



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 37

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Thursday

22 May 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, the peak Summer tourist season is rapidly approaching and the level of interest in vacationing in Newfoundland and Labrador is at an all time high.

In April alone the Department of Development and Tourism received a total of 8,900 enquiries as opposed to 5,000 for the same month in 1985, which represents a 77 per cent increase in requests for information.

We receive these requests in a number of ways. Potential tourists either write the department directly, they walk in 'off the street', or phone us on either our regular phone lines or on the toll-free tourist information phone service. This latter service, known as the Wats Line, is available throughout the Eastern, Northeast U.S. and Canada. This year alone we have recorded significant increases in the use of the Wats Line, particularly from the United States. In March of 1986 calls on this service were up 189 per cent from U.S. sources. In April we

experienced a 97 per cent increase, and to date in May the calls are up by 130 per cent.

In total from all sources, U.S., included, the use of the toll-free service has increased by 120 per cent in the last year. There are several reasons behind these increases, and other concurrent increases in written enquiries, not the least of which is the professional advertising campaign we have launched in our price target areas of the Northeast U.S. and the Maritimes. This year we have embarked on a \$1.2 million advertising effort using print, radio, and television mediums to promote the Province as a unique vacation alternative. In the United States this campaign is complimented by a \$30 million Federal ad campaign.

The timing of these major marketing efforts are opportune, especially as they relate to attracting American tourists. Recent trends have developed whereby American tourists are looking for vacation alternatives closer to home. There are several reasons for this. First, the unfortunate reality of the threat of international terrorism has made American tourists wary about travelling to overseas destinations.

Secondly, the American dollar is strong against the Canadian dollar and as a result the American tour wholesalers and travel agencies are finding that they can present affordable and attractive vacation packages to Canadian destinations. And third, the price of gasoline has fallen thereby making auto vacations more cost efficient for the average tourist. And what we are finding now is that, through the

promotional efforts of the Department of Development and Tourism, the Province is well positioned to get a significant portion of that growing market.

This is by no means a new trend either. Last year, for example, we experienced a 9.3 per cent increase in tourists visiting the Province from the United States by automobile and a further 3.4 per cent increase in American tourists travelling here by air. Overall our visitation levels from outside sources in 1985 increased by 2.8 per cent, with expenditures from the tourist sector approximating \$89 million into the Newfoundland economy. With the aforementioned factors influencing travelling destinations, we anticipate an acceleration in these visitation increases this Summer.

While we are concentrating the bulk of our promotional efforts in the United States on the New England States, and Boston in particular, we have experienced significant increases in interest from as far afield as Florida, Wisconsin, Illinois, and so on.

In Canada, there is growing interest in Newfoundland and Labrador vacations from the West, in particular Manitoba, Saskatchewan and the Northwest Territories, and we attribute at least some of this to our increased visibility created through media exposure at events such as the Grey Cup Parade, where Newfoundland and Labrador participation was widely praised.

The increase in enquiries we are receiving together with these major advertising and promotional initiatives, and what we are experiencing at tourism trade shows that we participate in, such

as Rendez-vous Canada, indicate that there is definitely more interest in Newfoundland and Labrador vacations.

This is certainly good news for the operators of tourist establishments in this Province. It should also positively effect the Summer employment picture in Newfoundland and Labrador. More tourists mean more new money injected into the economy of our Province, and with new money comes new jobs and greater opportunities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

First of all, let me thank the minister for giving me in advance a copy of his statement on tourism. He certainly correctly identified a number of the factors which make Newfoundland an attractive destination for would-be tourists from the Northeast United States and Eastern Canada, the American dollar, the concerns about terrorism by travelling, involved in travelling overseas, and so on.

I am glad to hear and we are glad to hear on this side, about the increase in enquiries. We have never had any doubt on this side, and, I believe, on all sides of this House, that people in other parts would like to come here. That is not the issue. One issue is what we have to offer them in facilities when they get here, and the other issue is how adequately are we taking appropriate steps to

promote Newfoundland so that those who come are not coming out of happenstance only but because they have heard about us through good promotion. The department has taken a number of initiatives that are worthwhile in terms of promoting but, yet, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the overall approach to tourism development in this Province is archaic at best and in many cases amounts to little more than pompous lip service. I can give you some examples from the very cheap partisan approach that is used in the distribution of promotion items. A case in point, an Opposition member cannot get a flag to give to a school in his district, yet, the following week a Tory member moves into that same school and presents a flag on behalf of, I suppose, the government.

I can give you examples of where members of the Opposition have had to go out and out of their own pockets buy flags to send in response to enquiries from across the country. We have been on parliamentary delegations together, we have been approached by national teams, and in both cases we see the government members with pocketsful of Newfoundland flag pins and if we want to get them, we have to get a few from the government member to give out. It is that kind of cheap partisanship, Mr. Speaker, which subtracts from our overall effort. Once we are outside this Province we are all, whatever our political label, ambassadors for the Province and we should be given the tools to do the job to the same extent that government members are.

Another suggestion I make to the minister is produce some maps that properly reflect the importance of

Labrador in the geography of Newfoundland. I suggest to him that they adopt the Liberal policy of making the Gulf ferry an extension of the Trans-Canada Highway in terms of costs of travelling on that ferry. You can have all the promotion in the world, if it is too expensive for the tourist to get here, he ain't going to come. Stop punishing the Bonne Bay area where the business is down because of a very negative initiative on the part of this government.

That booth in North Sydney, Mr. Speaker, is an absolute disgrace; it is tucked away in the corner of the terminal building there, some two bit, second-class, cheap operation. Spend some money and put up a proper chalet there and show a good face for Newfoundland and make it attractive for people to come here.

In short, Mr. Speaker, any increases in tourism -

MR. BARRY:

Have you mentioned the Gulf ferry system?

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, I have mentioned the Gulf ferry. Any increase, Mr. Speaker, in tourism in this Province, any increase in interest in tourism and any increase in tourism dollars that come to this Province are despite, Mr. Speaker, despite, not because of any of the efforts of this particular administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) I would like to welcome to the gallery a former member of the

House, Mr. Ray Guy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that in the recent budget speech presented by my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), reference was made to the provision in the estimates of the Department of Social Services for an amount of \$145,000 to develop a residential service for physically disabled adults at the Orange Home on Forest Road.

Most members of this House is aware, I am sure, that this home functioned for many years as an excellent short term residence for people from across the Province who came to St. John's to receive cancer treatment. Since it was no longer required for that purpose, the board of directors came to government with an offer that the facility be used for some other needed community service.

Over the years the department has been called upon to assist in finding or providing accommodations or placements on numerous occasions to younger people with physical disabilities only to have no other alternative to offer except a home designed and operated for elderly people with chronic care needs. Every member of this House is aware, I am certain, of instances of younger individuals who have been most inappropriately residing in such settings for extended periods

of time.

The Orange Home can, without question, and with relatively minor modifications be developed to provide a good service for up to eight people. In addition, being mortgage or debt free, the cost of using the facility to provide a first class service is well within that which we would normally have to face in establishing such a service.

My purpose today is to provide some additional information with respect to this service for I have had contact with some individuals and groups who have expressed certain anxiety that the establishing of this facility will result in disabled people being relegated in some way with no consideration or attention being given to rehabilitation or independence enhancement efforts. Today, I want to categorically lay to rest any such concern and to ensure all concerned that such is certainly not the case. Indeed, neither the department nor the board of the home would be satisfied with any such concept.

In the event, however, that there may be others who have such concerns, I want to indicate that although the actual detailed development of the service has just commenced, I am able to indicate that it will be within the following broad objectives or principles:-

(1) Admission to the home will be based upon carefully designed criteria and will be by application. While it might seem preposterous, there were some people who actually suspected that they would be obliged to leave their present place or residence and move to the home.

(2) The first emphasis of this service will be toward rehabilitation and increased independency. The board will be undertaking to recruit within the near future as co-ordinator of the home a qualified person with training, background and experience in working with people in the rehabilitation field. Through this person, access to training and developmental services will be assured and I am sure that in many cases, increased independent living capability will lead to certain individuals moving to new living environments in the community such as individual or cooperative apartments, etc. Much has been achieved in this regard by Civic #4 Transition Home which is also funded by my department.

Number 3, the other dimension to this project to which we are committed is that of a high quality residential service. This involves, among other things, attendant care services, accessibility of transportation to the social, recreational and cultural life of the community. It is based on respect for the dignity and rights of each individual to exercise the highest measure of freedom possible within such a setting. In short, Mr. Speaker, for those for whom a more independent living arrangement may not be attainable because of certain aspects of their disabilities, it will be a residential service developed around the individualized needs of each resident.

In order to facilitate and ensure the development of the service within these principles, the board of the home and the department has agreed to establish a six-member Advisory Programme Development Committee consisting of three

representatives of the board and three nominees of the department. One of the our representatives will be the Assistant Director of Rehabilitation who has spent almost ten years as a rehabilitation councillor with the Department of Social Services. In addition, I have written the chairpersons of the Boards of Directors of the Consumer Organization of Disabled People and the Canadian Paraplegic Association to each appoint a representative. Hon. members know, I am sure, that my department helps fund the activities of these organizations which do excellent work on behalf of disabled people. Others will have an opportunity if they choose to have input through these representatives.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that this will be yet another option in the spectrum of services the department is attempting to develop for disabled people. We are currently spending over \$1 million per year in special needs to provide individuals with attendant care and other home support services. In addition, we are looking at a proposal for an integrated housing project in which we are hoping to provide attendant care services for more independent disabled people.

I want to assure all concerned that efforts to provide for increased services for the disabled will continue to be a priority of this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we thank the minister for supplying us with a copy of his statement. We, on this side of the House, have recently had a briefing from the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) who has had some personal involvement with the Orange Home, the former home for cancer patients. I believe his parents were involved in managing that home for a number of years. With the Health Science Complex addition for a hostel, I guess you would call it, for patients and the families of patients, the Orange Home has lost the initial reason for which it was set up.

I think that what the minister is proposing here is a good idea. We understand that there are concerns that there not be a tendency back towards institutionalization of the handicapped, but the brutal reality is that at the present time there are handicapped individuals who are in institutions and, as the minister has mentioned, in homes for the aged, in an environment which is very depressing, not very conducive to rehabilitation and not very conducive to a high quality of life. The ideal is, funds permitting, to move towards group homes. Well, the ideal would be, if every patient were able to afford the facilities, the care that would be needed to permit them to operate within their own residences, their own homes. Finances do not always permit that.

In the case of motor vehicle accidents or other negligence accidents resulting in individuals

being impaired for the rest of their lives, this is one of the reasons why the awards in court cases and insurance payments have gone so high recently, that Canadian courts do take the approach these days that the injured party is entitled to be put back, as far as possible, in the condition he or she was before the accident, and that usually involves, if funds permit, money being paid to provide for the necessary type of residence or modifications to existing residence and the necessary attendance, the individuals to help care for those who are handicapped as a result of negligence. Where we have individuals who are not able to have access to the necessary funds, there is then an obligation upon government to do what it can to try, as far as is possible within the confines of fiscal restraint, financial restraint, to put these individuals in a setting which is conducive to rehabilitation and which gives them a reasonable quality of life.

Now, we would ask the minister to keep pushing. Central Mortgage and Housing, I understand, had a programme at one time - I have not heard too much about it lately - which provided funds, permitted the handicapped access to funds to put into small group homes. If I understand the minister's statement, we are talking about approximately eight residents, so we are into, I guess, something that would be a little larger than the normal group home but not that much larger, and if individuals apply, wish to move from a present unsatisfactory setting, then I think they should have the option of moving into a facility like this, even though it is not the ideal, it is not necessarily a

small group home or a small residence, as private a residence as individuals might otherwise have.

So we support the initiative that has been taken by the minister and his department. We think it is good, and we understand that the minister will still keep an emphasis upon rehabilitation and will not try to put these individuals 'out of sight, out of mind' into an institution and avoid any attempts to integrate them into the community of which they form a part. By and large, I think with those undertakings by the minister, the matter should be resolved satisfactorily in terms of utilizing the facility that is there and, at minimum cost to government, helping individuals who need assistance.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to inform the House that my department intends to lease our government-owned fish processing facility at Brig Bay to Port au Port Seafoods Limited, a processing firm currently operating on the Port au Port Peninsula.

This facility was originally constructed by government at the request of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation to help alleviate a herring quality problem in the area, and today is one of the better facilities on the Northwest Coast.

Mr. Speaker, the Brig Bay facility was leased to the Canadian

Saltfish Corporation as part of its saltfish operation, but the Corporation had to terminate the lease due to difficulties in obtaining a dependable supply of raw material at competitive prices.

During the 1985 season, the Brig Bay plant was closed. Although a number of processors expressed interest in leasing the facility, no serious applications were made until April of this year when two formal bids were received. These two applications were given detailed consideration, and a decision was made to offer the lease of the plant to Port au Port Seafoods Limited.

