



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 47

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

25 October 1985

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRETT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I would like to apologize. A copy of this was supposed to have been delivered to my colleague opposite and it is just arriving now.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to the House today that Marystown Shipyard Limited is entering into agreements with Moss Rosenberg Verft of Norway which involves the transfer of technology and a letter of intent to establish a joint venture company to pursue business opportunities related to the development of the Hibernia oil field on the Grand Banks.

Moss Rosenberg is an internationally established offshore contractor specializing in mechanical outfitting of concrete platforms, module fabrication, assembly, hook-up and commissioning of topside facilities for large North Sea platforms. The expertise, the management systems and skilled personnel and the experience of Moss Rosenberg all combine to make these agreements with Marystown Shipyard of extreme significance to the future potential of that

shipyard.

The first agreement calls for the transfer of technology from Moss Rosenberg to Marystown shipyard in order for the shipyard to acquire the know-how and experience required to develop systems, aprocedures, personnel and expertise to the standards expected by the Hibernia developers, as well as qualifying for fabrication of offshore structures such as modules and pre-assemblies for mechanical outfitting of the gravity-based structure. Through this agreement, Moss Rosenberg will assist Marystown shipyard to attain a position as a qualified fabricator and bidder for offshore contracts.

Moss Rosenberg will transfer their expertise through the training of Marystown shipyard personnel at the Rosenberg Verft facilities in Stavanger, Norway. They will also design the training programme and assist in preparation of the criteria for the selection of Marystown personnel who will participate in the technology transfer programme. I should also mention that training of this nature is currently not available in Canada and the international expertise in gravity-based structure systems, design and construction is generally acknowledged to be in the North Sea.

The training will involve integration of shipyard personnel into base and project organizations in Stavanger, access to systems and procedures, instruction and participation in tender preparation, as well as back up and support in preparation of business procedures and quality assurance manuals. The agreement

also calls for Moss Rosenberg to provide technical assistance in the preparation of a detailed proposal for the upgrading of facilities at the Marystown shipyard.

In entering into this agreement, it is acknowledged that Marystown Shipyard will continue its traditional activities involved with new ship construction and ship repair, and that the transfer of technology will better enable the shipyard to pursue the lucrative opportunities represented by the oil and gas play on the Grand Banks.

In conjunction with the technology transfer, Moss Rosenberg and Marystown Shipyard will enter into an agreement of intent to establish a joint company whose objective will be to qualify for the award of contracts relating to the construction of the Hibernia production facilities. Marystown Shipyard has agreed to consider the expansion and upgrading of its existing physical facilities into a totally modern plant oriented towards offshore work, and to upgrade the skills of its experienced workforce to the standard required.

The joint company would undertake marketing, engineering, construction contracting involving work inside and outside yard facilities, subsea installations, hookup and maintenance. The first objective for the joint company would be to qualify for the gravity-based structure mechanical outfitting work for Hibernia. Both partners in the company will be given equal opportunity to provide services to the joint company. Fabrication work, to the extent possible, will be carried out at competitive prices at the

facilities of the Marystown Shipyard.

These two agreements will greatly benefit the Marystown Shipyard, bringing the facility up to speed, and enhancing its ability to bid on major projects related to Hibernia.

I have said it before, and it bears repeating, that we have to move rapidly in Newfoundland to avail of the opportunities presented by Hibernia. We have to be aggressive in accessing international expertise and technology. Certainly the efforts of Marystown Shipyard in entering into these two agreements with a major Norwegian company, Moss Rosenberg, should be seen as an example of the measures that must be taken to prepare Newfoundland industry for offshore petroleum development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I, first of all, would like to thank the minister for his courtesy in getting the statement to me. Having said that I want to draw attention to a problem that we on this side face whenever we are given the option to comment on a matter of this nature. There is a basic difficulty of being up to scratch or being informed and up on the issue to provide intelligent comment which would guide the government in its deliberations which, obviously, is part of our role here.

I took the initiative soon after I

was designated by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) as a spokesman for Development to chat briefly with the Minister behind the Chair and to point out to him that I had no intention of getting into name calling.

He and I worked together on the Public Accounts Committee and I have great respect for him. I have great respect for his competence.

My God he is awake, Mr. Speaker, he is awake.

Anyway, I intend to keep that particular commitment. I have always regarded him as a very competent individual and one who brings to the job an awful lot of dedication.

Now, for his part, I would hope that he would keep a commitment to me if he could. I have been waiting about five months. What I said to him at that particular time was that I would like to have him designate somebody in the department that I could talk to, not in terms of prying out government secrets, but in terms of getting straight information so that when I rose on occasions like this I could speak from a standpoint of information rather than ignorance. I say that to him again. It would be helpful if there was a person in the department that I could liaise with on an information basis. I think it would make the exchange here much more helpful.

Mr. Speaker, let me come, then, to the substance of the statement. We on this side welcome any initiative that will help the beleaguered Marystown Shipyard, a yard that for a number of years has been literally and financially

savaged and sabotaged by this government.

At a time, Mr. Speaker, when the federal government was pumping in millions, this government was down here playing footsie with the St. John's Shipyard in playing off one against the other.

So, Mr. Speaker, we welcome any initiative that helps those men and women at that yard who have been savaged and sabotaged and fed a line of public relations by this particular government. These people on the Burin Peninsula need a break. Maybe this is the break they need, Mr. Speaker, but I am not certain because I do not have enough information to adjudicate. I will tell you this, Mr. Speaker, that Moss Rosenberg is a reputable firm, known for its work in the North Sea. We recently, through the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), had meetings with them during their recent visit to St. John's a week or so ago. We have been keeping in touch with them. We are delighted to have confirmed that they are indeed going to be doing business here through the Marystown Shipyard.

The statement omits saying what-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, can you keep order in this place or are there thirty-five speakers over there?

MR. SPEAKER :

Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER:

Thirty-five speakers?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Thirty-four and a half.

Mr. Speaker, the statement avoids saying what the cost will be to the Marystown Shipyard. Our understanding is that it will be of the order of \$1 million in terms of training. I would hope the minister might, either today or subsequently, confirm that that is the figure or tell us what the correct figure is. There is a cost here that is not mentioned in the statement. We understand it will cost in the order of \$1 million. So the question arises as to whether we need to go this route. If it is going to cost us \$1 million, perhaps the Marystown Shipyard could just as well and just as efficiently and just as inexpensively provide that kind of training. But that is just a question I raise, not a criticism. I raise it in the context that when we are given this kind of a statement as a good news package, we ought to be told what the bad news is, too, what the cost is going to be ultimately to the taxpayer of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time for reply has elapsed.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I have a concluding statement, if I may.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Has he leave of the House to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying despite all the hype -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

- all the hype about these two key questions -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

They do not want to hear it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Does the hon. member have leave to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you very much. I just want to say a couple of extra things, Mr. Speaker. Despite all the hype -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

- about the offshore, two questions they refuse to answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

There they go again.

MR. SPEAKER :

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Cover up! The old Marshall approach to everything.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member has been refused leave.

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform hon. members that the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, through the Department of Education, has received a gift from the Province of Alberta of 728 sets of the three-volume Canadian Encyclopedia published by Hurtig Publishers Limited of Edmonton, Alberta. A set of the Encyclopedias will be placed in each school and public library in the Province.

The encyclopedias were presented to the Provinces and Territories of Canada to commemorate Alberta's seventy-fifth anniversary as a Province of Canada, which was celebrated in 1980. In a letter accompanying the gift, the Premier of Alberta, the hon. Peter Lougheed, states, "as part of our celebration, we contributed to the creation of this new Canadian encyclopedia, and upon its completion, we want to ensure that the people of Canada would have access to this reference work in schools and libraries right across the country."

The encyclopedia contains three million words of text and almost sixteen hundred full colour illustrations. The entries and illustrations are products of some of Canada's finest authors and photographers and include several

articles from Newfoundland writers.

Mr. Speaker, the encyclopedia is truly Canadian and a magnificent publication of which all Canadians can be proud. This reference work will be an invaluable addition to the schools and libraries in our Province. On behalf of the government, this hon. House, and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, I gratefully acknowledge this gift from our sister Province of Alberta.

SOME HON MEMBERS:
Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, we would like to thank the minister of supplying us with a copy of his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we should have a unanimous vote of thanks from this House go to the Province of Alberta for this generous gift. I went out and purchased a set of this encyclopedia shortly after it was published and it is a fine piece of work - a very valuable piece of work.

The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) would do well to read it occasionally, or have somebody read it for him.

Mr. Speaker, this will be a fine contribution to the Province. I am not sure if the minister indicated the intent as to where these encyclopedias will be sent. Will we have enough for all the school libraries?

MR. HEARN:

Yes.

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Well, that is excellent. It is going to be a fine resource base for these schools.

I would just like to suggest to the minister that we have another encyclopedia that has been started, it has not been quite finished. Because of illness, Mr. Smallwood has not been able to complete his encyclopedia. There was a generous contribution to this work by the government of Canada. In recognition of a particular anniversary of this Province, the government of Canada purchased a considerable number of the last volume and donated them to the Province. I would ask the minister to look closely at seeing that this work is completed.

It would be very unfortunate if the Encyclopedia of Newfoundland and Labrador would be carried this far and not be completed. I think it would be a statesmen-like gesture on that side recognizing the senior statesmen that Mr. Smallwood has become in this Province. So I would ask the minister to give very serious consideration to contacting Mr. Smallwood and his family and enquiring as to how they might assist to see this work completed.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

I would like at this stage to welcome to the galleries His Excellency Mr. Oysdein Stabrun, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. He is accompanied by Mr. Jean Francois Durieux and Miss Sharon Rusu.

SOME HON MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). It is quite obvious to both sides of the House in these hard times that jobs is the number one issue in this Province, especially jobs related to offshore oil and jobs onshore connected with the oil industry. But there is grave concern expressed at all the Mobil hearings that jobs on the offshore are being denied Newfoundlanders, number one, because they are not members of various unions and, second and most important they cannot become members of unions. The main concern because of this is that outsiders will be called in to take those jobs.

The question to the hon. Minister of Labour: Is this policy acceptable to the government? If not what is the Minister of Labour going to do to correct this?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, I feel certain, must be knowledgeable that we have a policy of Newfoundlanders first where they are available and capable to perform the tasks. But on the particular issue that he speaks about I have had no recent complaints or anything like that. We certainly would be willing to

investigate any particular instance that he may have to bring to my attention.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question that really belongs to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), but in his absence I will ask the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer). It concerns the Department of National Revenue cancelling a Liberal policy that limited the amount of tax debt that could be collected from fishermen by the Department of National Revenue at any one time to 25 per cent of a fisherman's earnings. Now that lid has been removed. I want to ask the minister was he aware of this? Was the government involved in making that decision along with their Tory buddies in Ottawa? What is his position and has he communicated it to the Government in Ottawa? Will we hear the same type of overwhelming outcry that we would have had a couple of years ago, or has the Premier completely sold out the Province for the Atlantic Accord?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the great Liberal policy to which the hon. gentleman refers is one, of course, which began with harrassment of the fishermen of Newfoundland and the sending in of dozens and dozens of auditors going through their books and led to more worry and more concern and more highhanded tactics than the fishermen had ever experienced from a federal

government before. So when he speaks about the great benevolence of the former Liberal government with respect to the fishermen of Newfoundland -

MR. EFFORD:

Answer the question.

MR. OTTEHNEIMER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) I think probably supported that great policy of harrassment, although he is over there in a most concerned manner, but it was a policy of harrassment.

Now with respect to the hon. gentleman's question, I would have to consult with the Minister of Fisheries and others with respect to what, indeed, their deliberation was there. I understand the policy which was announced this morning, but I am certainly quite sure that their policy will be one of much more humanity than the harrassment that the hon. gentleman's party put in and which he calls such a great policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Mc Nicholas):

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is along the same line to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer). I would ask him if he would consider making representations to Ottawa now that the 25 per cent limit has been removed. At least, the press reports from Ottawa indicate

that. If the discretion as to how much an individual fisherman will have to pay on his taxes is going to be left to the individual tax collector, there will have to be some sort of protection written in this kind of a programme to ensure that the fishermen and their families will not be harassed, as in the past, up to the point that tax collections be in the amount of 50 per cent of their earnings or more. Because if that is the case, we are going to see many of these inshore fishermen leave the inshore fishery. The second part of my question, Mr. Speaker, if I could carry on, is: Would the minister, in consultation or discussion with the Minister of Employment and Manpower in Ottawa, Miss McDonald, who just recently announced a major works programme will come into play in the next little while for fishermen and plant workers who have no earnings, see to it that Revenue Canada will not move in to attach any part of those earnings from these make-work programmes which will come into place in the next number of weeks?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman has certainly identified two extremely important areas with respect to the 25 per cent limit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

No, they are not important for the Opposition but fortunately they are important for hon. members on this side. It is not important to the Opposition that the money which would accrue to fishermen

from the works programme not be subject to attachment. That is not important, is it?

