



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 24

---

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

***Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas***

Thursday

1 May 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

By way of explanation, and it maybe a matter of privilege, I will let Mr. Speaker decide, The Evening Telegram reports today that Mr. Cabot Martin has indicated that he is not a shareholder of North Atlantic. That is indeed the case. The confusion may have arisen when the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Board in response to a question from the Committee last week, indicated that NORTEK and Shell had been in a joint venture in terms of acreage of the offshore. Mr. Cabot Martin is not a shareholder of North Atlantic but of NORTEK, a company involved in the offshore, so that my overriding concern about having a gentleman involved in an offshore company as a consultant to the government stands. I would like to table a copy of the document that indicates that Mr. Martin is a shareholder of NORTEK.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege and it relates to that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is not going to be allowed to get away with getting up and tabling a document

which indicates that Mr. Martin is a shareholder in another company, any more than he is going to be able to get away with this subterfuge by tabling the genealogy of Mr. Martin or any one else.

I rise on a point of privilege arising out of this particular incident with respect to what the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) says, and with respect to what occurred in the Committee by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), and I will ask at the end that Your Honour take the privilege point that I am going to make under advisement, and get the tapes to examine as to exactly happened.

The point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is this, that in this House we enjoy the privilege of immunity. If one looks at Beauchesne or Erskine May or any other parliamentary authority, Your Honour, one will also see, as with any other right, that there is a duty on members of this House and that duty is a responsibility of each member, when he makes a statement, that he vouches for the truth of that particular statement, because this is the only way that parliamentary immunity can survive and there be any parliamentary responsibility as such.

I say that the hon. gentleman breached very seriously that duty yesterday in this House, when he rose on a point of privilege. I refer to the statements from Hansard made by the hon. gentleman yesterday, and I quote, "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege unrelated to Mr. Speaker's ruling, unrelated to the

previous incident. Last week in one of the Estimates Committees, the Resource Estimates Committee, my colleague from St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) put a question to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) in his capacity as the Minister responsible for the Offshore Petroleum Board. The question was whether Mr. Cabot Martin, who is under contract to the government as a consultant, had any connection with any companies associated with the offshore. The answer was an unequivocal no. Indeed, it was repeated two or three times.

"The minister this morning in Committee had it brought to his attention that Mr. Martin is indeed a shareholder in one of the companies whose bid for acreage has been accepted by the Petroleum Board."

Now, that was the statement that the hon. gentleman made. If I may proceed, as I know I can, Mr. Speaker, on matters of privilege, just to give a little bit of background with respect to this. During the proceedings of the Resource Estimates Committee, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was asking me certain questions along those particular lines. At a previous sitting of the Resource Committee, I had indicated that neither Mr. Loughheed nor Mr. Martin had any interest in any of the companies, and I was addressing at that particular time, the Hibernia area. But hon. gentlemen there opposite stated in the House or gave the inference in the House, and I would like to see transcripts of the proceedings with respect to the Leader of the Opposition and the member for St. Barbe, but certainly the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr.

Simmons) clearly said that Mr. Martin was a shareholder and that was completely and absolutely incorrect.

Mr. Speaker, as I explained in the Committee, when you are sitting down as a member of this House and another member makes a statement, you accept it. It was unequivocally stated, and the impression was given in the Resource Committee as was stated yesterday, that Mr. Martin had a share in this company. It did not bother me at all, it did not concern me at all with respect to any perceived conflict of interest for two reasons: First of all, Mr. Martin, is involved in the matter of Hibernia and this related to an independent decision made by the Newfoundland Offshore Petroleum Board with respect to leases not related to Hibernia at all, even if he was there. So it did not really concern me at all, Mr. Speaker, and secondly, it would have concerned him, obviously, but I will say that Mr. Martin is the type of person anyway, as a lot of Newfoundlanders are in the Province, whose patriotism and interest in the Province is such that it would not have affected one iota his determination to help and assist us in our offshore matters.

The statement was made so that last night, because Mr. Martin and I are obviously on a friendly basis, I was sort of concerned. It did not concern me in the House, I want to say, even if he had a share. So I said to him, "Cabot, how come you did not mention this to me?" Because I would have thought that with our relationship, he would have at least let me be the judge with respect to it. He said, "I do not

have a share in that company."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman got up in this House with the pure purpose, obviously, of trying to draw this to the attention of the House to try to discredit the government and, also, to try to discredit, obviously, Mr. Martin. It was untrue. It was false. It was completely untrue. I believe it was led in by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry).

The impression of the members of the Committee is that it was started by the Leader of the Opposition. I say we will get the tapes and we will see. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that that statement was made. As I say, a member in this House is responsible for the truth of what he says. I am not saying that somebody said something maliciously or somebody lied, but if somebody makes a statement, Mr. Speaker, that is carelessly made, that impugns the reputation of any person in this House or outside this House, surely the ordinary common rules of common decency and privilege of this House require a retraction of the statement, an apology to the House, an apology to the member concerned. And let not the hon. member try to get up and weasel around by saying, "Oh, Mr. Martin is connected with some other firm or something." What relevancy has that to that particular statement?

The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, owes this House an apology. And I think, when Your Honour looks at the proceedings of the Estimates Committee, he will see that, led by the hon. Leader of the Opposition with his jealous streak with respect to the offshore and his avowed intention in trying to

discredit everything in government, he started the process and started to knit the web which the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) found himself in. I have to say the hon. gentleman for Fortune-Hermitage does not need a web to be weaved for him, because he is a veritable web himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) will deal with other points in -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Sit down. Sit down.

MR. BARRY:

Could we have the rules enforced, Mr. Speaker, please?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

We would like to have the rules enforced.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition House Leader will deal with several of the points raised by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), I will deal only with what was raised in the Estimates Committee by myself, which Your Honour will be able to find by going through the tapes, and which at least one media person was present and listened to, I think the reporter for the Evening Telegram. My question did not deal with Mr. Martin, did not deal

with NORTEK, my question to the minister - if he is an individual who wants to have the truth established in this House he will confirm this - was whether or not he had informed the Premier and Cabinet with respect to the names of the individuals or companies involved in acquiring offshore acreage before those rights were granted by the Offshore Petroleum Board. The minister got up and confirmed, in the Estimates Committee, that he had in fact informed the Premier and informed his colleagues in Cabinet before the rights were issued. I then pointed out to the minister that the Premier had risen in this House some time ago, just after the rights were announced, the acreage was issued, and the Premier said it was the first time he had heard the name of the company that was a joint venture partner with Shell. When I pointed this out to the minister, the minister then started to backtrack and said he probably only informed the Premier and his colleagues with respect to the fact that it was Shell involved, which is somewhat unusual, Mr. Speaker. The normal procedure would be to inform Cabinet and the Premier of the full names, all the names of those requiring acreage before that acreage was issued by the Offshore Petroleum Board. The minister gave an undertaking to the Estimates Committee that he would go back and check his notes, check his files, check for Cabinet minutes and bring in information as to whether in fact he had been correct, in the first instance, when he said he had informed the Premier and his colleagues of the names of those companies or individuals acquiring rights offshore.

That is where it stopped with me,

Mr. Speaker. I made no reference to NORTEK. It was the minister, when I asked him who were the companies involved with Shell, who were the people involved with Shell, who said NORTEK, and the Estimates Committee minutes will establish that. That was an apparent error by the minister.

The minister then conferred with his officials and the matter was subsequently clarified, that it was not NORTEK, it was North Atlantic Petroleum that was in the joint venture with Shell. But the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) cannot be faulted for having heard the minister refer to NORTEK in the Estimates Committee. The member for Fortune - Hermitage cannot be faulted for taking the word of the minister, the statement of the minister.

MR. MARSHALL:

I took the word of you people, that is the problem.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) will finalize the points on this, but I would just like to close by saying that with respect to bringing discredit on government, every time the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) stands up and goes on as he just went on here today he brings discredit not only on government but on himself.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. As the Opposition Leader has said, the question, as I understand it, was put to the hon.

gentleman for St. John's East as to who were the companies involved with Shell concerning some acreage in the offshore. I think the hon. gentleman said one of the companies was a company by the name of NORTEK. He later, after he had checked, changed that to North Atlantic Petroleum, as being in the joint venture with Shell.

So the point to be made here is that if anybody misled this House, unintentionally I think, perhaps out of not knowing his department, it was the Government House Leader, the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate, by saying that NORTEK was involved, thereby indicating that Mr. Cabot Martin was involved, because Mr. Cabot Martin is a director or a shareholder of NORTEK. So he left the impression with this House, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Cabot Martin was involved.

Mr. Cabot Martin is still a member of NORTEK. I would ask the minister, and I would ask the Speaker in ruling on this point of privilege, to determine if it is proper for Mr. Cabot Martin to be a consultant to government while at the same time a member of NORTEK, which is a company, I understand, that is involved in the offshore. Is that proper? Should that be the case? Should you have a person who is involved in private enterprise employed as a consultant to government at the same time, being paid \$150 an hour for every hour he spends at work for them? Should that be the case? That is what the hon. gentleman should answer.

The third thing, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government House Leader stood in this House this evening and said that it really did not matter if he was. Now, that

should be addressed in the point of privilege, as well. It does matter. I say to the hon. gentleman that justice must not only be done but be perceived to be done. And he should abide by that rule, even though there may be nothing going on. It leaves room for suspicion, it leaves room for perhaps doing something to the character of Mr. Cabot Martin, which he does not deserve to have done to him.

MR. MORGAN:

I know you are concerned.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

So perhaps the hon. gentleman himself is doing the kind of thing to Mr. Cabot Martin that he is trying to accuse the Opposition of doing. That would not surprise me, coming from the hon. gentleman. He is well known for his ability to throw slime at people. When he stands in this House, that is the best he can do. We just saw the latest example of it in his going after the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), because the member for Fortune - Hermitage had the good sense to come in this House and clear up something that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) had said in this House and, therefore, misled the House.

So I say to the hon. gentleman that rather than raising the point of privilege, he should be the person apologizing to this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

That is right.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I think I can speak from the point of view of being a member of the Committee dealing with the minister's estimates and dealing with this very important matter. The hon. gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) was not there during the questioning of the minister on his estimates, when, first of all, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), secondly the member for Fortune - Hermitage, and thirdly the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) questioned the minister on his estimates and, in particular, the involvement of Mr. Cabot Martin. Hansard will show that the Opposition members clearly left the impression, through accusation, that Mr. Cabot Martin was a shareholder, that was their charge, of Northland Petroleum. And Northland Petroleum -

MR. BARRY:

It was not Northland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, of the petroleum company which was holding a 20 per cent -

MR. TULK:

Let us hear the truth, now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

- shareholding position, a joint venture with Shell Oil. The

accusation was made that Mr. Cabot Martin was using his influence in that 20 per cent company with Shell Oil and that the Petroleum Directorate was influenced by Mr. Cabot Martin and, therefore, the Canada Offshore Board in having these leases given to the company with Shell Oil. Now that was the accusation. There are no ifs, ands or buts that the Opposition clearly left the impression that Cabot Martin was a shareholder of that Petroleum Corporation. It was not NORTEK that was being discussed, it was the Petroleum Company and the accusation was clear-cut and laid by the Opposition that Cabot Martin was indeed a shareholder of the Petroleum Company involved with Shell, and that he used influence as an advisor to the government. 'He used influence' was the accusation, the charge made. And Shell used his influence was the accusation made by the member for St. Barbe, in particular, and Hansard will show that, Shell used Mr. Cabot Martin's influence on government to get the lease on those lands. That was the charge made.

It has been clearly stated to the House of Assembly by the Minister of Energy that that is totally untrue, Cabot Martin is not a shareholder of the Petroleum Company, and there is no question, Mr. Speaker, that these kinds of accusations should not be allowed to go without being challenged.

MR. FUREY:

And take ten days to apologize.

MR. MORGAN:

It should be challenged by the House. I have to stand and support the point of privilege put forward by the Minister of Energy. It is a very serious one,

whereby members of the Opposition put forward wrong information, misled a Committee of the House of Assembly with their accusations - and, in so doing, Mr. Speaker, misled this House. Therefore, in my view, there is, indeed, a prima facie case of breach of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final word, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I think, Mr. Speaker, first of all, in hearing the submission of the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) you see how it is possible for confusion to reign. Because so far we have had the name NORTEK, we have had the company North Atlantic and now -

MR. MORGAN:

It was not NORTEK that was discussed.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

- advertently, he introduces another name, Northland. I say to him the names are North Atlantic and NORTEK. These are the two companies.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I have no particular axe to grind with Mr. Martin or anybody else.

MR. MORGAN:

Be a man and apologize.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, if I may have the floor for a moment. I will not take long. I became aware of my error late yesterday afternoon. I

raised the issue in Question Period yesterday. It was the first time I had referred to Mr. Martin in the context of North Atlantic. I became aware of the error, that it was NORTEK and not North Atlantic, late yesterday afternoon. I had the documentation. As the House will confirm, I came in here today and rose immediately Mr. Speaker called order to correct the record. I believe that was my obligation and I discharged that obligation. If apologies are required to the House for inadvertently misleading the House on that point, I apologize without any qualification. But, Mr. Speaker, as soon as I became aware of the error I took steps to correct the record, and I have so done at three o'clock this day in saying that it was not North Atlantic, as I understood, but it was NORTEK, and I have tabled a document to demonstrate that that was indeed the case. So my first point, Mr. Speaker, is that as soon as I became aware of the error I took the appropriate steps to correct the error.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it was the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Board who first entered into the record of this House through a committee, the Resource Estimates Committee, the name NORTEK, not anybody on the Opposition side. From there I can see that there was some confusion between NORTEK and North Atlantic. That is the only premise on which I can assume I made the error. It was an error and I apologize for that. Mr. Martin is not a director of North Atlantic, he is a director of NORTEK.

