro-Canada, acting on behalf of the Liberal Government, for a piece of land to deal with a gas station.

The reason for the power of attorney, which was routine in nature, being given by Petro-Canada was, for some reason, internal to Petro-Canada Products, which choose to take title in this name, presumably because Petro-Canada Products Incorporated had not been registered when the transaction was made.

In any event it is clear that the President of the Council's law firm acts only with respect to matters dealing with retail gasoline sales which are dealt with by an entirely separate division, indeed a separate company, called Petro-Canada Products. Any relationship to Petro-Canada was entirely technical. The firm has no relationship to Petro-Canada's oil production or offshore matters.

Secondly, the President of the Council has never directly acted in any capacity for Petro-Canada or any related company of Petro-Canada.

Thirdly, the firm in no way sought or solicited this work, they were persuaded. Members of the President of the Council's firm were asked by Petro-Canada to take the work because they did not want to deal with the Leader of the Opposition's firm any longer, for whatever reason. Somebody will have to go and ask Petro-Canada

about that.

It came to a member of that firm, therefore, in the ordinary course of business as Petro-Canada was looking around to have this very minor little parcel of land for a gas station dealt with on an expeditious basis by a law firm in Newfoundland. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I can find no evidence of a conflict of interest on the part of the President of the Council in either of the two instances raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition attacked the President of the Council last year because I do not think the Leader of the Opposition thought that the Atlantic Accord could be signed unless he was a member of a government. Now he is attacking the President of the Council because the President of the Council's firm gets work that his firm had before. If it is based on jealousy, let him take care of it outside this House and let us get on with the business of what we should be doing in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear! Apologize! Apologize!

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

It is quite obvious that the Premier is making an attempt to impute motives, Mr. Speaker. I think it is quite apparent the tactics of intimidation which the Premier is attempting to engage in, to try and foreclose, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

legitimate questions concerning the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars and the manner in which government business is carried on, Mr. Speaker.

Let the Premier be put on notice that he did not answer the questions raised, Mr. Speaker. Whether it be Petro-Canada Father, Petro-Canada Son or Petro-Canada Holy Ghost, Mr. Speaker, the minister and the Premier will have to explain the minister's involvement in a division of Petro-Canada obtaining benefits from Petro-Canada while making decisions with respect to that company.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are the facts of this matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I am sorry that I have to shout to try and drown them out, Mr. Speaker. Let the Premier be put on notice that that does not explain why it is that a minister of the Crown is obtaining benefits from Petro-Canada whether it be a subsidiary company. And let it be noted that the document file is signed by Petro-Canada Inc., a benefit coming from Petro-Canada Inc., Petro-Canada the Father, in other words.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

It appears to the Chair that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is getting into debate rather than stating his point of order.

MR. BARRY:

The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the Premier is imputing motive, and that it is an unfortunately unfair tactic which we have seen before in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hold on now. Hold on now.

MR. BARRY:

We have seen it before, we are getting used to it, Mr. Speaker, but it is not going to stop us from proceeding in an orderly fashion. And let it be known that any references the Premier makes to my law firm, as I have stated in this House before, I have discontinued my practice of law to be full-time Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Let that be known for the record, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

After you wrote a letter.

MR. BARRY:

Would the Premier like to tell us to what letter he refers? I yield to the Premier. Would he have the guts to stand up? I yield to the Premier. Have the guts to stand like a man in your place. I yield to the Premier.

I yield. Come on! I yield to the Premier. Come on 'Brian', show some guts. Come on, get up on your feet!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Come on! Come on, get up on your feet.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

He does not have the guts, see. He does not have the guts, Mr. Speaker. He does not have the guts to say anything directly.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Sly innuendo and insinuation, that is his level!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I stood up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Stand up. Come on, stand up.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I stood up, and if you cannot understand, that is not my fault.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

(inaudible) the federal election.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

The House is recessed.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I called for a recess for a very obvious reason. I am not going to give a lecture, but we just cannot continue if there is this type of - call it what you will, but if both sides are just shouting over and back to each other, it is just impossible to continue.

To the point of order raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), there is no point of order, it is just a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, under Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given I would like, as a follow-up to my information to the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) a few days ago, to table for the House a list of thirty-six names of people who were appointed without competition by the NDP Government of Manitoba.

The Leader of the NDP Party had

said no NDP Government in Canada appoints people without competition, here are thirty-six names of people who were appointed in Saskatchewan. I gave some from Manitoba the other day.

MR. BARRY:
You did not read The Evening Telegram editorial, did you?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I do not live by The Evening Telegram, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:
You would think so, by your Letters to the Editor.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Well, that is quite fine. I am not trying to defend the Andrews' appointment, as The Evening Telegram would like to say, I am trying to demonstrate that a statement made by a public figure in this Province is inaccurate and throws a pall on the other political parties because the Leader of the NDP Party made the statement that no NDP government in Canada appoints people without competition. Here are thirty-six more from Saskatchewan, an NDP government when they were in power.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

A point of order.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, there was never a question to that effect. If he has a chance to liable me in the House then I have an opportunity to answer.

MR. BARRY:
That is a Ministerial Statement.

MR. FENWICK:

I at least have a right to answer that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

That was in Answers for Questions for which Notice has been Given, the topic we are on at the present time.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, are you ruling that I cannot respond to it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The question was asked a number of days ago.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. FENWICK:

My point of order is simply that I never asked the Premier that question, I asked the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) that question. At the same time there has already been a reply from the Premier to that when he tabled a list of five people from Manitoba. Now we have investigated the five people from Manitoba and we can prove factually that the Premier lied to the House when he said that these people were appointed in that way, and we wish a chance to defend ourselves. I just want the opportunity to explain the situation, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Just let me say, number one, that I was responding on behalf of the government to questions that were raised in the House over the last few days on political patronage. Therefore, I responded under Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given. Because members opposite had raised questions on political patronage, I was giving out information in relation to questions asked on political patronage. That is number one, Mr. Speaker. May I say that I am very disappointed in the hon. member that he would get in his place in the House and accuse another member of lying.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if we understand the Premier correctly, although the member for Menihek did not ask the Premier how many patronage positions have been delivered in Saskatchewan or Alberta or British Columbia or anywhere else, we understand that the Premier's thrust in response is that: Yes, the appointment of Mr. Andrews and others is patronage but look at all the patronage that has gone on in other Provinces. I would assume that that is the response that the Premier is making and, if so, Mr. Speaker, the Premier could do well to start reading a few of the editorials before he writes his letter to the editor. He should read one or two of the editorials, most recently the one which points out whatever the patronage, Mr. Speaker, in other Provinces, that does not justify

the patronage that the Premier is now admitting that he has embarked upon.