MR. TULK:

Why remove the limit?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

The hon. gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) thinks nobody knows anything but himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Oh, my! Listen to the hon. members over there. They do not like to hear anything but themselves talking and they make such utter nonsense of themselves. They do not want to hear the answer to the question asked by the hon. gentleman because they did not even want to hear the question. However, that does not deter us. Certainly in connection with the policy of the 25 per cent limit, the removal thereof, I will certainly be pleased to make a representation along the lines suggested by the hon. member. Certainly it is extremely important that money accruing from this works programme, which is to make up for the financial difficulties that fishermen who benefit from that works programme find themselves in, that that not be subject to attachment. And we will certainly suggest that the harassment tactics of the federal Liberal government be avoided at all costs and that that programme be implemented with understanding and humanity.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) whether he would confirm that Universal Helicopters received the government helicopter contract this year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this year the contract for a two year period was awarded to Universal Helicopters for some \$6,400 hours for the two year period.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would indicate whether he is aware of the involvement of any members of his colleagues in Cabinet with Universal and whether this matters was dealt with before any decision was taken by his department with respect to that contract?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any involvement of my colleagues. As a matter of fact, it is a normal tender. That transaction occurs between the companies involved and my department the same as it is for highway contracts or anything else.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Would the minister confirm that

this is a matter that either prior to the issuing of a contract requires a decision by Cabinet?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it was just the normal course. A tender call was put out and there were three bids on that particular contract, Universal, Sealand and Viking, and the low bidder was, as in the normal case, the one accepted.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the minister did not answer my question as to whether or not a Cabinet decision was required prior to the issuing of the tender, or prior to the granting of the contract.

I would like to table a document, Mr. Speaker. This is a document dated December 15, 1983 to the Registrar of Deeds, Companies and Securities, Department of Justice, Confederation Building, St. John's:

'Dear Sir: TAKE NOTICE that the registered office of Universal Helicopters Newfoundland Limited is now situate care of Charles W. White, at Marshall, White, Ottenheimer and Green, 10th Floor, The Royal Trust Building, 139 Water Street, St. John's. Sgd. A. Charles White, Marshall, White, Ottenheimer and Green.'

I wonder if the minister would bring this to the attention of the Premier and whether he would ask

the Premier to add this to the list of matters which he will be investigating with respect to conflict of interest. And perhaps the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) might indicate whether he has yet reached the point where he is prepared to do the honourable thing.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, the line of questioning that the Leader of the Opposition has been pursuing in the last couple of days I find very offensive as a member of this Legislature.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that the public tender procedure, which is carried on by this administration and by my department as it deals with contracts in transportation, is a method of public procedure that was brought in since the Progressive Party attained power in this Province. It was not the method used by former administrations, under Liberal regimes.

Mr. Speaker, it is a clear, straightforward process involved in tendering for government work. I sign, and my Deputy Minister signs on behalf of the Department of Transportation, many, many documents dealing with contracts for highroad projects, for the operation of the ferry services in the Province, for the acquisition of various properties and many, many things, and the signing is done between the principals of the company involved and the officials of the Department of Transportation.

As I understand it, unless there is a problem with litigation, there would not be involvement of a legal firm representing a contractor at any point in time. This is a straightforward contract which was called by public tender, there was a public opening of those tenders, and the company which was the low bidder was awarded the contract. I see no reason, Mr. Speaker, in this instance or in any other I have dealt with, to my knowledge, where I would have to ask the Premier to investigate whether my colleague's firms, or he as an individual, were involved in the company. It is a straightforward, open, public tender, openly done, openly carried out, a very worthwhile procedure brought in by this administration.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) seems to be somewhat deliberately foggy this morning. Perhaps the minister might give some consideration to the following question: Was there any wish on the part of Universal Helicopters to become closer to government by its decision to not only retain but to have its registered office at the firm referred to? I will leave that with the minister. I would ask the minister to bring it to the Premier's attention and let the Premier decide whether the minister is correct or not.

Now, I would like to ask the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) in the absence of the

Premier, and it is becoming more and more frustrating, Mr. Speaker -

MR. PATTERSON:

Did your law firm act for Craig Dobbin?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, my law firm acted for nobody with whom I had a conflict in my involvement as a minister of government. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I was not in practice when I was a minister of government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) a question in the absence of the Premier, whose absence is making it more and more difficult, Mr. Speaker, for the Opposition to carry on a series of questions and perhaps this is why the Premier is periodically absent. In the response of the Premier yesterday with respect to matters concerning Pippy Park, the Premier in his statement said, 'These lands were in the difficult situation for their owners of being neither purchased for park use -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am afraid I was a bit lax on the last question when I allowed the hon. Leader of the Opposition to read from a document.

MR. SIMMONS:

Smarten up!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would refer him to our Standing Orders, 31 (d): "Oral Questions

must not be prefaced by the reading of letters, telegrams, newspaper extracts or preambles of any kind".

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I distinctly heard, and I am sure the whole House heard the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), I think it is, say to Your Honour, and I repeat it not in any derogatory sense but I must repeat it and it is a derogatory remark, "Smarten up". Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth derogatory remark that has been recorded addressed to Your Honour and I think it is high time that he correct that statement.

MR. SIMMONS:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the truth is, if the members want to hear the truth, I doubt they do but if they want to hear it, I said, "Smarten up". The truth is I said it in a reference to the Speaker. If you want the rest of the truth the reason I said it is that I watched the Intergovernmental Affairs Minister (Mr. Ottenheimer) abuse the rules of the House and the Speaker sit there in silence. I watched my colleague make a brief reading and suddenly the Speaker finds some little obscure rule to catch him up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I make an appeal

to you to allow the process to go forward, the normal exchange here where the Leader of the Opposition and other people can ask questions without having interference run by the Speaker himself. Mr. Speaker, that is what we ask, fair play on both sides of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am not prepared to take directions from the hon. member.

MR. BARRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, then the Speaker will take direction from the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

I will check in Hansard and I will have more to say on that point of order on Monday. I did not hear any remarks but I will certainly check.

In regard to Oral Questions, it is perfectly clear in Standing Order 31 (d) about Oral Questions the point that I drew to the attention of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Your Honour may not have heard -

MR. BARRY:

It is to kill Question Period.

MR. MARSHALL:

No, it is not to kill Question Period. It will be very short. Your Honour may not have heard the remark to which the member for St.

John's North referred coming from the member for Fortune - Hermitage, but it was quite clear. The other remarks that the member for Fortune - Hermitage made constitute, Mr. Speaker, a reflection upon the impartiality of the Chair, they constitute an attack on the Speaker. The House cannot function without a Speaker's impartiality being upheld by all sides of the House and I think it is incumbent upon the hon. gentleman to retract those remarks forthwith and immediately without equivocation.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Your Honour, we have the Standing Orders here and I am reading Standing Order 31(d). I see a reference to 'letters, telegrams, newspaper extracts or preambles of any kind.' I do not see any reference to statements made in response to questions by the premier of a province which have been tabled in this House in response to an earlier question. If the Speaker is deciding that he is going to prevent reference to previous answers or statements made in response to questions in this House, the ability of the Opposition to carry on its job is going to be severely, maybe, impossibly impaired. Now the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) is trying to bring that to the attention of the House. We know the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and other members opposite would love to have prevented from asking questions. Mr. Speaker, we

cannot, as an Opposition, stand for being muzzled. We have a job to do. This, Mr. Speaker, I would submit with respect, is an improper interpretation of 31 (d). It is an extension that has never been applied in this House before, Mr. Speaker, that you can not read from a response tabled by the Premier in response to a question on a previous day.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, just further to that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

What the hon. gentleman is talking about now is not the issue. I dare say there are times that a Speaker in this House, because no Speaker is infallible, may make a ruling that is not in accord with the rules of the House. But you are not permitted under the rules of this House, if you are going to have any order in the House at all, to challenge the bona fides of the Speaker as the hon. gentleman did. I am not saying that the hon. gentleman did so because that is a matter for Your Honour to consider. But if Your Honour did make an error, which may or may not have happened, it excuses no person in this House from assailing Your Honour's integrity and impartiality as an officer of this House in the Chair, as a presiding officer elected to preserve order and decorum in accordance with the rules of the House of Assembly and in accordance with the rules of British Parliamentary practice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

He should be named, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

To the point of privilege raised by the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), Mr. Speaker, there are two ways to go about this, Sir. One is to hide behind the rules; the other is to hear what members of this House are saying to you. What I am saying is that from my preception I do not think you are treating this side fairly. I say that in all honesty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it suits the niceties of this House let me say this, you are the best Speaker we have ever had.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege. I am going to review Hansard when this sitting is over and I will rule on these matters on Monday.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, maybe the Speaker was unaware of the documents to which I refer. I am referring to the Premier's response to a question yesterday where the Premier said that owners of lands were being put in a difficult position. To avoid misinterpretation, Mr. Speaker, may I quote a sentence from that statement where he says, 'The owners of the land in

question had been pressing the Park Commission for a decision on the ultimate fate of these lands.' Now this is the Premier's own statement.

Yesterday on television he states that he never heard of Fairview Investments Limited when we had tabled the document the previous day with that company's name on it. Yesterday in this House he said he had never seen the document filed in the Registry of Companies which indicates that the minister is a member of this company.

Now, first of all, would the minister indicate was there any investigation at all carried out by the Premier? If there was, how could he have failed to find the public document which shows the minister as a shareholder and a director of this company? And was the minister, as part of this company that was the owner of the land in question, involved in pressing the Commission for a decision on the ultimate fate of these lands?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the hon. gentleman in the past few days has been attempting to destroy my credibility and integrity. Now whether or not that is fair game is up to people to judge. If you are in elected politics maybe that is the way in Newfoundland we conduct it over a period of time, I do not know. But I do say, Mr. Speaker, that it is is really, I think,

inappropriate to be bantering around in the House of Assembly the names of people outside, not connected, and their own private affairs and what have you.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman tabled a share list in the House. Perhaps I made a mistake not getting up in the House and refuting it right away because these things get reported. All I did was just sat down and looked and I saw an exhibition of the hon. gentleman with his usually instability, with which we are familiar, coming out with this publicly, in the public House. So I should have responded, perhaps, because it was being reported.

But I want to say, and I want to say categorically here, that I have no financial interest in Fairview Investments Limited. I have acted for it, obviously. I mean I am a lawyer, I am in the House of Assembly, and it is not an impediment to practice law or to carry on any business when you are in the House. There is no impediment, either, to being in Cabinet, Mr. Speaker. I have done this for seventeen years and I will continue to do so. I do it in the nighttime, I do it in the summertime when the hon. gentleman is adjusting his contacts and trying to make contact with a golf ball at Bally Haly.

So, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is - I am talking about him bantering around names - I have no financial interest, I have never received anything by way or profit, by way of dividend at all from that particular company.

MR. BARRY:

You are a director.

MR. MARSHALL:

I have never directed its affairs. I have never, Mr. Speaker, partaken in any decision at all of any substance with that company with respect to whether they buy land or whether they sell land. That is done by the owner. So the diabolical part about it is that you put in a share list of somebody's private affairs and they see my name on it so some people, not attuned to these things, perhaps might say, 'Well, now, Marshall, boy, your name is there so you are guilty. Why is your name there?'

Now the hon. gentleman knows the reason. If my colleagues on my own side could keep quiet I would like to explain this briefly. In private companies, under the Companies Act, there are, as everybody knows, required to be three shareholders. Very often in family companies a man and his wife incorporate a company and they need the third shareholder. Very, very often it is the lawyer who incorporates the company puts his name on it as a qualifying shareholder, but has no interest at all. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants to dig in his muck he can find 100 companies - and he would probably get jealous again - that my name is on. I cannot help it.

I know that people in this House, from time immemorial - the hon. P.J. Lewis served in here with distinction as a member of the Cabinet is one I can think of; Chief Justice Mifflin; Mr. Justice Mahoney; Mr. Roberts, to name a few - have conducted their affairs in this House and have been in exactly the same position. It is a very common practice. I have acted for this particular company since 1958. He has not gone to another firm because he has been satisfied

with the services, I am afraid, for twenty-five or twenty-seven years.

It is also very often the normal practice for a lawyer to be designated as Secretary to look after the technical, legal matters. But I can say on ten stacks of bibles, Mr. Speaker, that I have not a single interest in that company. I have never directed its affairs past or present, and neither will I in the future. I think it is diabolical of the hon. gentleman. He may want to destroy me, and that is fine, he is welcome to it and he can continue to try to do it. He brought up today about Universal Helicopters. It is also practice, Mr. Speaker, for law firms to lend their names as the registered office, but I have no interest in Universal Helicopters. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I do not know. I presume we do act for Universal Helicopters.

I built up, Mr. Speaker, a firm with sixteen lawyers over the years. I do not know now all of the clients, but I guarantee I never got a client in my life from using my position in the House of Assembly as a minister of the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have turned them away and I will continue to turn them away.

Now as to the substance of the allegation the Premier answered yesterday. The Pippy Park Commission asked for the change. I never opened my mouth and never said a word. It was as if I did not exist.

On the Petro-Canada allegation, we do not act for Petro-Canada.

The share list, business which is adequately explained, the hon. gentleman raised with his smear tactics, and now he is on Universal Helicopters. Well, Mr. Speaker, he can do it, that is fine. But I do not think it appropriate to bring in other names. Let him centre on me all he wants to.