My original concern remains, that we have a gentleman actively



involved as a director and a shareholder of a company dealing in the offshore who is also, on the other hand, an advisor to the government in offshore matters. That was the basis of my concern when I first made the point and I stand by that concern. It is a genuine concern that I feel I had an obligation to express in this House.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
I will not pursue the statement the hon. gentleman has made, but I just want to say one thing, that it was stated in this House in the Estimates Committee. This is where this whole process began. When a member in this House, on either side, makes a statement, any member, and indeed the public, is entitled to take it as being true. And the statement that was made in the House, and it emanated originally from the opposite side -

MR. TULK:  
You named the company.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Never mind the name of the company. The fact of the matter is, the statement and the whole burden of the thing, Mr. Speaker, was that Mr. Martin was a shareholder in this company which has a 20 per cent interest in the Shell acreage.

I am going to ask Your Honour, if Your Honour will, to look at the proceedings and see how this occurred. And this shows the danger of the whole thing, the way people's characters can be taken

into account and their integrity impugned; and it is seeded right in the determination of everybody-knows-who, because of that person's jealousy with respect to the way in which we are operating the offshore, to try to discredit us.

Try to discredit anyone in this House if he wants to; that is part of the game, maybe, of debate in the type of House of Assembly we have, but, Mr. Speaker, it transcends the bounds when that leads down the road towards discrediting somebody who is not in the House who is rendering admirable service to this Province and is invaluable in the area in which he is advising us.

I say to the hon. gentleman opposite, it takes a lot of time and effort and co-operation with everybody to try to build something, as we are, but it just takes seconds to destroy.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

There seem to be two points of privilege, but I am not sure in my mind at this stage how far I should get involved in the matter. I will certainly take the matter under advisement. I will not be able to say anything tomorrow, there is not enough time, but I will certainly study it over the weekend and I will have something more to say on Monday or Tuesday.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:  
On a point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the House will recall Mr. Speaker's rulings, I believe on Monday of this week, in which, among other things, the Chair affirmed that henceforth it would be even more vigilant in matters relating to the assignment of unworthy motives.

MR. J. CARTER:

How come he had to phone you up?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) in his original submission in raising his point of privilege a few moments ago, said very clearly that I was trying to discredit Mr. Martin.

First of all, I say that is not the case but, secondly, and to my point of privilege, he has not the right to say that in this House, Mr. Speaker. It is clearly unparliamentary for him to assign unworthy motives to another member of this House. And it is a very interesting mix, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from St. John's East is able to carry off, that at once he can stand there and lecture people about being, in his view, so low as to want to discredit somebody, and in his very actions and his facial expressions and his taunting people, he engages in that very exercise. What he would have nobody else do, he takes with licence unto himself. It is alright for him to discredit everybody and to assign all kinds of motives to everybody else, but dare anybody else tread that ground. Somehow, he wants it all to himself. Well, Mr. Speaker, he can have it all to himself. I do not want to discredit him or to

discredit anybody. If I cannot come in here and debate the issues on their merits without getting into personalities, I do not want to be here. I have no intention, Mr. Speaker, of trying to discredit Mr. Martin or anybody else, and I believe the minister has been most unparliamentary in suggesting that. I believe Mr. Speaker ought to take this one under advisement and, if appropriate, I would prepared to move the proper motion.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of privilege, that is coming in in the matter that I am going to study over the weekend.

#### Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to ask a question to the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. PATTERSON:

You are going to get an answer now, buddy.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I would like to ask the minister whether he has agreed to this procedure carried out by the Federal Department of Fisheries, whereby fishermen from Port de Grave have been treated like common convicts or pirates on the high seas, arrested by federal fisheries vessels, towed ashore, and their property confiscated?

Just exactly what does the minister intend to do about this?

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, there is no one in Newfoundland today who is not deeply disturbed and saddened by the events that took place off this coast yesterday. There is nobody in Newfoundland today who was not deeply saddened and disturbed by the events that took place off this coast over the last several years when it comes to jurisdiction over the 200 mile limit off Newfoundland and Labrador, particularly as it relates to the area 3NO and 3L. Certainly there is nobody on this side of the House who has not been consistent in their approach, Mr. Speaker, that the jurisdiction of Canada should extend to the area 3L and 3NO on the Nose and Tail of the Banks. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we support the right of Canadians, in this case particularly Newfoundlanders who are most adjacent to the resource, to have the first crack at that resource. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that in 1977, when the great government of the day in Ottawa implemented the 200 mile limit on behalf of Canada, they saw fit to leave part of the territory of Canada which is contiguous to Newfoundland and Labrador outside Canada's jurisdiction.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a further question to the minister. What the minister has just said does not square with his statement that the law must be applied equally to all, to the Port de Grave fishermen, so that we can show a good example to the foreign fishermen who are out there. Is this what the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) is more interested in, helping the Government of Canada remain on good relations with those foreigners when they are blundering our stocks, or is this part of the same approach to government that we saw being taken with the NAPE people, when they were arrested by the orders of the administration of which the member forms a part? Is this just a chain now in the new approach to government, arrest Newfoundlanders wherever you find them?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Are you making your maiden speech?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, are the rules going to be enforced here for all sides, or do we have to shout and scream to try and get over the catcalls of these members opposite all day long?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Would the hon. the Leader of the Opposition please pose his question?

MR. BARRY:

I will, Your Honour, if Your Honour will give me the protection I require from the other side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to pose his question.

MR. BARRY:

Will the minister tell us what he is doing to see that these good fishermen get a chance to exercise their profession and fish?

MR. PATTERSON:

Sit down and stop making a fool of yourself. Let 'John Efford' ask the question, he is the member for Port de Grave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Will the minister tell us what he is going to do to see that these fishermen are protected and are allowed to fish and earn a livelihood?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, there are hon. gentlemen on the other side, I know, who want to deal with this very important question in a logical and sensible manner, as they did this morning in this very Chamber, in Committee. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, no, we are not on the side of the foreigners against Newfoundlanders, we are not on the side of the foreigners against Canadians, we are on the side of Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is why, Mr. Speaker, if we

are going to go from one end of this globe to the other preaching that we are against Cuban overfishing in 3NO, or Japanese overfishing, or Portuguese overfishing, or any kind of activity to justify our case for extension of jurisdiction, then that has to apply to Nova Scotians, Mr. Speaker, it has got to apply to New Brunswickers, Mr. Speaker, and, until such time as Canada has the jurisdiction which we do not have today, which the party opposite gave away, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately it has to apply to Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Does the minister not recall that this problem was raised with him early last Fall by members of this side of the House in this House? Does the minister not recall that he was asked to do something about the problem then? It is not a matter of overfishing, it is a matter of no fishing. We have Newfoundlanders who are not allowed to fish and are being arrested for trying to fish. Will the minister tell us what he is going to do about it?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of overfishing, it is a matter of no

fishing. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that 3NO is a NAFO area over which Canada has no direct control because the party of the hon. gentleman did not have the foresight and the guts to ensure that Newfoundland jurisdiction, and Canadian jurisdiction, extended to the nose and tail of the Bank?

Now, have we done anything about it yet, Mr. Speaker? Yes, we certainly have done something about it. Mr. Speaker, the only surplus allocation of cod in 3NO today is an allocation of cod held by the Russians. As I said to my friend from Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) this morning, I did not make that decision, he did not make the decision, but, Mr. Speaker, we inherited the decision, a decision that was made not by this party, either, I can tell this House. The fact of the matter is, the only place in 3NO today where you can get your hands on some cod that is surplus at 3NO, is by doing a deal with the Russians, and this Province initiated that last year. That has now been approved by the Russian and Canadian governments but, because neither of us has jurisdiction in that area, it has to be referred to NAFO; it has been referred to NAFO and we expect to have a favourable decision within the next three or four weeks, from the parent body, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would say to hon. members opposite that

if they were as worried about the fishermen of this Province as they are worried about the feelings of Cabot Martin, we would not have the problem on our hands that we have today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:  
My question is to the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Fisheries stated earlier that he has the Newfoundland fishermen at heart and that he will do everything he can to help the Newfoundland fishermen. Can the minister explain how it is that Nova Scotian boats forty-five feet and up had been fishing for years before the Newfoundlanders arrived on the scene, but as soon as the Newfoundlanders arrived, the federal Spanish Armada set out to harass and arrest them? Is the minister aware that at least one of these captains, who had been fishing for twenty-odd years, is now on a Newfoundland boat and he knew of absolutely no prior surveillance, no prior problems from the federal boats until the Newfoundland boats went out there last year?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, I referred to that question in Committee this morning when the hon. gentlemen raised it and I said to him, as I will say to him again at this moment, there was never, in 3NO, an allocation for vessels less than sixty-five feet. Now, Tom Rideout cannot say if they were there, neither can the hon. gentleman say if they were there.

MR. EFFORD:

Oh yes I can.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, he can say it because he was told. I can say it because I have been told, but I have never been out there on a vessel forty-five feet or less than sixty-five feet. What I am trying to deal with, Mr. Speaker, is the reality. The reality is that there was an allocation for those vessels in 3Ps and I have been told, and I have said to federal officials, as I am sure previous ministers have, as probably the hon. gentleman did when he was the minister, I have been told that those vessels have from time to time, perhaps a great amount of the time, slipped over into 3NO from 3Ps. But the fact of the matter is, I cannot deal in this House with 'there was some kind of an Armada dispatched to 3NO because some Newfoundland vessels went out there', all I can say is, speaking as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) for Newfoundland, there is no allocation for vessels of less than 65 feet in 3NO, nor has there been, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

So what the Minister of Fisheries is saying, presumably, is if these boats were 65 feet and over, they would be eligible to fish in the 3NO area. I hold here in my hand two registrations for the same boat, one in which the boat was registered in 1983 as 65 feet, and the other for the same boat registered in 1985 as 64 feet 11.5

inches.

I would like to ask the minister if he would indicate how this came about? Did the boat shrink? Or, if this boat were still registered at 65 feet, would the regulations be amended so that the boat 65 feet and one-quarter inches would not be allowed to fish in the 3NO division?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I wish the world was as simple as the hon. gentleman would like to make it.

MR. BARRY:

Or as the minister.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The minister is going to answer the question factually. Mr. Speaker, again I say as I said to him this morning, he did not do it nor did I do it, but the fact of the matter is, when those vessels were built they were registered in sector (1), and sector (1) is all areas from 3Ps North - North, Mr. Speaker, not South. It does not include 3NO. In order for those vessels to have been registered in sector (1) they had to be 65 feet or less. They had to be less than 65 feet, Mr. Speaker. They could have been registered in another Sector at 65 feet or greater than 65 feet, but they were registered in sector (1) and the qualification for them to be registered in sector (1) was that they be less than 65 feet.

Now, if that makes them 64 feet so many inches and a half and so on, then that is how they were

registered. I did not do it, the hon. gentleman did not do it, but they were registered in sector (1), which are all sectors from 3Ps North, and they had to be less than 65 feet to be registered there.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

I think it is a crime for anybody who represents the Newfoundland people to stand on their feet and say that one half an inch can stop a bunch of Newfoundlanders earning a living, and put them in a position where they have to get down on their hands and knees and beg for the right to fish on the Grand Banks, or in any waters in Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, personally, just something that was brought to my attention, I would like to ask the minister if he agrees with his colleague back there, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), who stated that these fishermen from Port de Grave are nothing but poachers? Does he agree with that statement?

Also, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans -

MR. DOYLE:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, that is a lie, and I do not intend to withdraw that statement. That is a lie, what the hon. gentleman is saying there. Never at any point did I ever make that statement today in this House, or before coming into the House. It is totally untrue, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Withdraw it. Withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I must rule that there is no point of order. There is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, back to my question.

MR. TULK:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) has called the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) a liar. He said 'that is a lie.' It is obvious that is unparliamentary, that that cannot go on. I would ask the Speaker to wait until after Question Period to make a ruling?

MR. MARSHALL:

To the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister got

up on his feet and he made his statement. It is an age-old custom in parliament that one is not allowed to call anyone a liar or say somebody lied. In place of that, people do withdraw it and say, 'it is a terminological inexactitude', if they wish to. But obviously when they are doing it, whatever meaning they have in their hearts they have, and the message is communicated.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

To that point of privilege, there certainly is not a point of privilege. There may be a point of order. I did not hear the word 'lie', but I will certainly look up Hansard and see into it.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:  
The Department of Fisheries and Oceans in corresponding with Mr. Richard Cashin on January 17, 1986 stated, 'The Atlantic Fishery Regulations will be amended to close all groundfish fisheries to the NAFO Division 3N-0 for all vessels less than sixty-five feet.' Will the minister indicate why the Department of Fisheries and Oceans felt it necessary to amend the regulations to keep these Canadians, and I presume they are Newfoundlanders, from fishing off this coast while foreign countries, which have been continually raping and pillaging these areas, are still allowed to go out there and fish?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is coming back to the real point at hand here and. Let me say to him, as he said earlier, it is a crime and it is a shame! And I say to him, as I said to him in Committee this morning, welcome aboard! God forbid that you were not with us earlier. God forbid that all Newfoundlanders were not on the same side earlier, when those foolish decisions were taken to leave a part of the area of Newfoundland and Labrador, called the Grand Banks, that had been fished for hundreds and hundreds of years by Newfoundlanders, outside the jurisdiction of Canada, when the decision was taken in 1977. So I say to the hon. gentleman, welcome aboard. I agree with him, there is no difference between us. It is a crime, it is a shame! But the fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the boundary is drawn such that part of the area of 3N0 on the Grand Banks and part of the area of 3L on the Grand Banks remain outside the jurisdiction of Canada and they can come from hither and yon, as they are doing out there today, as they have done since 1977, and as they have done from the fourteen hundreds.