Mr. Speaker, Port au Port Seafoods Limited presently have a fish processing operation at Piccadilly on the Port au Port Peninsula, and have excellent access to markets for fresh and frozen groundfish products in the United States. The company proposes to process a minimum of 100,000 pounds of groundfish daily at Brig Bay, operating two shifts and employing approximately 120 people. It is estimated that another ten to thirty workers will be required during the trap and caplin season, making for a total employment complement of 150 new jobs that did not exist in that area in the past number of years.

Mr. Speaker, the new operator is very optimistic that, given their connections and access to markets in the U.S., the Brig Bay operation appears to have considerable potential for the future. Residents of the Brig Bay area have made representation to government on several occasions concerning a new operator for this plant and we feel certain that they will be very pleased with our decision to lease the facility to

Port au Port Seafoods Limited.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the minister for providing me with a copy of this statement earlier. I too would like to welcome Port au Port Seafoods to the district of St. Barbe. I would like to congratulate the St. Barbe Development Association and all the various interest groups that did bring forward presentations on behalf of the local people there.

Mr. Speaker, this particular plant is being opened after being shut for two long years, and it certainly will give our people in the area, which is an area of high unemployment, a glimmer of hope.

I would like to offer my personal congratulations to the minister for his efforts in this regard, particularly for his sensitivity towards these people in an area of high unemployment, the representations I have made to him and the various people in the area who did make representations to him. I congratulate him for his sensitivity in this regard. Had other ministers, Mr. Speaker, one-tenth the care and sensitivity for the ordinary people of St. Barbe, my district would be a lot better off.

For example, on the Bonne Bay ferry, had the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) had as much sensitivity as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) has, we

would see -

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was quite correct in his description of the Minister of Fisheries and in heaping praise on the Minister of Fisheries. We all agree with that. But he cannot go into a general debate on everything. He must know that a great majority of the people of Newfoundland would speak in the way that he did about the Minister of Fisheries and about all ministers on this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, he is way beyond the confines of this statement.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I must say the point is well taken. The hon. member was beginning to stray away from a reply to that statement.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I was merely illustrating -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would like to remind the hon. member his time has now elapsed.

MR. YOUNG:

Answer your phone calls boy.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of

Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, if I might, as a brief follow-up to the last statement, correct some comments of the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) in that my department does not supply any flags to anybody for any schools anywhere. I do not know where he might have gotten that indication. Neither do we supply in quantity any flag pins or anything to members on this side of the House anymore than we do anywhere else. It is just a matter of correction, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to announce to the House today, Mr. Speaker, that Marystown Shipyard Limited have negotiated a contract with Moss Rosenberg Verft of Norway, which will involve the employment of twenty-two welders from the shipyard at the Moss Rosenberg facilities in Stavanger, Norway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

This agreement, Mr. Speaker, will provide an opportunity for the twenty-two workers from Marystown to have their welding skills upgraded at the Moss Rosenberg Welding School.

Following this training, which is about a two week period, the Newfoundland welders will be employed directly on an offshore project in Norway which will involve work similar to that which will be required on the Hibernia project. This hands on experience will be instrumental in bringing the welding staff of Marystown

Shipyard up to speed on the intricate techniques and standards involved in major offshore welding projects.

The term of employment will be approximately three and a half months for each person, and the first eleven welders will be leaving this Sunday for Norway. I should also add, that these welders are presently on lay off at the shipyard, so this arrangement will effectively provide employment for them at a time when they normally would not be working.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, to correct the correction I did not say that his department had given flags, I said that a government member had gone into a school in the last few weeks and presented a flag on behalf of the government in a direct effort to undermine a member on this side who had not been able to get a flag.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

They might acknowledge the partisanship, but it is being reflected in the latest poll which they probably will not brag about. You may love the partisanship but the public does not like it.

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, kill my time, go ahead.

MR. SIMMS:

I do not care about your time, what you are saying does not make any difference, anyway.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. SIMMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, so that there are no unfair accusations made such as those being made by the member for Fortune - Hermitage now, only today I gave his seat mate, his colleague, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), a flag to present to an army cadet corps out in his district this weekend. There is no partisanship there. The man asked me if I could get a flag for him and I said I would see if I could, as I have done for my own colleagues. So, I mean, the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage is talking through his hat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What? Take it back. Take it back.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. BARRY:

It is very interesting that as soon as my colleague gets up and mentions the recent poll that they

have had over there, which has led to this spate of press releases by ministers, they try to cut him off. Mr. Speaker, the reality is that -

MR. MATTHEWS:

You will need more than a pink shirt to get back.

MR. BARRETT:

What does his shirt have to do with it?

MR. PATTERSON:

You will have to wrap yourself up pretty fancy.

MR. CALLAN:

He likes your shirt. Say, thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, no wonder the poll is the way it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

We welcome all those remarks by the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), and we will see the numbers of the Tories keep plummeting the way they have in recent months.

Mr. Speaker, the minister has just indicated the reality of what is happening. I am very happy if he has, in fact, deigned to give a flag to the member for Bellevue through his good graces. Now why was it, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Tourism, or the Department of Development, or any other department would not give a flag to certain international athletes who are representing this

Province and who did very well, Mr. Speaker, representing this Province? Why would the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) have to buy them a flag out of his own pocket because there was not a government department that would supply a flag to them?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member is getting away from the point of order.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, the point is should members of this House of Assembly have to go and plead with a government minister as to whether or not they are going to get something to promote the interests of this Province?

Mr. Speaker, we have a rotten situation, where they are using petty patronage and petty politics. And the efforts of the Minister of Tourism to promote tourism will be undermined as long as this sort of petty politics is exercised by his colleague.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I must rule there is no point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, if I may now respond to the second statement the

minister made, the one about the Marystown Shipyard. I want, first of all, to commend the workers. I had an opportunity in recent weeks to talk to most of them over in Stavanger and I got good feedback from them as to their impression of what the programme is doing for them.

MR. TOBIN:
Well, you should have, you have been representing them for about ten years.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, does he never stop yapping? Does he never stop yapping at all?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
He has a lot to say.

MR. SIMMONS:
I guess he has. If he had a mind how much would he have to say?

MR. TULK:
Do not you mention polls.

MR. SIMMONS:
I guess he comes by it honestly.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
It is more than you can say.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Oh shut up 'Brian' you are making a fool of yourself, boy. You are making a fool of yourself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Thirty percent in the latest poll, that explains (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have allowed the hon. member to go on and reply. He had just about a minute and a half but, as far as I can see, he has had no opportunity in that minute and a half to reply so he has a short time left to finish.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say it is a good training programme. The real test will come, of course, when and if they get the opportunity to put those skills into practice over here, those workers who are about to embark on a trip to Norway as a result of the most recent contract.

The question is, when will we see the Atlantic Accord legislation? The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this government cannot get the government in Ottawa, their Tory friends in Ottawa, to give any priority to the Atlantic Accord legislation. That is why it is not before the House of Commons and that is why it is not here. Until they get their heads together on that one, Mr. Speaker, those people can whistle. The real test will come when we get this Atlantic Accord legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

There they go, the trained seals. There they go again. That is all I wanted to say anyway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier, in addition to confirming whether in fact his latest poll does confirm him at 33 per cent, whether he has had any recent discussions with Premier Getty and whether the Premier has the same concerns as Premier Getty, with respect to the lack of involvement by the provinces in the free trade negotiations which have commenced?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, one of these days I might have to release that poll. The Leader of the Opposition was running behind his party. The Leader of the NDP was running behind his party. I was running ahead of my party, and this party was ahead of the other two. Now that was what the polls said, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Also, in large areas of this Province the Leader of the Opposition scored 7 per cent. I scored somewhere around 60 per cent. The Leader of the NDP scored somewhere around 30 per cent. So those are the facts and

they have been reconfirmed, Mr. Speaker. So there is no problem there.

MR. SIMMONS:

He has seen the enemy and it is him.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

On the more serious question, the Premiers have been discussing the matter of provincial involvement in the trade negotiations with the federal government and are continuing to do so. Last week, as I informed the Leader of the Opposition, members representing this government were in Ottawa to go over with Mr. Reisman the opening round of negotiations, really preliminary, the agenda items, and what the Government of Canada was going to be saying, and all the other provinces were represented. We will now be informed of what happened in the first meetings and we will have other meetings with the federal government.

There are some Premiers in Canada who have some concerns about various things dealing with trade. Obviously we do too. We will be making those concerns known to the federal government as we proceed through the negotiations. But there is an open policy by the federal government on the question of the trade negotiations where there will be involvement of the provinces, and we are moving ahead nicely.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Premier for that statement, but it was not the answer to the question that I asked. Premier Getty has indicated dissatisfaction, not just with matters related to free trade but with the process, with the lack of provincial involvement. And I ask the Premier why is it that he is expressing satisfaction with the process, which sees very little in the way of provincial involvement, when the premiers of other provinces, such as the Premier of Ontario and the Premier of Alberta, have indicated that there is not sufficient provincial involvement? Is the Premier continuing to be the lapdog of Ottawa that we have seen him be since the Tories were elected?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am not a lapdog for anybody, the federal government or anybody else, and never will be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We will take positions on matters national which have a provincial influence. We will oppose when we think it is in the Province's interests to oppose. We will support when we think it is in the Province's interests to support, and so on. That is the way we operate and I think the majority of the people in the Province know that is the way this government operates. We will oppose the Government in Ottawa whenever we think they are doing something that is going to be injurious to this Province, there is no question about that, and we will

continue to do it. We make no apologies to anybody for taking that kind of an approach.

As it relates to the present trade talks, we are, all of the provinces, with the federal government consulting and discussing right now about ongoing provincial involvement. We have had substantial provincial involvement to date. How much we will have from here on we will see as these talks continue. But to this point in time things have gone very, very well. You know, there was extensive consultation last week before the first meeting and we anticipate that that kind of consultation is going to continue. If in fact there is something that happens to that process which we do not agree with which shows that we are not having the kind of input we want, we will be the first to let the federal government know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
I think, Mr. Speaker, it is the first time in history that we have seen a crackie turn into a lapdog just through a federal election.

I would like to ask the Premier-

MR. SIMMS:
There is not supposed to be a preamble.

MR. DINN:
That certainly raises the level of debate in the House.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
- something when the backbench subsidies on the other side, Mr. Speaker. I know they are paining over the recent poll, but that sort of behaviour is not going to improve their standing.

MR. MATTHEWS:
We saw the poll. You did not.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! I do not see why I should have to continually call for members to my left to keep quiet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think that the Premier should answer why it is, if he is not a lapdog, we did not hear one word out of him with respect to the free trade video prepared by the Government of Canada which omitted the province of Prince Edward Island altogether and had Newfoundland included with the United States? Is this just an example of how the Government of Canada is taking this Province for granted since the Premier decided to develop his lapdog ways?

MR. TULK:
Good question! He is not going to answer that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:
The Premier is not going to answer that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier should not let one bad poll completely wipe him out to the extent that he will not get up and answer a question.

MR. SIMMONS:

That makes three.

MR. BARRY:

Right! This is the third one.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I noticed that you just recently called members of this House on your left to order, and I certainly respect the Chair for doing so. But I think, at the same time, it is more than appropriate to consider the actions of the Leader of the Opposition and the language of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker and the way he is getting on in this House. The fact of the matter is he wants to talk about a poll. Indeed he does, Mr. Speaker, because he has refused to show the members of his caucus the poll that they had done. That is his problem and he is trying to change the tune. Show you caucus members the poll you had done.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, will the Premier answer why is it that other Premiers of Canada are speaking out for their provinces and objecting to the lack of provincial involvement in the free trade negotiations when the Premier in this Province is silent? When is he going to speak out and insist that the Province get proper involvement in the free trade negotiations?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, how does the Leader of the Opposition work? I have not heard anything from the leader of the government of British Columbia, Premier Bennett, who is a Premier in Canada, and I do not think he has said anything. I do not think Premier Pawley has said anything, I do not think Premier Devine has said anything, I do not think Premier Bourassa has said anything, I do not think the new Liberal Premier of PEI has said anything. I spoke to all nine of them a few days ago. As Chairman of the Premiers' group in the last number of days I have been in constant contact - talked to the External Affairs Minister (Mr. Clark) and the Trade Minister (Mr. Kelleher) - with the Government of Canada. There are two Premiers, apparently, who said something. I do not know what Mr. Getty said. I heard Mr. Peterson's comments on TV the other night. Mr. Peterson said he is not pleased with the format or it is mismanaged or something. Well, that is something that a Liberal Premier, I guess, would say about a PC federal government, I suppose.