If this House is going to be used for attacking people outside the House in their private capacity to try to hurt them, then we are in a very, very sorry situation in this House that I do not think should be tolerated by any sense of decency. I can justify my position, Mr. Speaker, any time. I can justify it, as I have with the Premier and with any fair minded person in this Province and I will take second place to none. So what is wrong, 'Leo', have you lost another client? Is your jealousy so engrained yourself that you have to do it? Or have you leaned the lessons from the Rat Pack?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, all I can say to the hon. gentleman is if he wants to emulate the Rat Pack, even in the rodent family rats have a certain stature which he has not. He is a mouse. I used to read to my children years ago *The Little Grey Mouse that squeaks*. But he, Mr. Speaker, is the little grey mouse that sneaks!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to waste the time of the House in calling the member to order for all these breaches of the House procedure. May I just ask the minister if he could explain how he stood up in this House on Monday or Tuesday and said he was very careful in not having a conflict of interest by scrutinizing carefully his client list and now he stands in this House and pretends that he does not know who his law firm acts for? He cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. He is either careful to avoid conflict of interest by scrutinizing his client list or he does not know. Now which is it? Will the minister answer?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, all I can say the hon. gentleman is very sick. In less sensitive days there would be people chasing him around with nets.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, another question for the minister. Would the minister explain how it is he is there as a qualifying shareholder, he says, because there are three shareholders needed when in fact he makes the fourth shareholder? There are three disinterested, non-minister shareholders already in this company. Explain that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I will explain that, Mr. Speaker, sure. 1958, I guess it was, that this company would have been incorporated. I am not going to get into the man and his children, I do not want to bring in other people, but as people grow up - the hon. gentleman would not know that because he never has - Mr. Speaker, as they have gotten to nineteen years old, he has given them a share, but he happened to have left me there. But the fact of the matter is I am there, I was there originally as a qualifying shareholder, my name is still there on the share lists from years ago, but the fact of the matter is I own no interest in that company.

MR. BARRY:

Why is it was not on your conflict of interest statement?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He has no interest.

MR. MARSHALL:

Exactly, because I have no interest, Mr. Speaker, in it. I have absolutely no interest except as the qualifying thing. Now I am not going to sit here and be crossexamined. I think we have answered fully and sufficiently to a man. Perhaps we should ask one of these days as to whether lawyers should be in government at all. Maybe lawyers should not be allowed to be in the House of Assembly, in government and carry on a practice at all.

MR. BARRY:

You should ask should they be in Cabinet while they are acting for clients.

MR. MARSHALL:

Perhaps they should not be. And maybe we will have it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

And when we do that, Mr. Speaker, if we ever come to that day -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would ask the hon. minister if he would just answer the question.

MR. MARSHALL:

I will just say, Mr. Speaker, if we ever come to that day perhaps we can have an enquiry and I will put my record up against the hon. gentleman's and we will see which one will work with honesty and integrity.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, Order 16, Bill 21.

MR. SPEAKER:

An Act to Amend the Fisheries Loan Act. That was adjourned by the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could tell me just how much time I have left in the debate. I think it is eight or nine minutes.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, while we are getting to that. Yesterday, as I was saying, this piece of

legislation was introduced by the Premier in his statement about the fall agenda.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has nine minutes.

MR. TULK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This piece of legislation was brought into the House, supposedly to be a piece of legislation that would give the Premier, according to his explanation this fall, issued in September, a third party demand in the case of loans that were outstanding.

As the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) pointed out in his opening remarks, it is very obvious the Premier decided that he could not go ahead with that, that he would back off and I think that is what we have seen.

Mr. Speaker, I was also talking about the general state of the fishery that we found and I think that is well documented in the report that we submitted. I was making a point yesterday when I adjourned the debate about greatest concerns that inshore fishermen have in this Province. The first one that they obviously have, now, immediately, is their ability just to live - to have an income.

The second one I think I said I made was the overriding concern of fishermen is that the Northern cod stock, as is predicted by our scientists, is being overfished and the fish is just not there to come to ashore. I think there was one other.

When we started our tour of the Province we made the point that unless certain things change in the inshore fishery, we believe

that the it will not be around in five years. We also made the point that we could not believe that anybody was doing this in any other fashion than out of ignorance. We soon found out from fisherman in this Province that they have the concern that the inshore fishery will not be around in two years and that there is a deliberate attempt by bureaucrats and indeed, in spite of what the Premier and his government says, and in spite of what the federal government has been saying for the past number of years, there is a deliberate attempt to do away with the inshore fishery.

Mr. Speaker, that brings up a very important question to this Province. If we are going to have the kind of Newfoundland that we have today, then I believe there has to be an inshore fishery, because many of the many of the small communities that exist around this Province depend solely on the inshore fishery to survive.

If we make the decision either overtly or undercover that we are not going to have an inshore fishery, then we can make up our minds that the face of Newfoundland will change drastically. Mr. Speaker, we saw one government in this Province get its comeuppance as a result of bringing in a policy of centralization. I say this in this House with the full knowledge of what I say, that this government, the previous governments in Ottawa and the present government in Ottawa are carrying out fishery policies in this Province that will lead to centralization through the back door. Many of our small communities that exists around the Province will fail to exist if the

present trend continues. There will be no inshore fishery.

Mr. Speaker, we found a number of other problems that the fishermen were concerned about: the costs of licensing and the date on which you have to get a license. There is no other trade in the world where you have to buy a permit to work six months before you go to work, yet that is exactly what is happening in the inshore fishery. Our fishermen have to buy their license in December and many of them do not see any work at all before April 1 or the middle of May. Some of them do not indeed even see work by then.

Overregulation was another overriding concern of many fishermen in this Province. For example, an old gentleman in Musgrave Harbour decided one day he was going to go out, seventy years of age and fished all of his life, had given his salmon license to his son, decided he was going to go out. While his son was down tending to his lobster pots, he was going to go out and tend to his salmon nets for him. He made the trip. When he returned, standing on the wharf was a federal fisheries officer who took his boat, motor, nets, salmon and carted it off to a place called Gannet, where it was impounded.

The regulation states that that old gentleman was not allowed to get in the boat because he was not a licensed fisherman, because he had given up his license, yet all he was trying to do was trying to help his family. It cost him \$500 in lawyer's fees and his son lost the boat, engine and nets for the whole Summer.

A regulation exists that was found out in Port de Grave, a practice

in Newfoundland, where a young fellow was going to get some bait for his father to go fishing the next day, as the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) says, on the squidding grounds, to get some bait for his father the next day. The federal fisheries officer said, no, a young fellow fourteen years of age is not allowed to do that because he is not a full-time fisherman.

The kind of regulation that takes place without fishermen even knowing about it was very apparent as well. For example, it has always been the case in this Province, not always, but it has been the case for this past number of years, that before you could transfer a license, whether it be a lobster license or a salmon license, you had to be fishing with another individual for two years. Without any warning at all, without any notice at all, fishermen were told, fishermen received letters from the Grand Falls office of the Department of Fisheries saying, 'Sorry old chum, that has gone up to five years.'

Regulations are coming out of the federal Department of Fisheries so fast that fisheries officers are not even aware of it themselves. I think we came to the conclusion that surely somewhere in Ottawa, particularly in Ottawa, there must be a bureaucrat who wakes up in the morning, has his bacon and eggs, goes to his office in the Centre Block somewhere, and says to himself, 'Now what regulation can I write today to put the screws to the inshore fishery?' By the kind of regulations that come out of the federal Department of Fisheries, there must be a bureaucrat hidden away somewhere. I wish we could find him.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing that fishermen and plant workers are scared of in this Province are the activities of Fishery Products International. There is a firm belief, and I think it is coming through and I know the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) will agree, and it was expressed by his own people in Charleston as I am sure he is aware of that, there is a firm belief that Fishery Products International are going to take the Cadillac plants, the plants that are sure to make a profit, they are going to take those and they are going to close down the rest. That belief exists. We saw evidence of it in place, after place, after place and I am not sure that they were even taking the viable plants.

AN HON. MEMBER:
The fear exists.

MR. TULK:
The fear exists that that will happen, that the plants will close down and that there will be no more Charleston plants and Twillingate plants. They are being purposely downgraded so that FPI can say, 'yes, we can close them.'

Mr. Speaker, somebody has to protect those people. If we are going to have an inshore fishery we have to first of all make the decision, are we going to have an inshore fishery or are we going to have the type of Newfoundland we have today? If we make that decision, then governments have to protect those people. It falls upon the provincial government because how can you depend on a Central Canadian to protect Atlantic Canadians? The answer is you cannot. We do have a small number of people representing us in Ottawa, seven in total out of

287. So it falls into the hands of the provincial government in this Province to protect those people - you are looking at the clock, Mr. Speaker, are you?

Mr. Speaker, I am going to conclude by saying to this government that they have been extremely quiet of late.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:
They will what?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Create a noise in Ottawa.

MR. TULK:
Oh, I think they will. I think eventually they will recognize that that is not going to work, that they cannot cozy up, Mr. Speaker, to their Tory buddies in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I got no warning.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) time.

MR. TULK:
No, no, but I just pointed out to the Chair I got no warning. Is my time up, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER:
You had nine minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:
Three minutes.

MR. TULK:
Two minutes?

MR. SPEAKER:
Three.

MR. TULK:

All right, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

This government will learn that the people of the Province will not allow them when there is a Liberal government in Ottawa to be all noise and no strength, all noise and no substance. They will also learn that the people of this Province will not allow them to have neither substance nor noise when there is a Tory government in Ottawa. They have to learn to stand up, and they will change. As my friend from Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) says, they will change. Because the man who sits in that chair is firstly a politician and secondly a Newfoundlander.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, there does not seem to be too much interest in the House today on Fisheries matters, according to the very small number we have in the House. I have to say that it appears the media in the press gallery -

MR. TULK:

I know the hon. the member for Bonavista South is going to make a good speech and I would like for his people to come in here and listen to him. Mr. Speaker, may we have a Quorum call?

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Call in the members.

Quorum

MR. SPEAKER:

A quorum is present.

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I was saying at the outset that maybe when you stand in the House of Assembly and speak in a non-partisan way on a topic which is important to Newfoundland, that the media will find no interest and, in many cases, many of the members of the House of Assembly may not find it of interest either. That is unfortunate, because in Newfoundland today, without a working fishing industry, without a successful industry in the future, we are not going to have a rural Newfoundland.

A few nights ago, with friends from both the Opposition and the government side, including my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) and the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), at the request of the graduate students at the university, we listened to and took part in the discussion among the teachers assigned around the Province in a question which they posed to us: 'What do we tell the young people residing in rural Newfoundland today about their future? What future do they have? Do they indeed have a future living and working in rural Newfoundland?'

It is a very important question.

I would have to say from the fishing aspect of it that it is not all that bright. It is not really doom and gloom, but we can only be very cautiously optimistic regarding the future of rural Newfoundland if we are going to depend on the inshore fishery, in particular. And I see more and more; I saw when I was Minister of Fisheries for a period of years the attitude, not necessarily of politicians, but of the people who advised the politicians, the people who, in many cases, develop policy and pass it along to the politicians for finalization and approval. I saw it in the attitude of many bureaucrats and unfortunately some of these bureaucrats were people who originally came from Newfoundland. They are Newfoundlanders. They always seem to take the attitude in Ottawa that, 'Oh, because I am a Newfoundlander, because I am involved in policy making and programme development, I have to be very careful I do not show favors toward the province I came from. I cannot patronage my own province and be condemned by other provinces'. That kind of an attitude has hurt the inshore fishery in our Province, there is no question about that, and the overall fishing industry.

It is more than in just that one department in Ottawa. There are other bureaucrats in other departments. I, today, for example, was concerned when I heard the news this morning regarding this removal of Revenue Canada's limit and giving a free hand, which I hope it will not be, to these bureaucrats to go out and do as they want to collect taxes owing. Nobody is saying fishermen should not pay taxes. Nobody is saying that. But give them a fair

chance to pay the taxes they owe. That is all I have been saying over the years.

I am convinced today there are people in Ottawa who are saying this morning, 'Oh, finally we are going to get a few more inshore fishermen out of the fishing industry in Newfoundland'. Because if they go out this Winter and start seizing possessions of fishermen and seizing their incomes, etc., we are going to see many more fishermen leave the industry.

Let me come down to the key question. I was hoping that, I say again, the media would listen to what is being said by both sides of this Assembly on this important industry.

Oil and gas will come and go. I would not build up my hopes today on the oil and gas industry. Sure they are going to get some jobs out here for the concrete platform construction but down the road that is going to be gone. It is a non-renewable resource.

We are going to depend, in this Province, on one industry to survive as a Province, the fishery. And less and less, year by year, are there any encouragements for young people to become involved in that important industry. They are fading away more and more from the industry and there is less attraction to them to get involved in the fishery. If that is going to occur two or three or more years longer, the generation we now have in the fishing industry will step aside or will have to retire from the industry and once that generation is gone, we will have nobody left to carry on the fishery in many areas of the

Province. That is the reason why this debate is so appropriate on an amendment to an act which governs loans to fishermen.

I think that my friend from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) and Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) and on this side, Carbonear (Mr. Peach) and other areas and the Southwest Coast (Mr. Gilbert) and Trinity Bay (Mr. Reid) all understand fishermen, through no fault of their own, have been unable to make their payments the last number of years, through no fault of their own. They are asking a very important question. They keep posing it all the time. "What is happening to our fishery?". I go out and sit down on the stage heads on the weekend and talk to fishermen. I puff on my pipe and they will puff on their pipes and we will chat and they will say, "What is happening to the fishery?". Are the scientists right? They are saying, 'Oh well there is a cold water barrier coming around the coast and fish cannot come through the cold water barrier. Water temperatures are too cold. The water is too dirty. Cod fish cannot come in'.