MR. TULK:  
Well, you arrest them.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
They are pirates, coming to Newfoundland and Labrador. They came because, in the final analysis, the hon. gentlemen, when they were the government - and we are still preaching extended



jurisdiction. We are at it day after day.

MR. TULK:

And you are still (inaudible)

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I keep my mouth closed when the Opposition are asking questions.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

The only way the problem is going to be solved, Mr. Speaker, is for Newfoundland and Labrador, as part of Canada in 1986, to get back the birthright that was taken from us in 1977.

MR. TULK:

Yes, and they are arrested in the meantime.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I am not arresting anybody, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

No! No!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries. Does the minister not consider it strange that last year West Germans overfished that area by 11,500 metric tons, the Portuguese were accused and, I think, eventually caught overfishing to the tune of about 10,000 metric tons, but the moment a Newfoundland vessel goes in the same area and catches 1,000 pounds it is arrested, towed into

shore, and the crew is treated like pirates, like criminals? Does the minister not see some inconsistency there?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I would hope that the hon. gentleman is not being deliberately deceiving in his question, and I am sure he is not. The West German fleet, Mr. Speaker, was accused of overfishing, and rightly so, in NAFO areas 2J3KL, particularly in 3L, and that is a far cry from what we are talking about here today. It does not make it right, it was wrong, and the Canadian government took action, Mr. Speaker. But for him to leave the impression that somehow or other the whole thing was swept under the carpet and let go, is not right. This Province took a firm stand at the LTA. That, again, was signed by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power, and should have been cancelled. It runs out next year anyway, but our position was that it should have been cancelled because they had already caught last year, by overfishing in 3L, what they would have caught in the next year, that was left in the agreement. Mr. Speaker, one thing you can say about us, whether you like us or lump us or think we are indifferent, is that we are consistent. If we are going to err at all, Mr. Speaker, we are going to err on the side of conservation. Because the fishery, as it has been for the last 500 years, will be the prosperity of Newfoundland for decades and centuries to come.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, in the 3NO area there is a quota for Canada of roughly 16,000 metric tons, there is a quota for the EEC countries of 250 metric tons, and for Spain 10,700 metric tons, a total of about 27,000 metric tons of fish allocated in that area. Bearing in mind that the minister was aware of this problem last year, he knew that the Port de Grave fishermen had to find new grounds, is he telling us now that in the process of negotiations that 1,000 tons could not have been put aside to have accommodated the Newfoundland fishermen who own boats capable of fishing in that area and who want to fish in the area?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know when the hon. gentleman is going to become consistent in his questioning. The fact of the matter is, Canada does not set the allocations in 3NO.

MR. W. CARTER:

You can make representation.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Canada can go to the table. Canada went to the table and wanted all foreign effort out of 3NO altogether because it is a trans-boundary stock, Mr. Speaker. There is tremendous overfishing in 3NO, once you get outside where the 200-mile line comes across. Canada wanted no foreign effort in that area whatsoever, but the foreigners in the organization called NAFO sat

down and divided up and decided on those particular numbers that the hon. gentleman has raised. Canada, as a country, asked for allocations for vessels under sixty-five feet, vessels over sixty-five feet, vessels greater than 100 feet and all that kind of thing. We were not able to get them and, because it is not within Canada's jurisdiction, we have no right to get them, and that is criminal and that is wrong.

So, what do we have to do, Mr. Speaker, as Canadians and as Newfoundlanders? We have to go beg and negotiate our birthright back, Mr. Speaker. That is the process that we are involved in with the Russians today to try to get something so that Newfoundlanders from Port de Grave and other places, who have the heart to go out in area 3NO, can have some fish. We do not have it as of right, because they gave it away, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have heard this minister stand in the House and make a good many statements, but I have never heard the Minister of Fisheries or any other minister stand in this House and somehow try to say that Newfoundlanders, for fishing in Newfoundland waters and around the Newfoundland Coast, should have the law applied to them equally with the Russians.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, my question to the member -

MR. MARSHALL:

To a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is making a speech. If he wants to ask a question, let him ask a question.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I was just calling attention to the hon. member at the time.

MR. TULK:

Let me ask the hon. gentleman does he believe that the people from Port de Grave, those hard-working Canadians, Newfoundlanders from Port de Grave, should be arrested, harassed by the Cape Roger, by the Cowley and by airplanes? Did he make that kind of statement this morning? If he did, will he act like the provincial Minister of Fisheries, not the federal Minister of Fisheries, not an international diplomat with the Russians, and withdraw the remark?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, of all the hon. gentlemen in this House to make that kind of statement. He should be ashamed to get on his feet, Mr. Speaker. There is a gentlemen over there who was Minister of Fisheries when the 200 mile limit was imposed in 1977. The party that that gentleman is so proudly part of today is the party that imposed it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. minister is getting away from the answer.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I am responding to the preamble, Mr. Speaker, and I hope it works both ways. The answer to the question, Mr. Speaker, is no. The answer to the question from this gentleman, as a red-blooded Newfoundlander, is no. But when she is lined up against me, Mr. Speaker, and I have to become part of a national effort to try to win back what was given away on us in 1977, then I have to be consistent.

MR. BARRY:

Given away?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, given away.

MR. BARRY:

What was the limit before that?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, given away, because the Grand Banks of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, were part of Newfoundland long before the hon. gentleman was a Liberal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, do I not get a supplementary to my question?

MR. MORGAN:

This is very important.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, what is going on here?

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to ask questions in this House. Tell the hon. gentlemen to keep quiet for a second now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, on this same topic, and it is a very serious matter. I would ask the Minister of Fisheries, my colleague, if he would pursue this this afternoon to determine from federal surveillance officials both in the Province and outside the Province, in Ottawa, why it is that this boat from Port de Grave was seized, arrested and brought into port - and I repeat information that was brought to my attention just before I came to the House, and I mentioned this to my colleague just briefly - when at the same time there were four or five Nova Scotian boats of the same size fishing in the same area, and they were left there to carry on fishing.

MR. FUREY:

We have already asked that question, boy.

MR. MORGAN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are more than the few members over there concerned about fisheries in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, my question is will

the minister indeed this afternoon try to get some answers from federal fisheries surveillance authorities as to why they are suddenly zeroing in on one little fisherman from Newfoundland while ignoring the fishermen from Nova Scotia, who are also out there fishing illegally?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, that is a very good question and one that we are already pursuing. As I said in answers to gentlemen on the other side, we know what the problem is. We did not create the problem, I did not create it, nobody in this House created it. We did not create the problem but we know what it is. And, by heavens, Mr. Speaker, if there is going to be equity and fairness in this country, then it applies to all of us equally, whether you are a New Brunswicker, or a Nova Scotian or a Newfoundlander, and I have already got my officials onto that and before the day is over, I hope to know something further about it.

MR. EFFORD:

It is too late now, they have been at it for the past twenty years.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, too late the hon. gentleman says.

MR. EFFORD:

The damage is done.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The damage is done, and your party helped do it.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. FUREY:

Sit down, he has recognized Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Am I recognized, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member for Fogo asked a question and I by-passed him for a supplementary to give the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) an opportunity to ask a question. I am now recognizing the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman once more -

MR. MORGAN:

You are afraid of the 'bully boy'.

MR. TULK:

The minister has now indicated that his push, that was talked about by Mr. John Crosbie last year, to get a quota for those longliners, those boats in the 55 to 65 foot range, is before NAFO. He has been warned about this for a year, he has had a year to do something about it and he has done nothing, and the federal government has done nothing. So I would ask him if he would, while he is negotiating with NAFO, ask his federal counterparts to call off the charges that are obviously going to be laid against those hard-working Newfoundlanders, those hard-working Canadians who

have a right to fish off this Coast, and will he ask them to call off the surveillance and the harassment of those boats that is now going on out there? Will he do that, or is he just going to sit there and allow a Tory Government in Ottawa - by the way a Liberal Government put in what we have, the 200 mile limit, it was not the Tory Government - Central Canadians, to harass Newfoundlanders when they are just carrying out what is their birthright to carry out, to fish off this Coast?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, do you know what? You will never see the day, Mr. Speaker, you will not live long enough to see the day a Tory Government in Ottawa crucify this Province as the Party represented opposite did, Mr. Speaker. You will never live long enough!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the gall of the hon. gentleman! Mr. Speaker, however long we have been into Question Period, I have not once, when the Opposition was asking their questions with great political platitudes, to which any person in this House will attest, open my mouth to interrupt them.

MR. BARRY:

Nor did anybody else.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I am not as blind as the Leader of the Opposition was as Chairman of

the Committee the other night, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the nerve of the hon. gentleman to say that we have done nothing to try to undo the crime that was committed against this Province when the nose and tail of the Banks was not included in our 200-mile limit. The nerve of him to suggest that we have done nothing, when we have. We should not even have to negotiate, Mr. Speaker, but we have to, unfortunately, because of their stupidity.

MR. EFFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we have a very serious problem here facing all Newfoundlanders, not just the fishermen of Port de Grave. Last year, we had people all over the Province, who had to get on their hands and knees, go on strike in order to get money to survive. We now see the Minister of Fisheries -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

What is the point of order?

MR. EFFORD:

The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is we now see the Minister of Fisheries, in answering a question, go back to the former Liberal government, what happened some ten, fifteen, or twenty years ago. That is not the issue, the issue is what is happening here today.

MR. RIDEOUT:

To that point of order, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, this is terrible! You would not know, unless you were totally blind and stunned here, but the hon. gentlemen can get up and accuse us of whatever they like. They accuse us of being political nincompoops, they accuse us of being everything other than something a bit better than human life, but if we get up and give it back to them in turn, then they want to take their tail and run. Well, I would say run, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

I did not want to interrupt Question Period but clearly, a few moments ago, when I recognized the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) was obviously referring to the Chair on two occasions when he made comments to the effect that 'he was afraid of the bully boy.' I would ask the hon. member for Bonavista South to withdraw that unequivocally.

MR. MORGAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, in no way was I referring to the Speaker when I said he was afraid of the bully boy, it was members on this side. So, Mr. Speaker, I again indicate that I in no way referred or cast any reflection on the Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Withdraw! Withdraw!

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I am satisfied with the hon. member's explanation.

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this: As a member of this House, Sir, I have right to stand and ask questions and to be also given the right to ask supplementary questions the same as any member of this House, whether in Opposition or otherwise. The day I am denied the right to ask questions in this House I will challenge, if I have to, the ruling of the Chair. I am dead serious. I have a right to stand here any day in Question Period and ask questions. No member of the Opposition will stop me from doing it, only the Chair will stop me from doing it, Mr. Speaker. When the day comes and I am stopped from asking a question and a supplementary question, I will challenge the rule of the Chair. It is as simple as that.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, speaking of bully boys, did I just hear the hon. gentleman say 'I will ask my questions even if I have to question the Chair?'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No! No, he did not. No, he did not!

MR. TULK:  
Yes, he did. Yes, he did. Hansard will show that he did. Even if I have to question the rulings of the Chair, he said, I will ask my questions.

Mr. Speaker, the Chair in this House, whether he likes it or not, rules supreme. While I know the hon. gentleman would like to take the place on his back, as he has tried to do with the Committee, and as he tried to do last Spring in this House with a point of privilege, the hon. gentleman cannot be allowed to get away with that kind of thing. So I would ask Your Honour once again to check Hansard and see if the hon. gentleman is not threatening the Chair, that he is going to ask his questions even if he has to question Your Honour's rulings. It is terrible, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, I do not think we can let this debate or discussion on this particular point raised by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) go by without reminding Your Honour, the members of this House and everybody else in the gallery of the hypocritical kinds of comments that are being made now by the member for Fogo as House Leader for the members opposite. All members have to do is remember not too long ago how many times the member for Fortune - Hermitage

(Mr. Simmons) cast slurs on Your Honour in the Chair. How many times did the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) cast slurs on the Your Honour in the Chair?

In fact, I remember the Leader of the Opposition getting up in this House and saying that he had lost confidence in the Chair, Mr. Speaker. I remember that very well. Nothing happened to those hon. members and I suggest that what is coming across from that side over there on this particular point is nothing but hypocrisy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order. I would refer hon. members to our own Standing Orders No. 31 (b) 'In the discretion of Mr. Speaker, a reasonable number of supplementary questions arising out of a Minister's reply to an oral question may be asked.' I would also refer to 31 (f) 'The Speaker's rulings relating to oral questions are not debatable or subject to appeal.' I did recognize the hon. member for Fogo at the time and it was quite in order.

Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I wish to table the annual report for 1985 of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro.

MR. PEACH:-

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH:

As Chairman of the Resource Estimates Committee, I wish to report to the House that our Committee has considered the matters to it referred and passed without amendment items of expenditure under the headings of Mines and Energy; Fisheries; Development and Tourism; Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development; Forest Resources and Lands and the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

If it is in order I would like, as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, to make an oral report to the House. During the course of the deliberations of that Committee, Mr. Speaker, we found ourselves in a most unorthodox procedure, a procedure that has been publicly condemned by the Tory member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) in that parliamentary secretaries, members of the administration, had asked questions. The Chair said that was not permissible and, in so doing, upheld a long standing tradition. Mr. Speaker, the Chair was overruled by the government



majority of that Committee. The minority on that Committee regrets that very much.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees is not a time for debate. You just present a report and this report will come on for debate in the House in the concurrence motions. Any member of the Committees who has any observations with respect to the committees is quite able to do it at that particular time. The hon. gentleman might be a Vice-Chairman but if the hon. gentleman looks at the rules he will see it is the Chairman who makes the report to the House. As I say, he is another member of the Committee and he can speak in the debate.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
To the point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I had fully assumed that if the Chairman speaking for the majority of the Committee could make a brief report to the House, that I, speaking for the minority on the Committee, could make a brief minority report.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No, no!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
It was not my purpose to debate the matter, Mr. Speaker, but to report to the House an event that I figured was of some significance and affected substantially the minority on that Committee. In essence my report is that the government had used its majority to frustrate the will of the Committee. That is my report. Thank you.

MR. HODDER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:  
As Chairman of the Government Services Committee, I wish to report that it has considered the matters to it referred and has passed without amendment items of expenditure under the following headings: Public Works; Transportation; Municipal Affairs; Consumer Affairs and Communications; Finance; and Labour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Section 144 of the Labour Relations Act, I wish to table the report of the Labour Relations Board for the calendar year 1985, together with my own report for matters transacted in the

Department of Labour for the calendar year 1985.

MR. BARRY:

Another point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Where the reports of the Estimates Committees have just been filed, I think it would be appropriate to note that we have received communication from the media who were written by the three party leaders requesting a meeting to discuss coverage of the Estimates Committees.

I think all members would have to note and recognize the excellent efforts of The Evening Telegram. After this matter was raised, apart from possibly one or two places where meetings might have been scheduled at short notice, I think that The Telegram faithfully attended and reported upon the proceedings of the Estimates Committees.

The other media, however, were noticeable by their absence and, I think, it would be very worthwhile for us to follow-up in order to ensure that the next Estimates Committee will be fruitful and effective. We should follow-up, as suggested, with meetings between the party leaders and the various media involved. We have had communications from several. The Chairman of the Resource Policy Committee, I understand, has received copies of this communication. Perhaps the Chairman or the Government House Leader might take it under advisement and approach the Premier with a view to seeing if a

meeting could be arranged with the various media individuals concerned.

MR. J. CARTER:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I think it should be said at this point, right now, that the other media, besides The Evening Telegram, should certainly not be blamed for their perhaps spotty and irregular attendance at the Committee meetings. Early on in these meetings they saw the lack-lustre performance of the Opposition and found there was very little to report. I think they showed their uncommon good sense in choosing to come to some meetings and not others. I certainly do not think there should be any reflection on the members of the press. I think it is entirely a judgement on the behaviour, attitude and the lack of accomplishments of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am quite prepared to rule on that matter now. I do not think there is any point of order. I think there was an opportunity taken for both sides to clarify the matter.

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a brief comment of clarification on what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has said. Further to the three-party letter that I co-ordinated one day several weeks ago to send off to the various media in the Province, to date,

Mr. Speaker, I have seen one piece of correspondence which I had photocopied and sent out to the Leader of the Opposition and to the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). It was indicated in those letters that the media would be pleased to have representatives meet with a three-party group to discuss this. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, when the remaining media have been heard from, something can be co-ordinated along those lines.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

#### Notices of Motion

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Petroleum And Natural Gas Act."

#### Petitions

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from 168 students at the Henry Gordon Academy in Cartwright who are protesting the federal government closure of the coastguard marine radio station in their community. Five jobs will

be eliminated from that community and sent to Goose Bay.

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

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

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Speaker, at the outset, the hon. member said he is tabling a petition in which the petitioners are protesting the federal government closing of a station in the Cartwright area. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how that petition can relate to any minister or government division of this administration or this House of Assembly. With all due respect, that petition should be forwarded to the member of Parliament for the area, tabled in the House of Commons and then passed on to the Minister of Transportation, the minister responsible.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:  
If the former Minister of Fisheries, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) would have allowed me to continue, the petition says quite clearly that it is to be presented in this House and given to the appropriate minister. I have even been given letters with the request that they be delivered and presented directly to the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

To that point of order, I would like to have a look at that petition and then I will be able to rule on the matter.

Order, please!

I will read this petition: "We, the students of Henry Gordon Academy are signing this petition in protest of the decision by the hon. Don Mazankowski to remove the coastguard station in Cartwright, Labrador. We feel that the moving of the workers to Goose Bay would have bad economic and social effects. Not only would Cartwright be losing valuable jobs and capital, but there are people who are going to be losing friends and relatives." There is a list of those who signed the petition.

I must rule that this petition is out of order because it is not a petition to this hon. House.

MR. HISCOCK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

I have been a member of the House of Assembly here for seven years. We have had both sides present petitions and when asked to present them to the appropriate department, it has always been customary for us to ask this House to direct them to the appropriate department. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House of Assembly, I feel that my rights as a member are being violated.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

It appears to the Chair the hon. member is challenging the Chair in

this matter. I have already ruled that that petition is out of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

The Speaker's ruling is quite right, as far as we are concerned, without any precedent at all, Mr. Speaker. I realize Your Honour's ruling was correct, but if the hon. gentleman wishes to present the petition, he can certainly present it with the leave of the government side. So he may go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Does the hon. member have leave of the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, after having spent almost seven minutes, I would have been finished now, had I been allowed to continue.

One hundred and sixty-eight students from Henry Gordon Academy are protesting the fact that they are closing the coastguard marine station in Cartwright, thereby moving students, parents and friends to Goose Bay. The resulting repercussions will be not only the taking of jobs away from the community, where there is 90 per cent unemployment during

the Winter but, as well, the school next year will probably lose two teachers, making it necessary for those one hundred and sixty-eight students to double up on classes, the end result being that the quality of education will suffer. So the students themselves will be directly affected. They contend that the move by the federal government to Goose Bay will necessitate the building of more housing there.

The station will go to automatic control and operate remotely. The operators will be in Goose Bay. The students are concerned and I think they have a right to be. They are not only losing friends and relatives but, as I said, faced already with the jeopardy of declining enrollment, this could mean the loss of possibly two teachers and a lot of those classes will have to be doubled up. So they ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) take this petition and present it to its appropriate department, send it to Mr. Mazankowski and to the Prime Minister and let them know that the students themselves are concerned about this technical and bureaucratic decision. When first looked at, the decision will seem logical but once you get to the human, cultural and social side of the community, they find that it is effecting people.

Yesterday, over 400 people marched through the community of Cartwright and had a meeting in the town hall. They signed petitions, wrote letters, presented them to me, asked that I present them in this House and forward them to Ottawa. They also gave me other ones to send to Ottawa which I am doing by mail.

I am glad that the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) has seen fit, unlike the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) who wanted to interrupt the right of these students and the rights of the members of the Assembly -

MR. MORGAN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

I did not try to obstruct the member from bringing forward the views of the people of his riding. I merely pointed out that the procedure he was taking was out of order and the Speaker has ruled on that. Then I agreed to give leave for the member to put forward the petition, so we have been quite fair to his petitioners and in no way did we try to obstruct the voice of the people in the area.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That point of order is well taken.

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be sent to the Minister of Transportation and the Premier, presented to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Transportation in Ottawa, Mr. Mazankowski. Hopefully, they will change their mind.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Rural,

Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a minute or so to speak to the petition that was presented. I do congratulate the students in the Cartwright school for taking on this project and presenting a petition asking our Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to look into the matter to see if these eight jobs cannot be left in Cartwright.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to inform the hon. member that some two weeks ago the provincial Minister of Transportation, and myself, met with the Mayor of Cartwright. He brought this matter to our attention. The Minister of Transportation has already looked into the matter. He is doing some more work on it. We are waiting from some formal correspondence from the Cartwright Town Council and the federal Department of Transportation to see what representation they had made before. Our Minister of Transportation is going to take the matter up with the federal minister. It is correct that this station will be remoted to Goose Bay if the plans go ahead.

To explain what is going to happen a little more in Cartwright, this thing could be removed and we will try to keep it there but there is also going to be a North warning system brought into Cartwright, Mr. Speaker, which would create some ten to fourteen jobs, eight to ten permanent jobs, particularly. There will be new facilities built up there. There is a \$7 billion programme all across Northern Canada and Labrador. There will be overflow accommodations built in Cartwright

for another twelve people, facilities for helicopters, landing and docking facilities will also be installed, Mr. Speaker, when this North warning system is in place.

There could be an additional 100 seasonal jobs on these sites, Mr. Speaker, in Cartwright and Labrador generally during the construction. I think DND estimates that the long range stations will involve a total contract of approximately \$45 million. So, even though it is not acceptable that these eight jobs do go out of Cartwright, Mr. Speaker, there are plans in effect and construction has already started to create another eight to fourteen jobs in that community, plus some 100 part-time jobs during construction.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

I rise in support of that particular petition. What we essentially hear the minister saying over there is the verbal equivalent of that great dance called the turkey trot, which is simply one step forward two steps backwards, as Mr. Crosbie put it so eloquently. It is simply a shell game, shifting jobs with the left hand and moving more jobs with the right hand.

I think it is absolutely commendable, Mr. Speaker, that these young people would put forward such a petition. I think it says something about young people in our Province today, Mr. Speaker. There is a great sense of fear amongst them, probably

brought on by the administration that has been sitting so cosily on their rear ends for the past fifteen years on that particular side of the House, Mr. Speaker. They are very frightened. Imagine young people having to petition adults across this Province, indeed fifty-two adult members in this Chamber, to protect their fathers and their mothers, their livelihoods and their way of life. It is really emblematic of what is happening across the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think Brian Mulroney was kidding one single bit when a year ago, Mr. Speaker, nearly two years ago now, he used the word 'infliction', 'I will not be afraid to inflict prosperity upon Newfoundland and Labrador'. What a prophet Brian Mulroney was. Let me define infliction, 'to cause something damaging or painful and to be sure that it is enduring.'

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
We gave leave for the presentation of the petition but we did not give leave to completely ignore all the rules of the House. What the hon. gentleman is doing is not addressing himself to the petition. He is debating and he is not addressing the petition. The rules clearly say you are to address the points in the petition or to support the petition. Is the hon. gentleman supporting it or is he not? He is cavorting, Mr. Speaker, he is not supporting. He is cavorting all over the place in a debate.

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

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

MR. FUREY:  
The hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall) should, I do not know if he is having ear problems, if there is a massive build up of wax in his ears, he just does not want to hear or what his problem is.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Would the hon. member speak to the point of order.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, I support this petition.

MR. J. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:  
If the hon. gentleman wishes to speak any more on that petition I would remind him that he is speaking by leave of this House and I certainly withdraw my leave for one.

MR. MORGAN:  
If you withdraw leave, that is enough.

MR. J. CARTER:  
There is no leave. Leave is withdrawn.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, I will address the petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

This petition is by leave and it appears to the Chair that leave has now been withdrawn.

MR. J. CARTER:  
Sit down. Sit. Sit.

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

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

MR. FUREY:  
Let the record clearly show, Mr. Speaker, that it was one tiny word in Webster's which withdrew leave, the word 'infliction'.

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to present a petition, Mr. Speaker, that was sponsored and circulated by the Parent/Teacher Association of Booth Memorial in Windsor. I will read the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker.

The prayer is simply: "We, the undersigned, parents of Booth Memorial High School, fully support the Booth PTA in its efforts to obtain a commitment from the Integrated Education Committee to allocate funding for the construction of an extension to Booth Memorial in Windsor. The annex presently being used by Grade VII and VIII students is

totally inadequate, demoralizing for students and teachers, in addition to being in serious disrepair."

Mr. Speaker, it goes on to say that, "The Booth PTA submits the attached petition to indicate its complete dissatisfaction with the progress being made towards finding a solution to the current situation at Booth Memorial High School in Windsor. We have inadequate gym facilities in the present high school, no showers, and numerous badly needed repairs. In addition, we have Grade VII and VIII students housed in the former Clyde Brooks Elementary. It is doubtful if the annex could come close to meeting today's fire standards and certainly does not meet the standards required for today's educational needs.

"Teachers working in this environment appear to be demoralized and this attitude is passed on to students. We have been pacified in the past by being assured that the extension was top priority. However, it now seems that this will not come about for several years. This is completely unacceptable to the parents of Booth and, by way of this petition, we strongly urge you to re-examine the situation in an effort to speed up the funding for the extension and to commit funds immediately to provide better facilities for Grades VII and VIII."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition and the covering letter says it all. One would almost have to be repetitious to put it any better than it has already been put. With the time allocated to me, I want to support the petition by making a few



comments, Mr. Speaker, about which I am concerned and very well aware.