I do not know exactly what words Mr. Getty used. I have not heard the Liberal Premier of PEI, or Mr. Buchanan, or Mr. Hatfield, so if you want to talk about numbers there are more premiers who have said nothing than have said something and that is primarily because, and Mr. Ghiz, I think, was the Premier who mentioned this, until our process is completed with the federal government, the Trade Minister and the External Affairs Minister as to how these trade negotiations are going to proceed, we are not going to say anything. And then if that process does not turn out, next week or two weeks from now, to be the one that the provinces have agreed, by the way, collectively it should be, then that is the time for us to speak up and say, "This is wrong, federal government. We are not going along with this approach because it is injurious to the provinces," or "We do not have enough consultation." But I am not going to sabotage that today. I am not going to play that kind of a role. I will attack the federal government on the whole question of their process on trade if, in fact, as we go down the road and keep talking to the ministers and keep talking to the kind of involvement we had last week, and if this continues, then if something happens to subvert that kind of legitimate process where the provinces are involved, then Mr. Mulroney and the rest of the people in Ottawa will hear from Brian Peckford. No problem!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), I want to direct a question to the Premier on the subject of the University Extension Service, the offices to be closed in Marystown and Stephenville, and I understand that there are plans afoot to close the remaining offices in the next year or so, which would eliminate completely the field serves function that the university has so well performed over the years in Newfoundland.

Now I am quite aware of academic freedom and of the prerogative of the university to set its agenda and so on, and I am not particularly interested in a dialogue on that subject, but taking that into account, I wonder would the Premier indicate to the House whether he is concerned about those closures and, in particular, whether he has any initiatives planned or already taken that might forestall the closing of those centres?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker, I do not have anything under consideration as it relates to that. We provide money to the university, this year a 14 per cent increase, larger than in any other sector of the budget estimates. Fourteen per cent in total was the increase, a very, very large increase. Then it is up to the President, the Board of Regents, the Senate and so on to establish their priorities with the amount of money we give them, and we do not intend to interfere in their internal decision making.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct this question, in the absence of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), to the Premier of the Province.

We now have deregulation coming into existence in this Province. Air Nova has decided to start a business and they have also decided to leave two major centres out of their routes of transportation. I would like to ask the Premier, the First Minister, what concerns he has with this as to the services provided? Deregulation is supposed to bring in better service and improved service. I would like to have his response to that, because right now it looks as if it is going to be a downgrading.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, the overall deregulation process has not seen a downgrading in the Province with Air Atlantic now operating with three, I think, Dash 7s or Dash 8s, and they are to get another later on in the Summer. I think the frequency of flights, as well as the convenience in time of the flights have been much improved. And now, when you add Air Nova to it, you are going to have a much better service overall. So I do not think the comments of the hon. member imply that deregulation meant less service, it has meant more service. But what the hon. member is talking about is that

Air Atlantic has spread its centres where it is going to go with its flights, into so many -

MR. K. AYLWARD

I am talking about Air Nova.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Just one second now! I know what I am talking about.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Do you?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Air Atlantic is into a whole number of areas, both in the Province and in the Maritimes. They are landing in Stephenville, Deer Lake, Gander, St. John's, Goose Bay and so on. And now, Air Nova comes along, a second commuter airline. We already have one which is providing more frequent service and more convenient time service. Now, on top of that, we have Air Nova coming in as a competitor who have outlined where they are going to land and not land. And it is with the Air Nova schedule, as I understand it, that the member for Stephenville has some concerns because they are not going to land in Stephenville or Gander when they start up. So the members for Stephenville and Gander are concerned. I imagine the member for Stephenville has already written Air Nova about it and talked to them about it, and the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) has written Air Nova, and I would like to have copies of their letters, if I could, to write them myself.

MR. TULK:

You do? Is your letter writing machine working?

MR. PECKFORD:

Now, Air Nova has said, as I understand it just from the news, because the Minister of Transportation is not here, that they are going to begin in these centres. They are not saying that they will not be going into Stephenville or Gander sometime after they get started. They may be going in there. So it may be too early to put a final judgement on the question of whether, in fact, Stephenville and Gander are going to be served by Air Nova. As I understand it, Gander and Stephenville are now being served by Air Atlantic and, of course, they want to be served by Air Nova and, if somebody else comes in, they want to be served by that airline, and if a fifth airline comes in they want to be served as well, and a sixth airline and so on -

MR. AYLWARD:

Do not get ridiculous now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- which is only fair for those members representing those areas. So I will have to check with the Minister of Transportation and see what kind of talks he has had with Air Nova and whether in fact they do have some plans, after they get in business, after a number of months, to also add Stephenville and Gander to their list because obviously those are important centers and are now being serviced by one airline, and why not be serviced by the other. So I will have to take the matter under advisement. But I do want to say the hon. member that I think air

service in the Province has improved overall. The fact that Air Nova, as a second airline, is not now going in at the beginning to service Stephenville and Gander may be a problem, but we are not sure yet that it is. I will take it under advisement and talk to the Minister of Transportation about it.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Would the First Minister or the Premier explain this: At the present time Air Atlantic has one flight in and out of Stephenville and forty seats. That is a total downgrading of service to the West Coast as far as I am concerned. The rates have even gone up higher, and it is a total downgrading of service. Since you are the government and you are managers of the Province, Mr. Premier, I would like to ask you, what do you know about any proposed moves by Air Nova to service Stephenville and to service Gander as deregulation is supposed to be competitors competing against each other, not one monopolizing the market? I would like to know what your position is on that. You do not have to worry about our representation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, first of all the hon. member starts off his question with a preamble which tends to suggest to everybody here that we have complete control and

management over the airline business in Newfoundland. He said, 'You are the Premier. You are the manager of the Province.' I, as Premier, and the Cabinet of Newfoundland have complete and absolute jurisdiction, I am told, over the airline business. There is no question, there is no other implication.

Now I know the hon. member is a new member, I know he does not know a whole lot about everything to do with the split jurisdictions between Newfoundland and Ottawa and so on, but would he please learn, if he is representing an airport town, that the federal government has the major responsibility as it relates to airline business in Canada. We do not. Unfortunately we do not.

We can make representation. We can take his concerns into consideration. I said in my last answer I will take the hon. member's concerns, I will sit down with the Minister of Transportation, see what talks he has had with Air Nova, and see what we can do to arrest the situation. As I know, Air Nova themselves have said publicly that they may be going into Stephenville a little bit later. It might be a financial problem for them to get started first and then they can move into the other areas. But I appreciate the hon. member's question, I appreciate his concern, and I will take it up with the Minister of Transportation at the earliest opportunity.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:

This is the same Premier who, if there were a Liberal Government in Ottawa bringing in deregulation, he would have been battling long ago and, as a matter of fact, it would not happen here in Newfoundland because he would have fought it tooth and nail.

Now, would the Premier just tell us - and I appreciate his lecture and I will try to learn from the great wisdom that he has - is he going to make any commitment to check this out so that proper service is brought to the people of Stephenville and the people of Gander, and let other competitors come in and make sure that there is no downgrading and there is no monopolizing of the market? Would he do that? Would he make sure that he will do that? I appreciate it very much and so would the people of Stephenville, so would the people of Gander and the people of the West Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador, and also the people of the Province, who are getting nailed by deregulation, as his government will not fight the federal government on it because there are Tories in Ottawa?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. member stands. I take it from what he has said that he opposes deregulation, and the Liberal Party of Newfoundland oppose deregulation. That is what the hon. member just said in his statement. They are against deregulation and allowing companies to come in and monopolize business. Deregulation

means that there will be no monopoly. Deregulation means that anybody can get into the business. They still have to be licenced by the federal government. So the hon. member on the one hand is for deregulation and on the other hand he is against deregulation. I do not know where he is coming from. It is very hard to say. Then he goes on to say, 'Make a commitment to make representation.' I have given that already in the two previous answers. I said I will take the hon. member's concerns representing Stephenville, also the concerns from Gander, and I will sit down with the Minister of Transportation, go over what kind of meetings he has had with Air Nova, what their plans are in the short-term, medium-term, long-term, and try to ensure that Stephenville and Gander get plugged into that system with that second air line. I am going to do that at the earliest opportunity. I said that in my previous answer. I say it again - is the hon. member listening? - I will take your concerns to the Minister of Transportation as soon as I get an opportunity to see him, and then move them onto Air Nova and see what their plans are so that your area of the Province is protected.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and it concerns the recently announced early closing of the salmon fishery. Has the minister made representation to

his federal counterpart with a view to having the government compensate fishermen in Newfoundland whose livelihood will be affected by virtue of the early closing of the salmon fishery this year?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. gentleman asked this same question a couple of days ago.

MR. W. CARTER:
No, I did not.

MR. RIDEOUT:
At that particular time I indicated to him that this Province took a definitive position against the early closing of the Fall salmon fishery.

MR. SIMMONS:
You lost.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Well, Mr. Speaker, it is better to have tried and lost than not have tried at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the federal government feels that in order to be able to make strides in the international negotiations on the conservation of salmon they need to have the support of the United States, and the price of that support, as I explained to this House a couple of days ago, was that there had to be a demand for an earlier closing season on Atlantic salmon to October 15. I indicated at that time that we did not support the federal government

in that regard, because we believe the commercial salmon fishermen of this Province have already paid the price, we do not believe they should be asked to pay any further price and, yes, Mr. Speaker, we have said to the federal government 'that if you are going to support that kind of policy then we expect you to put your money where your mouth is.'

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, will the minister ask his federal counterpart to try and rationalize his actions in restricting the season for Atlantic salmon fishermen, affecting, as it does, the livelihood of a lot of Newfoundlanders? How can they rationalize that position with the recently announced cuts in their budget, the reduction of surveillance, for example, of the offshore, and of river wardens? The result will be, of course, that what they will save in one area, Mr. Speaker, they will lose in poaching in the other one.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will recall, and if he cannot I will refresh his memory, that when he talks about all of the Newfoundlanders who are going to be affected by the earlier closing date, the fact of the matter is that there are a number of fishermen, who should not be affected, along the East and Northeast Coast of this Province.

The fact of the matter is that the total amount of salmon landed in that period is somewhere between two and five tons of salmon. It is not a lot of salmon but it is important to the people who live in Brent's Cove and Harbour Deep and the rest of the places along the Northeast Coast, and that is why we took the position that we did.

Perhaps the hon. gentleman, in asking that kind of question, would also like to compliment the federal minister for the extra money that he is now putting into surveillance and hiring extra people to surveil the offshore stocks, for example. We heard the criticism, Mr. Speaker, but we do not hear the praise. And we have already indicated -

MR. TULK:

Praise what? Praise what?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, when somebody on this side of the House was yapping a while ago, Your Honour was very quick to ask us to be quiet so that they could be heard. I would assume that that applies to the gentlemen on the other side as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to the hon. gentleman's colleague in this House, I believe it was earlier this week, that we have at the present time made some suggestions to the federal government how together, the Province and the federal government, utilizing the resources that we are both deploying in enhancement, surveillance and the preservation of wildlife and fish and game in

this Province, can perhaps do a better job if we put our heads together, Mr. Speaker, so that the resource out there can better be protected.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
Again I say to the minister, the increase referred to in his answer, Mr. Speaker, is in fact a 10 per cent reduction this year in the number of game wardens and river wardens, and a 5 per cent decrease, not to mention the inflationary factor, on offshore surveillance. Would the minister not agree then, Mr. Speaker, and maybe remind his federal counterpart, that Newfoundland fishermen, especially the fishermen of my district, Twillingate district, and his district, should not be asked to balance the federal budget on their backs? That is what they are doing now.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, the increase I referred to in the answer I just gave the hon. gentleman was in fact a real increase in the number of people who are deployed on offshore surveillance in Newfoundland and Labrador, was in fact the number of flying hours purchased from D and D for extra surveillance offshore, was in fact, Mr. Speaker, more money over and above last year in the budget this year for surveillance offshore.

MR. TULK:
Not true.

MR. W. CARTER:
Not true is right.

MR. RIDEOUT:
I call that progress, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle). The minister yesterday announced \$800,000 for the town of Gander from the Department of Municipal Affairs. I would like to ask him if this means that \$800,000 is being made available to the town of Gander to install hydrodynamic separators, or is this, in fact, overstated by \$200,000 and in fact only \$600,000 is being made available to the town of Gander from the Department of Municipal Affairs.

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

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, I think I made it perfectly clear to the hon. gentleman yesterday in the announcement that the \$800,000 that we were announcing would be cost-shared between the municipality of Gander and the Government of Newfoundland and the extra \$900,000 that would be required would be a federal contribution. But the \$800,000 is a cost-shared arrangement between the municipality and the Government of Newfoundland.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
In light of the fact that the minister says in his statement that this announcement was made in order to get an early start on the projects mentioned, I would like to ask the minister if the town of Gander can now immediately start this project and start to spend that money?

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

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman also is aware, that will be contingent upon the availability of federal funds. Now our funding is in place to provide the hydrodynamic separators for the Town of Gander, it has been there for the last year or so, but whether or not these funds will be spent will be conditional upon the availability of federal funds. When the federal funds are put in place the \$800,000 are there to be used.

MR. BAKER:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
Is the minister saying that once the \$900,000 from the federal government is spent, then he will release the \$600,000? Is that what he is saying? And if so, Mr. Speaker, why then is the announcement made so that an early start can be gotten on the project

if in fact the \$900,000 has to be spent first?