I will always say, and in most cases the fishermen will say it before I do, 'What nonsense! What rubbish! What trash! Year after year to hear scientists giving us excuses about what is happening to our stocks, scientists who are protecting bad policies put forward by bureaucrats over the years and still maintain policies governing the resource that we have'.

A few days ago a factory freezer trawler brought in someone for medical attention down in St. Anthony and rightly so. They had a worker on board and he wanted

some medical attention but nobody sort of zeroed in and said, "A factory freezer trawler! What! Surely it cannot be a factory freezer processing vessel landing in Newfoundland for some other reason than landing fish. Who is that vessel? What is she doing?'. Nobody even cares to mention that. It was a Russian factory processing vessel. She is out there gathering all the fish from the feeding vessels around her and she is processing every pound that comes on board. Nothing goes back overboard, in other words there is no wastage. So here we are with Russian factory freezer trawlers processing fish right within our 200 mile zone - and, by the way, I have done some checking and that Russian factory vessel processing at sea was processing what species? Was it a species we cannot catch as Canadian fishermen? No, it was processing Northern cod. Northern cod! I flew in a helicopter a few days ago belonging to a fish company - no criticism there. I can do as I please these days. I am a free agent as MHA. I can take rides in helicopters and go where I want - and I flew all the way from Roddickton on the Northern Peninsula down to Bay de Verde. In fact, the man who owns the helicopter is in the fish business.

MR. HODDER:

Quinlan. It must be.

MR. MORGAN:

Quinlan Brothers, that is right, one of the best companies around, making money without government assistance.

Now, flying along the coastline what do we see? We looked down at the fish plants and Mr. Quinlan said to me, 'What do you see?' We

saw fish plants, fish plants, fish plants but not one car parked by their doors, which means not one worker was working in these plants. Inshore plants closed up with no fish to process, and we are sitting here and we do not even make a squeak about the fact that the Russians can come in and catch the fish in factory processing vessels and take it back to the markets, in many cases in competition with our product, which we are marketing ourselves. That is one reason why we are having a problem in the inshore fishery.

We are going to catch this year, I understand, and maybe my colleague from Twillingate (Mr. W. Cater) will correct me if I am wrong - but I think I am right - around 60,000 metric tons in the inshore catch. Our quota allocation for the inshore fishery is 115,000 or 120,000 metric tons. We are going to catch half of what we have out in the water, allocated. It did not get in. Why? It is not out there to come in. I have always maintained that, and both levels of government, especially the federal level, should realize that and put a total ban on foreign fishing activity. If that is not done, we are going to have the Russians, and the Japanese, and the West Germans and others using their factory freezer processing vessels within our zone, taking our fish, and we will have less and less fish for our inshore fishery.

Let me add one more thing to that which is going to maybe sound controversial: Not only are the fish not getting to the inshore because of foreign activity, the fish is not getting to our inshore, small-boat fishermen, boats up to twenty-eight feet and

thirty-five feet, or you could even go to sixty-five feet, because, and I would ask any member of this House to go with me, but hopefully I will not see again what I saw last Spring, in the early part of April, just before the inshore fishing season started, you could stand on the banks of Cape Bonavista at eight o'clock or nine o'clock, or in the evening after dark, and what would you see? You could look out at lights, just like a small city.

So I did some checking on it. I said, that cannot be what I think I am seeing out there, trawlers fishing. Indeed it was trawlers fishing. Then I said, well, they have to be foreign, let us get on to the federal authorities right away and report it and get somebody to go out and check, if they are from foreign nations, what they are doing out there? Why are they in so close as to be visible from shore? They were checked out. They were not foreign ships, they were our own trawlers, large trawlers fishing as close as twenty-five to thirty miles from shore.

Now, you take fifteen or twenty trawlers fishing twenty-five miles around Cape Bonavista, in that vicinity along the East Coast - and all other areas - for three or four months of the year -

AN HON. MEMBER:

And any other cape in Newfoundland.

MR. MORGAN:

And any other cape, any along the Northeast Coast, and the fish is not going to get to the inshore waters; they are scooping it up before it gets to the inshore waters. 'You cannot catch the same fish twice,' we have all been saying that. So the fish is not

getting into the inshore waters for two reasons and it has to be dealt with and dealt with fast before we have no more inshore fishery, especially the Northern cod fishery.

MR. TULK:

That is right.

MR. MORGAN:

Remove foreign harvesting efforts within the 200 mile zone on Northern cod, in particular, in 2GH, beyond the NAFO and Northern cod zone. Number two, the most important step of all is to take out immediately factory processing vessels, all foreign factory processing vessels. Then, added to that there must a regulation put in place, and I would like to see this House do it during this session, to have the federal government - Mr. Young will not like this and other managers of FPI - but a regulation put in place from Ottawa which will protect the inshore grounds of the inshore fishery and prevent any Canadian trawler from fishing within a certain distance from the shore, not to fish within that certain boundary, called the protected boundary.

My friend, the former Minister of Fisheries, I am sure will agree with what I am saying. When he was minister he advocated the same thing. What has been going on, he is my predecessor, Mr. Crosbie was there. I think he advocated the same thing. It is still the same today and I am convinced it is not because of the politicians in Ottawa.

Yes, to some extent it is, because instead of the politicians listening to the politicians in Newfoundland, which they should be doing, both sides of the House, we

pass resolutions here, they are listening to the bureaucrats. They are listening to those people who do not give a darn about the inshore fishery. They do not care if tomorrow morning the inshore boats are all pulled up and fishermen go on social assistance.

MR. TULK:

Not only do they not care, they want to do away with them.

MR. MORGAN:

Now, that is one aspect of the fishery I am concerned about - I think we all are - the resource itself and the reason the resource is not getting to the inshore waters.

MR. TULK:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. MORGAN:

Well, if I do not lose part of my time.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Would you also agree that we should close down the fishing of that Northern cod stock for January, February, March and April?

MR. MORGAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe we are just wasting our time as a little province with a House of Assembly of fifty-odd members and nobody listening. I recall when I was a private member in Mr. Moores government sitting somewhere in this same area as I am now, bringing in a private members' resolution that all fishing on the Hamilton Banks during the spawning season in January, February and part of March that all fishing be stopped. It was passed

unanimously. It went to Ottawa and it is still going on today. As long as you have that what you call a big mother cod caught in January, February, March full of spawn, every individual spawn means a fish, as long as that is going on, if you kill all the spawning fish, you are going to hurt the growth of the stocks. There is no question about that. It is still going on. The key question is, why? That question has to be addressed before too long by both levels of government and dealt with head on by stopping the activity of fishing during the spawning season.

Now let me get down to the second part. I was astounded a couple of days to learn that the independent fish companies many of them never got a cent from government, I do not know how they can take it, how they can tolerate it, they sitting here watching hundreds of millions of dollars coming into this big large conglomerate and if Mr. Young cannot make a go of FPI he should be banished from this Province. If he cannot now make a go of FPI after getting \$130 million recently, and \$100 million before that again, and selling off fifteen plants, if he cannot make a go of it now with all of that money and all that fish he got allocated as an enterprise allocation, I say here today, Tommy Toe can make a go of it now. Anybody can make a go of it. Well, I mean, they have the fish, they have the money, and they have the loser plants put off to one side. So they have to make a go of it.

MR. W. CARTER:

They have the jewels in the crown.

MR. MORGAN:

That is right. But that is not

the issue. The issue is those other independent companies, I will mention one, there is Fred Earle from Carbonear, there is Boyd Way out in Wesleyville and I can go on, and the Fogo Island Co-op, independent, how can they sit there and have the patience to tolerate all this money going into FPI? FPI getting the offshore fish and their plants closed up and why? I will tell you why.

The Deputy Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa, who is now acting fully in Ottawa as a minister, because there is no minister there, Mr. Nielsen, a fine fellow, but a big heavy workload, he does not have the time to give the attention to the Department of Fisheries like should have been given by a full time minister because of his other responsibilities. So the officials are running the show right for the last number of weeks in federal fisheries, totally. Dr. Art May is a fine gentlemen, a very knowledgeable man in the fishing industry.

Why, for the life of me I do not know, why they turned down the application by those independent fish companies to harvest the fish that is going to be left in the waters this year. Left in the waters. Fish left in the inshore quotas in the offshore, number one. But even more importantly, Fisheries Products is going to leave twenty-five million pounds of fish in the water at the end of December. When Mr. Bill Wells told me that a little while ago, I nearly fell off my chair! I could not believe it!

With all the bright boys they got down there managing that company and they are now going to leave twenty-five million pounds of northern cod in the water this

year! What is that going to do to the argument the Premier has been using, and a strong one on behalf of the Province, a good argument, a strong case to stop factory freezer trawlers from coming into the fishery. What is that going to do?

It is going to substantially damage the Premier and the government's argument against factory freezer trawlers. Surely they could have caught the fish, Mr. Wells said to me, "Well, we had a strike in January."

Sure you had a strict in January but you do not normally start fishing until the middle of January. It is always two weeks after Christmas, the strike was over by the end of January. Oh, no, the main reason why the fish is going to be left in the water is because of someones wisdom or lack of wisdom in the company who decided to divert their trawlers in the peak of the northern cod catching period, to divert their trawlers to the flat fish species because they thought it would be more lucrative for them in the market place.

At the same time, ground fish, northern cod in good packed filets, and even cod block was going up in price. It is up now to the best price level it has been for a long time in the market place. But they diverted their trawlers and left the northern cod. Here we are now at the end of the season, thousands of fish plant workers unemployed, doors closed, companies with overhead to pay, without any government dollars, keeping the company alive and surviving but they cannot get a pound of fish from that offshore quota left in the water to put in their plants to create jobs.

Gentlemen, something is wrong in Ottawa, something is wrong. That new minister, whoever he or she may be, has got to take the bull by the horns and deal with that matter. It is nothing short of a big Newfoundland joke to be having fish plants and we so desperate with a nineteen per cent unemployment rate in the Province - one of the highest across Canada - and we have the resources off our shores to create jobs and the resources are going to foreign countries. It is one big Newfoundland joke!

Now if they told us, "Look, you cannot go out to catch cod like you cannot catch herring because there are no stocks left. You cannot go out and catch it because the fish is not there." But the fish is there. It is being given away to foreign countries and here we are with all of our fish plants. I had seventy-two workers in Charleston plant and the doors closed the end of August this year. My friend Mr. Speaker, his constituents as well were left without enough stamps to qualify to get unemployment insurance this fall and winter.

Here we are with those factories, like a Russian a few days ago, and others catching our fish and providing jobs for foreigners. It is nothing short of a Newfoundland joke.

Then to add insult to injury, Dr. May and his advisors in Ottawa, I am not blaming Mr. Neilson because I do not think he was on top of the situation - I do not think he is fully aware of the situation - not being knowledgeable, and rightly so in fisheries matters, he just took it as an acting position, so Dr. Art May and his people made a decision to say no

to the independent fish companies of Newfoundland, "You are not getting any fish from the offshore this fall to go into your plants."

That kind of thing is almost criminal, it is almost criminal because those works programs coming forward by Mrs. MacDonald and her Department, in the next little while are going to be mostly designed to help fishermen but on top of that you have got all of these thousands of female plant workers and many of them will not be able to go to work on works programmes, building wharves and breakwaters, etc., etc. They will be left without income this Winter, when all they want is a bit of fish coming from the offshore to their plant so they can go in and perform their normal line of work, processing fish.

Mr. Speaker, I will carry on to one aspect further on the fishery and that is marketing. The Premier addressed the issue a couple of days in the House of Assembly and I know from his comments that he is indeed very concerned. I think all of us today have good reason to be concerned as individual Newfoundlanders because - I said it was criminal what was happening with policy decisions in Ottawa - but what is happening now in the USA is frightening. It is absolutely frightening.

They are going to win their case, no question about that. Why? Because this time President Reagan has the authority under the law, and I checked this out, to overturn the decision if they say, "We are going to put countervailing tariffs on, first of all, fresh fish products coming in from Canada." When Mr. Carter

was there and his administration he had the authority to overturn the decision and he did.

The Prime Minister of our country Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Reagan are good friends. That is very obvious from public receptions. But in this case President Reagan, unfortunately, will not have the power to help his good friend the Prime Minister of Canada and overturn the decision. They are going to win that argument. They are going to win the argument about too much dollars from the taxpayers going into the fishing industry, number one, and they are going to win the argument on the basis that the fish going into the USA is going in at less prices than what they themselves - the domestic catchers in the USA - can supply the marketplace.

MR. W. CARTER:

I wonder would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

It is enlightening the fact that the President has lost the power of veto. Would he mind explaining, I am not disbelieving him I know that he is speaking from fact, but what happened? I was always under the impression that the president could veto any bill that came into the House. Could he explain to the House what has happened to bring that about?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, without going into detail on the thing, to

answer the hon. gentleman's question is that the International Trade Commission of the USA was given some degree of autonomous power which it did not have before, under a new act or legislation. That is my understanding of it, and their recommendation, when accepted by Industry, Trade and Commerce Department of Government of the USA, cannot be overturned. It is almost like a quasi judicial administration.

So, because of that, and now with the comment from the Fisheries Council of Canada that they are unsuccessful in raising funds to be able to attack this countervail movement, you know it is a laugh. When I saw Ron Bulmer on television one night asking the fishermen and asking the fish plants to put up money to help him in his campaign, oh, I nearly squashed the television. The Fisheries Council of Canada having the nerve to talk about fighting a countervail? They are the guilty culprits and read Hansard. I said it over and over when I was Minister of Fisheries, you had companies going down in the USA, Nat Sea, Fishery Products, then it was, the Lake Group, and John Penney and Sons and T.J. Hardy, others and Nova Scotian companies, all of them in the same boat, what were they doing? I used to go back and forth to Boston and back and forth to New York on the marketing missions, they would be down there competing with each other.