The minister, Mr. Speaker, will know that that school that the PTA at Booth Academy is talking about replacing was built in 1955. It is thirty years old. Up until 1981, it was used as an elementary school. In 1981 there was a new elementary school built in Windsor and the elementary classes were moved out of the school on the basis that the school was really no longer fit to be used as an elementary school. In the intervening years it was necessary to move classes from the high school out into the old annex. To the parents, teachers and students of Windsor, it was a step backwards.

Nobody is suggesting, although it is referred to in the letter, and certainly I will not suggest, the minister will understand that I do not believe, that the old annex that we are looking to replace is a fire hazard or a fire trap. If that were so, I am sure the minister and his officials would have long ago moved to correct the situation. However, since it is thirty years old, there is a concern with that type of construction. It was built to replace a school destroyed by fire. It was built in a rush. It certainly does not contain fire-retardant materials and there is a fear that in the event of a fire the property and the student body could not be protected in the sense that one would expect students or property or teachers or staff to be protected in the event of a fire in a new school.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Booth Memorial houses 450 students. It is one of the largest, if not the largest, high school in the Windsor area.

That tells you, Mr. Speaker, that 450 students do not have adequate gym facilities, no facilities for home economics, no industrial arts facilities, and no library facilities. In short, Mr. Speaker, and the minister will be concerned about this aspect, with the present facilities the students of Booth Memorial are denied the benefits of the reorganized curriculum.

Mr. Speaker, the covering letter made that great point. It made the point, Mr. Speaker, that the students at Booth are denied the chance of enjoying to the fullest the new reorganized curriculum. Mr. Speaker, that is grossly unfair.

The big concern is that the funding authorities, the IECs, recognize the need for that extension that Booth was asking for three years ago. It was placed as a priority three years ago on the funding list. However, each year, because of other perceived priorities - and I am not saying that there were not other priorities with possibly worse needs than Booth itself - Booth continued to slip back, year after year after year. Now the authorities at Booth, the parents, the teachers and the student body understand that they cannot expect their extension and to have this very inadequate, this old decrepit building replaced until at least 1988. They are very concerned, Mr. Speaker, that they are not being treated fairly here, that what was a priority in 1986 should certainly maintain its priority into 1987. There is no way to explain to those involved, and they will not accept, and I understand they are not accepting this, that something that was a priority in 1981 is not now a

priority until 1988. One has to remember, Mr. Speaker, that when the elementary classes were moved out of the old annex we are talking about, the building we want to replace, that those classes were moved because the authorities of the day felt that the Clyde Brook's Extension was not fit to house the elementary classes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FLIGHT:

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there appears to be in my mind to be no sense of logic that if indeed the school was not adequate or not fit to house the elementary classes back in 1981 when the classes were moved, then certainly by that very logic it should not be expected to be adequate or fit to house the high school grades, Grade VIII and IX in 1986. Mr. Speaker, not only are the Grades XIII and IX now being asked to use a building that was deemed unfit for the elementary classes, the present students in Booth have been denied the facilities, as I pointed out, that will allow them to take advantage of the reorganized curriculum such as industrial arts, fine arts, library facilities and gym facilities. I am sure the minister will be as concerned about this as I am and I would look for his support for this petition.

I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the petition, as I would for any petition that has to do with any improvements in the field of education, whether it be facilities or otherwise.

I would like to point out for the record that the petition is addressed, as it should be, to the Integrated Education Council. The Council has the responsibility for the construction of facilities and the repair as it relates to capital repairs or expenditures on facilities throughout the Province, facilities which come under the domain of the IEC.

For a number of years, we were having problems in relation to building new schools and carrying out repairs to schools in the Province because of a lack of funding. However, in recent years the amount of money put into capital construction and capital cost, generally, has increased tremendously. This past couple of years we have been putting in \$20 million a year into school construction and repair. Last year, not only did we put in \$20 million but, we told the education councils that we will be putting in that amount for the three years to come. This year we gave them that commitment again and we extended the funding for another year. Also, we have eliminated the 10 per cent requirement of boards coming into effect in 1988, so that they will not be caught not being able to raise the 10 per cent that they themselves would have to put in.

However, a couple of years ago, from requests that we had submitted to these Denominational Education Councils, we were told at that time on the priority list of all Councils that it would take

about \$100 million to answer all the requests. Now we can increase that undoubtedly with the escalating costs of materials and labour and so on over the last couple of years but, at that time, a couple of years ago, it would take about \$100 million to bring all our schools up to standard and replace the ones that we have to replace. Since that time we have put in \$20 million a year for the past couple of years, that is \$40 million, with a commitment of \$20 million more for the next three years to come, so that is \$100 million. Undoubtedly, at the end of the three year period, we may not have completed all the necessary construction but, we should have made a major dent in many of the dilapidated schools and schools that are below the requirements now of either the Fire Commissioner or the building regulations.

It is unfortunate that in certain areas, and here we have a typical example, schools are below standard. It does have a serious effect on the education that can be delivered in the area and that is what is of such a great importance. The member is quite right when he says that certain courses that can usually be made available to children in the various parts of the Province cannot be made available if you do not have the facilities in which to teach.

The reorganized high school programme, which came onstream a few years ago, has been recognized as perhaps the best thing that ever happened to education. We have now been able to offer a variety of courses to the students throughout the Province but if we do not have the facilities, then we cannot offer the courses.

Certainly in this case the students of Windsor are being deprived. I can fully sympathize with that.

I would suggest, perhaps, to the member that if he were to make, and maybe he has, contact himself with the Integrated Education Council to stress his concerns, we have found them to be fairly co-operative. They do control the funding. They have the say in where money is spent. They do that on a priority basis and usually there is not a complaint. I notice the member has recognized that there are many priorities so if he were, perhaps, with a delegation, to sit down with the Committee, perhaps some pressure can be applied to make sure that that work is done as quickly as possible because the students in that area are being deprived of many of the advantages that students in other parts of the Province now share in. I can certainly appreciate and support the petition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the minister may need some more good reasons why he ought to rush out and find some of that extra money for Booth High School in Windsor. Apart from the fact that the petition has been so ably presented by my friend for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), the minister should know the following facts.

The first principal of Booth High School was the gentleman from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). That

at once tells you the calibre of the school and how old it is. I say to him secondly that the former Clyde Brooks Elementary, the building next door to which my colleague for Windsor-Buchans referred, started many years ago as an all grade school and that I was half of the first graduating class. That again will tell you how old and dilapidated that particular building is. It was thirty-one years ago that the school was erected. It was erected, as my colleague might have said, in a bit of a hurry because the previous structure had been destroyed by fire. They had to rush into action to get a facility in place to accommodate the eighteen or twenty classes of students that were on the street. They did it essentially over the Spring and Summer, and, as a consequence, the building has perhaps not got the functions built into it that it would have had in this day and age, as I am sure you will understand.

The minister makes a point of saying that the petition is properly addressed to the Integrated Education Committee. I support him on that point but I make an appeal to him, that he cannot have it both ways. During elections, his Premier goes out to places like, I believe Benton or Gander somewhere, and announces schools, not announces that there is money and he hopes the Integrated Education Committee will make the right decision, but the Premier in the 1982 election, I believe it was the 1982 election, but certainly in a general election, went to the Gander area and announced a school. That was a dangerous precedent that has been repeated since.

The minister and his colleagues would be smart to keep the separation. Not only is it a good political buffer but, otherwise, it is proper that the people who administer those schools, the Integrated, the RC and Pentecostal Education Committees have the say as to where the money is apportioned from time to time. The minister would be a very inept politician indeed if he opened that can of worms and if he destroyed that buffer. As I say to him, they cannot have it both ways, they cannot attempt to take credit during elections and then between elections say, "It is not our problem, it is somebody else's problem."

It is their problem, Mr. Speaker, and the problem of this House insofar as the total allocation is concerned. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in the budget took great pride in saying that they were extending the \$20 million for another year. Of course, what was the choice, Mr. Speaker? Were they going to announce that they were going to stop providing money to build schools? I do not think any credit can be given for maintaining the status quo alone at a time when construction costs are going up by leaps and bounds. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) would have done more credit to themselves and to the education system in this Province if they announced that instead of the \$20 million for this year, they were building in the cost of inflation and so on, and putting in something of the order of \$22 million or \$23 million. That extra \$2 million or \$3 million, when shared around, would have meant that my friend from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) and

his people, whom he represents so well here today, would not have to wait for 1988 but would be hearing that the board has put the school back on the priority list and indeed is able to move forward because we have a generous government, in that context, which has come up with the extra money. That is not the case but I say to the Minister of Education that it is not too late.

Perhaps what he ought to do now, with the extra impetus that this petition gives him, is to go back to Treasury Board and see if he cannot use that eminently sensible argument that \$20 million is not enough, it is not enough to freeze it at the rate of the last four years, but they ought to put in another \$2 million or \$3 million to reflect the inflationary cost and so provide an assist to my good friend from Windsor-Buchans, and in the process salute a school whose destiny was bright from the beginning with a principal like the gentleman from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) and whose destiny was made difficult from the beginning with a student like me.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents of Major Street in the Town of Roddickton I present this petition. I will read the prayer of the petition.

"We, the residents of Major Street in Roddickton, hereby pray that the hon. House of Assembly will instruct the hon. the Premier and the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to take immediate action to have Route 432 completely upgraded and paved."

This petition is signed I believe by if not 100 per cent of the voting people on that particular street, it is close to 100 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, when I rose to mention this petition I saw the hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall) breathe a sigh and mumble some words to the effect, "Oh no," or what have you. I am not going to be nasty, Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very philosophical on this today because as I present this petition I am reminded of some seventeen or eighteen years ago when I sat in the gallery and I watched the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) who was at that time a member of the Opposition. I was sitting there and everyone knew my politics then. I was a Liberal. There was a great big Liberal administration over there and he was trying to petition something for his district.

When the hon. gentleman stood up, he was booed, he was laughed at, he was overwhelmed by an arrogant, uncaring, corrupt administration which was truly bankrupt of ideas. It had nothing to do with Liberals or Tories. It was just people who forgot who had put them there and why they were there. As a result, Mr. Speaker, we know what happened a few short years later.

Mr. Speaker, I was challenged a few days ago when I made the

accusation that history is repeating itself. I was challenged to sit in the gallery and decide if history is really repeating itself. Mr. Speaker, I went up to the gallery a couple of days ago and I watched. I saw a similar arrogance. I saw a similar bankruptcy of ideas.

The Premier, on three different occasions, got up and interrupted Question Period with frivolous points of order. One of these points of order was to interrupt my friend from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush).

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

This is not, I do not think, a frivolous point of order. My understanding is the hon. gentleman is on a petition, unless he has risen on some point of order or something.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, I would ask the hon. member to keep his remarks relevant to the petition.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was trying to point out for the hon. members, to enlighten the hon. members, that I feel, as I am presenting this petition on behalf of the residents of Roddickton, the way that the member for St. John's East Extern must have felt when he was faced with this arrogance and this uncaringness.

I am speaking in support of that

petition, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure if the member for St. John's East Extern was here, he would be able to sympathize with some of my frustrations and the difficulty I am having being heard in this House. I am sure that as I speak to this petition on behalf of those people, I have the same frustrations that he had.

When I sat in the House, Mr. Speaker, I realized that I was wrong and I am man enough to admit it. I was wrong, Mr. Speaker. History is not repeating itself. It is worse today than it was seventeen or eighteen years ago. I will venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that within a few short years, the people of outport Newfoundland, who had to take action in 1971, will take action as soon as they get the opportunity again, to throw out an uncaring, corrupt administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this petition. I am saddened that I am not getting the co-operation from the other side of the House. I have an awful job to get people to stand up and support this petition but I am standing up to support it, Mr. Speaker. It is a great privilege and a great honour to support this petition on behalf of the residents of Roddickton.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

This petition is the latest in a

series of petitions from, in aggregate, hundreds of people in the communities of Roddickton and Main Brook and Englee and Boyd Arm.

MR. HODDER:

There are no signatures on it.

MR. SIMMONS:

No signatures!

MR. HODDER:

I can not see any.

MR. SIMMONS:

Ah, the two issues are quite different. Whether there are signatures and whether the member can see are two quite distinct situations.

Mr. Speaker, surely the Parliamentary Secretary, a good friend of mine for many years, is not suggesting that I would support an illegitimate petition. Mr. Speaker, this is as legitimate as anything ever was, in blue ballpoint and black ballpoint. There are some petitioners with trembling hands. None of the names are those of secretaries in our office or members on this side of the House, other than the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, who, according to the rules again, has signed the petition because he supports it just as avidly and diligently as I do.

Here are people, Mr. Speaker, who are depending on Route 432, depending on that bit of access road between the Viking Trail and the Canada Bay area. Those people in the communities of Croque and Conche and the other communities that I mentioned depend on that bit of road. They have gone out and they have exercised their democratic right in the hundreds. How many petitions is this so far?

MR. DECKER:

That is No. 13.

MR. SIMMONS:

No. 13 and I predict when he goes to the mail tomorrow morning he might find another one, and over the next few days we could have many more petitions on this very urgent subject.