MR. FENWICK:

To the point of order please, Mr. Speaker. The Premier rose in his place on a point of privilege, not in answer to a question.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I have heard enough on that point of order. First of all, I ask the hon. the member for Menihek to withdraw the comment that he made about the Premier lying.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is he lied. I am not retracting it unless you give me a chance to explain it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

On that point of order, the hon. the Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. EFFORD:

Right on! Right on!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

If the hon. genius for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) will allow me to make the point of order, I will.

MR. CALLAN:

Why not?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I think the hon. member for Menihek is aware of the fact that one hon. member cannot call another one a liar. The other hon. parliamentary expert, wherever he is from, says, 'Why not?' How typical of the cynical attitude they would have toward

the Speaker and the House - Why not call him a liar? It is part of the smear tactics, that is the hon. gentleman opposite. I am not attributing that to the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), but I would call upon him to recognize that that is a term which one does not call another in parliament. Every occupation presumably has certain ethical guidelines and members of parliaments and members of legislatures govern themselves by that and they are not necessarily put of by the inane remarks of the hon. member, wherever he is from. I would ask the hon. gentleman, as he always consistently has in this House, to act within the rules and accept certain traditions and practices which must have great value as they have been there a long time and they have endured under a great deal of stress and under a great deal of emotion. So I would ask the hon. gentleman to do it. Obviously that is all I can do.

MR. SPEAKER (Mc Nicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, the comments that started this whole thing were made by me in front of a television camera, never in this House. The next thing that happened is that the Premier got up in his place and moved a question of privilege, which you ruled out of order, but he entered in a bunch of evidence that I have never had a chance to see. We have checked out that evidence at great cost to us because we do not have the fifteen people in our office as the Premier does. We have demonstrated to ourselves that he has been factually inaccurate on the previous list he gave us and I can hold no more of a conclusion

to the whole affair than the Premier did deliberately mislead us and that he lied to us on these particular five appointments. How can I withdraw it when you do not give me a chance to even get my evidence back in. I am afraid I have to say it again. The Premier lied in that instance and I have no way of checking the other list and I do not know what he did with that one.

MR. SPEAKER:

I ask the hon. member for the last time to withdraw that remark about the Premier being a liar?

MR. FENWICK:

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am compelled, then, to name Mr. Peter Fenwick for disregarding the direction of the Chair.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of regret that I move that the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) be expelled from the House for the duration of this sitting today.

MR. SPEAKER:

It has been moved and seconded that the hon. member be removed from the House for the remainder of the day.

All those in favour, "Aye"?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against, "Nay"?

MR. FENWICK

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER

Carried.

Order, please!

Orders of the Day

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act," carried. (Bill No. 40).

On motion, Bill No. 40 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Conflict Of Interest Act, 1973," carried. (Bill No. 39)

On motion, Bill No. 39 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Companies Act," carried. (Bill No. 28)

On motion, Bill No. 28 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The District Court Act, 1976," carried. (Bill No. 34)

On motion, Bill No. 34 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Career Development And Advanced Studies to introduce a bill, "An Act To Provide For Payment Of Financial Assistance For Students Attending Post-Secondary Educational Institutions," carried. (Bill No. 29)

On motion, Bill No. 29 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Career Development And Advanced Studies to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Marine Institute Act," carried. (Bill No. 36)

On motion, Bill no. 36 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Pippy Park Commission Act," carried. (Bill No. 27)

On motion, Bill no. 27 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs to introduce a bill, "An Act Respect Municipal Taxation Of Electric Power Utilities And Cable Television Companies," carried . (Bill No. 43)

On motion, Bill No. 43 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Social Services to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Social Assistance Act, 1977," carried. (Bill No. 44)

On motion, Bill No. 44 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands to introduce a bill, "An Act to Amend The Land Development Act," carried. (Bill No. 41)

On motion, Bill No. 41 read a

first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fisheries Loan Act". (Bill No. 21).

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The debate was adjourned by the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, as I began to say the last time I spoke to this particular amendment, there is no real problem for me personally or with this side of the House with this. I would like to refer to as a minor piece of legislation, a minor amendment to The Fisheries Loan Act.

We, on this side of the House, insist that any monies that are collected from fishermen shall not have to pay a second time and there shall be no interest charged the fishermen for money that they already paid. That is the only stipulation we have, Mr. Speaker. But as I said it is minor, insignificant little piece of legislation.

Here is the picture: The government assigns fishing companies to collect certain monies from fishermen. When this happens, Mr. Speaker, the fishing company is acting on behalf of the government. The fishing company becomes an arm of government, a collecting agency, a trust fund and a holding company. The fishing company takes money from the fishermen on behalf of the

government. So the fishing company then actually becomes the government. So how in the name of goodness can we ever suggest that when the fishing company, which is the government, collects money from a fisherman, then that the government should insist that the fisherman pay that money again. The surprise of it all to me, Mr. Speaker, is that such a question should even be asked in this hon. House.

If the law were silent on this, I do not know of any court in the land that would insist that the fisherman would pay his bill twice. I do not know of any court in the land, I do not know of any fair play, I do not know of any common sense which would suggest that a man would pay his bill twice to the government. It supercedes all logic that I have ever learned or all that I have ever been accustomed to. I do not know any government which would insist that fishermen would pay their loans twice. That fishermen would pay double. I do not know any government that would. Certainly a Liberal Government would never insist. This could never happen with a Liberal Government. We do not need such a law as this because common sense and fair play would prevail, therefore, we would not have to write this into stone. It could never happen.

With respect to my friend, the NDP member in this hon. House, who was thrown out today, I do not think a NDP Government would need that kind of legislation engraved in stone. I do not think as socialist as they are that they would force a Newfoundland fisherman to pay his bill twice.

Maybe, the Minister of Fisheries

(Mr. Rideout) knows something about another government that I do not know about. Maybe, there is a party in this hon. House who, if the fisherman was not protected by the full weight of the law, if the fisherman did not have the law of the land to his back, then he would be forced to pay his bill twice. Maybe, the Minister of Fisheries knows about that. I wish he were here today to explain why this has to be engraved in stone.

No, Mr. Speaker, it is a minor piece of legislation that men and women, persons, I should say - I wish the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) were here - that persons of good will would never, never insist that a fisherman or anybody else be forced to pay his bill twice.

So, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, as far as we on this side of the hon. House are concerned, it is a minor piece of legislation which only adds to common sense. It makes me suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is merely the mote in somebody's eye. This is not attacking the real problem. This is a smoke screen.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we saw evidence of smoke screens at work in this House today. We saw smoke being thrown across the floor of this House to divert people, to blind people so that they cannot see the real issue as to whether or not a conflict of interest is taking place, as to whether or not a minister can serve two masters. This was the real question. Can a person serve two masters and hold to one and hold to the other? It cannot be done, Mr. Speaker. No man can serve two masters! When we were making that point, we saw a smoke screen thrown in on us.