Walter Carter and Jim Morgan had two companies, Walter was out competing with me, and me with him. Why? Because back home the banks were saying, "Look here, Morgan, your bills are not paid this month old man, you had better

get some fish sold." So I go down and dump my fish on the market at lower prices, get it sold fast, come back and pay the bills - distress selling.

That was one reason for what they were doing, but the other reason was greed, nothing short of greed. National Sea was greedy of getting all the markets from Fishery Products, Fishery Products vice versa, and the Lake Group came on the scene and John Penny and Sons and others, the larger ones. All out in a cut throat effort to market fish. So what happened? When the Americans saw this fish coming in at low prices, they had to say, 'What is going on? The Canadians bring in good quality fish? How can the Canadians bring in fish and market it in the USA less than what we can catch our fish and market our own product caught in the USA, caught in the New England States, for example? How can they do it?'. They were doing it. Obviously, the reason why Fishery Products could do it was because they were losing money. Why the Lakes could do it is because they were losing money. John Penney and Sons were losing money and on we go. The taxpayers were coming behind to fill the gap.

So that is the main reason today why the countervail movement is ongoing in the USA. It is not because of the subsidies. It is not because of the unemployment insurance to fishermen, etc. It is because of the activities of those companies over the years of, I call it, dumping fish into the US market, dumping it in at low prices and hurting the domestic fishery in the USA. Now the Americans have had enough. The Americans have said, you could not get your act together up there in

Canada. We have had enough of this nonsense. We are no longer going to tolerate you hurting our industry in the USA.

So now they have a big campaign on, supported by senators, congressmen and others and they are going to win. I have to say that is a sad comment on the industry in Canada, not the politicians, not the governments, but on the industry itself, to not be able to control and regulate themselves and to co-ordinate their marketing effort and consolidate their marketing effort over the years to a point where it would prevent what is now happening in the U.S.A.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you, it is going to be frightening what will happen. Fresh products first from Nova Scotia is going to be hurt. I heard Mr. Leefe, the Fisheries Minister from Nova Scotia, condemning Premier Peckford here because we put money into FPI and that was going to help the cause of the countervail movement.

The fact is that fresh fish is going to get hit first and that is a Nova Scotian product primarily, a bit from the Southwestern part of the Province, but the rest is coming from Nova Scotia. But the frightening thing behind that is they were successful on the salt fish - once they are successful on the fresh fish, bang-o, on the fresh frozen product.

We are supplying 82 per cent today of our ground fish caught by all the independent fish companies, by FPI and everybody else in the Province, 82 per cent is presently marketed in the USA in that very form, fresh frozen products.

If we lose 82 per cent of our

product because of a tariff coming on preventing the companies from marketing their fish in the USA, we all know what the consequences will be. Not only will fish plants be closed in the month October, they will be closed in the month of July because no matter how much fish we can catch if we have not got a market to sell the fish and there is no point in catching it. That is the reason why it is so frightening today.

I know the Premier and his government here are addressing the issue. His comments made in the House a couple of days ago clearly indicate how serious he is taking this whole issue because, indeed, it is a serious one.

We have not got alternate markets to go to. If we could say tomorrow morning to Mr. Reagan, 'You go ahead now. Let your congressmen and others approve this resolution. Let the trade commission approve it. Put your tariffs on. Go ahead, put your tariffs on, we do not care'. Why would we not care? We only care for one reason, if we had other markets to go to. But do we have other markets to go to, Mr. Speaker? No, we do not.

The European Economic Community signed an agreement with Canada to buy some fish. They signed it a number of years ago. This government here, under Premier Peckford, opposed that decision. They bought no more fish than would make a good meal of fish and brewis for a schooner's crew. Put it in that perspective with the overall value of fish products from Canada, in that perspective \$1.5 billion worth of fish produced in all of Canada, and what did they buy last year? A

few million dollars worth of fish.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. MORGAN:

May I have leave to clue up my remarks?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Grant leave, grant leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, if we could go to the USA and say, 'Put on your tariffs, go ahead and mount your tariff campaign all you want, we do not care,' but we cannot afford to do that as a country and as a Province in particular because we have not got alternate markets.

The EEC is not going to buy our fish, they have greater protective measures today and protectionist policies in place in the EEC than any other part of the world. The European Economic Community today and the member countries, and Spain and Portugal are going to join shortly, West Germany, in particular, and Great Britain is one of the worst culprits. We are suppose to be here in parliament as a result of the great parliament in Great Britain but Great Britain is not showing itself much of a friend towards our fishing industry in recent years, either in buying our fish products, or, in this case, banning our seal products. They have been culprits as far as I am concerned. The old saying is, 'With friends like that who need enemies?'

So we have not got a market in the EEC for our groundfish products. The USA is our only source of

market for the next five to ten years. Now we may have a market in the Far East.

I am very pleased with Prime Minister Mulroney's concept that the future trade for Canada is in Pacific rim countries. I think there is a big perspective development of trade for Canada in the Far East. The populations are over there, their economies are improving, Japan's economy has improved substantially over the last five to ten years. If China's economy improves to the point where they can buy products from Canada and we can develop markets for certain products, there is a big potential for the development of markets in the far East.

We have a market now for caplin. A couple of years ago the independents made a small fortune on caplin, and my friend for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) I am sure will agree, last year, again because of the industries themselves, the companies, not properly co-ordinating their activities with regards to marketing and not doing things properly, they got so badly burnt last Spring and last Summer from the caplin buyers, from Japan, it was not even funny. They dropped down their prices by \$200 or \$300 US per ton. They dropped down the quota they were going to buy from our plant owners and fishermen. They bought 18,000 metric tons the year before last and this past Summer they bought anywhere from 12,000 to 13,000 metric tons. They dropped the total amount they were buying and they also dropped their prices from \$1,450 a ton down to \$1,150 per ton, a \$300 per ton reduction. Why? Because we did not have our act together here as an industry. I have no hesitation

in saying that, and because the Japanese took unfair advantage and there was no government intervention to stop them from doing it.

The Government of Canada should have stepped in last Spring and should have held negotiations with the Japanese government sources to prevent the kind of thing that occurred by the Japanese buyers in Newfoundland last Summer. So, if the Japanese buyers, if we have lost our market there to a point, if we cannot develop a market in China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, or any of these places for our fish species, if we cannot get our products into the EEC because of the currency exchange values and their protectionist policies in the EEC, and if, I should not say, 'if', because I might sound awfully pessimistic, I should say, and when the USA comes on with their countervail tariffs within a year from now, gentlemen we are going to have to have more than one debate in this House of Assembly and put our heads together as leaders of the people, elected by the people, on both sides of the House, to try to find solutions to do one thing, to keep rural Newfoundland alive, to keep the outports alive!

Without the inshore fishery in those small outport areas you have not got an outport area. They will have to all resettle.

I certainly hope that there are not people today in Ottawa - but I am not convinced there are not - who are the same people who worked on the old centralization, resettlement programme and passed it on to Mr. Smallwood's government here and told Mr. Smallwood's government, 'You put it in place and we will pay for

it'. I can name a few but I will not today because it is unfair to them because of being in the House and not outside the House. I can name a few of the same bureaucrats who came forward with policies and programmes for this little old rock down here. 'Oh they have too many small communities along the coastline. You have to do something to deal with these small communities. A scattered population never get the amenities of life that we get up here in Central Canada. That is a dream'. So what do you do? You resettle them.

Along came the resettlement programme, the centralization programme. This government here and the previous government, under Mr. Moores, took a firm stand and I think that they - practically every member of the House of Assembly on the government side would agree - that resettlement and centralization did not work, it was a bad programme. It was not conceived with Mr. Smallwood. It was conceived by the bureaucrats in Ottawa.

MR. TULK:

It is not the government side, it is the Opposition side (inaudible).

MR. MORGAN:

The Opposition side. I am sorry, the Opposition side. Today, Mr. Speaker, in Ottawa we have the same bureaucrats trying to find a way to make sure they can get the resettlement or centralization programme working down in rural Canada, down in the coastline of Newfoundland in particular, to get that programme to work in an indirect way.

The indirect way, Mr. Speaker, - I have no hesitation in saying it - is to see the eventual demise of

the inshore fishery. If we, as politicians, do nothing else over the next six or seven months but prevent those bureaucrats from getting their way in Ottawa and if we can influence the policy-makers, the politicians, if we can do that, we will then ensure that indeed all of us who represent rural districts can go back in a number of years either as politicians or otherwise and still see a vibrant rural Newfoundland.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak in this particular debate but it was the contribution made by my good friend from Bonavista South, a man who knows the fishery intimately and who has made a fair contribution to its development, his words drew me to my feet today. I just want to respond to a particular point that he was making.

My good friend from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), a former and eminent Minister of Fisheries who made a marvellous contribution in that portfolio and he, like the gentleman from Bonavista South, would have continued to make their contributions as would have the former member for the old district of Hermitage, Mr. Roy Cheeseman. All three of these men, in their turn, would have continued to make their contributions to fisheries development had not something intervened, something that Mr. Cheeseman put his finger on publicly in the Fall of 1973. I remember the date well because it was during the course of the Hermitage by-election through

which I first came into this Chamber. Mr. Cheeseman told the public why it was that he had resigned from Cabinet. It was the same kind of reason that explains the absence from Cabinet of the gentleman from Bonavista South and the leaving of Cabinet by the gentleman from Twillingate.

The reason Mr. Cheeseman gave at that time, 1973, still stands today and still stands as an indictment to this government. The indictment was made about twelve months after he was elected. He was elected in March of 1972 and he resigned in March of 1973. The reason he gave that Fall for resigning is that he said publicly that he could not find anybody at the Cabinet table who was concerned about matters outside of the overpass.

The gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) just articulated that concern too when he talks about rural Newfoundland. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to indentify with his remarks in terms of his concern for rural Newfoundland and his concern for the fishery. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to lament his absence from Cabinet. I would like to lament the fact that Cabinet no longer has that particular voice to keep it on track when they are so immersed in carving up Pippy Park, Mr. Speaker, so immersed in spreading and sharing the spoils of metropolitan St. John's. Who there, Mr. Speaker, is speaking for the other side of the overpass?

The gentleman for Bonavista South was, the gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) was, and Mr. Cheeseman was. But who now, Mr. Speaker? But who, Mr. Speaker, can disentangle himself from the jollies they get from sharing up

the spoils? Who there speaks for rural Newfoundland? I know there are some members who ostensibly represent seats in rural Newfoundland. But are they bringing-

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, do we have to listen to this? We have had a scandalous suggestion that the members on this side of the House are divvying up the spoils. You should withdraw that. That is a disgusting insinuation.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That ruling is a good ruling.

The other point I wanted to make in response to the gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) is that, I just wanted to correct him on a matter of, well not so much as correct as to add to his observation about the bureaucrats in Ottawa.

I can tell him from some brief experience there over the last five or six years that he is right about the bureaucrats. They are like the Amazon, they are like the Nile, they are like the Exploits River, they go on forever. He is right. The architects of some of our past disasters are now working on our future disasters. There is

no question about that. Those bureaucrats go on forever. So I do not disagree with him.

But I would add to what he said in respect to his comments about resettlement that if he is looking for one of the chief villains of the piece, he does not have to look to Ottawa, I am sure there was some complicity there. He should look closer to home. He makes the point and he makes it well that those people who might have given the former Premier, Mr. Smallwood, some bum advice from the vantage point of Ottawa on resettlement are now monkeying around with restructuring of the fishery and soon they will be restructuring the future of rural Newfoundland and trying to move us all to Toronto somewhere. He is right.

He should also recognize that, in addition, one of the chief villains of the piece is right here under our nose. The same person who is responsible for the harassment of small business people in Bonavista North who go out and spend \$150 to advertise their business. Then they get the sign torn down because some person had the idea we should become a little New York. Well I respect that. But I do not respect and I do not subscribe to the way they are going about it.

Businesses in rural Newfoundland are being savaged by an unrealistic regulation about advertising their small businesses. The person who was the architect of that mad scheme, I say to the gentleman for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), who had a recent issue involving this, the person who engineered that man's scheme about highway signage also was one of the chief villains

in the piece having to do with resettlement.

The person, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the Ottawa bureaucrats is still in the department, still gives advice to this particular government. Of course, the gentleman we are talking about, I respect him as an individual, I think some of his ideas about highway signage and resettlement are abhorrent.

MR. J. CARTER:
Who is he?

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Allston. Mr. Allston, of course.

MR. J. CARTER:
Now you are criticizing someone who is not in the House.

MR. SIMMONS:
Oh, I am not. Mr. Speaker, one of my roles in this House is to ensure that the actions of the bureaucracy are held up for proper and responsible scrutiny by this House. I make no apologies, Mr. Speaker, for drawing attention to the public actions of an individual who works in the employ of this Province. Surely that is part of my responsibility here. The part-time member for Mount Scio would not recognize that. But the fact that he does not recognize the reality does not make it not so.

MR. CALLAN:
He is from St. John's North.

MR. SIMMONS:
Wherever he is from - St. John's North. The member from Mount Scio Farms is what I meant to say, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

That is right. That is better.