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

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, the cost of the entire project will be somewhere between \$1.5 million and \$1.7 million. And in order to go ahead with that project the Department of Municipal Affairs has put up \$800,000, cost-shared between the Municipality of Gander and the Government of Newfoundland. Now, as soon as the federal funding has been put in place, naturally that \$800,000 will kick in and will be used in conjunction with the federal funds. Now I certainly do not know at this point in time when this federal funding will be available, but hopefully it will be available in the not too distant future and this particular project can get underway.

The Town of Gander knows we have a commitment to that project, we announced it last year. This a reconfirmation of the fact that our funds are in place to address that particular sewerage problem that Gander is having.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
There is just time for a short question and answer.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
A short question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn). I would like to ask if the minister could tell the House the status of the proposal made to government by Tech Corporation

with respect to the hydro subsidization for the Newfoundland zinc mine at Daniel's Harbour?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

I thank the hon. member for his question. Basically what happened there was we received a request about a month later than it should have normally come in. We got it through the manager of the mine, Mr. Hewett. It was sent from the Vice-President of Tech Corporation but it never did arrive in a government department, neither my department nor that of the hon. the President of the Council. So we eventually received a request. Some of the figures in the requests were inaccurate so we had to go to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro to confirm the figures and we eventually found out what the correct figures were. We then took that, did an assessment, and it is in the government process now. Government has not made a decision but I expect a decision will be made shortly on the request from Tech Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Question has elapsed.

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate under this heading for me, as Minister responsible for the office of our Legislative Counsel and as required by Section 18 of the Statutes and Subordinate Legislation Act, to lay before the House a copy of subordinate legislation that has been filed under that act. So I now table the editions of the Newfoundland Gazette published between October 22, 1985 and May 9 of this year, 1986.

Notices of Motion

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills: "An Act To Amend Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law" and "An Act To Amend The Motor Carrier Act."

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), who not in his seat today, I just want to answer in the House questions asked yesterday by the Opposition directed at the Minister of Transportation

concerning the role of TerraTransport in the Province. The question concerned TerraTransport trucking operations in the Province which they said were about to be sold. I would just like to inform hon. members that this is untrue. CN Route is being sold and CN Route is not in Newfoundland. There are thirty employees of CN Express or parcels who work for TerraTransport but CN Route is not in the Province and that is what is being sold, not TerraTransport or anything to do with it.

Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Order 3, Mr. Speaker. I move the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain bills, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

Bill No. 20. Shall clause 1 carry?

MR. MARSHALL:
This is a long Bill.

MR. TULK:
What bill is it, 'Bill'?

MR. MARSHALL:

This is the Corporations Act. There are five hundred-odd sections here. There are no amendments to the Bill, Mr. Chairman, and if it is in order, I move that Sections 1 to 524 inclusive carry.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed a bill, "An Act To Revise And Reform The Law Respecting Corporations," without amendment, carried. (Bill No. 20)

MR. MARSHALL:
Order 4, Bill No. 3.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Shall clause 1 carry?

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

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

MR. TULK:
I think the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) had indicated to the Leader of the Opposition that there were going to be certain changes in this Bill. Were there any changes made from the original draft of the the Corporations Act, the one that was just passed?

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

MS VERGE:
As I have explained to the Leader of the Opposition - perhaps he would like to take his seat - the Corporations Act Bill which we just dealt with is essentially the same as the draft act that he prepared in the mid-seventies and that then became a White Paper which was published and which was given to a Select Committee of this House who encouraged comment on it from individuals and groups in the Province. Partially in

response to some of the input to the Select Committee, there were a few changes made from the original draft. Those changes are relatively minor and do not alter the principle, the principle being basically the same as the principle underlying the Canada Business Corporations Act and the Ontario Act. Among the few changes that were made, as I mentioned when I spoke during debate on second reading, is a removal of the requirement for a solicitor to be involved in the corporation of a company. Presumably many investors in corporations will choose, for various reasons, to have solicitors but this Bill no longer makes it absolutely essential for a solicitor to be involved in an incorporation, and in that respect our Bill is the same as the federal act, which has been working quite satisfactorily for ten years or so now. There are a few other minor changes, but the principle is the same as that in the bill which was the handiwork of the Leader of the Opposition and the Senior Legislative Counsel of a few years back.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would give us a listing in writing before we get to third reading? We do not want to have to debate this bill at third reading, but if we have to, of course, we will. I wonder if you could supply the Leader of the Opposition with a listing of the changes that have been made from

the original draft?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Chairman, yes, I will be happy to provide that list of the various changes in the Corporation's Bill before us, from the White Paper, to the Opposition before third reading.

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 4, Bill No. 8.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Justices And Other Public Authorities (Protection) Act." (Bill No. 8)

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Queen's Counsel Act." (Bill No. 13)

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, there is a slight amendment to Clause 1. I will propose the amendment and the minister will speak to it and give the reasons for it. I move that Bill No. 13 be amended by adding immediately after Clause 1 a new section 1 (1). Section 2 of the said act is further amended by adding immediately after subsection 4 the following: ' Subsection 5, notwithstanding subsection 4, a person may be appointed under this section if that person has an accumulation of at least ten years standing at the

bar of the Province and the bar of another province." The explanation I am given here is that this amendment would provide that the minimum qualification of a person eligible for appointment as Queen's Counsel is an accumulation of ten years standing at the bar of the Province or another province of Canada. I think that is self-explanatory. That is in order. I propose the amendment.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The position of our party has been stated in that we feel that the time has come to consider whether it is any longer appropriate to engage in the issuing of these honorary titles. Over time, their historical significance has lessened and the position is that we feel that the granting of Queen's Counsels should no longer be done. If government is not prepared to accept that basic change in principle, as far as the amendments that are proposed, they are reasonable under the present system. No response?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

No, Mr. Chairman, I just moved the amendment. I think the hon. gentleman just got up to make a point. I think we can propose the amendment.

On motion, amendment, carried.

On motion, Clause (1) as amended, carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed a bill, "An Act To Amend The Queen's Counsel Act", with amendment, carried. (Bill No. 13).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Law Society Act, 1977". (Bill No. 11).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, An Act To Amend The Department of Justice Act". (Bill No. 7).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Department of Environment Act." (Bill No. 3).

MR. BARRY:

Can we slow it down a little bit before we end up passing the Order Paper and The Globe and Mail? Bill No. 3. This is an Act To Amend The Department Of Environment Act.

We would like, before this bill passes, some explanation from the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) with respect to - the Minister of Environment should be here, his act is going through.

DR. COLLINS:

He is listening in outside.

MR. BARRY:

Maybe the minister can hear us in the common room. Before we pass this act we would like the minister to tell us what is the

position of his department with respect to these municipalities where money is not available through the Department of Municipal Affairs, or the Council does not have the funds to do the work itself, and where we have conditions of raw sewage, in some places, or other health hazards existing.

Now, Norris Point comes to mind. We have a situation down in my own district of Mount Scio-Bell Island, an area that I took in from the minister's district which may be, I am not sure, I have not had the opportunity yet to determine, but it may be modified by the funds that were made available to the Town of Paradise, as announced yesterday. I think the example is a good one so as to deal with the principle. There we have a situation where the council, as I understand it, had a certain priority as to where funding should go and I think that they were looking at the money being spent to open up area for development. Whereas we had another area of the community where older residents of the town had inadequate sewerage disposal facilities and, in fact, we have a hazard to health from raw sewerage in certain areas down there.

At what point does the minister feel that his departmental responsibility arises and despite the priority that might be set by the Department of Municipal Affairs, at what point does the minister step in and inform his departmental officials that they have to take certain action to avoid a health hazard arising or continuing to exist in a community?

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, in Committee of the Whole, the debate is supposed to centre on the precise provisions in the act before us. Now the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is getting into a much broader area; he has really nothing to do, precisely anyway, with the provisions in this amendment. So, if the hon. minister wishes to speak, he speaks by leave of the Committee and I am sure he would have no difficulty doing that, but this would be a courtesy to the Leader of the Opposition on the part of the minister and on the part of other members of the Committee. Strictly speaking, he is out of order in asking these questions.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. BARRY:

If I could refer the minister to the bill: "Where pollution occurs and the person or municipal authority that the Minister considers responsible for the occurrence of the pollution fails to do" certain things, then a fine may be imposed. This is directly on point here. We are talking about imposing fines or increasing the fine that might be imposed on a person or a municipal authority. I have yet to see the minister, this wishy washy pollution minister, I have yet to see him step in and tell his colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) to

loosen up the purse strings and do something to see that the health hazard in a municipality is corrected. He has not done it in Norris Point. He has not done it in Benton where they have a situation where they have a plant there but, as I understand it, the municipality cannot afford to pay the cost of operating it.

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:
By leave, by leave.

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

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Chairman, I will gladly respond to the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Barry) questions. The reason why municipalities are singled out in section 39 (1) of the proposed amendments is it will enable, for example, the Department of the Environment to go into a municipality, clean up after a polluter, whether that is a private individual, a corporation or the municipality itself, if it does not have the funds or the resources to do it. It will enable the Department of the Environment to go in there and to clean it up and to then bill the individual or corporate polluter responsible. That is the sole purpose for that.

Just let me address a couple of other questions that are really not relevant to this but just to set the Leader of the Opposition straight on a few things. He mentioned a couple of prime examples in using Fogo, Gander and Norris Point.

To be specific, I wrote in support of a secondary treatment plant for Gander. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition will note that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) announced that project yesterday.

I wrote in support of the people of Norris Point. The hon. Leader of the Opposition will note that yesterday the Minister of Municipal Affairs addressed that as well.

I wrote the Minister of Municipal Affairs on behalf of the people of Fogo and that is being addressed.

So, contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition said, in every single case that he names where I wrote in support of that municipality - and I see the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) nodding his head - in fact, the Minister of Municipal Affairs responded in kind. The funds have been put in place and they have been announced. So, contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition has said, Mr. Chairman, I think that we have been very effective in our representation to the Department of Municipal Affairs to provide funding. That is the funding agency. The Department of the Environment is the regulatory agency in this case and the Department of Municipal Affairs is the funding agency.

There have been other requests come in to me which I have responded to and, in fact, I am sure that as soon as the Minister of Municipal Affairs is in a position to do so and has Cabinet approval, there will be other announcements forthcoming that will address other concerns raised by hon. members. Thank you.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Chairman, we supported and do support the principle of the bill, but now that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) wants us to be very specific, let me be very specific about the provisions in this bill.

The bill would increase the fines in the case of individuals to one thousand dollars from one hundred. I submit to the minister that while we have no objection to this new scale of fines, the real problem is not so much the size of the fine as lack of enforcement, and I give him a very particular example. That heretofore lovely stretch of four-lane highway just going outside St. John's - I say heretofore because it has been littered so badly that there is not a ten foot space out there without a chicken box or a milk carton strewn around. I drove out there last weekend, and just within my view as I was driving past people, I saw three people fling objects from the window, paper food wrappings, I presume.

The problem, I say to him, is that there is nobody policing it in an active manner, and those persons, I submit, whom I saw throw the wrappers from the window would have stopped doing so in the face of a \$100 fine, let alone a \$1,000 fine, but they will not stop it whether it is \$100, \$1,000 or \$10,000 as long as the word is out there there is nobody doing anything about this anyway. There is no enforcement.

Now, I understand that the enforcement may not directly come under his auspices, but he might want to speak to it or indicate to the Committee whether he sees this as a problem and what steps are going to be taken to rectify the problem. I see that, Mr. Chairman, as the essential problem here. There is no enforcement and there is an attitude in this Province - and I am a Newfoundlander born and bred, so I can say it without appearing to be condescending or pointing the finger elsewhere - we have an attitude that as long as it is not immediately our own private property, we can litter it up. It is amazing what people will do by way of littering. On public beaches and in public washrooms, I have seen people do things that they would never do on their own premises. It is amazing what they will do in the name of the general public that they would not be caught dead doing in their own name. It is amazing, and they need some education.

Perhaps the first item of education they need is something that would focus their minds. You need some enforcement and that would be the best possible means of publicizing this new scale of finds. I refer members of the Committee to a news report this morning coming out of Toronto I believe, in which a company had been convicted sixty-nine times on a pollution charge - I believe dumping some kind of pollutant into the the sewer system - sixty-nine times they have been convicted of the same charge over the past four or five years as I understand. So yesterday the judge, in handing down sentence, not only fined the firm but sentenced the president, in absentia - he is in United States

at the moment - to a year in prison.

Now, I will not get into the merits as to the stiffness or the easiness of the sentence and the fine, that is not my point. My point is that that one case will send across this country, across Ontario in this particular case, a much stronger signal than any amount of debate in this House or any amount of ads in a paper will do. I ask the minister would he indicate to the Committee whether he shares the concern that I have voiced and whether he can apprise the House or the Committee of any new initiatives such as stepped up enforcement that is being contemplated or being planned to deal with this particular concern that I have noted?