The inshore fishery in this Province is about to be devastated. It is about to be wiped aside. Just as the Premier gave us a smoke screen to get us off the main issue, I am wondering if the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) is not throwing a little smoke screen in this House so that we will be diverted from the real problem in this Province, which is the destruction, the scrapping, the devastation, the destroying of the inshore fishery. This is what is going on.

Maybe the Minister of Fisheries - I wish he was here, oh how I wish he was here! - maybe he wants the people back in his district to believe that he is doing something and from time to time he has to amend a certain bill. Why do they not amend something to do with horseshoes or something completely irrelevant to this day and age Mr. Speaker? They amend the Fisheries Loan Act. They try to insist that we do something that persons of good will would do anyway, namely when a bill is collected by someone, then that bill is paid, especially when the government collects it for itself which we are saying it is doing.

So I only see this minor piece of legislation as a mote in the eye of the Minister of Fisheries when he ignored the beam, the big plank that is sticking out of the eye of the inshore fishery. I see it as an attempt to throw a smoke screen in this House to take us away from the real problem which is the attempt by the party in power to destroy the inshore fishery.

The inshore fishery, Mr. Speaker, is about to join the other industries which litter the landscape of this Province of ours. What about linerboard, Mr.

Speaker? There is no linerboard. It was scrapped just as the fishery is about to be scrapped. There is no linerboard being manufactured in this Province today. Will someone get up and have the guts to tell me that there is no market for linerboard?

Mr. Speaker, we are living in the age of communication and every time that a computer is invented or some means of communication is invented, a little more perfect than we already have, the need for newsprint becomes a little less. Every time, Mr. Speaker, that a computer is invented there is another need for a cardboard box to put that computer into to ship it somewhere in the world, Mr. Speaker. Because of political intervention, a perfectly legitimate business which was about to be turned around, could have become a good business in this Province, it was destroyed and the same thing is happening to our inshore fishery today, Mr. Speaker. The party is trying to destroy the inshore fishery. As I look over the landscape I see the scuttled remains of a linerboard industry. Taxpayers millions of dollars taken and given to a company, taken and thrown away because of government ineptitude, because of political intervention.

When I look at the landscape of this Province, Mr. Speaker, I look at Come By Chance and there I see a heap of rust. I see an oil refinery which could have become a reality in this Province, but again, because of political interference, because of the party in power lacking the will to govern, I saw a Come by Chance doomed to destruction, a heap of rust, littering the landscape of this Province. This is what is

happening to industry in this Province, Mr. Speaker. It is being devastated.

I see the inshore fishery joining the scrap heap. I look at the woods industry in this Province, Mr. Speaker, which again has been destroyed by this party. There was a time when a lumberjack worked ten months of the year and, in some cases, twelve months of the year. Listen to the unions. They are barely getting ten to fifteen weeks a year production, barely getting ten to fifteen weeks a year of work. The woods industry has been destroyed.

Farming, Mr. Speaker, in 1949 we had more farmers in this Province than we have today, more farmers in 1949 than we have in 1985. We have a devastation of industry. The inshore fishery, Mr. Speaker, is going to be forced to join the other devastation that this party has wreaked upon this Province.

I think of the poem of E.J. Pratt: "It took the sea a thousand years/A thousand years to trace" - it took men of good will nearly a thousand years to build up some industry in this country so we could live here.

"It took the sea an hour one night/An hour of storm to place/The sculpture of these granite seams/Upon a woman's face." It took the Tory Government a matter of a few simple years -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, we are always hearing from the other side of the House, from the Premier and the Government House Leader about the decorum in this House, the state of affairs that go on and how are you going to do business in this House or how are you going to have a debate in this House when people are doing the kinds of things that the government side are doing right now. So I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that you keep a close eye on them and try to keep them down. They have had a few hard days but there is more to come. So they had better learn to keep quiet and keep some discipline among themselves.

DR. COLLINS:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order. We were enjoying a beautiful evangelistic speech over there. I have not heard one since Billy Graham's last speech. And the member opposite interrupts, I think he should be reprimanded for interrupting a beautiful evangelistic speech.

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

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, there we hear it again, there we hear the reference, the blatant reference to somebody's religion or somebody's religious background.

I think there was a point made in this House last year that we should refrain from such things and keep the decorum of this House where it deserves to be. Mr. Speaker, that is a valid point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I would ask all hon. members to hear the member for the Strait of Belle Isle in silence please.

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

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, it took persons of good nearly a thousand years to establish to some industry in this country. It is taking a P.C. administration a few years, barely a few years, to wipe out and to destroy the industries that persons of good will have built up. What is the government's answer to it?

At the time that the inshore fishery is going down for the third time, the best that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) can do is to propose a convenient announcement, is to propose that fishermen not be required to pay the same bill twice. Is this the bill they have to come forward with?

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the bill is nothing but a smoke screen like the smoke screen we saw earlier today coming from the Premier, diverting attention from the real issue. That is the way to solve the problems, divert attention from the real issue. Get their minds of what the problem really is, get people debating over whether or not they have to pay money twice.

They are not going to trap me into that one, Mr. Speaker, because I am not going to be bound by whether or not money has to be paid twice. I am going to ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and the PC Party what they are going to do about the inshore fishery? If the inshore fishery is allowed to go under, it will not matter whether the trust company advances the money or not. That will not be the problem. The problem will be where is the money going to come from in the first place so that the inshore fisherman can pay his loan to the Fisheries Loan Board. This is where the real problem is going to be and not whether or not the company who collects it wants to submit it. The problem will be whether or not the inshore fisherman can pay in the first place.

The reason why I was a few minutes late coming into this House today was because I had a call from someone in my district, the wife of a fisherman. They have been notified by Newfoundland Hydro that their lights will be cut off immediately. I know those people, Mr. Speaker, and they are not scheming, conniving people who want to get away from paying their bills. I know these people. They are living on unemployment insurance, \$123 a week. Their biggest problem is not whether or not FPI is going to forward the money that they took from them, their biggest problem is whether or not they can pay their light bill.

And their next biggest problem, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not they can afford to pay their grocery bill. They know that the merchant, who in most cases on the Northern Peninsula is a small

businessman with a heart and a conscience has probably extended them far beyond what they will ever hope to pay. Their second problem, Mr. Speaker, is how can they make some payment on their grocery bill.