MR. SIMMONS:

You see, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) makes an urgent plea. I support his plea. I hope his plea is heard by those in Cabinet who are, these days, understandably preoccupied with covering their tracks and generally confusing and befuddling the issue.

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Greening):

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I think it is a misuse of the privileges of this House that a member can get up and say almost libelous things about a person who is not in this House. Now, he can get away with it. He can say it inside the precincts of this House without any action being taken whatsoever, without any risk to his personal belongings. But if he were to make the same statements or similar statements outside this House, he might find himself in court, not an unfamiliar experience to the hon. gentleman, I might add.

But I would say that he should not name names of people outside this House, especially the civil servant, unless he is prepared to take the consequences.

MR. SIMMONS:

For clarification, the reference to Mr. Allston, is that the reference you mean?

MR. J. CARTER:

Yes.

MR. SIMMONS:

I just wanted to be sure he was referring to Mr. Allston. I give an undertaking to the Speaker that as soon as I finish saying what I have to say here, I will go outside the Bar of the House and I will say the same thing.

MR. J. CARTER:

Good! Good! Let us see what happens.

MR. SIMMONS:

I will give that undertaking, because you see, Mr. Speaker, it ought to be understood by the gentleman for St. John's North exactly what I am saying. I am not making any allegations, I am stating a publicly known fact. The publicly known fact is that the gentleman I mentioned in response to an invitation from the gentleman for St. John's North, whose name I put on the record in response to his invitation, has been known to be associated with the highway signage thing, and that is an abhorrent thing - that is the word I use, abhorrent - and I will say that anywhere at all, here or outside the House, and, secondly, he was involved in the resettlement programme. Now, if it is libelous, Mr. Speaker, to make statements of fact, facts which are also in the public record, yes, I guess I am libelous. I guess I am.

Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of abusing privilege. The gentleman for St. John's North knows what he is doing and knows full-well he is good at doing it, he is being his usual obstructionist. I understand that, Mr. Speaker. I like to see a man do what he does well. That gentleman is a good obstructionist self, there is no question about that, but I have removed the basis of his objection. He asked would

I do it outside the House and I said to him, 'Yes, I will do it outside the House.' Now, will that appease him? Will that shut him up for a moment so I can get on with the substance of what I want to say, or will he find some other way to obstruct the House for a few minutes? Now, his bluff has been called. The bluff of the member for Mount Scio Farms has been called.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I, with great pride, identify myself with the urgent plea made by the gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) to the Cabinet to look out for the precarious situation in which the fishery finds itself, and the substantive implications it has for rural Newfoundland and its future. It is an urgent plea and it is a plea that commands the support of every member of this House, I would hope.

In the process I note for the record that I share his suspicion, his caution about the overpowering influence of the bureaucracy at times in crafting particular policies which come back to haunt us. Although the bureaucrats craft them, they tend to come back to haunt politicians. And I share that caution, a caution that relates not only to bureaucrats in Ottawa but also to certain bureaucrats here. And I have named one particular bureaucrat, not by way of being unkind to him. He may be very proud of what he has done about highway signage and about resettlement, I do not know. I would struggle hard and

long to see where there is anything in those two matters to be very proud about. But that is for him to live with and not me. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Is it the pleasure of the House that the Bill be now read a second time?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order. We would have no objection if the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) wishes to reply to some of these very serious matters that have been raised by members opposite. If the government wishes to recess the House or adjourn this debate and move on to the other bill until the minister came back and had an opportunity to close the debate. We do not want to take advantage of the disorganized state of government members over there.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of order, when the Bill was introduced the Minister of Fisheries gave a very detailed explanation of the bill. He is unfortunately out of town today on government business related to his department. The other members from this side of the House,

especially those very knowledgeable in terms of the fishery, have spoken extensively in the debate.

I do not think there were any points of substance left without answer. There were many opinions expressed, some supported by some element of fact and some totally unsupported, in regard to the fishery, but I do not think there were any substantive matters left that government need respond to so we call for the question.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fisheries Loan Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 21)

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Motion one, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

There is something very strange happening here now. We were given an agenda by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) showing a list of bills that would be coming up.

The first bill was the Loan Board bill we just dealt with, the second bill that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) indicated to the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) was the Fisheries Advisory Board Bill, and, subsequently, we were informed that Supplementary Supply would follow. But now we have the minister changing the agenda. Is

this a deliberate attempt to mislead, to confuse, an attempt to avoid giving us time to prepare properly? What is going on over there?

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) remarked that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) was not in the House to close the debate on a previous bill and I gave an explanation as to why that was not necessary.

Now the hon. the Leader of the Opposition wishes to go on to another fishery bill which I think should be introduced by the hon. the Minister of Fisheries. As I already explained the hon. Minister of Fisheries is unexpectedly - it could not be prevented - out of town on government business so he is just not here to do it. Perhaps I was a little remiss in sending a note over that we were going to put that one aside and go on to the next one that was indicated, i.e., the Supplementary Supply Bill and, if so, I do apologize to the Opposition on that fact. But there is nothing devious about this. Unfortunately, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) is not here to introduce his next bill. He will do it when he comes back at the earliest possible opportunity. I am just calling the next item in the lists that we had already given the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Just briefly in response. We accept the minister's explanation, but I would ask the minister to convey to the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) that we are going to have difficulty because they are only informing us on the order of business a day ahead of time now, basically, and refuse to give us any longer notice. So we are going to have difficulty if that day's notice, Mr. Speaker, is subject to the presence or absence of a particular minister. If it is on the agenda and if a minister knows, as presumably he did yesterday, that he would not be here today, we should be informed. We would ask the minister, with respect, if he would bring this back to the Government House Leader.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I have received a message from His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor:

"I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending 31st day of March, 1985 by way of Supplementary Supply and in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution Act, 1867, I recommend these

estimates to the House of Assembly.

(Sgd) W. Anthony Paddon,
Lieutenant-Governor.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I move that the message, together with the amounts involved be referred to the Committee of Supply.

On motion, the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of Supply

On motion, resolution carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
Shall the resolution carry?

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman, in Committee we are debating the resolution. I will not read the resolution again since Mr. Speaker read it out a little while ago. I will just recall to the Committee members' minds the sum is \$56,361,600. Now, that is the aggregate of the extra expenditures required to meet the expenditures in last year's budget, that is, the expenditures related to the year 1984 - 1985, and that sum is in addition to the amount that the House had assented to when the budget was introduced in the earlier part of the last fiscal year.

I might add that aggregate amount makes up the total of the Special Warrants which were presented to this House. I will just recall to peoples minds what those warrants were: there was a warrant for \$20,000 in regard to the Legislature. This referred to extra salary requirements by the Auditor General. There was a warrant in the amount of \$211,000 for Executive Council and that was required to meet the expenses of offshore negotiations and also to meet certain expenses related to the Social Policy Committee of Cabinet.

The members, I am sure, will remember that the late lamented hon. Wallace House occupied the position of Chairman of the Social Policy Committee of Cabinet and when he took on that post it was required that certain funds be made available for that purpose.

The total amount for Finance was \$190,000 current and approximately \$8,500,000 capital, for a total warrant for Finance of \$8,696,000. It was made up of a number of items. Approximately \$3,800,000 was required for equity injection into Fishery Products International, \$1,500,000 for equity financing of St. Lawrence Fluorspar Limited, approximately \$500,000 to meet certain loan guarantee obligations which were called, and these loan obligations were, by and large, in response to support we had given to certain fishing companies, Belle Isle Sea Foods Limited and Placentia Bay Sea Foods Limited, but also in support of Newfoundland and Labrador Credit Union. Another amount under Finance was approximately \$150,000 which related to the new electronic data processing and accounting system which was put in. In other words,

the computerization of government accounts. There was also \$41,000 for additional funding for the expanded messenger and mail service in the Department of Finance. And, finally, there was just over \$2,500,000 for funding to enable Fishery Products International to undertake essential trawler ice strengthening repairs to some of their trawlers.

The next warrant was for the Department of Development amounting to \$3,400,000. Some \$2,500,000 of that was to provide capital funding for the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation in the absence of an agreement with the federal government. As the hon. members will recall, the federal government has decided not to continue participation in that Development Corporation and we were left with the alternative of either having the things closed down or to take on a certain amount of funding ourselves. We elected to do the latter, and I think that was a wise decision. Another part of the Development warrant, \$90,000, was to meet the Province's obligations under the Federal-Provincial Agreement on Ocean Industries Development.

The next set of warrants relate to the Mines and Energy Department, \$5,800,000. There was \$2,600,000 resulting from an arbitration award that was required of us for the expropriation of the Advocate Mines Limited, \$3,200,000 was additional funding required for the Electric Power Control Act and for the Power Distribution Districts because of increased costs of generating power for the requirements of the people in the Province necessitated by the low rain fall and, therefore, the need

to go to more thermally-generated power. The next one is Forest, Resources and Lands, approximately \$750,000. That was mainly for the Divestiture Program put in place for Bowater, but also there was the cost for the Burlington forest fire.

Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, \$3.1 million approximately, made up of a number of items, including equity capital for Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation. There was funding required for the Federal/Provincial Rural Development Agreement. There was \$1.7 million required for the Rural Development Subsidiary Agreement No. 2. And, finally, there was \$750,000 required to meet the operating deficit at Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation. Transportation \$12.8, million, made up of \$5.6 million, approximately, for high priority road improvement and construction projects; \$1.6 million to acquire land for the relocation of Portugal Cove Road out here. This was consequent upon the development of the new Fisheries College and so on, and the need to make arrangements for the Outer Ring Road the intersection to be looked into, to be arranged. And, finally, \$5.6 million which is totally recoverable from the Government of Canada in regard to the airstrip construction programme in Labrador. There was \$4.3 million for Education, \$3.4 million of which was made up of \$1.9 for capital expenditures on furnishing equipment in regard to vocational training; \$674,600 capital expenditure for furnishing equipment at the College of Fisheries, and \$830,500 for a similar expenditure in regard to the College of Trades and

Technology. Those amounts I mentioned are totally recoverable from the Government of Canada under the Skills Growth Fund Programme. In addition to that there was approximately \$400,000 required by Memorial University to purchase the Blackhall School, and there was an additional \$500,000 required to meet teachers' salaries for the balance of that fiscal year. Social Services, \$10 million approximately, \$4 million of which was to provide additional assistance to social assistance recipients. There was \$50,000 for the drought relief grant to North Africa, and, finally an additional \$6 million for additional funding of the community development programme. Labour and Manpower required a Special Warrant for \$340,000 related to additional monies for the Labrador West Mobility Assistance Programme. And, finally, Municipal Affairs required one for \$6,783,300, 70 per cent of which was recoverable from the Government of Canada and that covered sleet storm damage that occurred on the Avalon Peninsula in the previous calendar year. Flood damage occurred at Bishop Falls in the year prior to that, and flood damage at Robinson's River, Harry's River and Terra Nova River in 1984 also.

So these were the Special Warrants that the House was already aware of because they are all tabled in the House pursuant to certain sections of the Financial Administration Act and it is now required that a bill be brought in to wrap all those special warrants into one resolution and a bill subsequent to the resolution so that the House can further ratify and agree to those expenditures. That would then close out the budget process for 1984-85.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Before getting into some questions, Mr. Speaker, could the minister just explain why we are doing this now and why it was not done before the end of the last session? Has government been spending money illegally because this was not dealt with earlier by government? It seems to be very strange that we have Supplementary Supply for the financial year ending 31 March 1985 being dealt with in the Fall of 1985 when we had a session that just ended that went into July, I think. Would the minister briefly explain why this has not been dealt with before? Has his department and has the minister operated according to the legislation, and properly, in delaying the matter until now?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, it has only been in recent years that we have had a Fall session. My memory serves me that previously often the Supplementary Supply Bill did not go in until the next calendar year. In other words, the House would sit and complete its business, say, by June of one year and it would not sit again until February of the following calendar year, and at that time the Supplementary Supply Bill for the previous fiscal year would be brought in. So it would be a very long delay. In this case, it is only whatever it is, the end of March is the end of the fiscal

year. The date today is October 25.

MR. CALLAN:

Tomorrow is the 26th.

DR. COLLINS:

The hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) does keep me straight. He said, 'Tomorrow is the 26th.' So he agrees with my conclusion that today is the 25th. So in actual fact we are only a few months in getting Supplementary Supply in on this occasion. It just takes a certain amount of administrative time to make sure that all of the amounts are in and to compile and put them into one act, the aggregate of the Special Warrants. To reassure the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) the Financial Administration Act, I think it is Section 28, Subsections (2) and (3) do permit and they do allow, and this has been the practice for years, for government to make expenditures that were not anticipated at the time of the budget, provided those expenditures are done through Special Warrant and the Special Warrant is tabled in the House within a certain period of time, and then subsequently a Supplementary Supply Bill is brought in to complete the whole process. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that we have gone through that process that is clearly laid out in legislation, at the earliest possible moment.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, just to spend a few

moments again on this obtaining of Special Warrants and the propriety of this, as an example, we had a budget that was brought down this past Spring. Nowhere in that could I find any reference to extensive renovations to the Premier's Office, as an example. Would this be something that would be covered? Is this the type of thing that would be covered by a Special Warrant? Is it proper to do this sort of thing by Special Warrant when it must have been intended at the time the budget was brought down that this would happen, because the renovations started, I think it was the day the House closed or the day after the House closed, Mr. Chairman. So it had to be in the contemplation of the Premier and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and Cabinet that this work would be done.