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Chairman, the member raises a valid point about enforcement. It is a problem, of course, not only in this Province but all across the country. It is one we are trying to address in a number of different ways and by increasing fines it does act as a deterrent. Setting a higher fine, I think, in the final analysis will help because the fines that has been levied on polluters by the courts here in the Province and, indeed, across the country, on occasion at least, reflects what has been the minimum, not maximum fines. I think increasing minimum fines will be reflected in judgements that come down.

Now on the whole area of

enforcement, it is not strictly related to this bill because these two amendments are really being offered to the House for passage because of problems that has arisen in the past mainly when dealing with people involved in hydrocarbons, oil and so on, and the problems that we have had with oil companies. If hon. members will note today in The Evening Telegram there was an article in there where we had a successful court case against an oil company. We are winning a few and we are making them more environmentally conscious.

We have availed of community development people. They are used quite successfully, particularly right now on the West Coast of the Province. It is not solving the problem with people discarding paper or chip bags out on the medium out in a highway, which continues to be a problem - and I certainly agree that it is a problem - but on the West Coast of the Province right now, through the Community Development Program we have put in place temporary environment officers, if you like, that have worked very successfully.

Last year, for example, in the Bay of Islands area they cleaned up about 80 per cent of wrecks and refuge in that area because we went in and did an assessment after, which was quite significant. We have enlarged on that programme this year to take in right from St. Anthony down to Port aux Basques and as far East as Deer Lake, that takes care of the West Coast section and that has already been announced by the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), who funds that particular programme. It continues to be a problem and I have said it many

times in many circles.

I think that the younger generation of Newfoundlanders now coming up are perhaps a lot more environmentally conscious than their parents. It is probably an appropriate time as well, although I am straying a little bit, to commend the St. John's Roman Catholic School Board who have implemented an environmental programme into their school curriculum. Besides their classroom studies, they are now taking the children involved in this curriculum programme to Brother Brennan Park up on Salmonier Line where they teach it in a very natural environment, out in the bush or in the woods, if you like. I think, as times goes on, with some encouragement and some help as well from government and municipalities, because the environment is everybody's business, that we will get more people involved in this. I think that the key to it in the end is a good educational programme. It is perhaps very significant to point out that indeed at least one board has embarked on this programme. I hope others will come on stream in the near future. It is an excellent programme for the young people and, as I have said, it is the young people in the Province who we have to look to for the future if we are going to maintain and improve on the environmental outlook in the Province.

When you compare the Province of Newfoundland to other Maritime provinces, sister provinces right in the area, for example, I think we have a lot more papers and things like that discarded but yet we have virtually no pollution as compared to New Brunswick in our water, for example. Those people have indeed polluted themselves to

death with their water up there and it is going to take millions and millions of dollars to clear it up. Now we do have some isolated problems here but, in fact, most of our water, even driving along the Trans-Canada Highway, the rivers that cross it, you can put your head down in it, as I have done many times, and drink it and it is quite good.

Mr. Chairman, the enforcement part is somewhat of a problem. We are trying to address it through some government programmes that are already in place. But I think the key to stop people from doing it certainly lies with a good educational programme. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister for responding to my concerns about enforcement. I just want to take it a step further for a moment. Let me wonder out loud - perhaps he can help the Committee - whether this term 'pollution' as defined in the new 39(1) embraces littering or if perhaps there is another clause of the act that might cover littering. As I read that there it would seem that it could cover littering but I am not completely certain. He might want to indicate to the Committee whether there is other legislation that covers the point that we are talking about.

I hear what he is saying about New Brunswick and about water supplies but I would say to him that the difference here he should take no

encouragement from. The difference here is just because of the lack of a concentration of population. We still have a lot of water that they have not gotten around to polluting yet and that is no credit to us as a people. There are only 500,000 people here and they have not gotten to all the lakes yet.

The point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is reflect on the forest fires last week. Without speculating unduly, how do we know that perhaps there was a piece of glass that was left where it should not have been and that could have triggered a fire? How do we know? That is the kind of thing I am talking about. People have this cavalier attitude that, when I am finished with the beer bottle I can throw it out the window; when I am finished with the milk carton, I can fling it anywhere. You can hardly go anywhere now. I was into some territory last week that I thought was still fairly untrampled. I was amazed at the amount of littering that I had to climb over, crawl over almost, walk over certainly, in terms of beer bottles, beer cartons, food wrapping and boxes from food containers and so on.

The reason I rose a second time on this, apart from wanting to reinforce what I was saying, is to put a direct question to the minister. He might not have this information now but perhaps he would undertake to get it over the next few days. In terms of individuals, individuals who have heretofore been subject to a \$100 fine for a breach of this clause, can he indicate now, or subsequently, how many successful prosecutions there have been in respect to individuals? How many

successful prosecutions have there been in any time frame, in the last year, the last two years or whatever the case may be? How many charges have been laid and how many have been successful?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Chairman, I will have to take that question as notice and assure the hon. member that in the next day or so I will give him those statistics. I do not have them on me, obviously, but I will be quite happy to present them to the hon. member.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to speak briefly on this amendment and say to the minister that when he is talking about our younger people in this Province being more environmental conscious than our older people, it may or may not be true. One of the things I would like to recommend to the minister is with regard to gravel pits in municipal areas. After the company is finished, the municipal councils are not always responsible for getting the companies to clean up and I think that is one of the things that should be done. The environment should be allowed to go back to its original state.

Also, with regard to the Department of the Environment and Municipal Affairs, the sites that they pick for dumps often are in

unbelievable locations. When you are driving by they are open to public view and do not always have fences around them so there is a lot of garbage blowing around.

I was also a little bit concerned the other night while watching CBC regarding dioxin in fruit and vegetables in Ontario. One of the things that came about was that the burning of garbage is one of the main causes of dioxin and, of course, one of the main ways we get rid of garbage in this Province is by burning it. Again, I am sure it is nothing to be alarmed about because of the size of the communities themselves.

I want to go back again to the garbage on the roads.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the hon. gentleman for a few moments and I just want to bring up a point.

MR. HISCOCK:

You may.

MR. MARSHALL:

I think it is fair to say, and I do not mean any offence to my hon. friend, one is not suppose to make observations about anyone not being in the House, but the hon. gentleman was not in the House. He has been away on the business of his constituency most of this sitting and he was away when the principle of the bill was adopted on second reading. I just put this to Your Honour and perhaps he would like to take it under

advisement because it is a good and valid point of order, there is not mistake about it. When you are debating the principle of the bill, you do it in second reading but we are on clause by clause now, looking at each clause and talking about the framework of each clause. Does the language express the principle, etc.? I know the hon. gentleman has been out looking after his constituents and all that but we are really getting out of hand in this House. If some of us do not stand up and try to enforce the rules it is going to be utter and complete chaos.

MR. HISCOCK:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

The President of the Council does have a valid point of order and I shall abide by it but there are only two resolutions in the amendment. In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that when the pollution occurs, and the question I want to ask is not covered here, the Department of the Environment will be responsible for cleaning up and then billing a municipality or the company after, if I am correct. Okay?

MR. BUTT:

Get the polluter.

MR. HISCOCK:

Okay. What about the areas that are not incorporated in municipalities, like the open spaces in our Province? Is this covered under this?

MR. BUTT:
Yes.

MR. HISCOCK:
It is also covered under this. That is the point I was making before the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) interrupted. If that is the case, one of the things is a fine now for disposing garbage on the sides of the roads, is it not?

AN HON. MEMBER:
What?

MR. HISCOCK:
Disposing garbage in open spaces.

MR. BUTT:
Yes, you can get fined. The fines are being increased for polluters, individuals, right from \$100 to \$1,000 and \$10,000 to \$25,000 for corporations.

MR. HISCOCK:
Okay, and that is the point also I wanted to make on clarifying the clauses.

The other thing I want to mention involves Manitoba, and this is a suggestion. I am going over my bounds here, Mr. Chairman, but it will be brief. What Manitoba has for garbage is something call 'space orbits' where kids and people driving along the side of the road take their garbage and put it in space. The signs on it say, "Put your garbage in orbit." They have orbit things all along their highway system to put their garbage in. For teaching our younger kids who have an interest in space and things I think this would be a novel way of continuing the education process. In gravel pits now all we have is a garbage can, an old drum barrel or whatever. I would ask the minister if he would look into

that programme and look at the possibility of setting up a similar programme throughout our Province, particularly on the highways and in our parks, and come up with some innovative idea to encourage our younger people and adults to put their garbage in outer space.

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

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Chairman. just one brief comment. In fact, what the hon. member raised was discussed in great detail during second reading. If the hon. member wanted to have a look at the Hansard, I am sure he would see just that.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. TULK:
I want to bring the Minister of the Environment back to a point that was made some time ago in this debate this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition. I do not believe that the hon. the gentleman understood the real question that was being asked of him.

Basically what the Leader of the Opposition is saying the minister referred to it the other night in a television interview on CBC. He did indicate that if there was a conflict between his department and the Department of Municipal Affairs, in the case of Norris Point for example, and I know what the minister did yesterday, he held out the cash, pending settlements with the town council

or with a commission or whatever. But he did indicate that if there was a situation where it became obvious, as it is in Benton, by the way, and the minister has allocated no funds for that as I understand it, that he would take extraordinary measures. I think the term that he used was extraordinary measures. Of course the interviewer should have taken him one step further and said to him, "All right, if in the case of Benton or Norris Point where you have this pollution, the council has resigned and they have refused to take the money, then maybe the Minister of Municipal Affairs is going to be able to set up a commission and maybe he is not, who knows. There might be 100 per cent of the people who will tell him to go you know where and not take his money. In the case of Benton, the minister has put no money in. As I understand it, raw sewerage is flowing into the Town of Gander's water supply. The minister has given some money to Fogo and to Tilting but, in the case of Joe Batt's Arm I would tell the hon. gentleman that I could take him down now and show him raw sewerage on the side of the roads. There are many other places in the Province like it.

Surely that is an environmental hazard we are looking at, and it is one that the minister cannot condone, nor can he allow it to happen. Now, the question for the minister, and this is a question I think that was put to him and it does apply to this bill in the same manner. Let me put this to him: A municipality has a dump site which the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) has some responsibility for through the council, but nothing is done by either the council or the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

I have to tell the minister that there is a perception in this Province that he has one of the weakest portfolios in Cabinet, the one that is the last to have any say in what happens. It has been true on a number of major developments, as was pointed out by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight). The minister has to realize that his department has become, in the minds of a lot of people, somewhat passe, in that we do not have, and I believe this is unfortunate, the same kind of concern today, perhaps, that we had in the late 1960's and early 1970's for the environment.

I want to ask the minister to outline for us just where, when it comes to a conflict between his department and the Department of Municipal Affairs, in the case of Benton, in the case of Joe Batt's Arm and the case of Norris Point, is he going to say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs -

MR. BARRY:

He should be listened to at the Cabinet Table, too.

MR. TULK:

He should be listened to at the Cabinet Table. I suspect that he is not. This has nothing to do with the minister personally, but I suspect that his department, as I say, is way down on the totem pole. Just when is he going to be able to put some teeth into his department and into his words? There is no point in the Minister of Environment standing up in this House and saying, 'Yes, we are going to have legislation that increases fines from one dollar to \$1,000 or \$10,000 or \$100,000 or \$1 million if he does not have the authority to say to his own people in Cabinet, and to say to other

departments in government, 'Look, you go into Benton and you clean up the mess and you go into Norris Point and you clean up the mess.' And you can name dozens of other communities around this Province that do not have sufficient water and sewer facilities, and that have raw sewage on the sides of the roads. You can name dozens of them! They are out there!

At what point is he going to say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, 'Listen here, Old Man, I do not care whether you have the funds or not, as Minister of Environment I say you have to clean up a certain mess'.

Mr. Chairman, having said that, I want to, if I might be allowed, take one minute to congratulate my friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert). You would not realize this was possible, if you look at the face of the man, but last night, I understand, he became the proud grandfather of a granddaughter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
Being born on the date she was born, I am sure she is going to be a good Liberal.

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

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the member on the birth of his granddaughter. I wish her a long life.

Mr. Chairman, I will be out of order as well as the hon. member was, because we are going through clause by clause on these bills.

But I will be out of order and just answer the hon. member on a matter that he raised specific to Norris Point or Benton. What the hon. member has asked, in essence, in responding to the clause by clause debate on this bill, is for the Minister of Environment to go in to any or all municipalities, or unincorporated areas in the Province, where there is a problem with a council and assume the responsibility of a town council.

MR. TULK:
No, no.

MR. BUTT:
Well, I mean, that is basically what the hon. member is saying.

Now, I will answer the hon. member, if I can get the attention of my colleagues here. In Norris Point, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. TULK:
On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
I want to hear what the Minister of Environment is saying. Now, he just had to stop the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). That is nothing strange, it has been done before. I wonder if the Minister of Soccer Balls (Mr. Matthews) over there and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) could be quiet so we can hear what the hon. gentleman is saying?

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Could we have silence, please, while the the hon. Minister of Environment is speaking?