They are not worried as to whether or not FPI deducts money and does not send it along to the government. That is not their problem whatsoever. Their problem is how can we make this inshore fishery work so that we can get out and earn enough money to pay the loans on our boats, to pay for our light bill, to pay for our grocery bill, to pay for our children to go to school, and to pay for the odd luxury which believe you me, Mr. Speaker, is very rare and very exceptional indeed.

So we see a smoke screen, tear gas, thrown into this hon. House of Assembly asking us to forget the real problem and zero in on whether or not FPI, who collects ten dollars from a fisherman up in the Strait of Bell Isle, is going to forward it or if FPI goes belly up.

As far as I am concerned Mr. Speaker, this is preposterous hogwash. The real issue is we have an inshore fishery which is dying. The real issue, Mr. Speaker, is that we have a fish plant in Englee in my district which is put up on the block to be sold. That is the real problem. How are those people who live in Englee going to pay their loans, their light bills, their food bills or their school bills?

MR. WARREN:

I have people just like them in my district.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, my friend for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has got the same problem. He tried to solve it by going across the floor, that was his way of solving his problem but it is quite evident, Mr. Speaker, that that is not the solution because clearly it did not work because since he crossed the floor he has lambasted this hon. House with petition, after petition, after petition and we cannot even get members opposite to speak unless we embarrass them into speaking in support of his own petitions. So to cross the floor, Mr. Speaker, is not the solution I would suggest, Sir. Next time, we will probably find a solution.

Mr. Speaker, the fish plant in Englee is about to be closed down. The fish plant, Mr. Speaker, in Flowers Cove is about to go on the block. Tell those people in Flowers Cove that the law says, if you pay the FPI ten bucks, you will not be made to pay it twice. That is what the law is going to say after this amendment.

They do not care about the ten bucks. They care about their light bills. The same is true for Anchor Point and for many other fish plants in this Province and so we worry ourselves as to whether the hem of our gown should be an inch shorter or an inch longer, and so we worry because of the little speck in our eye, and so we worry. It is like fiddling while Rome is burning, it is fiddling while the inshore fishery is being destroyed, Mr. Speaker, that is what it is. We bring in such silly little amendments that persons of good will would never think would grace this hon. House. Who would force a man to

pay his bill twice or who would force a woman to pay her bill twice. I have never heard nothing so foolish in my life.

Mr. Speaker, the landscape of this Province is littered with devastation. With devastation, Mr. Speaker! The landscape of this Province is littered with broken promises, Mr. Speaker. When I drive from here to the Strait of Belle Isle, which I do quite often, I see company after company which has been closed down. I look at the unemployment list and it gets higher and bigger and bigger. Oh, someone plays around with the figures, creates a few short term jobs, a few make-work programs and you say we have solved the problem. Tell the lady in Sandy Cove whose lights are about to be cut today, that the unemployment rate has been dropped. If you dare stand to her face and tell her that is, I suggest you phone her, do not dare stand in front of the lady because she is becoming upset, and I do not blame her. It is because this irresponsible Party has managed by political maneuvering, by political trickery and by the manifestation of horses mouth being sent in here, Mr. Speaker, and they get up and the only thing they are capable of doing is neighing from time to time and trying to disrupt the truth from being proclaimed in this hon. House. There are people whose greatest contribution to this hon. House is to sit back and neigh, Mr. Speaker, while the fish plant in Englee goes on the block. While the fish plant in Anchor Point goes on the block, Mr. Speaker.

The real problem is the inshore fishery. What are we going to do about that inshore fishery? For

the benefit of members on the other side, I will advise that when the Kirby Task Force presented its report, it was suggested that a Northern Fisheries Development Corporation be established to take over fish plants north of the fiftieth degree latitude. Kirby recognized that the fish plants in this particular area needed special treatment and he also realized that this special treatment could not come through Fishery Products International. His solution was that we would put in place an order in Fisheries Development Corporation so that the fish plant in Englee, the fish plant in Anchor Point, the fish plant in Flowers Cove, the fish plant in Cow Head, the fish plant in Port aux Choix, Mr. Speaker, and the fish plant in St. Anthony could all go in together. He realized that there are times when the inshore fishery cannot keep these plants going. So he saw the possibility that maybe a dragger could go in and then in downtime we could bring extra fish. He also realized that there were times when the fish plant could have a glut problem. Then that fish could be spread around, could be sent to Englee or Anchor Point.

He realized that some time Englee could be blocked and that fish could be sent across to Anchor Point. But if we have a separate company in Englee and a separate company in Anchor Point and a separate company in Flower's Cove all competing against each other, Mr. Speaker, we will not solve the problem. We do not want our fish companies competing against each other. We want to compete with the outside world. We want to compete with Russia, not with each other. We want to compete with

Iceland, not with each other. We want to sell our fish to the markets of the world and the way to do that is to bring in a Northern Fisheries Development Corporation.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) has been asked over and over again to meet with the people on the Northern Peninsula to discuss this Northern Fisheries Development Corporation, which we were told the PC Party and the government of this Province agreed with. We have been told that, this, as my friend point out, this socialist policy. This has been accepted, we understand. We have been told publicly that this has been accepted now by the Minister of Fisheries, this socialist legislation. I did not say, socialist, but it seems like someone over there said it was, socialist. This has now been accepted. But where is it at this present time? Nobody will tell the people on the Northern Peninsula, who eventually are going to be affected by it. Nobody will tell the people on the Northern Peninsula whether yes, there will be a Northern Fisheries Development Corporation or no, there will not be a Northern Fisheries Development Corporation.

Now the time is slipping by. FPI says within two years Englee plant will be sold, Anchor Point plant will be sold, and Flower's Cove plant will be sold. We cannot afford to wait til the eve of that last year is over. We cannot afford to wait. We must know now, Mr. Speaker, whether or not there is going to be a Northern Fisheries Development Corporation put in place. Because if there is no Northern Fisheries Development put in place, there will be no inshore fishery on the Northern

Peninsula. If the answer is going to be no, we have to be told that as well so that we can take some action, so that we can try, so that we can struggle, and believe you me, Mr. Speaker, people in the Strait of Belle Isle know what a struggle is, because unless you have lived in a district where it is represented by a Liberal member, in a Province which is governed by a Tory Party, you do not know what it is like to struggle. Believe you me, Mr. Speaker, we know what it is like to struggle and we have to know whether it is yes or no, what is going to happen to the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation. Are we going to have it or are we not going to have it? We do not want indecision. We do not want fiddling while Rome burns. We do not want people who cannot make up their mind. We want a yes or a no. We prefer a yes. But if the answer is no, then for goodness sake tell us so we can deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, you have given me my signal, that my time is running out.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave.

MR. DECKER:

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. I see this minor amendment as an attempt by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) to divert this hon. House and the people of this Province from the real issues which face the fishery today. This is what is happening. He is diverting us from the real issue.