It is urgent, Mr. Speaker, because it bespeaks what is happening not only in respect to Route 432, with respect to the road to Harbour Mille in my district, and English Harbour East in my district, and Pool's Cove down to Coomb's Cove in my district, and Hermitage/Seal Cove in my district, and I could mention the Burgeo Road in my friend's district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, and so many other pieces of road. They are being neglected by an administration that lacks the confidence to tend to the transportation needs of the people in this Province. An administration that, by their confrontation, left hundreds of millions of dollars on the table in Ottawa that could have been used for transportation purposes.

We would be, without using a pun, miles ahead, Mr. Speaker, in terms of road transportation in this Province, in terms of the upgrading and paving of secondary roads had we had less spite over the past few years and more intelligent intersection on behalf of the people of Newfoundland to retrieve from Ottawa some of the hundreds of millions of dollars that were left on the table there because this administration was more interested in barking and fighting and stirring up public rows than they were in getting money for this Province, getting things done, getting money for transportation, getting money for

other issues that would help generate this Province economically.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I support the petition with a heart and a half, and the House very soon is going to have to focus on this particular issue because it affects not only Route 432, it affects many other routes with other numbers with the same kind of problem. People are down the end of these roads who are trying to pursue their unique lifestyle, trying to eke out a livelihood from the fishery or the forest, have to trek over roads that are abominably bad while the government criss-crosses St. John's with yet more four lane highways instead of using the money out in rural Newfoundland; and while the government leaves hundreds of millions of dollars on the table in Ottawa because it has not got the will to speak intelligently and co-operatively on behalf of the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A further petition.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition signed by quite a few residents of Route 432 in the Roddickton area. This petition, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows:

"WHEREAS route 432 which connects the Viking Trail to the Canada Bay Branch is not completely upgraded and paved; and

"WHEREAS the people of Roddickton totally depend on this road for the exporting of all goods such as crab, other species of fish, lumber, pulp and the like; and

"WHEREAS the people of Roddickton totally depend on this road for the importing of all food, fuel and supplies, building materials, and the like; and

"WHEREAS the people of Roddickton depend upon this road for all ambulance services to the hospital at St. Anthony; and

"WHEREAS this area has an excellent tourism potential, which is not being developed because of the poor conditions of Route 432;

"WE, THE RESIDENTS OF HILLTOP CRESCENT, RODDICKTON, hereby pray the hon. House of Assembly will instruct the hon. Premier and the hon. Minister of Transportation to take immediate action to have Route 432 completely upgraded and paved."

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in presenting this petition signed, as I said, by a large number of residents in the Roddickton area.

I know the area very well. I had the honour and privilege of representing that part of Newfoundland. It was then known as White Bay North in this Assembly back in the early 1960s and I have a very good feeling for the people in the area and, I might say, a lot of sympathy for the problems that they are experiencing with respect to their roads.

The government, Mr. Speaker, must bear a few things in mind. The condition of roads are very



important to people living in the rural parts of this Province. The member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), of course, and the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) and Harbour Main (Mr. Doyle) do not have to worry too much about driving over bad roads. The member for St. John's East can get in his car on a nice paved driveway and drive down Long Pond Road and down Prescott Street into his very fine and posh office in the Royal Trust Building and then he can get in his car and drive back in here and not encounter a pebble, much less than a bad pot hole or a gravel road. I suppose there is a lot to be said for that kind of a lifestyle but the fact remains that there are people in this Province who are not so lucky.

I can name parts of my district where roads are primitive. In fact, one would hardly think there was ever a road there. I have made numerous representations to the appropriate minister and I must say I am not too impressed with the degree of attention that he is paying my representation.

Mr. Speaker, as this petition points out, this road is one on which must travel supplies and goods, services, fish is being hauled on that road to the various fish plants, ambulance service, people who are ill going to the St. Anthony Hospital must travel that road. It is not a very pleasant task I suppose to travel in an ambulance even over the best of roads but when you are travelling over a road that is in the condition that this road is in, then it makes the drive that more unpleasant.

Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot in this Province about the need for

producing a better quality fish product. We all realize the importance of producing a good quality fish that is going into the US market and other markets. Well, this sort of thing hardly lends itself to the production of a good quality fish and if for no other reason - and surely there are other reasons - but if for no other reason, Mr. Speaker, than to give this area a chance to develop and to attain its full resource development potential, such as that which exists in the fishery, then the government has a responsibility to accede to the request of the petitioners I present here this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, again I take great pleasure in presenting this petition. I recognize many names on the petition, people that I know personally from my days in that district, all sincere people, good, decent God-fearing people, who not asking for very much and not asking for a big four-lane paved highway or two-car garages. Their only request is that they be given something, Mr. Speaker, that is being taken for granted now by most Newfoundlanders and all Canadians and that is the right to be able to drive over and conduct business on a decent road.

There is another important factor, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague has alluded to in his presentation of some of these petitions and that is the cost of maintaining a vehicle, car or a truck, driving over these roads. I think he said the other day that when a person living in the Roddickton area and the Canada Bay area turn in a vehicle, that vehicle has been identified as having come from that part of the Province.

MR. DECKER:

They call them Coast cars.

MR. W. CARTER:

They call them the Coast cars and that thereby reduces the value and the trade-in value of that vehicle.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. W. CARTER:

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this petition for the reasons I have given and for the reasons contained therein. I would table it and ask the minister responsible to give it his utmost and sympathetic consideration.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before I recognize any other hon. member, I would like to announce that there is one question to be debated at five-thirty. It is a question by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). He is not satisfied with the answer given by the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) concerning the fishing in 3N0.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I sent the Speaker a note five minutes after I asked the Minister of Fisheries a question with a similar request, Sir. It was delivered to Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:

Actually, I will not take responsibility for them. They were left here but they were not drawn to my attention. They are in order, of course. There is one here from the hon. the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford). He is not satisfied with the answer from the Minister of Fisheries on the Port de Grave fishermen and he would like to raise that matter. There is another one by the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) who again is not satisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Fisheries about the fishery situation. He would like to debate it.

I am sorry about that but I was not aware that there were two other questions.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The member for the Strait of Belle Isle. Is it another petition or are you supporting this petition?

MR. DECKER:

I am supporting the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if there is some way I could be addressed as the hon. the member for Route 432. It is beginning to sound like that now.

As my colleague was saying, people who drive vehicles on this particular road and in the whole

Roddickton, Englee, Boyd Arm, Conche, Croque area, they are finding that their automobiles are taking a terrible beating and when they go to trade they get less money for them, as my colleague heard me say before.

Mr. Speaker, the injustice here is that when people go to buy those cars, whether they are new or whether they are secondhand, they have to pay the same retail sales tax on those vehicles as people who -

MR. HODDER:

It is the same petition we have been hearing for weeks.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:

If the hon. gentleman from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) would restrain himself and let my friend present his petition because all the hon. gentleman is doing is his duty as a member of the House. Surely the member for Port au Port does not want him to stop doing that. I know there is a desire on that side of the House to do those kinds of things but I would be disappointed in the member for Port au Port if he was part of that. I really would, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that I have heard this petition over and over and over almost every day. It is very easy for a member to go out in his district and circulate a number of petitions throughout the district, if they are worded differently or not, and bring them in here and present the petitions. Obviously, the member has done something like that because day after day we hear the same petition. There are many things that this House can deal with other than that particular petition. Once the member has presented his petition, that should be it. We heard it once. Mr. Speaker, if I were the Minister of Transportation and had to hear that over and over and over again, he would never get it.

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

While we were being completely hypothetical about what a member may do, I suppose, hypothetical speaking only, it is easier for a member to run out and sell his soul and then become an apologist for something that he opposed all of his life.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

But if a member, quite hypothetically, of course, wants to be an apologist for something that he opposed all of his life, do not let him in the process, Mr.

Speaker, interfere with the democratic right of a member to bring petitions here.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is more than one petition. Yes, they say the same thing. Yes, they have been hearing it for a while. Yes, they are going to hear it for several more days. They are going to continue to hear it from Route 432 and a number of other routes of which I could give the numbers, until this government smartens up and stops doing what it is doing in the Bay St. George area right now, putting all the money into Tory areas, none of the money into Liberal areas. As long as they continue that discriminatory practice and as long as the member for Port au Port supports that kind of discrimination, which he condemned all his life, and which he abhors in his heart, as long as that happens, yes, there will be more petitions. If not enough were coming in, I will go out with him and round up a few more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! To that point of order, there is no point of order. If the hon. member is repeating, and I am sure he is not, if he is repeating the same petition that, of course, would be out of order. It is not up to the Chair in any case to look at that matter. I assume that every petition is a new and original one.

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am supporting a petition which I did not present, but which I am very happy was presented. I would like for the member, when he is going to accuse me of some Machiavellian act, that he would at least know what he is talking about and get his facts straight. I did not present the petition. I am supporting the petition. I would have hoped the member will support the petition instead of standing over there like a sheep where he toed the party line.

MR. FUREY:  
Daniel Webster.

MR. HODDER:  
Well, in that case, perhaps the people in the district do not trust you if they have to send their petition to the member for Twillingate to present in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

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

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

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, I understand from the gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) that the table has the petition. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is something wrong about this petition, if as the member alleges it is a copy, if it is in some way illegitimate then the table has an obligation to tell the Chair that is so. The Chair has the obligation to tell the member that he is out of order.

But in the absence of those events, I have to assume and he has to assume that the matter is in order. This idea, Mr. Speaker, that these people can sit over there because they are in the majority and shout and undermine, because the gentleman for Twillingate and the gentleman for the Strait of Belle Isle is up doing their duty, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons we are here is to represent the needs of the people along Route 432 and elsewhere in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that it is unworthy of a member of this House to question the motives of a member in presenting a petition or to undermine the legitimacy of that petition, particularly when the Chair has already accepted that the petition is in order.

MR. HODDER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

I do not know who the ten day wonder in the federal Cabinet is referring to, but certainly I did not question the motives of the member. All I said to him was that his constituents probably did not trust him, if the member for Twillingate had to present the petition. It is a very strange circumstance where a member for a district does not present his own petitions and has the member for another district, the member for Twillingate, present them.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A very brief comment.

MR. SIMMONS:

A very brief comment is all I need to make. I just say to the gentleman for Port au Port he can understand coded signals. Now, either he sticks to the substance of matters in this House or he gets into personalities. If he gets into personalities, I will talk about people who left town because a motel burnt down. I will talk about people in many other circumstances.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

I am not talking about him. I am coding it and I am saying to him that he will make up his mind as to whether he will debate the issue or debate the personalities, and if he starts debating personalities, he has as much to lose as I have.

MR. HODDER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Very briefly.

MR. HODDER:

When the hon. member stood up in this House a little while ago, it seems to me I remember something about me selling my political soul. I take it it meant something about me being over here instead of over there. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be over here. I would not want to sit with the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I do not think there is a point of

order at all. It seems to me that both sides are intervening on a matter that I have already ruled on. I have ruled that the petition is in order.

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I have another petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents of Balsom Avenue in the town of Roddickton, here is the prayer of a petition: "We hereby pray that the hon. the House of Assembly will instruct the hon. Premier and hon. Minister of Transportation to take immediate action to have Route 432 completely upgraded and paved."

Mr. Speaker, this is a perfectly valid petition. It is not a copy. It was not the case of me going out in the district and looking for a petition. It is signed by twenty people which is the total population of Balsom Avenue, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDER:

That is as much support as you have.

MR. DECKER:

I would challenge -

MR. PEACH:

After your remarks last week, I doubt if you have that. You should be up in the gallery barffing up salt water boy.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I would refer the member again to when I sat in the

balcony. I was reminded of eighteen or nineteen years ago and history is repeating itself again. An arrogant majority is trying to stop the minority from even speaking. That is what is happening in this House, Mr. Speaker, and it is an utter disgrace, and the member from Carbonear (Mr. Peach) knows it is a disgrace. I have the right to present those petitions and until my right is taken away by the Chair I will present these petitions to this hon. House.

MR. HODDER:

You do not have the right to -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the residents of Balsom Avenue -

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. DECKER:

They are not going to let me present my petition again.

MR. J. CARTER:

I wonder if this might not help the Chair. Since we are being bombarded by so many petitions that seem to address worthy causes but, at the same time, seem to be endlessly subdivided and obstructive of the ordinary business of this House, I wonder if it might not be in order, or if Your Honour might not take it under advisement, that before petitions are presented at all that they might be passed by the

Chair's eyes so that the Chair can rule as to whether they are mischievous or whether they are actually sincere.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

There is no point of order. I am going to be very quick. It is just an attempt to obstruct the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) and, of course, His Honour is in control of this House, not the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). He does not have to give His Honour advice. God help His Honour if ever he should take it.

MR. DECKER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

I realize that the suggestion the hon. member is making is a departure from tradition. He says I have been here one year but I have not been totally dead or totally asleep for the rest of my life. I do know that there is a tradition.

AN HON. MEMBER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DECKER:

I am speaking to the point of order! Will you sit down and shut up? I am getting more and more

irritated. I am speaking to the point of order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize it is a departure from tradition to have petitions examined first. But, having said that, I am prepared to do even that, if that is what I have to do so that the people from my district can be heard. I am prepared to submit my petitions whenever the Chair directs me to do that, Sir. I was speaking to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order. There really is no point of order. There is a suggestion by the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) that the Chair would look at the petitions beforehand, but that has not been done as long as I have been in the House and I have no reason to suggest that it should be done now.