I wonder if the minister would tell us is this an example of the type of thing that is done by Special Warrants? Would the minister tell us just how much has been involved? The information I have received is that it is starting to push something like \$1 million. Is that correct for the renovations that are being done on the eighth floor?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I think there are two parts to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Barry) question there, or his comment there, one as to the process and, secondly, to the amount that might be involved in a particular expenditure.

MR. BARRY:

Yes.

DR. COLLINS:

In terms of the process, the Department of Public Works will have as part of its vote an amount set aside for renovations and repairs and rebuilding, that type of thing. Now if some of that is assigned for specific purposes, I believe there is a certain amount that is left on a discretionary basis because who knows what repairs will be needed on an anticipated basis over a twelve month period? It will depend on any number of things. So I think that there is an amount in the Department of Public Works and Services whereby the department can carry out that work without the need of going back for authority, which could only be acquired through a Special Warrant, and therefore there would be a tremendous amount of delay. So if the block fund for that purpose reaches on to renovation or repair or whatever, there is no need to go to a Special Warrant. On the other hand, if there is not enough in that block fund to carry out certain things, the only way that the Department could get the funding would be to transfer funds from some other vote that is permitted by Treasury Board provided there are unexpended funds available, and that can be done, or, if that is not available, then the only recourse would be to go for a Special Warrant? That is the process. Now, in regard to the specific matter the hon. member brought up in regard to the Premier's office, I cannot answer that. Firstly, it has nothing to do with what we are doing here today. We are doing the Supplementary Supply Bill for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985 and there is no such expenditure in regard to the Premier's Office in the books for that fiscal year and, secondly, I

am not aware of what cost it might be. I do not know if anybody else is aware, perhaps the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) is or is not, I do not know. But certainly it has not been to my knowledge compiled what the cost is, whether it is \$10.00 or whether it is \$1,000,000 or whether it is \$10,000,000. As far as I know that has not been compiled, it has not been put forward in any way, to my knowledge, and of course the House would know this, requiring a Special Warrant. If it were put forward in that way, the House would know about it because I would have to table the Special Warrant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Greening)

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, it is a nice smooth delivery but it is not good enough. Before we, on this side of the House, are prepared to vote for an additional approval of \$56,361,600 I think we are entitled to know if there are matters that have arisen since the House rose this Summer. We are entitled to know whether payments are being made, expenditures are being made that were not set out in the budget. If there is a slush fund there in Public Works, apparently this is what the minister is indicating, that does not satisfy it either. The minister, I think, has an obligation to inform this House when there are extraordinary expenditures, and I think we would all have to admit, Mr. Chairman, that the renovations that are now being carried on - I guess they are just about finished now, if not finished - where somewhat of an extraordinary nature when you consider the position of

government with respect to Public Service employees contracts and insisting upon restraint; when you look at the numbers of hospital beds, Mr. Chairman, that have been closed or not opened, like in Port aux Basques, and I am sure the member for Lapoile (Mr. Mitchell) would be interested in the fact that there are large numbers of beds in the hospital out in Port aux Basques that still have not been brought into operation; when you look at the need for nursing home beds; when you look at the needs of people on social assistance, Mr. Chairman; when you look at the needs for additional expenditure, even though there is considerable expenditure on Community Development Programs, and we will be having a few questions on that; when you look on the need for additional money to create jobs with this devastating level of unemployment in this Province, Mr. Chairman, and everywhere you look in this Province, whether it be with respect to day care, with respect to education and the restraints on Memorial University and vocational and trades schools, in every sector of our economy government has been saying, "There must be restraints, there must be cut-backs." But, Mr. Chairman, there is no restraint applied when it comes to renovating the eighth floor of the Confederation Building. Now would the minister be so kind as to indicate, in the expenditures that were made, that we are being asked to approve now, did this principle of restraint apply in all cases or are there certain exceptional circumstances, such as the Premier's Office, the eighth floor of Confederation Building, to which restraint is not expected to apply? Would the minister give us some indication - maybe he might consult with his

colleague, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) - and get the answer to that question of how much is it costing? Is it costing the \$1 million that has been indicated, or close to \$1 million, to renovate the eighth floor, Mr. Chairman?

MR. YOUNG:

All done by public tender.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, okay, I am delighted to hear it is all being done by public tender. I am very pleased and delighted to hear that since that should be the case. But could we have an indication? I think in all fairness to the House, this is a large expenditure and before we start giving approval, Mr. Chairman, for these Special Awards we want to know how is government spending its money. Does it have a proper process in place? Is it observing restraint? And would the minister consult with the Minister of Public Works to find out just how much was expended on the renovations to the Premier's Office on the eighth floor?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

I do not know if anyone else wants to comment.

MR. BARRY:

There will be.

DR. COLLINS:

The bill before us does not apply in any regard whatsoever to expenditures in this current fiscal year, that is, since the beginning of April 1985. It refers to the fiscal year prior to that time. So that any expenditures that occurred for the Premier's Office, or any other

expenditures that might not have been anticipated in the Budget, has nothing to do with this bill. If there are Special Warrants issued in regard to unanticipated expenditures that will occur in the present fiscal year, that will come out in the Supplementary Supply Bill that is likely to be brought down something like a year from now, anyway sometime after the end of the present fiscal year. So I just want to make that clear.

Now I think what the Leader of the Opposition is saying is, "Look, I want to make a request for information that has nothing to do with this bill." I do not have too much problem with that because the tradition in this House is if you bring in a financial bill you pretty well open the gates to almost any question. So I mean one cannot quarrel with that. Strictly speaking the Leader of the Opposition is not being quite proper, he is asking something that has nothing to do with the bill itself up for consideration but, as I say, we do allow that irrelevancy, if you want to call it that, or at least that flexibility. So I have no problem in discussing that matter with him. The only thing I will say is that I have absolutely no idea what precise figures are involved in the renovation of the Premier's Office, whether someone else has them, I am not aware. It is not for me to direct them to get them, that is up for them to decide whether they want to go into that exercise. I would like to make this point, though, that I have been elected now since 1975, I have been in the administration since 1979, I have some knowledge of the Premier's Office from the period 1975 to 1979, I have a fair bit of knowledge of the Premier's

Office in 1979 to the present date 1985, so let us go back to 1975, which is ten years ago. To my knowledge there has been minimal renovation and refurbishing carried out in the Premier's Office up until this present period when it was carried out. And I think the Premier's Office was a tatty affair before this present renovation was engaged upon. As a matter of fact, it was a bit embarrassing to have VIPs, let us use that phrase, come to visit the Premier and they had to sit in a public corridor, which VIPs who visit me in my office do not have to sit in. VIPs who visit me sit in a comfortable chair in a private space, not sumptuous, luxurious but adequate and private and proper for such people visiting me. The Premier had people visiting him - premiers of other provinces, federal ministers, ambassadors from foreign countries, this type of person - who had to sit in a public corridor where, in actual fact, when they sat if you wanted to pass by you had to climb over their feet. I mean, I am not exaggerating. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) knows what I am talking about because he has been in the Premier's Offices at least as often as I have been. The Premier's suite was a totally inadequate, rather tatty, and unrefurbished affair up until the present Premier, very sensibly and out of a sense of decency to the people he deals with said, "I am not going to subject these people to this."

MR. YOUNG:
(Inaudible).

DR. COLLINS:
In conjunction with the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

In conjunction with renovating this building.

DR. COLLINS:

And related, of course, to the renovation of this building, as my hon. colleague points out. I would remind members of the Committee that the members of the Opposition, quite rightly, have said, "Look, we were given accommodation here ten, twelve, eight numbers of years ago which probably was reasonable adequate for the time, but now it is totally inadequate. We, members of the Opposition, or private members on the government side, are still living in accommodation which has outlived its usefulness. It is not adequate, it is deteriorated, structurally it is not good enough, and obviously government had to respond to that.

Now the same situation applies to the executive offices, not only the Premier's Office but certain ministerial offices. They are scattered around town. They have outlived their performance capability and something had to be done about it, hence we built a new building, hence we bring in new accommodations on the drawing board for members of the Opposition, private members on this side and hence we have to upgrade the disgraceful surroundings and environment in which the hon. member had to work which was not doing the Province any good image-wise and was a very inefficient type of operation. That is why the whole exercise was undertaken.

In terms of the cost of that, I will have to leave it up to my hon. colleague, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) in his

own good time and I am sure he will do this very expeditiously, to inform the House in whatever way it comes out, and it may come out in a Ministerial Statement, it may come out in terms of a Special Warrant, and it may come out in some other way where his department will require additional funds, if that is the case, if there is not already funds voted in some block vote.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, the minister is nice and smooth in his delivery but you have to listen carefully, even though his voice is going a little bit. We cannot blame it on that. It is a nice stroking melodious tone but we still need a little substance. We still have to ask what is he really saying? I would like to ask the minister would he give an undertaking? We can either do this Supplementary Supply in an easy fashion or in a more difficult fashion, would he give an undertaking, it is not just up to the Minister of Public Works, it is up to Cabinet to decide what information is going to be supplied to the House and it is up to the minister - he controls the cheque book - will he undertake to get the information on the renovations? We will pass this Supplementary Supply a lot more efficiently if you will give that undertaking.

Secondly, I would like to ask what is being done as far as the media is concerned? What is being done as far as that media room on the eleventh floor, which is now being

taken over for the use of Cabinet? Is it intended that that media room be permanently taken over by Cabinet and that the media be displaced? The little room on the tenth of the half floor, by the way, is not adequate for the media, they are closed in there, there are no windows, there is no ventilation, it is very, very, not only unpleasant, I would submit it is unhealthy to ask people to work in that type of situation. Will the minister indicate what is contemplated there?

And will the minister indicate, and this has to do with the prior year's spending, what is the estimated cost, if they are going to keep it as a Cabinet Room, that will be lost to this Province as a result of putting in all of this high technology for media communication to tie into satellites and back to the studio and so forth. Is all of that now a waste of money? Was that money wasted? Is it intended to move the media from that area?

Also, while I am at it, Mr. Chairman, how much money did the Province have in the Canadian Commercial Bank? Did we have any deposited in the Canadian Commercial Bank and what is the status of that money? Why was the money deposited in the Canadian Commercial Bank, if we did have any? Were there any brokers fees earned in the process of having that money deposited in the Canadian Commercial Bank? Would the minister just give an indication of his position on these questions?

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Greening)
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) would be only too glad to give the hon. Leader of the Opposition some technical details or construction details in regard to the renovations on the eleventh floor and so on, so I will leave that to him.

In regard to the Canadian Commercial Bank, I can quite readily get exact figures, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition requires it. I can approximate it now and if that is not satisfactory, I will certainly be glad to get the exact figures.

We did have short-term money invested in the bank and also in the Northlands Bank. It was a relatively small proportion. It was of the order of a few per cents of our total short-term investments. They are done by very experienced members in the Department of Finance. There is really little, if any, brokers commissions or fees involved in that sort of thing because it goes on all the time, almost at the end of a phone. Quite often the short-term investments can be for as short as hours even, certainly they can be as short as just over weekends and for a short number of days.

The total amount was very small, I think in the aggregate, something in the order of a couple of million dollars. Now I might remind the hon. members that that is not money lost, that is money that we will recover. The federal government has indicated that unsecured depositors will be fully reimbursed, so we will be reimbursed beyond the amount we would get back from the banking

insurance arrangements, which is a very small amount actually. So we will get back the other amount because of commitment to the federal government. If you want to look at it this way, what we will lose is the amount we would have gained if this unfortunate collapse of those two banks had not occurred. In other words, that amount of money would be earning us something so what we have had to forego certain monies that we would have earned if this had not happened. We will not lose the amount we put in there. The total amount we will get back but it is the interest that we would have earned that we will lose and the total lost there is something in the order of several hundred thousand dollars. Again, I can get precise figures.

It is unfortunate that we have to forego those amounts of earnings but it is a relatively small amount of the total amount of our interest earnings over a year. It is something that nobody, obviously, could have foreseen. The amount of the short-term investment we had in those banks was quite commensurate with the size of those banks. It was not that we were loaded up with out short-term investments in those banks. As a matter of fact, we were underrepresented in many respects in those banks. We could have, without anybody questioning our financial management I believe, have had much more money in those banks but we just did not happen to do so and so there were some losses of anticipated earnings. No actual losses and the amount of loss of anticipated earnings were quite small in the context.

MR. YOUNG:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Just for the information of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) we all know that there are major changes planned for this building and it is in line with the other department's moving out. Also, we need swing space when we are renovating, so it was decided this year that the eighth floor would be renovated because of that fact.

I must say publicly. I want to thank the Speaker for giving up his office for the use of the Premier and also for the patience of the Premier and his staff because most of the Summer they worked here in the House of Assembly.

MR. BARRY:

Almost as patient as the Opposition.

MR. YOUNG:

Yes, as for the Opposition, last year you had difficulty over there through no fault of my own, through elements of the weather, but you are quite comfortable now. I agreed with him the other day. He wanted to hang some pictures on the walls and so forth up there. But, I must say, Mr. Chairman, the main thing is going on this year with renovations to this building.

This year planning is being done, it is in the budget, so we have to try and connect up the tunnel there so all that floor will be renovated this year. Also the contract will be let for the House of Assembly on the North wing, I think it is, so that will occupy the second and third floors,

behind the elevators. When it comes to the question of where the Cabinet will be, it has not been finally decided yet. Proposals will be put up and the Cabinet will make the decision. I do not know if they are going to stay on the eleventh floor or there is a possibility those two floors here will be used for the Cabinet, we do not know. The decision of leaving the Cabinet where it is has not been finalized yet. Like I said we want swing space. We are going to move some departments over in the new annex and we will be still maintaining some here.