The real issue, Mr. Speaker, is this: The inshore fishery is being scuttled. The inshore fishery is being destroyed. When I spoke

first to this amendment I referred to the statement that Mr. Smallwood was alleged to have said, allegedly Mr. Smallwood said, 'burn your boats.' I explained that he did not say it.

But, Mr. Speaker, the landscape of this Province is littered with broken promises, is littered with businesses forced into bankruptcy. The landwashes of this Province, Mr. Speaker, are about to be littered with boats turned bottom up, rotting in the sun and the wind and the snow, Mr. Speaker. It is the Tory Government who is lighting the torch. It is the Tory Government who is holding that torch, Mr. Speaker, to those boats. The Tory Government is lighting the torch to burn the boats of the inshore fishermen. The Tory Government is lighting the torch to burn and destroy the inshore fishery. The Tory Government, Mr. Speaker, is lighting the torch that will ultimately burn and ultimately destroy the inshore fishery of this Province and the best we can do for them is come up with a bill that says, 'No person will be forced to pay his same bill twice'.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I think I will take a few minutes to speak on this bill.

I just listened to the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle and I am sure that the hon. member must have had the opportunity today, during his caucus, to see the headlines in today's Evening Telegram that he failed to mention. I believe that any other time if this headline was not in there I am sure that the hon. member or some other member of caucus would probably be coming in asking questions, "Is there any help for the fishermen?"

The headline in the Evening Telegram today is, Help Coming For Fishermen. Now the hon. gentleman just spoke for thirty minutes and not once did he mention that the Minister of Employment and Immigration, the hon. Flora MacDonald, announced that help is coming for the fishermen and hopefully it will be in a matter of days. Then let the hon. member get up and repeat his statement, word for word, of what he said for the last thirty minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have to realize, and I believe we all know, that there are pockets of our Province of Newfoundland and Labrador that have gone through a very, very rough fishing season. There are also pockets in our Province where the fishery was well and had a fairly good season. In fact, there are two or three sections in my own district of Torngat Mountains where one community had a very poor fishery and another community had a very, very satisfactory fishery.

So, Mr. Speaker, let the hon. gentleman realize once and for all that both governments, the government here of this Province, led by the hon. Premier, and the

government in Ottawa, led by the second Brian, are devoted to making sure that the fishermen of this Province are going to be taken care of. So let the hon. member get that out of his thick skull once and for all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the Loan Board. I am sure every hon. member will agree on both sides of this House that we have seen a tremendous improvement in the Fisheries Loan Board over the past number of years. The former Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter), who some fishermen have said was one of the best Fisheries Ministers we have ever had. Then there were other fishermen have said, 'Yes and he gave away the shop sometimes'. So, Mr. Speaker, whether you are good or bad is immaterial to me. However, I believe the former minister, the member for Twillingate, can honestly say that he has seen improvements taking place in the Fisheries Loan Board since his time as the minister of that department.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, once in a while he makes a dig at individual persons. He said the hon. member for Torngat crossed the House to make sure he could get things for his district. I should advise the hon. member that this fishing season alone, in the district of Torngat Mountains, has seen more loans processed for fishermen that were looking for loans to buy small boats to prosecute the fishery than in any three years previous.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

It is, Mr. Speaker, because I had made representation to them. I have told them of the serious needs, how important it is to make sure that fishermen, regardless of what area of the Province they live, are treated equally and fairly. And, I must say, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen in my area are treated equally and fairly.

The hon. gentleman also mentioned the Northern Fisheries Co-operative. Yes, I believe the Kirby task force did recommend that a northern fisheries co-operative be originated. However, I think we have run into all kinds of problems. And one we cannot forget, one which was most obvious, the one which caused the biggest problem of all, was the former administration in Ottawa.

The former administration in Ottawa was the one which made this Northern Fisheries Co-operative -

MR. TULK:

May we have a quorum call, Mr. Speaker? There is no quorum.

Quorum

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

There is a quorum present.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

I should probably continue on the Northern Fisheries Co-operative, which the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) said is a long time coming. I agree with the hon. member,

because one must realize that this task force was put in place by the former administration in Ottawa.

Mr. Kirby presented his report to the former administration. Subsequently, there were so many problems with the report and with the implementation of this Northern Fisheries Co-operative that officials in Ottawa and in the Province are now getting together to try to iron things out, and hopefully, in the not too distant future, we will see that co-operative become a reality.

In my district of Torngat Mountains I have two provincially-owned fish plants. In fact, if anyone watched CBC yesterday, they probably saw the Chairman of the Torngat Fisheries Co-operative talking about taking over those two fish plants from the provincial government.

I might add at the same time, that the provincial Department of Fisheries is seriously looking at their request. If there is a co-operative willing and able to take over and run a fish plant in my district or anywhere in Northern Labrador, I would be quite receptive to sitting down and discussing their proposal. However, everything that has been told to Mr. Saunders is hinging on the finalization of the Northern Fisheries Co-operative.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can say, as the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle said, that all this act is doing is telling the fisherman he should not pay twice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason we have amendments to different acts is to make the acts more workable for the group of people the act

affects. This is the reason we are bringing in this amendment. If the amendment was not brought in, you would have the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle getting up next year and asking the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) the question, why did So-and-So have to pay twice? This is to protect the fishermen of Englee, this is to protect the fishermen in Anchor Point, this is to protect the fishermen in Sandy Cove. Wherever the hon. member's fishermen are, it is to protect those fishermen as well as any other fishermen in our Province. The member can say we are wasting the time of the House, but the member can also say we are protecting the fishermen of this Province. That is what we are doing in this act, protecting the fishermen of this Province. Mr. Speaker, the same thing can apply to other Bills concerning other employees in this Province. It is an Act to protect an individual group of people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to further say that the Loan Board has been receiving more positive comments from fishermen, from the Fishermen's Union, and from other people in our society in the past year and a half than they have ever received in the past twenty years. One must realize that the dedicated public servants that are down in the Loan Board will try and do what they can to help any fishermen that needs help or assistance. I have to contradict the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle in that no fishermen will be treated unfairly, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. gentlemen opposite should realize a question was asked the first day that the House was opened by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) or the member for Port de

Grave (Mr. Efford) to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) about help for our fishermen. The hon. Minister of Fisheries gave the answer, "We are doing what we can to put a plan in place."

Now, the hon. Minister of Fisheries was in the House yesterday and just came back from meeting with officials in Ottawa. The hon. Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) who is in the House today, just came back from meeting his counterpart in Ottawa concerning the plight of the fishermen and not on hon. member, out of the sixteen on the opposite side, took the opportunity for the fishermen in this Province of getting, through the media, by using question period, of letting the fishermen know that the government of today is progressing favourably in getting assistance for the fishermen.