MR. PEACH:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker, having to sit here in the House and listen to any hon. member ask another hon. member in this House to shut up and sit down is not very becoming of parliamentary language. However, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this: The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) has stood here in this House, and I, as a member, could do the same thing, I could take every street in the town of Carbonear alone and bring in a petition here with the same wording on it and waste the time of the House asking for the same thing.

The member for the Strait of Belle Isle knows full well that if he is asking about a particular road in his district, he could present a petition on behalf of all of the people requesting the same thing. He is wasting the time of the House. He spent this afternoon trying to kill time until the Late Show at 5:30 p.m. He has been at it for the past week and obviously, he has been led on by the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) just to try to kill the time of the House. The time of the House could be much better spent, Mr. Speaker, in presenting a petition on behalf of his constituency, which is his right and which he should be doing but, not in the manner he is doing it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

My friend from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) came in here with two petitions today. The gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) had one from the same area. It was their intention at 3:00 p.m., as I understand it, to present these three petitions, before they knew we would be at this stage of the game at 5:15 p.m. or at 3:45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, what happened then, from the gentleman from Carbonear (Mr. Peach) is; again, unworthy of a member of this House, not only to question motives but to assign unworthy motives to a member. We

cannot allow that to happen. Either the Speaker says these petitions are in order or they are not in order. I understand the Speaker has ruled de facto they are in order, because he has allowed them to proceed. We cannot have this nagging away at the rights of members of this House.

If anybody has wasted the time of this House, Mr. Speaker, it is the several gentlemen on the other side who have risen on spurious points of order. Had they not, we would have been through the Petition procedure about a half hour ago.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, further to that point. It is very important.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Just one final word.

MR. J. CARTER:

I would like to reinforce what my colleague from Carbonear (Mr. Peach) has said about petitions. Now, Your Honour, on Wednesdays, it is a rule of this House that petitions or nothing must supercede the business of this House. At 4:00 we must go to Private Members' Day.

MR. SIMMONS:

This is Thursday.

MR. J. CARTER:

I realize that. I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if it might not be useful to consider changing the rules of this House so that on any day the ordinary business of the House proceeds at a certain time.

MR. SIMMONS:

Shut her down altogether, boy!



MR. J. CARTER:

It seems to me that what we are seeing is a deliberate attempt on the part of members opposite to endlessly subdivide petitions so that the ordinary business of this House is disturbed. And, Your Honour, as keeper and arbiter of the business of this House, I would urge you to look very suspiciously upon what the hon. members are doing.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. I have ruled on that matter earlier and then, when it was raised again, I said it was not applicable, so there is no point of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I want to rise and speak in support of the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

He already did.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. TULK:

He already did, except for the interjections by hon. members opposite, who used up all of his time.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the gentleman from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) is doing an admirable job in this House. It is his duty. He should be praised for doing the job that he is doing. He is bringing before this

House and he is going to make sure that the wishes and the feelings of his people in their petition to this House, which is one of the most important things that can be done, are aired and made known so that everybody is aware and that they are constantly reminded that Route 432 must be upgraded and paved. It will not go away. It will be there forever, we hope, and if the member for the Strait of Belle Isle has his way, hopefully this year he will get some paving done. So the member should be congratulated. He is doing -

MR. PEACH:

He is going about it the wrong way.

MR. TULK:

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is the essence of the problem. We just heard it from the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) and the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms). 'He is going about it the wrong way.'

MR. SIMMS:

I was talking to your colleague up in the gallery.

MR. TULK:

Oh, I am sorry. The member for Carbonear made the statement. The member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) says he did not. I accept his apology.

Mr. Speaker, there is the essence of the problem. There is nothing else in this Province that is used more by the government to try and put those people who opposed them in any way, shape or form, down, to keep them down, to jump on them, to show their arrogance than the road system in this Province. There is the arrogance coming through again. The member for the

Strait of Belle Isle, if he does not do it their way, he is not going to get it, they are telling him.

MR. DECKER:

There way is to be a Tory.

MR. TULK:

There way is to be a Tory.

We have had in this House people cross the floor because if they were not on the Tory side, they were not going to get anything. Now that is shameful. I have to say to the hon. gentlemen that I do not believe there is anybody who came on this side with the intention that they had to get road work done or something done in their district. That is not true and I think the hon. gentlemen will admit that that is not true but that is the attitude. They have used roads to try to pressure that point more than any other government in history.

MR. J. CARTER:

Are you speaking to the petition?

MR. TULK:

Of course I am speaking to the petition. I am speaking to why it is so important that this petition be presented the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, they are learning something though. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) in this Province showed his arrogance by getting on television and saying, 'I give to my Tory buddies. I do not give to districts that are Liberal.' That is basically what he said, paraphrasing him, that is what he said. They found something and I will tell you when they found it out in the last election, Mr. Speaker.

The member for Lewisporte (Mr. Russell) knows what I am talking about. He lives next to a district that has been threatened for years, the district of Fogo. If you do not elect a Tory member, you are not going to get anything in Fogo. It was running out of our ears down there. Do you know something, Mr. Speaker? I made up my mind in 1985 that I was going to take that on head on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

When the election was called, unlike the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), who confessed to me himself that he was scared stiff to run in Port au Port as a Liberal because of the road conditions down there - I accepted that - I said you cannot blackmail me, you cannot bribe me and you cannot buy me. Do you know something? The people of Fogo district upped my votes by 700 votes on that theme alone. They came along and they said, 'No, Beaton Tulk.'

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:

I hope so. I hope so. We will have another giant killer go down, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan).

MR. SIMMONS:

He is going to have to find a seat, that is for sure.

MR. TULK:

That is right. The member for Bonavista South should run in Fogo because he is scared to run in Bonavista South from what I am hearing. I understand that he could not even get his mayor

friend elected in the town of Bonavista.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I will come back to the essence of this petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is elapsed.

MR. TULK:

What, all ready?

Mr. Speaker, I want to say I support the petition, and the great job the member for the Strait of Belle Isle has done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Orders of the Day.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I do not see any point in going to Orders of the Day for five minutes. Why do we not begin the Late Show now, if hon. members agree?

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, just before we get into the Late Show -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

- I should like to say that the Social Services Committee will meet at the Colonial Building this evening to review the Estimates of the Department of the Environment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

One other thing, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask why, it has got us very curious I want to say, as to why so many of the Opposition are haunting the galleries? I wonder is it because the hon. members cannot stand each other that they have to go to the gallery? I can understand it then.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker, raised by the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). He asks why the Liberal members are sitting in the gallery. We are doing some scouting. We cannot make up our minds whether the gentleman for Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) should be Lieutenant-Government or Speaker. But we have a place for him. We are doing some general scouting, just watching the behaviour of people for when the new millennium takes over.

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, when the time comes, in about twenty years time when the federal Liberals get in again, then they can consider the member for Waterford - Kenmount for Lieutenant - Governor.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

This is the Late Show and I will call on the hon. member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:  
He has been called before, many things.

MR. TULK:  
Yes, and I will be called many things again.

I hope the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) is around.

MR. SIMMS:  
Somebody will respond to you.

MR. TULK:  
Well, I want the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. SIMMS:  
It is not absolutely necessary.

MR. TULK:  
I know it is not absolutely necessary, but I want the Minister of Fisheries to reply because while the Minister of Fisheries -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Here he is.

MR. TULK:  
Good. While the Minister of Fisheries perhaps - and I will finish why I want him to be here - does not know and do all that he should do with fisheries, I have to say that the hon. gentleman probably knows and does more than anybody else over on the other side does.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:  
I really want him to answer my question. I want to put the question to him in this form: Yesterday we had the spectacle - and I cannot call it anything else only a spectacle - of Newfoundland fishermen being towed into port under arrest, with gear seized, and perhaps even their boats seized. All that those people stand accused of, Mr. Speaker, is trying to earn a living.

They are some of the best fishermen in Newfoundland, the people from Port de Grave. There is absolutely no question about that. You can even get agreement on the other side about that. Some of the people in the fishery who have made the best livings out of the fishery come from Port de Grave, and they have worked hard to do it. Yesterday was an historic day in Newfoundland. If ever there was a day when we should have worn black arm bands and flown black flags it was yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:  
We saw those gentlemen being towed into port, arrested and authorities said, 'no more can you earn a living the way you have always earned it. No more can you earn a living.'

Mr. Speaker, if that was a new incident yesterday, something that the Fisheries Minister was not aware of in Newfoundland, or was not aware of in Canada, then maybe there would have been some legitimate reason to tow them into port.

But the truth of the matter is that the Minister of Fisheries

(Mr. Rideout) in Newfoundland and the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa (Mr. Fraser) has been aware of this problem for at least a year and perhaps more. The Minister of Fisheries's department, as a matter of fact, and there is an agreement that shows this, he helped outfit and helped pay some of the expenses of those fishermen to change from the crab fishery to fishing halibut. There is an agreement signed by one Mr. King from his department with one of those fishermen.

He must have recognized last year that those people had to have a new fishery because the crab fishery was failing and he was given a whole year. Those people were harassed last year by the Canadian Coastguard patrol boats. I do not know if the Cowley was there last year or not but the Cape Roger was certainly there. Those people were patient but the Spring came and they had to make a living. They had to start working. They do not want to wait until July or August to go to work. The minister in the last year has done little or nothing and the federal Minister of Fisheries has done little or nothing. We know where they stand in the fishery in Newfoundland. We have seen the cuts. We have seen the chops. They have done nothing.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday those fishermen were towed into port and that is a spectacle that is unprecedented in this Province. I have to say to the Minister of Fisheries that his solution now is this, at the present time, if he is seeking a quota from NAFO on fish that he has recovered from the Russians and if he has any hope of getting that quota, then he should rise in this House and

say he is going to get that quota. He should say one other thing, that until he gets that quota from NAFO, the arrests that were made yesterday are going to be repealed by the federal Minister of Fisheries, they are going to be taken away, withdrawn -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
- and that the harassment that is going on out there by the Canadian Coastguard, on Canadian fishermen -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please! The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. TULK:  
- will not -

Mr. Speaker!

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):  
Order, please! I have called for order four times.

MR. TULK:  
Have you? Mr. Speaker, I just want to conclude by saying to him, do the right thing for Newfoundland fishermen. For the love of God, do the right thing.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, unlike Question Period today, 99.9 per cent of what the hon. gentleman just said would be echoed by me or, I am sure, any member in this House.

MR. TULK:  
You are in a position to take some action.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, did I open my yap while the hon. gentleman was making his remarks? I do not think anybody can say I did. So let me say, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There are two or three meetings going on. Both sides, order!

MR. RIDEOUT:

- that there is no disagreement on 99.9 per cent of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman by me as the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Was the hon. member saying something? I am having difficulty interpreting two or three people talking at one time. The hon. member sounded as though he was objecting to something.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, to continue let me say that basically everything that was said, with one or two exceptions by the hon. gentleman, I totally concur with, this government totally concurs with, and I do not think there is a Newfoundland alive that would argue against the infamy of what we saw happen to Newfoundlanders yesterday. Nobody, Mr. Speaker, and I say that even though remarks from both sides at one time or another today were intertwined with political innuendo as well, there is nobody that would decry the shameful act that took place off the coast of this Province yesterday, nobody. Now, once we all agree on that, as we did in Committee here this morning, as we did in Question Period here today

and as we are doing here in what is commonly referred to as the Late Show, I can only say to the hon. gentleman or eyeball to eyeball to any Newfoundlander that I do not think that anybody has done more or anybody can do more than what we have tried to do to face the reality of what is facing us as a Province and faces Canada as a country in the NAFO area referred to as 3NO.

No matter what the heart of Tom Rideout says or what the heart of Tom Siddon says or what the heart of any Newfoundlander says, we do not, as of today, in 1986, have the right to go out and take fish that is allocated by NAFO and give it to Tom Rideout's brother or his mother or his best friend. We can fight for it. We have fought for it and we have screamed for it and we have bawled for it and we will continue to do so, Mr. Speaker. But I do not, and nobody in Canada today has the constitutional right or authority, no matter how much we do not agree with the way that hard-working fishermen in Newfoundland are being treated, we do not have the right to overturn it as of today.

So, what have we tried to do, Mr. Speaker? Last year there was a directed halibut fishery given to those vessels in 3NO. The federal government gave a quota allocation for vessels less than sixty-five feet. The hon. gentleman accuses us, as a Province, of helping them to gear up. Mr. Speaker, we helped the vessels to gear up for 3Ps where there was an allocation last year and still an allocation today. Some of it is still uncaught.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

If the hon. minister would just wind up.

MR. RIDEOUT:

So all I am saying, Mr. Speaker - I am at the end of my time - is that yes, we totally agree and we have been working within the legal framework that is available to me or available to any Newfoundlander, if he becomes Minister of Fisheries tomorrow, to bring that fish back to Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The next item is the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) who is dissatisfied with the answer given by the hon. the Minister of Fisheries regarding the Port de Grave fishermen.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am not at all satisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). He quite clearly stated this afternoon and just again now that he does not have the power to do anything about the problem. The federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Siddon) up in Ottawa apparently is not such a good friend to the provincial Minister of Fisheries as the people of this Province were led to believe in last year's election when everybody was told in this Province, 'You vote Tory in Newfoundland because we have a Tory government in Ottawa and everything will be okay'. That commitment was made to every Newfoundlander and the majority of people in this Province believed that and the majority of people

elected that government over there and now they are turning around and telling them the complete opposite. Well, that is not good enough.