It has been a decision of government that we will give top priority to the new House of Assembly. The plans are being done now, we will shortly chose an architect and construction will start mid Summer on the new House of Assembly.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
I would like to thank the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) for that information, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to hear the House of Assembly publicly acknowledge a bit of a change in approach by the minister and thank him for giving us a roof. We now have a roof and the water is no longer pouring in.

I want to thank the minister for having the offices plastered and painted and for having a bit of paint put on the hallway to brighten it up a little bit. I think there are a couple of other minor requests that the minister

is giving his attention to. We thank the minister, not on behalf of ourselves as much as on behalf of our constituents and the members of the general public who have to come into our offices, as they have to other offices in the building, who deserve to be safe in life and limb and not have light fixtures fall on their heads because they fill with water or not be subjected to electrical short circuits because the electrical system is filled up, or not to have the fire alarms taped up on that floor, as they have been. I do not know if the tape has been removed yet but the fire alarms were taped up there for a period because of the electrical short circuit. So I want to thank the minister, for after some time, attending to those matters.

I wonder if the minister would give us an indication, just a general figure if he can, of the cost of renovations to the eight floor? As the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has pointed out, we are into expenditure. I will be prepared to debate, and we will have to debate whether or not it relates to this bill. I think the Minister of Finance is taking a very rigid and narrow interpretation of Supplementary Supply.

Whenever a Minister of Finance comes to the House looking for approval for additional expenditures, for approval for Special Warrants, we are intitled and, in fact, it is our duty as members of the Opposition to establish the present financial position of the Province, to establish where we stand at the point in time that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) comes into the House? Naturally we are not going to debate the entire budget,

which we have had an opportunity to debate in the past session. But, Mr. Chairman, it was passing strange that we were not made aware of the fact that the Premier's Office would be renovated and that the media would be displaced from the eleventh floor. Nor were we aware, because it had not happened, that the collapse of the Canadian Commercial Bank would put at risk several millions of dollars invested by the Department of Finance and, in fact, we would lose several hundred thousand dollars in any event. We will have to wait and see whether it comes through. If the Government of Canada goes through with its undertaking to repay all depositors, not just the ones under \$60,000, but the ones over \$60,000, if the Government of Canada does that, then the Province will have been saved from a bad investment.

The minister is really going to have to indicate to us why, in heaven's name, are public funds invested in a small bank out West? I mean, what is going on here? What influenced the minister and his department to invest in a small bank out West the several millions of dollars - the minister says 'a couple of million, it was not too much, it is only a couple of million. What is a couple of million?' - what possessed the minister to have this money invested in the Canadian Commercial Bank?

MR. CALLAN:

And the Northland Bank.

MR. BARRY:

So those are three questions, one to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and two to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young).

Would he give us the approximate cost to renovating the Premier's Office on the eighth floor of this building, and the eighth floor generally? And would he tell us whether there is going to be some adequate arrangement made for the press when they are covering the House of Assembly and, otherwise, for them to operate in the Confederation Building? Right now it is totally inadequate and it is very difficult for them to do the job that they have to do in terms of reporting what comes up in the House.

MR. TULK:

I suppose they will send them all down to Buckingham Porch on the eighth floor.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) for his remarks concerning the building. But I would like to ask a question of the hon. the hon. Leader of the Opposition. If someone had died down there when it was in the mess, would I be in conflict of interest, I wonder?

MR. BARRY:

No, but you might have been libel.

MR. YOUNG:

I will gladly get the cost and give you the figures. I can get them for you later, if you would put it on the Order Paper. I do not know how to answer you, but I can easily get that for you.

MR. BARRY:

Close to \$1 million, is it not?

MR. YOUNG:

No, not to my knowledge. It was all called by public tender. I will have to get the tenders up. I have no idea, Sir. I could not tell you.

MR. BARRY:

\$80,000 or within \$100,000?

MR. YOUNG:

No, I can tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I will get the information, the facts, not hearsays or 'theirsays', I will get the facts for the hon. gentleman. I will gladly do that.

As for the press, unfortunately, will have to probably wait for a little while. I am sure that when the new House of Assembly is open they will have the most elaborate space in any Legislature in Canada. I can assure them of that.

As for the press room upstairs that is going to have to wait until we decide where the new Cabinet Room is going to be. Also, if anyone can tell me where I can get any more space or how I can get more space in this building with the people who are in here now, I will be more than glad.

MR. BARRY:

Move some of the people out and make space for the press.

MR. YOUNG:

Well that is what we are trying to do, but you cannot do this overnight. Give us time and it will be done, we will move them out and you will have the most elaborate place in Canada.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, just to answer the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) on why we invested some of the public monies in these banks in Western Canada. I am sure hon. members of the Committee understand that when we bring in a budget we match to the extent we can our expenditures and our revenues. In the last number of years, unfortunately, we have fallen behind somewhat of the order of \$30 million to \$80 million. There are more expenditures than revenues. But, you know, they are very, very close. In most years, we aim to have them exactly in balance, and in most years prior to the recessionary period, it was actually the other way, we had a bit more on the revenue side than we had in the expenditure side, so we ended up with a surplus. The point I am making is that we aim to have a balanced budget on current account. That is our primary aim. That is over the twelve-month period, clearly through the period our revenues and our expenditures will not match one another.

For instance, when we do a bond offering, when we draw down the funds from that we might get suddenly, as we did the other day, end up on one day with \$100 million in our hands. On another occasion we will get a transfer from the federal government under EPF or equalization or CAP or whatever and there may be \$10 million or perhaps as much as \$50 million or \$60 million. On another occasion the Liquor Corporation will, as is required, send us over some of the funding that they receive from their mark

up and so on. So we get large blocks of funds every once in a while. If we just put them down in the basement, or put them in my office, or put them in a file cabinet in one of the Clerk's offices, that would be very poor financial management. What we do with it, when we have funds like that, we invest it on a short-term basis in almost all cases so we will have ready access to it, and we will earn good income from those short-term investments.

If we put all that money in say to IBM or Bank of Montreal or General Motors or whatever, if we put it all in there, it probably would be safe, but there is always a chance that some catastrophe could happen, even in giants like that, so we do not do that. We spread the money around. We try to limit our risk. In spreading it around we will have different interest rate from this investment and from another investment and so on and so forth so we have some concern for getting a maximal interest return on our short-term investment but our primary concern is to spread the money around so that if anything goes wrong in one quarter, there is not too much lost, and we limit the damage. That is what we did here. We invested a very small amount proportionately of the funds that were additional to our immediate needs on a short-term basis in these two Western banks. We were very prudent, I think, in the relatively small amounts we did put there. The unexpected happened, the unanticipated happened, that they went belly-up and we are not, I would emphasize, in a loss position in terms of what we put in. We are not going to get back quite as much return as we had anticipated because those funds will be returned to us

in principal but they will not be returned to us in principal plus interest.

There is nothing strange about our investing in the Canadian Commercial Bank or the Northlands Bank anymore than there is in our investing in the Mercantile Bank or in the Continental Bank or in the Bank of Nova Scotia, or the TD or other firms or corporations and operations whereby we can acquire a short-term investment at a reasonable rate, on safe grounds and, therefore, increase not only the monies available, but also do it in a safe way. To suggest that we should have anticipated that the Commercial Bank and the Northlands Bank were not safe, if we are going to be criticized for that I think there is an awful lot of very knowledgeable financial people in this country and indeed in other countries who similarly invested in those banks would also have to be criticized.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We have had a beer strike ongoing in this Province now for a long time, for much too long, and we have not seen -

AN HON. MEMBER:

You certainly miss it.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, you know something, I am starting to miss a good old Molson Canadian, LaBatt's Light, a Jockey Club, a Blue Star or India.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Blue Star has been gone a long

time.

MR. BARRY:

Jockey has been gone a while, but India I miss. Carlsberg, you know, I can take or leave. There are some other good brews in that brewery but that was not one of them.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Black Horse.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, Black Horse, Dominion, Mr. Speaker, they are becoming names of the past. You know, it is like Black Cat Cigarettes. Sometimes you go out around an abandoned settlement in Newfoundland out in Placentia bay and you will still see tacked up on the side of an old store, just about falling down, Black Cat Cigarettes or you will see Royal Blends. Mr. Chairman, these are signs of luxuries of long ago. I think, actually, Black Cat has been brought back in some areas by some company as a logo.

I can remember growing up on Red Island, there was this one big sign that I used to pass everyday with a fantastic big black cat there and you had to stop and look at it and wonder just what was going on. I was a little too young. I did not start smoking for another year or so after that; I was only two or three years old at that time, but the old beers of Newfoundland of long, long ago like Blue Star, Dominion and India, we can just barely remember the touch that they brought to the palate. Another few days or another few weeks and the taste is going to have disappeared completely.

Mr. Chairman, I am starting to get worried because I am starting to

get to like some of this Old Milwaukee and Schmidts and these other brews that are coming around. They did not seem to do very much for you at the beginning. They did not seem to have very much taste. They were kind of flat, bit too much fizz, a bit too much gas, but you know, even for reasons of pure nostalgia I would like to see a few of the old beers back on the stands.

Mr. Chairman, we should also keep in mind that there are workers who have been out hitting the bricks all summer, well into the fall now, whose families are suffering as a result, who are under tight financial pressure; the uncertainties as to whether this strike will ever end, the uncertainties as to whether the breweries will continue to brew in this Province. We have seen little almost no action by government and we wonder, Mr. Chairman, does it have anything to do with the fact that government is making more money by selling American beer than if they were selling Canadian beer - Newfoundland beer.

Would the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) give us a view as to how much money has the Province already made on the backs of these workers? How much increase has this meant to the revenue of this Province? The minister has told us before, he gave the amount, is it one or two dollars per dozen that we make more for every dozen US beer that we sell? I forget the figure but it is considerable. Now would the minister indicate to us how much we have seen in the way of an increase to the revenues of this Province and is the Minister of Finance telling the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), "Go slow

because this will help me avoid coming in as I have had to do for the last three years, every three months and say that the deficit is gone up." Is he saying, "Keep those workers out on the streets so that I can help avoid having to come in as quickly and say that the deficit is gone up because I am making money?" The longer those workers are out the more money is made for the Department of Finance, for the Liquor Corporation. Is that not what is happening here, that the Minister of Finance loves to see this strike continue because the money keeps flowing in in increased amounts to his department?

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman, what outrageous allegations! I have never heard the like before in my whole life. I am absolutely appalled by this body blow attack on my integrity.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, we only have a few moments, I do not know if I can answer all the points brought up there. Let me make this quite clear; we did not start to strike, as my hon. colleague mentioned in repartee across the House. We did not cause to strike. We deprecate the strike. We want it over as soon as possible. We have made great efforts through the Department of Labour to try to bring the two sides together. We have done it at some risk of appearing to interfere. I would point out that this strike is between a union, which has every right to do what it is doing - it is quite legal - and commercial firms. The government is not

involved, or if it is it is in a very indirect fashion. So we are on the sidelines, we are trying to use our good offices, we are not directly involved in the strike.

I think that if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) wished to consult with both sides I think he would learn that our efforts have been helpful. They have been proper. There is an awful lot of frustration because the strike has gone on so long and there have been intemperate remarks made. But I think in a discussion with both sides it will be seen that our Department of Labour has been contributory and has not, in any way, tried to hold up the settlement of the strike.

Very briefly, in terms of the benefit to the Province, we asked the Liquor Corporation at the beginning of each year to give us a certain amount of money. We lay down the amount. We do it in consultation with them because obviously we have to be within practical limits. But we say to them give us this amount of money. They will give us that amount of money on a monthly basis. Because they make more profits or less profits that does not change their obligation to pass over to us a certain amount of money each month. In our Treasury to the present date we have just exactly the amount of money, within a small amount, that the corporation was suppose to give us.

I would like to also point out that the books are not yet closed on this strike. It maybe that the corporation is making a bit more of a profit on the sale of American beer than it did on the previous sale of Canadian beer. The reason for that is not that

they have increased the price, it is just that they can buy the beer cheaper in the American markets. They are getting, shall we say, the tail end of runs and that type of thing or they are getting it on bulk runs. So they are buying for unit price and they are buying at a better rate.

Now I hope the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is not suggesting that the Corporation should undercut the brewing industry in this Province by selling beer during the strike at very low rates.

MR. BARRY:

What brewing industry?

DR. COLLINS:

The brewing industry that we still have in this Province that is in abeyance at the present time because of an unfortunate strike. We still have a brewing industry and we will hope that it will get back into operation again.

Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to continue continuing giving an answer whenever we sit again. But it adjournment time, so I will propose adjourning the debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Shall the resolution carry?

On motion, resolution carried.

MR. MARSHALL:

I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chairman of the Committee of Supply reports that it has considered the matters to it referred, reported progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to propose the adjournment of the House until next Tuesday. I will, by way of just a brief explanation, give the reason for it. The new Fisheries College is opening on Monday at three o'clock, and that is going to be a momentous day in the history of the Province. I know most hon. members will wish to be there at the opening, so, in order to facilitate this, it has been agreed that we will adjourn the House until Tuesday. With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at 3:00 p.m.

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