The fishermen will be getting assistance. Assistance is a very, very short ways off, Mr. Speaker. It could be only momentarily before we will see the programs announced for fishermen that are in need.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I have no problem whatsoever as a member of the government to support the amendment that is put forward in this Act. Maybe the amendment will not help the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), but it will help the fishermen that he represents.

Thank you.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Before recognizing the hon. the member for Stephenville, I would like to inform the House that there are no questions for debate at five-thirty. The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure to talk about the inshore fishery of Newfoundland but it is not a pleasure to go around the Province and look at what a state it is in and the problems exist in the inshore fishery.

Before I get into this, I have to admit one thing, I am not a fishermen, never have been and never will be, and the way it is going, nobody will be. The thing is, I do not think that because you are not a fishermen that you are not educated enough to be able to comment on a problem so I decided to go out and find out what the problems were, along with the Committee. I thought that was a very good move. I thought that the Liberal caucus committee did an excellent job of going around this Province, visiting all of these communities, at their own expense, and finding out some of the problems. I thought it was an excellent initiative, one I think that the government side should really appreciate. The headlines in The Telegram says, 'We are getting to it, we do not know, we are soon going to have something.' That is fine. You have been saying that for about three, four, five, six months. We may see something Christmas time. I do not know what the people will do in between now and then, or when the legislation is going to be approved or when they are going to put a Minister of Fisheries in.

But when the hon. Flora MacDonald decides to bring something down that is going to be able to help the fishery here in Newfoundland, I think a lot of the recommendations are probably going to be a lot of the things that were recommended here by the caucus committee over a month ago. The funniest thing is some of the solutions are going to come from our work that was done. I hope that the government side and Ms. MacDonald up there in Ottawa sends us a nice telegram thanking the Liberal caucus committee for all its hard work that it has done this Summer. This document is nice and red, mind you. A nice red colour. I like that colour. It is very nice. I think the information inside is very beneficial to anybody who wants to study the fishery. As a matter of fact we are going to send it around to a few schools and students to help them get an understanding of some of the problems.

As I was saying, because I am not a fisherman does not give me any less right or any more than anybody else to comment on the fisheries. As a matter of fact, I have a fish plant in my own district which is not doing very well. But hopefully it is going to do better with the recommendations made by our caucus committee.

Getting back to the fact of no Federal Fisheries Minister, I have to mention that too. We talk about this wonderful consultative process. We cannot wait until we have a Tory government in Ottawa and one down here because we are going to get along so well. The most important industry in Newfoundland and they will not even appoint a Fisheries

Minister. I mean, if anybody, if that was a Liberal Government up in Ottawa, we would have more black arm bands on our arms going around here and it will be all over. This has got to be some realism here. How long do we have to wait before we get a Federal Fisheries Minister or somebody to look at the problems? Well, that is okay, nobody wants to follow it, that is fine. I think that they should have a Federal Fisheries Minister to address the problems that we have down here because this fishery is a disaster this Summer. It may be good in some parts of the Province. In about thirty-five communities or so, it has not done very well. At least I can say, though I am not a fisherman, I went out and sat down with them up in Englee, in Triton, and in Port au Choix. At least I can say that. I think I can give myself some credit. At least when you do not know something you will go and find out and you will try and address the problem. I think this Liberal Caucus Committee and I give credit to the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) and also the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) for doing an excellent job on it. As a matter of fact did an excellent job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Also the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) did a wonderful job. As a gentleman who used to be a former teacher and used to be a former banker, I tell you I have a good appreciate for the inshore fishery. I thank these gentlemen who have a great feeling for what it is like.

MR. TOBIN:

Who is the former banker?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I am the former banker. Yes, I am the former banker, Sir. Yes, right here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Now, could I have some silence, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

It is the former banker and the former teacher I think who has shown initiative by going out and trying to find out what the problems of the inshore fishery are. As a matter of fact, it was indeed a pleasure to go out and to talk to fishermen and look at them in the eye and ask them what their problem was? I was not doing the talking. They were doing the talking. They were doing the talking and they did a good job. They gave us some excellent recommendations. Some of them probably could not solve the problem, but a lot of them will. A lot of them made a lot of good recommendations. For example, one, I believe we have here, is getting a fisheries conference on the go, bringing the fishermen in to sit down and talk as we listen. As far as I am concerned, the Fisheries Minister over that and the absentee Fisheries Minister up in Ottawa are not listening. Why do they not call that conference? I mean with all the money that is floating around everywhere else to pay out to the banks and to send tuna out on the shelves, a few thousand bucks would not hurt to get the boys in to have a good chat, to sit down and to get some recommendations from them.

Really, the fishery is in a disaster. Whether or not anybody wants to admit is up to themselves. We have some solutions and that is one good thing about this. The Opposition, we could have sat back the Summer and we could have done nothing and we could have come in here and said, 'The fishery is in a disaster, you solve the problem'. Well, this time around, hon. gentlemen and ladies, we went out and we created some solutions and we have submitted them to you. You have had them and I am willing to bet that when Ms. MacDonald comes down with her recommendations that some of them are going to be from this. I only hope that credit is given where credit should be given. If it was not for that caucus committee the problem would not even have been addressed as far as I am concerned. I mean we are going to be in November now by the time he gets around to it and people have been suffering for the last four or five months.

MR. TOBIN:

According to the calls coming into the Premier's office from Stephenville there are a lot of people thought you did nothing this summer.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Might I inform some hon. gentlemen in this House that -

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible) live in Stephenville.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much. If I may speak about Stephenville for a second, right now an inventive idea that was used is that fish is now going through the Stephenville airport which has been very successful as a matter of fact.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is called flying fish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:

I cannot believe the attitude towards people that are starving.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, are we going to have any decorum in this House or do we get down in the bear pit with that crowd?

MR. DECKER:

I think it is disgusting.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is the member for the straits getting ready for Halloween?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

One of the things that we found as we went around the Province was the rules and regulations and the confusion by fishermen over these rules and regulations which are nothing but a lot of bureaucracy inventing thing that probably do not apply.

From a new person looking at the inshore fishery who does not know much about it there are a lot of regulations that should not even be there. I think that they

should seriously look at the powers that be, wherever they are, because they seem like they are non-existent in a lot of ways. They should be looking -

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

I know Your Honour does what he can to keep some decorum in this House and keep members like the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) quiet. We have seen occasions in this House where that member has been called to order thirty-four times in one evening. We have seen that since he came into this House.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Thirty-seven.