MR. BUTT:
Very quickly, Mr. Chairman, I have

no intention of going in and replacing a town council when there is a water and sewer problem or anything, and I do not think anyone expects that to be the role of the Minister of the Environment. In fact, if people in a certain municipality do not wish to govern themselves, and I have said this before, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) has the legislative authority to appoint a commission from within that municipality, or outside, to govern them.

I am very pleased at the outcome of what is happening in Norris Point. I know there is a pollution problem there, but we have addressed it now. And if, in fact, the people in Norris Point do not wish to elect their own municipal council, then the Minister of Municipal Affairs will put a commission of administration in place and the monies will go in there to correct a sewage problem they have right now, where three lift stations out of eight, I believe, are not working and has been causing sewage to back up which, in fact, is causing a big problem. There is no question about that, it is a big problem. But if the people in Norris Point do not wish to govern themselves, a commission will be put in place and that problem will be addressed in short order.

In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, I want to say again that I have been totally out of order, because this has nothing to do with these two amendments.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Environment Act", without amendment, carried. (Bill No. 3)

DR. COLLINS:
Order 10, Bill No. 25.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Before we call the next bill, I would like to read the questions for the Late Show.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Chairman, could we have it quiet please?

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please! I will now read the questions for the Late Show. The first question is from the hon. the member for Stephenville to the Premier. He is not satisfied with the answers given by the Premier as it relates to Air Nova bringing service to Stephenville and Gander, and if a commitment will be made.

The second question is to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries by the hon. member for Twillingate who is not satisfied with the answer to the question concerning compensation for Newfoundland fishermen whose earnings will be affected by the early closing of the salmon fishery.

DR. COLLINS:
Only two questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Two questions.

DR. COLLINS:
Order 10, Bill No. 25.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order 10, Bill No. 25.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Real Estate Trading Act To Provide For The Establishment Of The Real Estate Foundation." (Bill No. 25).

On motion, clauses 1 through 3, carried.

On motion, preamble, carried.

On motion, enacting clause, carried.

On motion, title, carried.

MR. BARRY:

One second now, Mr. Chairman! Why do you not pass The Globe and Mail while you are at it?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Chairman, you do not have to take that.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Menihek, is this a point of order?

MR. FENWICK:

Are we on Bill 25 right now?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

We just passed Bill 25.

MR. FENWICK:

No, you did not. You were going through it. I was asking for order all the time to be recognized, and I have not been recognized.

MR. TOBIN:

If the record shows it is carried, let it carry.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, let the record show, let the record show. Do not be so foolish.

MR. TULK:

What, Bill 25?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Bill 25 has been passed. Are you on a point of order?

MR. FENWICK:

No, I am on Bill 25. I want to

propose an amendment to Bill 25.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SIMMS:

You cannot rise on a point of order, the hon. the member for Menihek is on a point of order.

MR. FENWICK:

No, I am not. I mean to speak to Bill 25. I wish to propose an amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

We have a point of order. The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, it is becoming extremely difficult in this House to hear, even from where I sit, what the Chairman is saying with all the racket that is going on over there.

MR. BARRY:

You cannot hear what the Chairman is saying. Nobody heard you call Bill No. 25.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

We have an amendment that we passed to the Government House Leader, that we gave notice of that we were going to put to Bill No. 25, and now, because of the din and the noise on the other side, if this bill is passed -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!

There is a point or order on the floor. The hon. the member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak until I have quiet on that side, if I have to stay here until 6:00 p.m.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Very good!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Could we have silence, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making is that if Bill 25 was called by Your Honour it was unable to be heard by anybody on this side of the House because of the din and the noise that was here. As far as I am concerned, I thought, just following the Order Paper, that you were on Bill No. 15 or something, but now we are told that it was Bill No. 25.

MR. BARRY:

Are you going to try to ram that bill through?.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, we just passed a little while ago, Bill No. 3. That was Order No. 8. When the Committee of the Whole was finished with that bill, I then called Order No. 10, Bill No. 25.

Your Honour then said, 'Before I call Bill 25 I would like to announce the Late Show.'

MR. BARRY:

Oh, come on, boy.

DR. COLLINS:

After you had announced the Late Show, I then again called Order 10 and Your Honour said, 'Bill 25.'

MR. BARRY:

That is what was missed.

DR. COLLINS:

On two occasions the order was called and the bill was called and His Honour, the Chairman, responded to both calls. Now, if hon. members opposite cannot listen to what is going on, if the papers on their desks are so confused they cannot find their place in their papers on their desks, that is not His Honour's fault. They are supposed to pay attention when His Honour calls once not when he calls twice.

MR. TULK:

He cannot be heard.

MR. BARRY:

I have heard it all now.

MR. TULK:

Pure arrogance!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, can I have silence?

MR. BARRY:

You will be here until July on this bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Could we have order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. YOUNG:

We do not care if we are here

until August.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, it is clear why hon. members opposite are so confused about things. They will not listen to anything. I am trying to respond to a point of order and they will not listen; they are making a heck of a lot of noise. I can hardly hear myself speak.

The point is, when Your Honour calls a bill, hon. members opposite are supposed to either agree or disagree. They just cannot go on chatting among themselves and ignoring what is going on and then, when the whole thing is through, rise in their place and say, 'Oh, I want to do it all over again.' I mean, they have to pay attention to what is going on in Committee.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. BARRY:

Can we get the government House Leader in here and get some control?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

There has been a long tradition in this House, Mr. Chairman, and you have been in the Chair long enough and acting Speaker long enough to know how this thing is run. Members on that side of the House want to try and sneak bills through by talking over Your Honour so that Your Honour cannot be heard. Your Honour called the bill and then started to discuss

the questions on the Late Show, and before we hear anything further, the bloody thing is supposed to be passed. Now this is nonsense! That is no way to run a Legislature. We will debate it on third reading until the cows come home now, and you have notice of that, and we will use every procedural debate, every procedural procedure and point that we can on every bill that comes up for the rest of this Session if that is the nonsense that you are going to go on with.

MR. FENWICK:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

Is that further to that point of order?

MR. FENWICK:

Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes, Your Honour, I heard you call Bill 25. I stood up in order to speak to it and introduce an amendment to Bill 25.

MR. BARRY:

Get your House Leader out of the common room.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Quiet! Quiet!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please! Could we have order please?

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I heard you

call Bill 25 and when you started to go through the sections, I stood up on my feet, I asked to be recognized and you went through about four clauses without recognizing me. I have an amendment to introduce to it and I think that it is appropriate that it be introduced, because I was on my feet. If you want to check Hansard and my comments, I am sure you will find that I asked to be recognized several times before you got through the bill.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

DR. COLLINS:

The hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) is taking a very reasonable approach to things, unlike the member opposite when he stood on a point of order. When the member opposite stood on a point of order he said, "Oh, we did not hear you call it," and all that sort of thing. The hon. member for Menihek, at the far end of the room, the furthest away from Your Honour said, "I did hear the bill being called but, unfortunately, when I rose you did not notice me." A very reasonable point. In view of that, we would suggest that the hon. the member for Menihek, by leave, because we have now gone through a certain procedure, we revert, by leave -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave. No leave.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

No leave. No leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wish to advise the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that I am asking for order, please!!

MR. BARRY:

Well, Your Honour might do the same on the other side.

MR. J. CARTER:

Name him, Mr. Chairman. It is high time he was named.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. BARRY:

What arrogance!

MR. SIMMS:

What a despicable display.

MR. BARRY:

What arrogance! To try and sneak a bill through this House.

MR. SIMMS:

You are some alternate Premier, you are.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I have heard enough on this point of order.

MR. BARRY:

Trying to sneak a bill through this House.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Grow Up!

MR. BAIRD:

Be a man, boy. Be a man.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, Please!
Order, please!

I have heard enough on this point of order and I will now make my

ruling.

Twice the bill was called. The first time I called the Bill then I asked to be excused to read out the questions for the Late Show. After that I called Order No. 10, Bill No. 25, and, as far as I am concerned, the bill is passed.

MR. SIMMONS:

On a matter of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FUREY:

He sounds sick.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that for a member in this House to be able to participate in the -

MR. BARRY:

Get him out of the Chair.

MR. J. CARTER:

You cannot bring up a matter of privilege in Committee.

MR. FUREY:

You can so.

MR. SIMMONS:

He is not still blowing over there, is he?

MR. RUSSELL:

You have to rise the Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

It goes without saying that for a member, including myself, to

participate in the matters before a committee, that member must hear what the Chair says. All right? Now, members opposite can doubt my word, I am not concerned about that, I am just saying to the Chair I, Sir, did not hear you. I heard you say that 'before I call the Bill' you would proceed to announce the items for the Late Show. The next transaction I remember was that the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) was asking you, 'Were there only two?' All right? Were there only two matters. And then orders might have been called. I am not saying the Chair did not call them, I am saying to the Chair that I did not hear them. The Committee must realize that we have given notice. I understand the gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) also has given notice. The Government House Leader will know that it has been the intention of this side of the House to propose certain amendments. Now I appeal to the government side to stop playing games on this one. We have been reasonable in terms of the passage of other legislation before this Committee this afternoon. It is not our intention to obstruct, but on this particular one we have taken certain public positions, both in this House and outside, and we would like to be heard. Now, we are either going to be heard through the convention of proposing amendments - whether they are carried out or not is another matter - in this House or we shall have to resort to other procedural wrangles, and we prefer not to do that. So we appeal to the -

MR. J. CARTER:

No? You have done enough of it.

MR. FUREY:

Shut up, 'Carter', and grow up, boy.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
We appeal, Mr. Speaker, to the House to hear what I am saying, what others are saying, that we did not hear the order being called. Because it stands to reason, given our public stance on this matter, that we would not have allowed the matter to go through. So you have to believe that we did not hear Mr. Chairman. He might well have called the order, we are not arguing that, but we did not hear it.

MR. WARREN:
That is your problem.

MR. SIMMONS:
No, it is not my problem, Mr. Chairman. I submit the reason I did not hear is because of the kind of hullabaloo that is going on right now, Mr. Chairman, and that is why I rose on a matter of privilege. My privileges are being breached in that I am not allowed to participate in this Committee because I cannot hear what is going on and I appeal to the Chair to keep better order. I realize he has quite a problem, because his own colleagues do not respect him, obviously, but until the Committee agrees to take the word of hon. members that they did not hear, and then go back if go back is what is required - we submit that it has not been called, we did not hear it, but if it has been called, we suggest this whole matter can be resolved very expeditiously by just calling the Bill and proceeding clause by clause.

DR. COLLINS:
To that point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman, there is clearly no point of privilege here. Your Honour has made a ruling and the ruling is that the Committee of the Whole on this Bill has now been passed. That is Your Honour's ruling. There is no point of privilege in terms of the hon. member not being unable to hear what was going on. If the hon member who is several metres further away from Your Honour than the hon. member who just made the point could hear it, clearly, he was capable of hearing Your Honour's speech. If the hon member did not hear it, it was not because he was unable to here it but because he was not paying attention. That is clear from the facts of the case.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to get us out of this situation, Your Honour has made a ruling. That stands unless we question Your Honour's ruling, which we have no intention of doing, but to overcome the difficulty we are quite agreeable on this side of the House, by leave, to allow the member to revert to clause 1, or whatever clause he wanted to get up on.

MR. BARRY:
By leave! You are talking a matter of principle.

DR. COLLINS:
Now, Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHARIMAN:
Order! Order! Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:

I reiterate, a ruling has been made and we cannot undue what has been done. A ruling has been made and the only way it can be undone is if we question Your Honour's ruling, which we have no intention of doing. Your Honour made a ruling which was within his authority to make and we are not going to question it. However, if members opposite wish to get out of this difficulty, we are quite willing to co-operate by reverting to the clause that the hon. member wished to rise on.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.e

MR. SIMMONS:

If the minister generally wants us to get out of this conundrum he can stop using the word 'leave' and he can suggest that by unanimous consent we will revert to the matter notwithstanding the ruling.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, I was here with an amendment for this Bill, and it was submitted to the Government House Leader, of which the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell) has a copy. I have to apologize. I was thinking that this was Bill 53 and, if the minister looks at the amendment I have given him, on it is Bill 53, an amendment to Bill

53. I have just now, knowing that it was Bill 25, crossed it out. But the minister can verify that. I had it down for Bill 53, confusing it with Clause 53, and I was waiting for the call of Bill 53, with the bill turned up to the appropriate clause that I was about to amend. I am sorry! I did not hear 53, and if I heard 25 I would not have stood anyway, because I thought it was Bill 53.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Do I understand unanimous consent has been given?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, there is a matter of principle involved here that should be stated. We should not have to waste fifteen to twenty minutes of the House's time because members opposite are trying to sneak through something when the practice has been, even though, Mr. Chairman, the Chairman has called and said carried, if it is pointed out, in the long tradition of this House, if you want to check Hansard, if it is pointed out that it is being done too quickly, if a member did not hear, if a member wanted to speak, it has always been the practice in this House, as members opposite I am sure would confirm, that they would revert. It is the first time in my membership in this House, it is the first time since I have been here, that I have seen a member get up, who is supposed to be Acting House Leader, and try and ram through a bill, and that because some member of this House had not heard, they were going to

block off debate on it. Now, that is ridiculous!

AN HON. MEMBER:

It was called twice.

MR. BARRY:

No, Mr. Chairman, because we are not sitting in this House in the expectation that from now on if we blink, if we turn our heads that there is something going to be passed in such an underhanded fashion. That is pure arrogance, and it is not going to happen in this House.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, it appears to me we are in a tempest in a teapot. I think what it comes to is this: The Chair has made a ruling. The Chair is occupied obviously by a person who is nominated on this side, seconded by hon. members opposite, and unanimously agreed. It is not the government's intention to overrule the Chairman. The Chairman has made a ruling. The Minister of Finance has suggested, by unanimous consent - that is not overruling the ruling of the Chair - by unanimous consent, we will redo the Committee of the Whole on this bill.

MR. SIMMONS:

We already said that and he did not agree.

MR. J. CARTER:

We agreed. By leave.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

That is what it is, by unanimous consent.

MR. J. CARTER:

Leave.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

It is leave. It is just a question of terminology. Leave may have a connotation which hon. members do not like, but unanimous consent means everybody gives their leave. If one person does not give leave, it is not unanimous consent.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

No, but it is exactly what the Minister of Finance suggested. Now some hon. members did not like the term, but it is the same thing. Unanimous consent means everybody is in agreement. Everybody has given their leave to be associated with that unanimity. So if we are all agreed on that, it is only a matter of going back and redoing Committee of the Whole on Bill 25. If we are all in agreement, that is what we can do.

MR. DOYLE:

Unanimous leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, briefly to that point. That is the normal practice and procedure. Your Honour has been placed in a difficult position because of the unreasonable position taken initially by the Minister of Finance, who was acting as Government House Leader. All the Minister of Finance had to do was state that at the time. And, for

that matter, all Your Honour had to do was what Chairmen have done since time immemorial in this House, which is to say, 'Yes, I have said the bill was passed, but obviously some member had not heard, some member wanted to speak. Is there unanimous consent that I revert back?' and that would be the normal procedure.

MR. J. CARTER:

By leave.

MR. BARRY:

By unanimous consent. And it was the member supposedly acting as Government House Leader trying to ram this through in an unprincipled fashion that has led to this problem and wasted the time of the House.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Just before we leave this part, if there is unanimous leave to go back to it I am willing to go with it, but I believe that I should raise a question of privilege as well. The basic rule of the House is that when a member stands in his place and asks to be recognized, he is. I did ask to be recognized well before the bill was completed. I think if the Chairman will check Hansard he will indeed find that I was on my feet and called for the right to speak at least twice prior to the time that the clause by clause reading was finished. If I am not going to be recognized, then my rights are very much abrogated. So I would wish that the Chairman would check the tapes and find out whether or not it was indeed the case.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of privilege, I would advise the hon. the member for Menihek to speak loudly. Apparently, the Chairman of Committees must speak louder, too. Could we have silence now, please, while I recall Order 10, Bill 25.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Real Estate Trading Act To Provide For The Establishment Of The Real Estate Foundation." (Bill No. 25)

On motion, clause 1, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall clause 2 carry?

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Clause 2 is the one that reads, I believe, subsection 1 of subsection 20 of the act is repealed and the following substituted. Am I correct, anyone looking at it?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I have an amendment here and the amendment is pretty obvious in terms of the debate we have been having on it. It is written. I have a copy here for the Chairman. This also includes a second amendment, which I will get into later on when we get to that clause. I have also given a copy to the minister responsible for the legislation. I will read it out. Since it is an amendment I believe it has to be seconded. I do not at this point have a seconder for it.

MR. BARRY:

It does not need to be seconded.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

MR. FENWICK:

Does it need to be seconded?

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

I do not believe that in Committee you have to have a seconder.

MR. FENWICK:

If that is the case, then that is fine. I will read it out.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I would like to recommend that the Act to Amend the Real Estate Trading Act to Provide for the Establishment of the Real Estate Foundation, Bill 25, be amended by inserting, after the word 'deposit' in part 1, section 2, the words, 'interest gained on each transaction shall be returned to the purchaser who has the funds in the trust account.'

MR. RUSSELL:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Chairman, I have had a look at it, and certainly I will accept whatever ruling is made, but I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that

this amendment is out of order from a procedural viewpoint, in that what the amendment would do, in essence, is go completely the reverse of the principle of this bill. On those grounds, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the amendment, from a procedural viewpoint, is out of order.

MR. FENWICK:

To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman, the way I look at the bill, the bill is to set up a real estate foundation to do certain things. There is also, at the same time, certain financing procedures that have been established for it. What my amendment is proposing to do is to delete one of the financing procedures and only one of them. It would still allow the foundation to be established, which is the general principle of the bill, it would allow it to do its educational purposes, which is the major principle, it would allow it to raise funds from whichever ways were legitimate and legal. In that respect, I do not believe that deleting one of the sources of funding is necessarily defeating the principle of the bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I would have to rule that this amendment is in order.

MR. RUSSELL:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

As I understand the principle of this bill it is to set up a real estate foundation to provide the interest on these accounts to be used by the real estate foundation for educational purposes and other purposes outlined in this bill. What the hon. member for Menihek is doing is bringing in an amendment which would see these monies not used for that purpose at all but returned to the consumers, which, in my opinion, is completely against the principle of this bill.

MR. FENWICK:

Is this a new point of order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The same point of order.

MR. FENWICK:

Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I do not think that is the case. There is another amendment to another clause later on which I will be also introducing, which will indicate that I wish to change another one to make it consistent. I think that the argument here is the Real Estate Foundation and I have no argument with the Real Estate Foundation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

There are at least three or four sections that indicate where funds can be raised. For example, you could die and you could bequeath

money to the Real Estate Foundation, it could have investments from these bequeaths and the investment from them could be used to generate it. Also, there could be an indication that they could tax, for example, their commissions, and put that money into it. In other words, there are many other areas in which they can raise the revenue. So I think the general principle is the Foundation and its objects. How the money is raised, I do not believe is an essential feature of it, no matter what the minister says.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I do not have a copy of the amendment, so I cannot speak with the precision one could if one had a copy of the amendment. But there is no doubt that what my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs said is a very valid principle. I mean, second reading establishes the principle of the bill and no amendment in Committee of the Whole can be counter to the principle of the bill which has already been established. It can change secondary or detailed particularized provisions but it cannot affect the principle. Now, what I would suggest is that the Chair, probably, after hearing arguments, might wish to take it under consideration to rule on this. On the printed thing, up at the beginning, it says an 'Explanatory Note: This bill would provide for the

establishment of funding of the Real Estate Foundation'. That is there as a kind of shorthand or guidance to hon. members. That has no, in my opinion, juridical force, it is an explanatory note which I do not think any court would take any knowledge of, nor indeed would I think the Court of Parliament, which is here in the Legislature, is guided by that. I mean, whatever the principle is - and I am not going to define it - it is more than to establish; you know, it is to establish for a purpose and to have certain means of fulfilling that purpose. That is the overall principle of the bill.

MR. SIMMS:

The principle is outlined in the objects of the Foundation itself.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Yes, as my colleague to my left has said, certainly in considering what the principle of the bill is, one can only do that with reference to that part of the bill which says 'the objects of the Foundation'. It is not just the creation, the objects or purpose of the Foundation have to be an important part of the principle. It is not thus to establish the damned thing; I mean, you could have one sentence, 'An act to establish a foundation for shoemakers' and there would be no other clauses -

DR. COLLINS:

Or cobblers.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Or cobblers, right. And you would then establish the bill, you would then pass the bill and there would be a statute saying that there is a foundation for cobblers. But it has to be the objects, the purposes of the foundation which

are part of the principle of the act. And it would appear to me that there are strong arguments for saying that this amendment is contrary to the principle, which has already been passed by the House in second reading, because it changes it in a way which affects the principle of the act.

MR. FENWICK:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman, the final argument, I think, to be put to it is if you delete this section, is it possible for a foundation to be established and is it possible for a foundation to do educational purposes? I contend that it is. It may be that they may have to access the funds from different areas but, nevertheless, the foundation would still be there, there still would be means to raise funds and so on. If, however, what the hon. minister is saying is that the sole purpose of the bill is to access this money, then that seems, to me, only part of the financing arrangement that has been put in place.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the amendment is entirely in order.

MR. SIMMS:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, along the lines of

what my colleague, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), has suggested, Your Honour might wish to hold in abeyance your ruling, or else take a few minutes, or whatever, if you wish. But my suggestion, Mr. Chairman, is contrary to the argument that the member for Menihek is making and in addition to the argument that the Minister of Consumer Affairs made with respect to the principle of the bill.

The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs outlined what he thought were the principles of the bill by talking about the objects of the foundation which really more clearly define the principle of the legislation. But, Mr. Chairman, further to that, in the objects of the foundation, section 53 of the bill, it says precisely 'the objects are to establish and maintain a fund and to use the proceeds for the following purposes:' and it mentions two, 'education, sponsor, support and promote research' and so on. In (c) it says, 'to do all other things that are, in the opinion of the Foundation, incidental or conducive to the attainment of the objects set forth above'.

Now, if this foundation, itself, therefore believes that the purpose of the member for Menihek's amendment is conducive or, indeed, incidental to the operation of the foundation, then they could, themselves, in fact, implement what he is suggesting. But to propose it at Committee stage, after the principle of the bill has been approved by the House, is totally out of order, Mr. Chairman, I would submit.

MR. FENWICK:

To that point of order, Mr.

Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. FENWICK:

You could probably check Hansard, but it is my impression that we have already raised this point of order and you have already ruled that the amendment was in order. It was only after that that the minister brought up - I do not know if it was an additional point of order, but it seems to me unparliamentary to, after the Speaker has ruled, bring up additional argument and try to make another ruling on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

I had ruled on one point of order and then there was a second point of order.

MR. FENWICK:

It seems like it was the same one, though, to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

We will have the Late Show in about four minutes, so I am going to have to make a ruling on this tomorrow.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I happen to agree with the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, that this amendment destroys the principle of the bill, but, of course, Your Honour will have to rule as to whether it does or not. That is his privilege and that is his job.

Since, as Your Honour says, we have only four more minutes before five-thirty and then we are into the Late Show, I would suggest that we call it five-thirty.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is it agreed to call it five-thirty?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

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

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bills No. 20, 8, 11, 7, and 3 without amendment, Bill No. 13 with amendment, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Is it agreed we call it 5:30?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Debate on the Adjournment
[Late Show]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There were two questions to be debated at 5:30. The first one was by the hon. the

member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward), who was not satisfied with the answer given by the Premier relating to the question of Air Nova bringing service to Stephenville and Gander.

And the second one was from the hon. the member for Twillingate, (Mr. W. Carter), who was not satisfied with the answer concerning compensation to Newfoundland fishermen whose earnings were being affected by the early closing of the salmon fishery.

So I will call on the hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I again want to express my concerns to the administration and to the Premier, and to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) in particular, as to problems that are being experienced right now with a new airline coming in and leaving two major centres out of their route. I am very concerned with it, and many concerns have been expressed to me by the transportation people out that way in Stephenville and the local area. I think that under deregulation, if it is done right and the proper arrangements are put in place, the two airport system on the West Coast can work probably better than it ever has. But the problem is that you have to have emphasis put on both and I think the Province should have some say, or at least state an opinion to these airlines providing services to the Province.

The whole West Coast suffers when one airport is not getting the proper service, especially in Stephenville, Port au Port and the

entire area, Bay St. George and the Southwest Coast, where health care needs and so on are again in jeopardy because only one airline is now operating one flight through there, and also business activity.

As a matter of fact, I went to a business conference just a couple of weeks ago over there and transportation is very important for our economy on the West Coast to get moving. So I see an airline business that is supposed to be coming in there to improve matters and compete with another airline or other airlines in the area, and right now they are not flying in there. What I have been told so far from transportation people out that way is the possibility they may come in there at all is on 'if.' And I want to express my concern on my constituents' behalf, on the entire West Coast's behalf, that Stephenville also be served by this airline, and that would make for a competitive environment which supposedly deregulation is supposed to bring. I do not necessarily agree with the survival of the fittest atmosphere under which deregulation comes down from Ottawa, we are going to go backwards twenty years if we go right to the extreme with it, but, I mean, I think that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) should be very, very well aware of the concerns of many people out that way as to the type of service that is being offered at the present time.

Air Atlantic has a fine service and they have nice airplanes and so on, but there needs to be competition there, it is not there at the present time, and it looks as if, for a number of months to come maybe, maybe even a year or

so, we may not see it.

So those concerns have to be expressed. I am not saying go and tell them that they have to go in there, but I think that the Minister of Transportation should certainly be putting emphasis on this. He should be overseeing it. I would like to know if there has been a study done, for example, as to the benefits or the non-benefits of deregulation in this Province. We just welcomed it in here, let it come in and take over, especially when it comes to transportation policy, yet we do not know what the outcome may be, we do not know how it is going to effect local areas of the Province. I think if the economy of the West Coast and the economy of the Island is to move ahead and move forward, we must have an improved transportation system, not one that cuts down services in certain areas where people are trying to get the economy going or to get a town or an area moving in that sense. So I want to bring those concerns to the Minister of Transportation and his colleagues as the future of the entire area is dependent on a good air service, and I think that that should be taken under consideration. I will be having meetings with Air Nova officials in the very near future. I have been told by the Transportation Commission people out that way they are very concerned that they do not know when or if the airline may be coming in there. And we want to make sure that a good service is provided so that the economy of the whole area can improve instead of going backwards, which we do not need to do right now because we are in enough economic troubles as far as I am concerned. We need improvements in our system, not

things that are going to hurt it in the future.

On that note I would like to thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
There is very little which can be said in addition to what the Premier said this afternoon. He made it very clear, number one, air transportation is an exclusively federal responsibility. It is not a provincial responsibility. Obviously the Province is concerned with matters of transportation, but it is totally a matter of federal responsibility. I do not know, but perhaps the hon. gentleman is not in close contact with his confreres in Ottawa, Mr. Tobin, the second Mr. Baker or Mr. Rompkey. I am not sure. It is totally a federal matter, it is not a provincial matter at all.

Also, as was pointed out, and indeed I heard it myself as I am sure the hon. gentleman did on the radio, when a spokesman for Air Nova sometime last week announced the beginning of their service and, as I recall, it was that at the beginning - and they will have less planes at the beginning than they will after they are into operation for a certain period - they will not be going to Gander or Stephenville. But as they get these additional planes, and depending upon need, on the passengers available, on the business available, then they will be looking at going into Gander

and Stephenville. So really there is nothing more reasonable. Even the hon. gentleman would not want Air Nova to be flying in and out of Stephenville with nobody on the planes except for the pilot, or with two or three people on them, when there is already another airline which is flying. Obviously it is going to depend upon the need. I mean, surely the hon. gentleman is not suggesting that taxpayers' money would be going to an air company to fly empty planes back and forth.

MR. SIMMS:
That is exactly what he is saying.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
The spokesman for Air Nova made it very clear that at the beginning, where they had less planes than they had originally expected, I believe, and there was some delay on the orders, they would be providing such-and-such a service and then, as they got additional planes and got into operation, they would be examining the options of flying to Gander and Stephenville. I do not really know that there is any more anybody can say.

The Premier also said that he would convey the concerns of the hon. member to the provincial Minister of Transportation, and there is really nothing further to be said. The air company itself has said that they will be examining the situation. They have not said, 'We will not be servicing Gander or Stephenville. What they have said is at the beginning of their operation they will not be, and they will judge that after they get into operation. So there is really nothing further anybody can say.

MR. SIMMS:

He is trying to get a headline in the Stephenville paper now.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

One of my hon. colleagues is suggesting that really the hon. member for Stephenville recognizes that and agrees totally with what the Premier said, and therefore does agree with what I said, but he is suggesting that really what he wants to do is to get a mention in the Stephenville paper. I am not sure when it goes to press. If so, that is not an unworthy motive.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:

First off, the Premier did not even show up to answer the question, so that shows a lot of concern -

MR. BAIRD:

He is a busy man.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

So he is busy. That is fine and dandy. But, I mean, I wanted to get an answer to my question. Now if he wants to go play around with it all he wants, that is up to himself. But it is going to hurt the West Coast if an airline does not come in there -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is not on a point of order.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the minister to answer the question. That is all I am asking, for him to answer the question instead of playing around.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

You have already had your five minutes. I have only had three and a half.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. BUTT:

And you love to talk.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

At times I like to hear myself talk, as one of my colleagues said. But I really do not think there is anything more one can say. The company has made it quite clear that they are going to examine going into Gander and Stephenville when they get into operation and when they have their aircraft. So that is all that one can do there.

I do not think myself that it is particularly relevant to tie in the whole question of deregulation with this matter. I think the vast majority of Canadian people would agree that we are regulated to death in this country. The whole economy has been strangled, and private initiative strangled on the regulations, mostly the bureaucratic regulation which has gone on for the past fifteen years under the aegis and guidance of the regulating Liberal Party, which is a very regulatory party. They regulate everything they can get their hands on. They regulate, I would think, perhaps even more than the Socialists would regulate.

MR. SIMMS:

No, Sir, they would not.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Well, maybe not, perhaps a little bit less. But they are great regulators. And the Conservative Party is endeavoring to help the country escape from this stifling regulation of initiative and of private enterprise and of opportunity and of challenge, which the country needs. If we are going to be regulated to death, then surely the economy is not going to prosper. That does not mean there is no room for any regulation in the public interest, but obviously it does mean that to attempt to regulate every form of commercial activity has been proven not to work, it has been proven to be stifling. Surely the hon. gentleman for Stephenville would not wish to so stagnate the economy by regulating it to death. All the hon. gentlemen will have to do is to wait and see after Air Nova is in operation. They themselves have said they will be examining the feasibility and the possibility of flying planes to Stephenville, and I am sure they will give the hon. gentleman a trip on their inaugural flight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the Fall salmon fishery is very important to a lot of Newfoundlanders, especially to the fishermen in Twillingate district where a large part of their earnings are derived from

the Fall salmon fishery. I believe that if the federal government is now going to take action that will have the effect of interfering with that Fall salmon fishery and, in so doing, reduce the earnings of those fishermen, then I believe that the government has a very serious obligation to compensate the people that are effected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I only have five minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

That is why, Mr. Speaker, in my question today to the hon. the minister I ask him to make representation to his federal counterpart and to make strong representation with a view to having fishermen on the Northeast Coast of our Province, especially the fishermen in Twillingate district that will be effected by this new regulation, suitably compensated. This is not something new to the federal government, the matter of compensation for fishermen whose livelihood is being interfered with by virtue of certain changes in the fishing regulations. It has happened before and that is why I believe if the minister and the government opposite were to make strong representation to Ottawa then, I believe, that maybe they would seriously consider offering some kind of compensation.

Mr. Speaker, we are seeing a gradual shrinking of the commercial salmon fishery in our Province. I contend that if we

are not careful and given the fact that we now have a very strong, a very powerful, a very wealthy lobby both in the U.S. and in certain parts of Canada to bring an end to the commercial salmon fishery, if we are not careful, Mr. Speaker, the commercial salmon fishery will go the way of the seal hunt. One day we may wake up and we will no longer have a commercial salmon fishery in this Province.

The minister, in a reply to my question today, made some reference to an increase in the budget this year for surveillance. Well, Mr. Speaker, the officials of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans are not putting it that way. In fact, what they are saying is that there has been a reduction in the number of people that will be employed this year on the rivers. They are also saying that there has been a reduction in the overall budget. In fact, they are talking in terms of about 4 per cent plus the inflationary factor as well.

In fact, I had a conversation today with a highly-placed official of the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans and he admitted that their budget had been reduced and that they were, to quote him, "trying to make do" with what they had and trying to reorganize the whole surveillance operation. My colleague for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has also been in touch with the Fisheries and Oceans Department. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, and I have no reason to doubt it, then it is quite obvious that the federal government is trying to balance its budget on the backs of the fishermen of our Province and, in particular, on the backs of the fishermen of Twillingate district,

where, as I said a moment ago, the Fall salmon fishery is very important.

I made reference a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, to the powerful sports fishing lobby that is working day and night. Off the Island of Newfoundland, in provinces like New Brunswick and in the U.S. they are working day and night, tooth and nail. There is a lot of money behind them and a lot of influence trying to put an end to the commercial salmon fishery. I happen to know personally some of the people involved in that lobby.

In fact, this might be of some interest to members in the House: One of the gentlemen, probably the forerunner or the mouthpiece, as it were, of that lobby is a gentleman whose name is Dick Buck who happens to be a very close friend and advisor to the President of the United States. This gentleman was one time Vice-President of the Pepsi-Cola Company. He is a very influential American and I presume he is still very active in that area. He is absolutely opposed to a commercial salmon fishery, not only in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, but anywhere in the world. This chap is totally committed to the proposition that salmon must be the sole property and for the sole use of sportsmen and people who visit certain parts of Canada, Miramichi and Restigouche and other rivers, to indulge in that sport.

MR. RIDEOUT:

A luxury.

MR. W. CARTER:

Right, a luxury. People come down in their expensive jets and occupy their expensive cabins on the

banks of the Miramichi will probably spend considerable amount of money to catch one salmon. Mr. Speaker, that is not going to do very much for the Newfoundland fishermen whose livelihood will depend on having access to that fishery.

I am not kidding and I am not here making politics. I can say with some authority and some knowledge that Twillingate fishermen, and that is my concern, and I am sure the same can be said for Bonavista North and Fogo and Labrador and the hon. minister's own district, my constituents this year. Mr. Speaker, will have to do with less money by virtue of the fact that the salmon fishery on the Northeast Coast and, in fact, all over Newfoundland will now close on October 15 and very shrewdly, Mr. Speaker. I have another word for it but I do not think it is parliamentary. Anyway, they are talking about October 15th as being the closing date.

The officials of Fisheries and Oceans know, as I am sure does the minister, as I know, that that is effectively closing the Fall fishery altogether because there is very little salmon fishing done prior to that date. The bulk of the activity in the salmon fishery, certainly in my district, would occur after October 15.

So what they are saying now is that the Fall salmon fishery will be done away with. That is why, Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon minister and on the government to go after their federal counterparts and to demand that suitable compensation be effected to take care of Newfoundland fishermen whose earnings will be reduced considerably by virtue of this new regulation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The hon. gentleman makes some very good points in his argument, as he did in Question Period today and earlier this week. But then the hon. gentleman makes a fatal mistake, Mr. Speaker, really flawing his own logic. I guess that was reflected in the report from this House this afternoon when the reference was made to him going off in tangents. There is absolutely no correlation whatsoever between surveillance on rivers in Newfoundland and the Fall salmon fishery, absolutely none whatsoever. In fact, every year, Mr. Speaker, since there has been surveillance on rivers in this Province and a Fall salmon fishery, those wardens have been gone long before you got into the Fall salmon fishery.

There is a correlation between the Spring and Summer salmon fishery and the fish that come back to spawn in the Newfoundland rivers and surveillance. That is another topic and another argument. To intersperse that, Mr. Speaker, with the Fall salmon fishery has nothing whatsoever to do with it.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

I presume that the reason that the people in Ottawa are moving the season back to October 15 is because there is a fall in the salmon population. I presume that

is the case. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that surveillance on the river is directly related -

MR. J. CARTER:

He is debating.

MR. TULK:

- to the number of salmon that swims in the ocean. So I would suggest to him that the logic of the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) is impeccable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Right on. Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order! There is no point of order.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the logic of his colleague is just as impeccable as the logic just pronounced by the former critic, the present House Leader (Mr. Tulk). The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, and nobody can argue against this, and this is not saying bringing the closing date back is right or wrong. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that every salmon that goes through the Newfoundland waters at that time in the year is headed to rivers in Connecticut, not to rivers in Newfoundland, none of them. The hon. gentleman, as a former Chairman, Mr. Speaker, of the Atlantic -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

- Salmon Advisory Board knows that. Those salmon are not headed to Newfoundland rivers, they are

headed to rivers in Connecticut. So it is the Americans who have brought on the pressure, in turn for getting Greenland to reduce their effort, to have that effort reduced. Now that does not make the situation right or wrong for Newfoundland. There I agree with him. But for God's sake, use the right logic and use the right arguments. Do not make it appear that you do not know what you are talking about when you are putting forth your arguments.

Now the fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is this: When the first effort was taken to cut back on the salmon fishery in this Province, and I assume the hon. gentleman was then Chairman of that Atlantic Salmon Advisory Board, it was done in the Spring of the year. When the season was moved back three weeks from the 20 May until the middle of June, and that affected thousands and thousands of fishermen in Newfoundland, one cent of compensation was paid, Mr. Speaker. Not one cent of compensation was paid to those fishermen who are affected when the season was moved ahead from the 20 May to three weeks in June, not a cent. That affected thousands and thousands of people.

In this case, there are going to be several hundred fishermen affected, and if one is affected, it is too many. In this case, there are going to be several hundred fishermen affected in various areas around the Province and Labrador. In my own district, for example, Brent's Cove and Fleur de Lys are the only two communities where Fall salmon are caught because the Fall salmon, Mr. Speaker, travel headland to headland. They do not go in the bays, so therefore, not every

commercial salmon fisherman in Newfoundland is affected. If one is affected, that is one too many. That is why we took the position that the federal government should not agree with the U.S. request. The commercial salmon fishermen in Newfoundland have already paid too high a price. If the federal government wants to do that and support the U.S. request, then there should be compensation. We agree on that.

But for heaven's sake, let us use the right arguments. Mr. Speaker, in putting forward our case, not false arguments, frivolous arguments, misleading arguments, arguments that the hon. gentleman should know better having been a former Minister of Fisheries and a former Chairman of the Atlantic Salmon Advisory Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 23, at 10:00 a.m.