If you are admitting that you have no power and you are admitting that you cannot do anything about it, well I say to the Minister of Fisheries, he is certainly into the wrong position. He should resign and let somebody else move in who can do something about it.

MR. PEACH:

It will not be you for sure.

MR. EFFORD:

The hon. the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) will have no worries about saying anything else in the House of Assembly after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Hon. members will be heard in silence. That applies to both sides.

MR. EFFORD:

I find it very strange, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Fisheries to get on his feet this afternoon and tell the members of this House and the people who are listening that it is a fact that the fishermen for Port de Grave, who operate those longliners, were not given permission to go into the 3NO. In fact, Mr. Speaker, last year it was stated very clearly at a meeting that Eric Dunne, Lionel Rowe, John Mercer, Richard Cashin, Earl McCurdy and a

number of fishermen who operated those longliners attended that they could diversify from the crab industry and they would be given numbers of dollars. One fisherman was even given up to 20,000 pounds of bait to go out there and fish in that particular area.

Mr. Speaker, also an operator of another boat, Mr. Chesley Petten of the Nautical Enterprise, was given permission and equipment to go out there and fish side by side the Glen Clova in the same area. Yet the minister this afternoon stands in the House and tells us that that is not so. It was only seven or eight short months ago that this happened. Those fishermen, whom the minister said in this House not too long ago could go out there and not make a viable operation out of it, have proven to every Newfoundlander that they could go out there and catch a quota of fish and make a very good profit at no cost to government, where his own middle distance fleet is going to cost millions of dollars. These boats of 65 feet or less, 64 feet 11.5 inches can carry just as much fish as The Glen Clova, or even more with less crew, and at less expense to the Newfoundland people.

Now, I am not jumping up and going against the middle distance fleet, but I will go against the middle distance fleet if all of those Newfoundland longliners, which are equipped and whose crews have the guts to fish 200 miles offshore, are stopped. If that be the case, then I will fight with all my power against the middle distance fleet, which is just something to satisfy the minister's ego.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

I find it very strange, Mr. Speaker, that the minister would stand in his place and tell us that it matters if a boat is 64 feet 11.5 inches, when one of his own boats which has a licence to fish in the area for boats 65 feet to 100 feet, is actually 106 feet. That is a question I would like the minister to answer when he stands up to reply.

Mr. Speaker, in the Committee meeting this morning the minister told me that there was an alternative fishery for these fishermen, that they could go up 2J3KL, and I actually sat down and believed him. I began to wonder why these fishermen would go to the 3NO area when they already had a place, as the minister said, to go off and catch their fish. I began to think I was probably fighting for the wrong people. Then, Mr. Speaker, I went and questioned these people and I found out that the reason they cannot fish up there is they have fixed gear, and the 2J3KL area is fished by draggers, by a mobile fleet. If those fishermen put their fixed gear in the water, as we have seen happen around our coast with the crab pots and everything, the draggers will destroy every inch of it. So how can they possibly go up there and have a viable operation with fixed gear?

I have to say to the minister that he is talking politics, he is twisting the thing around, and he is not taking the concerns of those people to heart.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

The hon. member should conclude his remarks now.



MR. EFFORD:

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want the minister to reply to this: He made a statement a short while ago that he was fighting and he had the concerns of those people at heart. Actually, I would have believed him had a quote that the minister made in public not been referred to me.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

The minister is quoted as saying that he hopes the federal government presses charges against those boats arrested yesterday. Is it ever possible that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) made that statement?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave?

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no leave. The hon. member's time is up.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I am tempted, except for the seriousness and the gravity of the situation that we are debating here today, to reply to some of the, again, political comments from the hon. gentleman from Port de Grave (Mr. Efford). Mr. Speaker, let me say to the

hon. gentleman that he has no monopoly -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I made a ruling before that the members from both sides were going to be heard in silence. That applies this time as well as the last time.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The hon. gentleman has no monopoly on caring or compassion for Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker. Let me try to answer directly some of the charges that he has flung across the floor in not trying to deal with the nub of the issue as a factual issue, as I am trying to do, but some of the charges, such as saying that I would like to have people charged.

Well, the actual quote if it was all played, Mr. Speaker, is what I was said in the House today in Question Period, what I have said as I have gone from one part of Canada to the other, and gone internationally with the Canadian delegation trying to press our case for extended jurisdiction. What I have said consistently and what I will say again consistently, Mr. Speaker, is that we will not, in this Province, stand for foreigners overfishing off our Coast, we are against it! The only way to have the problem corrected is by extended jurisdiction and when we make that argument, Mr. Speaker, in the international court of public opinion, we cannot be seen as being anything other than pure ourselves.

So this is the context, Mr.

Speaker, in which that kind of statement is made. Talking about our own vessel, I assume this is a public document, the 1986 management plan for all areas around Newfoundland and Labrador. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that last year, as I have said 100 times in Committee today and in Question Period, the federal government provided a quota for vessels less than 65 feet in NAFO area 3NO for a 90 per cent directed halibut fishery and a 10 per cent cod by-catch. Last year they did that. It became evident, according to the landings that were landed and reported and according to the reports, that in many cases, not in all cases, the ratios were reversed and instead of 90 per cent halibut, there were times when it was close to 90 per cent cod.

MR. TULK:

Oh sure! Why not?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am not going to say this again: The next hon. member who interjects, including the hon. member for Fogo, I will name him.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Oh! Oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

I will also say something else while I am at it. Maybe this is the time for me to say it. I heard what the hon. the member for Fogo said when I called him to order. He was displeased with my

ruling. The hon. gentleman, if he is going to treat the Chair with arrogance, it is not going to be tolerated as long as I am in the Chair. I will apply the rules of the House. I called order four times and his response was, 'Is that right? Is that right? Is that right?' Now, that is in Hansard.

I just want to tell the hon. gentleman, if he has a problem with my rulings, that is unfortunate, but he will abide by the rulings.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, this year there was no quota provided. We have been accused of doing nothing when we are trying to do the only thing that is available to us within the legal framework, try to access fish that is currently given to another nation. We are doing that and I think we are being successful.

The hon. gentleman talks about the new middle distance vessel, Mr. Speaker. There is an allocation for vessels over 100 feet in 3NO. He raised all kinds of other questions I would be glad to answer, if I had the time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have to interrupt the hon. minister to inform him that he has a minute left.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said today, Mr. Speaker, the allegation was made, by people, to the media today that we are trying to build a middle distance fleet on the backs of those vessels that want

to fish in 3NO.

MR. EFFORD:

What else are you doing?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. The middle distance fleet of Newfoundland and Labrador will fish in 2J3KL with very few small tonages in 3NO, or any other Southern zone, to round out their fishing plan in the month or two of the year they cannot fish in the ice-infested waters of the North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The third item on the Late Show is an item from the hon. the member for Twillingate who was dissatisfied with the answer to the question put to the Minister of Fisheries on the fishery situation.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister can shout all he likes, and he can defend his friends in Ottawa all he likes, he can defend the actions of the Cape Roger and the Leonard Cowley but, Mr. Speaker, it does not take away from the fact that yesterday in this Province we all witnessed the sad spectacle of a Newfoundland fishing vessel - it might just as easily have been from Twillingate as Port de Grave - being towed into this port, for what? For

having committed the crime of having the courage, first of all, to travel 200 miles in a sixty-five foot boat to pursue their occupation. That was their only crime. Manned by Newfoundlanders, a boat registered in a Newfoundland port, fishing out of a Newfoundland port, being towed into this port almost like the pirates of old, almost like you would read about in some old classic, being towed into port, treated like criminals, their 1,000 pounds of fish being confiscated, their gear being confiscated and, as I said, the owners and the people who were manning that boat were being treated like criminals. What a sad, sad commentary, Mr. Speaker, on what is happening in this Province, a country and a Province with an economy that is so dependent on the fishery. In fact, if you look around, Mr. Speaker, you will find that the fishing industry is one of the last great resources that we have, and certainly one on which Newfoundland must build its future, its social and economic prospects. I do not think the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) should be trying to defend the actions of The Cape Roger or their masters in Ottawa who directed those vessels to go out there and to arrest that ship. I am told by the owners of that vessel that they were fishing pretty well on the border of the 200 mile limit, in fact I believe less than half a mile outside of that 200 mile limit.

I am told that there were Nova Scotian fishing vessels operating in the same area, doing the exact same thing as they were doing, and I am told, Mr. Speaker, and this probably is even more serious, more important, that while The

Cape Roger was arresting that Newfoundland vessel, there were two or three, I believe Spanish, or maybe Portuguese nationals, fishing within the 200 mile limit. Now, maybe they were fishing within their quota, I do not know, but again, Mr. Speaker, it is a bit of a paradox that we have Spaniards and Portuguese and Russians and other countries in the EEC fishing within the 200 mile limit, and, I might add, in some cases abusing their privileges, overfishing, yet we have a Newfoundland vessel, again manned by Newfoundlanders who would dare go probably less than half a mile beyond the 200 mile limit, and this great country of Canada, this great nation that last year allowed a West German fishing vessel to plunder 11,500 tons of fish before they were able to catch them or do anything about it, this great country, this great Department of Fisheries and Oceans, went out there and, as far as I am concerned, spent a lot of time and a lot of the taxpayers' money harassing these fishermen. And it was nothing short of harassment what they were doing, planes flying overhead, certainly on one occasion, planes circling overhead, The Cape Roger or The Cowley standing by as if they were a bunch of criminals.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):  
Order, please!

I should tell the hon. member he has about a minute to give him a chance to conclude.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, I could go on for twenty-four hours, Sir, because this is the sort of thing that I think boils the blood of most Newfoundlanders.

The Port de Grave fishermen were led astray, Mr. Speaker, by the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans, in concurrence with the Provincial Department of Fisheries in this Province, because my friend from Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) a moment ago mentioned a meeting that was held which the federal officials attended, Eric Dunne, Richard Cashin from the union, Earle McCurdy from the union, Lionel Rowe and Jack Marshall. But he failed to mention, by the way, that there was one other very important player in that scenario. The minister's Deputy Minister, Mr. Ray Andrews, was privy to that conversation at which time the fishermen from Port de Grave were told to go ahead, to gear up, that 'we do not see too many problems.' And they did gear up and they did fish, but codfish are not respecters of borders.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Can I have a minute or two just to finish, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:  
If there is leave.

Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Yes.

MR. W. CARTER:  
By some strange twist of fate, Mr. Speaker, when these fishermen were fishing for halibut the codfish did not read the sign on the hook that said 'halibut only'. A lot of the codfish made the mistake of getting on the same hook. And by the minister's own admission the

ratios were reversed. Instead of 90 per cent halibut and 10 per cent cod, according to the minister it was closer to 90 per cent cod and 10 per cent halibut. That proves, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the fish in that area are not that scarce. Surely if a by-catch can be as large as the minister alleges the by-catch was in that particular case, there is not that much danger that the 1,000 tons these men need to make a living is going to have the effect of ravaging the resource and maybe jeopardizing its future rehabilitation.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, without hesitation, I can speak for twenty-four hours on the subject as well as the hon. gentlemen. Mr. Speaker, the platitudes that he has enunciated are ones that we all support, the principles that he has enunciated are ones that we all support. I say to him and I do not do it lightly, but keeping in my mind the fact that he alluded to himself, the hon. gentleman who talks in such great platitudes today, Mr. Speaker, was around when the problem that we have today was created. There is no doubt that people thought that we were solving the problem at the time, there is no doubt that great strides were made at the time, that great progress was made at the time, but we would not be here today in Newfoundland, in 1986, talking about the problem that Newfoundlanders from Port de Grave

or Ming's Bight or anywhere else.

MR. W. CARTER:  
I am going to (Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, this is terrible! I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Does this work both ways or does it not?

MR. W. CARTER:  
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:  
The hon. member was not privy or party to that declaration. In effect, if he checked the records, and I hope he will, he will find that I am one member who advocated that the limit be extended to include the Nose and the Tail of the Banks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Good. That is excellent!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of order. It is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
That is excellent, Mr. Speaker, and I can see the impact he had on Don Jamieson, who was Canada's External Affairs Minister at the time. The fact of the matter is,

Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK:

At least we got the 200 miles.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, at least we got the 200 miles.

MR. TULK:

Now you finish it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

We are trying to finish it. We need to.

MR. FUREY:

Trying?

MR. RIDEOUT:

I can shout just as loud as the hon. gentleman. That is not the way it should be here but I can do it.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to finish it and the only day that we will not face the bitter gall of what we are facing in Newfoundland today is the day that we do finish it. As of today it is not finished, and Newfoundlanders are suffering because of it. There are other Canadians suffering because of it, and we are trying to do the best we can to alleviate that suffering, to get them some fish so that they can legitimately fish, as they have a right to do in that area and in all parts of the 200 mile limit off our coast. Mr. Speaker, to suggest that somehow or other we condone treating Newfoundlanders one way and Nova Scotians another way, not on your life, Mr. Speaker! We have already indicated that and we will turn over every rock, whether it is a red rock or a black rock or a blue rock, to determine whether the allegations made are

true, that somehow people from this Province were treated differently from people from other provinces. Tory buddies, Mr. Speaker? I say to hell with Tory buddies, Newfoundlanders come first.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Motion, that the House at its rising do adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 2, 1986, at 10:00 a.m., carried.