MR. TULK:

It may have been thirty-seven. Indeed it should have been probably fifty-seven. Mr. Speaker, while a person in this House is speaking, I would ask Your Honour to do one thing or the other with him, keep him quiet or give him the flick that he so justly deserves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is certainly entitled to silence when he is speaking. I would ask all hon. members to give him that courtesy.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your

wise ruling.

Nevertheless, the fishery, as somebody new looking at it, is in real bad shape. I remember being back in University and watching this administration from the other side and every time the hon. Liberal government up there in Ottawa did something or whatever that was irate to these gentlemen on the other side, there would be nothing but fire all over the press and everything would be just a blast. You would not get anything constructive done. But now there is no Federal Fisheries Minister and we do not know when there is going to be one, we do not know if they are ever going to decide to put one up there, we do not have the slightest idea, and we do not see no concern being expressed from nobody. We have asked questions on that and nobody seems to know when and they are not to concerned.

The fishery and the state it is in, with no federal fisheries minister, shows the attitude of the administration on the other side. We are going to see, maybe in two weeks time, some good recommendations come down and I think first off they are going to probably be from this and it is probably going to be to late for a lot of people, but I hope not.

The attitude that prevails is waiting for the disaster to occur and then putting some suggestions in but some of us went around and tried to create some suggestions to solve the problem before it got any worse and all the present administration is trying to do is say, let it just get a little bit worse until people get so desperate they may even resort to whatever. I think you should probably try to be a little bit

more careful on that and try to solve the problem from the point of view that before it gets any worse that people definitely going through a hard time. Everybody knows it so try and do something about it like trying to get a federal fisheries minister who is going to come down here and give him a little tour of the place instead of having nobody up there who is going to have any emphasis on it whatsoever.

I would strongly urge the present administration to try and do something along those lines so that those fishermen out there who feel like they are lost, who feel like there is nobody really doing anything much about it, can at least say, "look, we have a sign of hope." Right now there is not much out there. At least I can say that from first-hand experience, I will guarantee you, because we were out there and we saw them, we sat down with them for hours at a time and we listened to them. I do not pretend, nobody here pretends to have all the solutions but I will guarantee you the only way to do it is to go out and listen to the people who are most effected and that is the fishermen of the Province.

We cannot go make regulations in here that are going to have no effect on them out there, or have an ill effect on them out there, and a lot of that has been done in the past. I think it is time for the present administration to start taking some of the blame. They have been in administration now for fourteen years and I think it is time, that instead of blaming it on the hon. Mr. Joseph R. Smallwood, I think it is time to stop blaming it on other people. It is time that you be

accountable to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

The fishery is a resource that you can do something with and if you want to be constructive about it then I would strongly urge you to take this report home tonight, read it very, very carefully and then, if you want, put it in blue and call it yours and we will get up and support it totally. At least it will be some constructive stuff that can help solve the problem.

On that note, Mr. Speaker, I am getting kind of dry but I think I have made a point. I thank you very much and I thank you for the attention you have given me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Mc Nicholas):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a few minutes on this bill. I think my colleagues have said most of what needs to be said about it but I do not believe that we should pass it without emphasizing and re-emphasizing some of the things that my colleagues have been saying because, obviously, the points that they have been making are very important to the fishery of this Province.

First of all if I could deal with the allegations that were made by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) the other day when he opened the debate. It is too bad he is not in this House. The allegations that he made concerned a comment made by the Leader of

the Opposition (Mr. Barry) in a press release this year. What he did not realize was that the Leader of the Opposition was acting upon information which had been supplied by the Premier when he sat down in, I believe it was late September or early September, to set out his Fall agenda. Being what he considers himself to be, a good administrator, the Premier made an attempt to set out, or at least he tried to make us believe that he made an attempt to set out his agenda for the Fall. In so doing, of course, he said that this piece of legislation that he was going to introduce, this amendment to the Fisheries Loan Board, would enable him to put in place a third-party demand in certain circumstances. Well, Mr. Speaker, we know having seen the bill now, we know one of two things, either the Premier did not know what he was talking about, which is not unusual, or -

MR. PATTERSON:

Do not be nasty like your Leader. You would be a good fellow if you only controlled your tongue.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to engage into debate with a man with an IQ the same size as his shirt collar. I am not going to engage into debate with either one of them. I am afraid I may get hit with a throwing missile of some sort a little later on if I do get in debate with him because he scares me stiff.

But as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the point being is that the Premier of this Province, either intentionally or unintentionally, it is not for me to say, was misleading, of course, the public of the Province as well as the House and the Leader of the

Opposition and other people when he pointed out that this piece of legislation -

MR. PATTERSON:

(Inaudible) the Opposition Leader.

MR. TULK:

I would like for 'Bigotry' to be quiet, and I will not name who that is, but everybody in this House knows.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the Premier had given false information to the people of this Province and the House when he pointed out that the piece of legislation that he was going to be introducing was going to allow the government to apply a third party demand.

Of course, we find nothing of the sort in the legislation. Perhaps he backed off from putting that in, I am not sure, because obviously, the bill does not show either one. There is no third party demand in this bill and, of course, we have no objection to supporting the bill itself. None at all. All the bill says is that where fish companies collect funds from fishermen, they will have to turn them over to the Fisheries Loan Board. Well, big deal! Big whoop-de-do! What a major piece of legislation we have here! As my friends have so well pointed out in speaking to the principle of this bill, the principle of the bill or the bill itself in detail does absolutely nothing to help the disastrous state in which we found the Newfoundland fishery this Summer.

I would like to address something

said by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). He said, 'A programme is coming'. Well, I want to tell the member for Torngat Mountains that there seems very little need for me to come into this House and pose a question so that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) or the Premier can reiterate what is already public. In case he did not read The Evening Telegram today, we have already been informed that there is a programme coming. I want to tell him something else.

MR. WARREN:

Why did you not ask when?

MR. TULK:

Oh, that was in there too. In a few days.

AN HON. MEMBER:

In a few days.

MR. TULK:

In a few days, said the article.

MR. WARREN:

(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:

Does the member for Torngat Mountains know what the article said caused the delay?

MR. WARREN:

Let me see now -

MR. TULK:

Think, if you are capable. Think. What did the article say?

MR. WARREN:

I do not have the brain you have.

MR. TULK:

No, you do not, you admit that. Now, what did the article say the delay was caused by?

MR. WARREN:
(Inaudible). *

MR. TULK:
Come on! You are so brilliant. You know what is going on over there - tell us! You do not know?

MR. WARREN:
No.

MR. TULK:
Well, Mr. Speaker, let me inform him. The article in today's Evening Telegram said the delay was caused by the delay of this government in fitting the programme to its own needs. That is what the article in The Telegram said. Read it. They had to wait for the provincial government - Ms MacDonald.

AN HON. MEMBER:
That is not right, is it?

MR. TULK:
Oh, I do not know. I would expect somebody over there to contradict me if it is not, that the delay was caused by the provincial government. And, Mr. Speaker, that has been typical.

Let me talk about Ms Flora MacDonald, the fisherfolk lady. Let me talk about her, Mr. Speaker. When this inshore caucus committee made up of the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) and myself pointed out to them initially what the problem was, sent off some Telexes and some letters to them, contacted the Premier, and Liberal MPs in Ottawa pointed out that the problem was there, what was her initial reaction? She is going to wait for a Fall fishery to see how things turn out. At the same time that that hon. lady was opening

her mouth to utter those words, the Fall fishery was over in Newfoundland along the Northeast Coast of the Province. So, Mr. Speaker, we should be grateful to Flora MacDonald, we should be grateful to the provincial government.

MR. W. CARTER:
Do you remember the Premier's reaction?

MR. TULK:
The Premier's reaction?

MR. W. CARTER:
He said he would put it on the fall agenda.

MR. TULK:
Oh, yes, the Premier's reaction. In spite of the fact that he was the Chairman of a Premier's conference, he spent more time talking about buying wine from South Africa, as my friend from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) so aptly pointed out, than he spent talking about the Newfoundland fishery. Where he was the center of attention!

AN HON. MEMBER:
Where?

MR. TULK:
At the Premier's conference here, when the disaster had already occurred. And then the Premier said, 'Let us put it on the Fall agenda.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:
If Mr. Speaker does not protect me, I am going to have to hide down behind my seat because I am scared of those two hon. gentlemen over there! Will you protect me, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I think there is a small amount of provocation here.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, you may regard it as provocation, I regard it as the truth, but I will accept your ruling, Sir, and try not to engage in debate with those hon. gentlemen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how important is the fishery in this Province? With what importance does the government of this Province regard the fishery? What was the Minister of Fisheries' reply the other, Mr. Speaker, now that he has been chastised he should be quiet. I do not want to have to spend the evening keeping him quiet.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. member has asked for silence.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me talk about, as we have so often in this House, some of the real problems that are in the Newfoundland fishery.

I am glad to see that the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), in spite of the fact that he is over there with the Tories, he is still acting somewhat like a Liberal. Of course I refer to his private member's motion which comes up, I believe, on next Wednesday. He is going to be extremely fortunate. He may have some problems because the agreement from Flora may not say everything that he says in his resolution but at least -

MR. PATTERSON:

Are you going to support it?

MR. TULK:

Support this resolution! This side will stand unanimously to a man as far as the principle of this resolution is concerned. You have no problems with that, Sir.

You know something, I want to read that resolution, Mr. Speaker, because I believe I can tell, if I am reading this correctly and I have not studied it closely, the member for Torngat Mountains that he is likely to receive a unanimous vote in this House for his resolution because, Mr. Speaker, it deals not with politics, it deals not with a particular political party in this Province, it deals with a very real problem that this caucus committee found this Summer and it has to do with the income of inshore fishermen.

Mr. Speaker, I have got five minutes left and I want to try and sum up what this caucus committee found this Summer. We found two key things, Mr. Speaker. One is an immediate problem. I know that there are a number of people in this Province - I understand yesterday morning, for example, on an open line show that there were a number of people who called in to that open line show and said fishermen in this Province are getting enough. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take them around this coast, as we did this Summer, and show them some of the problems that our inshore fishermen are experiencing. The immediate problem that inshore fishermen are facing is a lack of income because there was a lack of fish in the Summer and because of the discrimination that exists in the unemployment insurance

regulations.

They are the only people in Canada, the only labourers in Canada who, when their work finishes, cannot draw unemployment insurance. Anybody who has ever lived along the Northeast Coast of this Province and the East Coast of this Province knows full well that -

MR. TOBIN:

I would not call fishermen labourers. Fishing is a profession.

MR. TULK:

I do not care what you would call them. If you are in a profession, the same thing applies. I am just trying to illustrate the principle that there is no other labourer or professional in Canada that once their work is finished that they have to wait six to eight weeks before they can qualify for the social benefits of this country. That is pure discrimination so we find fishermen with a lack of income.

What was the biggest single issue that fishermen were concerned about? Was it that they do not have an income today? That is bad. Was it they do not have an income this Fall? No. That is not it, Mr. Speaker. That is not what they were talking about. That is not what they were overly concerned about. Their biggest single overriding concern was that that stock, the fish scientists are saying are out there are not there.

They do not believe, as I do not, this idea of cold water. For example, on the Funk Island Banks where, I understand, from 50 per cent to 70 per cent of the Canadian quota for offshore was

caught last year last Winter in January, February and March. Now would somebody explain to me why it is that when a fisherman from Fogo Island fishes that same area in June, July and August and the fish are not there. Is that cold water? Are you trying to tell me that the water is colder in June, July and August than it was in January, February and March?

AN HON. MEMBER:

If you asked the fishermen from Petty Harbour they would tell you it is because fish swim.

MR. TULK:

Because fish swim?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) out of the cold water (inaudible).

MR. TULK:

Oh, I am not saying it is not a factor. What I am saying to you is that when you stay on the same fishing ground and fish is not there, then it is not cold water because the fish should be on that same fishing ground again. That is all I am saying. I am not saying that cold water is not a factor but it is not the overriding factor that caused the disastrous inshore fishery this year.

Mr. Speaker, I have to clue up. But it is very simple what is happening. Our scientists are making projections and they are good scientists but what are they making their projections on?

We heard stories this Summer of trawlermen who told us - I am not putting down those trawlermen - that they stood knee deep in roe, in spawn if you want to, last year in January, February and March. They also told us that they take

only the fish over twenty-four inches and the rest is pushed overboard. Trawlermen have told us that and we do not blame them, because they are obviously out there trying to get the biggest fish they can get.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Trawlermen do not take anything under twenty-four inches?

MR. TULK:

In numerous instances they have told us that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Tell them why.

MR. TULK:

Tell him why! Because it is a better quality fish, bigger price and you do not blame any man who goes out there fishing on a trawler. He is going to try to make what he can make.

MR. TOBIN:

My family are out there, boy.

MR. TULK:

Yes and I have no doubt but they are good men, absolutely no doubt. But there is a great protection for our stock, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that some time in another debate I can get back into that and get back into it in a little more detail.

It being five-thirty I guess I have to adjourn the debate.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Are there any questions?

MR. SPEAKER:

No questions.

MR. MARSHALL:

After all of this this week nobody is dissatisfied with the answers gotten. What kind of game!

MR. SPEAKER:

It now being five-thirty, all those in favour of adjournment 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against 'Nay'.

The House stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow.