



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 41

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Wednesday

28 May 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Before calling Statements by Ministers I would like to refer to a point of order raised by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) with respect to a question posed by the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) to the hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge). I would refer hon. members to Beauchesne, paragraph 357 which states in part: "A question oral or written must not: ask solution of a legal proposition, such as interpretation of a Statute, a Minister's own powers, etc."

It would appear to me that the hon. member for Bonavista North asked the hon. the Minister of Justice for a legal interpretation of the Criminal Code and I must rule that there was a valid point of order raised by the President of the Council.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of privilege, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the Premier is aware of this but I just wanted to inform him and his colleagues that the solution to Newfoundland's deficit may already exist. The solution to the Province's fiscal restraint may have been discovered by the member for Bonavista North this afternoon when he went down to the traffic court and discovered a thirty minute meter into which he put his last quarter and then proceeded to go into the traffic court and get

into a thirty-five minute lineup, the end result being that when he came out, after paying the ticket for which he went in, there was another ticket on his car. Now, is this the answer to the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins) deficit problem? Is this the solution, to have a thirty minute meter and a thirty-five minute line-up at the Traffic Court?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! To that point of privilege, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
You have just ruled on a point of order from yesterday, which was a legitimate point of order as you have ruled, Your Honour, against the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) on the questions that he was posing for the minister yesterday. Now we have another example of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) getting up in his place on a spurious point of privilege, wasting the time of this House, demonstrating to the people in the galleries that the Liberal Opposition do not know the rules of the House any better than they know the rules of politics outside of this House.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
I think that the most recent poll has completely destroyed this Premier's sense of humour.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier, to the point of privilege?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege - 7 per cent looks pretty good to me, for the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege. There is no prime facie case.

MR. W. CARTER:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege to correct a statement attributed to me in today's Telegram in which I am quoted as saying, I think outside the House 'That the company to which we were referring yesterday, the Armaport Company, was an agent of the Saltfish Corporation.' I am quoted as saying that when, in fact, what I said was that 'Armaport was an agent of the company in Portugal, Armazans Limited', and not, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, not an agent of the Saltfish Corporation, as stated in the paper.

MR. BARRY:

On a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the same point of privilege?

MR. BARRY:

No, on another one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Let him rule on the other one.

MR. BARRY:

Oh, all right.

MR. RIDEOUT:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. RIDEOUT:

I do not know and I would not care to comment on what the hon. gentleman said outside the House, but I did undertake to get a transcript of yesterday's Hansard so I could attempt to answer his questions of yesterday, and I believe Hansard will confirm that he said in his question that the company was an agent of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation.

MR. W. CARTER:

(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:

That may be the case. I am sure that is why he is trying to correct the record, but that is what is in Hansard as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, there is obviously a difference of opinion between two hon. members. There is no point of privilege.

MR. BARRY:

Just briefly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Again a matter of privilege to correct, I think, an impression which has been falsely given by

CBC media reports yesterday, which I think does an injustice to both sides of the House, that reference being to the effect that for the first time in the history of the House of Assembly, government members had agreed with a suggestion by the Opposition. What was the exact issue? Oh, yes, applicability of landlord and tenant legislation to government housing. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if we had full coverage of the proceedings, for example, even yesterday as we were going through legislation we saw the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) agree to take a look at the clause in the student assistance -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You are raising a point of privilege.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is going on?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, either the Premier has gotten another poll, or he has gotten the decision of the federal government on the Newfoundland railway or he has gotten the decision with respect to Hibernia, but he is not in a very good mood today. Now, I think the wrong impression is given if government is being portrayed as being totally recalcitrant, totally uncaring, totally unagreeable. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) has shown himself to be very reasonable in taking under consideration suggestions for firebreaks around communities. Regularly we see, Mr. Speaker, gestures by government with respect to accepting suggesting made by

members of the Opposition, and I think CBC did an injustice to government when they portrayed them in that fashion, as having been totally unresponsive to suggestions of the Opposition. They even agreed with us eventually, Mr. Speaker, on the fresh air tax.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier to that point of privilege.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am not going to take up the time of the House as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) did or other members opposite. It is clearly a breach of the rules of this House what the Opposition has done for the last ten minutes and they should be brought to order.

MR. SPEAKER:

I must rule there is no prima facie case of breach of privilege.

Statements by Ministers

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, today I want to inform the House about an initiative that will create a number of logging and related jobs in the Bay d'Espoir area this Summer and Fall.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

My department has just issued an export permit to Eastern Wood Harvesters Limited of Birchy Bay for 6,000 cords of pulpwood to be obtained from forest management unit 7, which is the Bay d'Espoir area, with most of the wood coming from overmature stands in the Upper Salmon area. The permit will allow the company to export this wood to overseas markets by ship from St. Alban's.

The company will obtain half the wood from its own cutting operations, and the other 3,000 cords will be purchased by Eastern Wood Harvesters from local contractors operating in the Bay d'Espoir area.

Mr. Speaker, we expect harvesting to begin around the middle of June, so the beneficial effect of this arrangement on the high unemployment levels in the Bay d'Espoir area will not be delayed.

In fact, we expect that about 2,000 man days of employment will be created by logging activities, while other jobs will be generated in the handling, debarking and loading of the wood onto a ship.

While the actual number of jobs at any one time in an operation such as this is a function of how fast the wood is cut, Mr. Speaker, we anticipate that between fifty and sixty loggers will be employed along with another six persons in an associated debarking operation. As I mentioned, there will also be some jobs created in transporting the wood to wharfside and loading it aboard ships.

There are a couple of other benefits, Mr. Speaker, as well in jobs being created that are worthy of note, but one thing, the plan

will allow utilization of overmature wood that normally would not be able to be marketed within this Province.

The wood, if not harvested, could also very well become a major fire hazard in time, as well as providing a breeding area for destructive insect pests. So the harvesting will also provide a future opportunity for silviculture treatments.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention, as well, that the potential exists for other arrangements of this nature and in fact I hope and expect to be able to make further announcements along this line later in this year.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank the minister for giving me copy of his statement earlier to have a look at it and be able make some comments. While we welcome the news that they are going to create some employment, we are hoping to see a lot more announcements related to creating employment. While we welcome that wonderful news, I want to tell the minister that we are very concerned on this side of the House about the negotiating of the new F.E.S.P. Programme, or replacement of that programme, as it has been wiped out, it has not

been supplemented, or no funding has been found for it. I have gotten calls from people on the West Coast who have been employed under this programme and now find themselves without any work because of the lack of a replacement. The minister has indicated that he is in the process of negotiating that agreement. I just want to put it to him that I do not think we can wait another year and a half, as we did for the Forestry Agreement that we now have. I also want him to look at a better cost-sharing ratio than the 70/30 he got last time, because 90/10 is more than 70/30.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to inform honourable members that amendments have been approved to restrict roaming animals in this Province.

Under the authority of the Livestock Act, local service districts and approved community committees will be authorized to impound roaming horses and cattle that are considered a nuisance in that community. The impounding process will be carried out under the direction of the Agricultural Branch of my Department. Impounded animals will be released to their owners upon the payment of an impounding fee which has been set at \$50.00 per day. Impounded animals that are not

claimed within ten days may be disposed of by public auction.

Mr. Speaker, a growing number of complaints about roaming animals from several areas of the Province has made it necessary to take this action.

At present, nine local service districts and/or committees have been authorized to impound roaming animals. Other unincorporated areas of the Province which may have the problem of roaming animals can get authorization to impound by contacting Mr. Kevin Aucoin, Director of Extension Services, Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, Brookfield Road, Mount Pearl. The telephone number is included.

I have also included in this a list of the nine people who are already approved to impound animals. I might note that this regulation is to cover unincorporated areas. The Municipalities Act for incorporated areas covers the regulations for roaming animals, and this is for areas that are not incorporated.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the minister for his usual courtesy of providing a copy of his statement and tell him that I support and we support, indeed, measures that would relieve certain areas of the Province of this particular nuisance. It has

not been prevalent in my particular area of the Province, but certainly it is on the Island portion of the Province.

The statement does not give some of the details that perhaps might be of interest. For example, those who have now been approved, I do not know if that would take effect immediately. Should there not be some pre-notice to the general public, let us say, in areas effected that would allow them, in cases where owners have not corrected this ongoing problem, that might indicate to them that firm action is now being taken so that they would perhaps correct part of the problem before the impounding actually takes place? I think that might be an idea to consider.

There is obviously a cost in impounding, and with respect to local service districts, and so on, I would assume from the statement that the impounding fees, where owners retrieve animals, or in the case of public auction, these funds would go to the authorized committees, which would help offset the cost of the impounding itself. If that is not to be the case, and it is not clear in the statement, perhaps there could be consideration of some other form of assistance to offset the cost to the district.

In general terms I certainly support the action taken and would hope that areas of the Province yet to be affected will be given some encouragement, as you have done here, to participate in this particular programme, with some pre-notice, with the hope that owners would make corrections before this actually goes into effect.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order, or whatever you want to call it.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

I just want to mention to the hon. member and to members of the House that all of these questions and concerns that the hon. gentleman has raised are already included in the regulations.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there any further Statements by Ministers?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that government has decided to continue funding for the St. Lawrence Miners' Special Fund.

Members of the House of Assembly may recall that the Special Fund was established in 1971 to assist dependents of deceased workers at the mine in St. Lawrence following the unfortunate health hazards which occurred at the mine. The Special Fund was equally shared between government and the Aluminum Company of Canada until the agreement between the two parties expired on June 30, 1985. With the reversion to the Crown of the mineral rights covering all of ALCAN's former fluorspar operations, government has decided to pay the full cost of the fund, which will continue until there

are no beneficiaries eligible to receive benefits under the Special Fund.

The approximate annual cost of the fund is \$80,000 and projected to the year 2000, government will pay an estimated \$800,000 to the dependents. Mr. Speaker, as Minister with responsibility for administration of the Special Fund, I am extremely pleased to be able to announce government's decision to continue to provide this financial assistance to families in St. Lawrence who were so adversely affected by the health problems experienced at the St. Lawrence mine. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me thank the minister, first of all, for his courtesy in giving me a copy of his Statement. We, on this side of the House, welcome the Statement by the minister. It is perhaps very rarely that you will find both sides of the House agreeing on very many issues. On this particular issue, of course, we do agree and we congratulate him on having the initiative to see that the people of St. Lawrence, following the unfortunate health hazard they went through, are now going to be compensated, and the beneficiaries who are eligible under the fund do not have to wonder whether it is going to be for five years or ten years; as the minister says, for those people it is, as far as that

goes, perpetuity.

I want to congratulate the minister and say to him that we, on this side of the House, fully support his efforts in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER:

At this stage I would like to welcome to the visitors' gallery twenty Grade VII to Grade VIII students from Beth-El Pentecostal Academy, in Victoria, with their teacher, John Murray, Pastor King and Pastor Benson.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier a question concerning his speech yesterday to those businesses involved with the offshore. The Premier stated to these firms that they should avoid putting all their eggs in the offshore oil basket. Is the Premier now telling these companies 'to do as I say and not do as I do' in that we have all seen the Premier put all of the Province's eggs in the oil basket for the last several years?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is very appropriate that the Leader of the Opposition should ask that question when Fishery

Products International, through a restructuring agreement that we fought for, has seen a profit of \$11.8 million in the first quarter of this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If that is an indication that we have all our eggs in the oil basket, because we put \$40 million or \$50 million into FPI and have seen the offshore fishery turn around without closing down Gaultois and Harbour Breton and Burin and Grand Bank like the Liberals wanted to do, then my name must be Tommy Toe, Mr. Speaker. We have over the years put our eggs in many, many baskets. Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition would read the speech that I gave yesterday, and there is a copy available if he would so desires - he might learn something about the offshore, by the way, Mr. Speaker, if he reads the speech - what we were saying was as a result of the trade mission just recently to Norway in the auspices of the Government of Newfoundland, under which a number of members of the Opposition were included, we learned in Norway that a lot of the companies now existent in Norway had grown from traditional businesses and expanded these businesses to get into the offshore. In other words, do not forget what you are doing now and making money at and put all of your effort into the offshore, but keep what you have and expand your business so you will also have a foot in the offshore as well as the onshore.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

First of all, the Premier has a short memory as far as Fishery Products is concerned. It was only when he was forced to go to the bargaining table by the Government of Canada saying that they were going to put the agreement in place without him that he started to participate in the fisheries agreement.

Mr. Speaker, is the Premier not aware that there are continuing layoffs in the offshore oil sector, that many of the companies that he was addressing there yesterday are having to let people go, that they are seeing their investment threatened, and are we not, Mr. Speaker, able to expect further layoffs in the industry over the next several years unless there is a significant change in policy, particularly with respect to the petroleum incentive programme offshore?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, number one, as it relates to forcing us to the table, the federal Liberal Government and the members opposite supported a proposal which would see five or six fish plants closed down. We sat down to the table with the federal Liberal Government and we told them, 'You will not close down Gaultois, you will not close down Harbour Breton, you will not close down Grand Bank and you will not close down Burin.'

MR. FUREY:

'Morgan' said different.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

We forced Mr. Senator Michael Kirby and Peter John Nicholson, and a few other Liberal Party hacks to back down and give us the deal which would see those fish plants stay open, and now we see first quarter earnings of \$11 million profit for that company, which Senator Michael Kirby told us could not be done. That was the proposal they had on the table. Yes, we went to the table, Mr. Speaker, and we made them back down because they knew that they could not get away with it with this government. And in the same manner, Mr. Speaker, in response to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition might get a sorry fright, Mr. Speaker, to see how many jobs there are going to be in the offshore before this year is out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, that is called whistling past the graveyard, by the way.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier if he is trying to give assurances to these businesses involved in the offshore, why is it in his remarks yesterday he indicated another

several weeks delay before a Hibernia decision was going to come down?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now, Mr. Speaker, two or three weeks delay on a \$5 billion project in which the federal government, four or five oil companies and the provincial government are involved, if there is to be a delay of two or three weeks, or four or five weeks, or six or seven weeks and out of that will come a green light for \$5 billion project for this Province, well then, Mr. Speaker, I do not think any oil company or anybody in Newfoundland is going to worry about that. In the same way, Mr. Speaker, it was the Liberal Party which talked about all of the delays, saying, 'Oh, sign the Nova Scotia deal, Sign it. Get on with it. Give it away. We would rather have a few short-term jobs rather than have some long-term future here for our people.' Well, if it means a delay of two or three weeks so that we have long-term PC jobs instead of short-term Liberal jobs, we will wait.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Has the Premier forgotten that it was only several weeks ago he said in this House that unless a decision came down on Hibernia in early June that it would not start

this year? So we are talking about a one year delay if we do not get a decision in early June. Now we hear the Premier indicating that the decision is not coming down in early June.

That is what he said yesterday in his remarks to these companies, Mr. Speaker, and that is what he was carried in living colour on CBC and other television stations as saying yesterday. Now, will the Premier explain those remarks and will he tell the people of this Province whether we are now seeing the movement of Newfoundlanders back from Fort McMurray and these places where the Alberta oil industry is being cut back? And has the Premier now given his statement to these young men and women in Alberta that they can now come home?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I will not be bamboozled by the Liberal Party that wants to rush into something for short-term gain. I will not be bamboozled by the business community of St. John's or Newfoundland into signing a deal on Hibernia. The deal on Hibernia, when it is signed, quite likely will see a lot of the boys from Fort McMurray coming home, not to short-term jobs but to long-term jobs on a \$5 billion project. I will not be bamboozled by arguing over two weeks versus four weeks. I will not get into that little petty game. I will not lower myself to play that kind of game with the Leader of the Opposition.

The high road or no road, Mr.

Speaker. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to stay on the low road and talk about short-term, that is where he will find his political graveyard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciated the round of applause from the government side as I stood up to ask my question. I would like to ask the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) to confirm that the Labrador Innuit Association has refused to sign the federal - provincial Native Funding Agreement, which was the topic of recent meetings in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and other earlier meetings? Would he outline his opinion of what the reason was for their failure to sign that agreement?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, we offered the Labrador Innuit Association the same signing privileges as were offered in the last agreement. They did not wish to partake in it. I guess they figure that they did not want to sign it or witness the signatures as they did in the past. They want more significant say, as an equal partner, I guess, in the signing of the agreement. The Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland in this

interim two year agreement wanted to get the project started as fast as possible and get the monies spent. So we decided to sign the agreement, an agreement which is much needed in the communities of Northern Labrador and one that the communities are very anxious to get into operation and have the monies spent.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

First of all in my supplementary I would like to ask the minister, as he indicated in that response, that if the LIA, the Native people, will not sign the agreement, will that funding be held up? I understand that to be the case. And would he perhaps say what the Province's position is on whether or not the Native people should be in on the ground floor of the decision making process? I am talking about not so much signing after the fact, after certain block funding has been divided up by the federal and provincial governments, but they seem to want to get in on how the money itself will be split up and what programmes will be funded. What is the Province's current position on that? Do they believe that the Native people, the LIA and so on, should be in on that ground floor basis?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, there are \$2 million or \$3 million in that agreement

now signed, and the decisions on how that money is spent are made by the Management Committee, which is made up of the LIA, the provincial government, the federal government and a community representative, which, I might add, is a new part of the agreement for Northern Labrador, from Rigolet north. Last year we had some concerns that the communities, not only the LIA, wanted some representation and some say in how the money was spent, so we included them the Management Committee this year. I must say, from what I hear back from the communities, they are very happy that they are being included in the decision making process.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. KELLAND:

Has the minister not said in this House on earlier occasions that he agrees with a greater level of autonomy, perhaps even moving towards a form of self government for Native peoples in Labrador? In answer to that particular question, what he just said is that they can now get in on sort of almost third level decision making on which communities and which parts of which communities will be funded under the agreement. What they are asking the minister, and what I asked him was what is the Province's position on their being in on the ground floor? In other words, will the minister tell me does the Province want to have the Native people not at this particular level which exists now but at the level where the funding is

allocated first so they can be in on the decision making level at that stage to make a breakdown and allocation of funding to various types of projects and then of course continue on in that management role to allocate to the various communities and so on? What is the Province's position? Why do you not want them to be on the ground floor, the first level of the decision making process?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member that the President of the LIA and some of its members are on the eleventh floor today meeting with all the caucus of this government. I must say, Mr. Speaker, we had an excellent meeting with them. They seemed to be very pleased with the meeting and the co-operation that they are getting from this government in many areas, not only this agreement but for their land claims and other issues on which we are dealing with them. Mr. Speaker, they are in on the ground floor, as the hon. member says, in the community development projects that are included in this agreement. They are on the same level as the provincial and federal governments when it comes to spending the money in the community development sections of this agreement. There are funds in there that go to community administration which has been set up which has to have funding. There is a new store needed in Hopedale, which will be the last of the stores that the government is building along that coast. We will have all our stores up to a modern standard for a good supply

of services to the communities, Mr. Speaker, and that project has to be done. There are very necessary water and sewer projects that will be decided at the committee level. Input will be given, Mr. Speaker, to the committee from the communities and the LIA. Our intention as a government is to get on with the projects and get the money spent as soon as possible.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell). It refers to a question I asked yesterday. I understand the minister has some additional information so he can include it in the answer to this question as well. It has to do with the deplorable situation where 5000 tenants in subsidized housing are not covered by the particular protection which is afforded by the Landlord and Tenancy Act. My question to the minister is this: Is he aware that in January of this year, Judge Lloyd Soper, a District Court judge in Corner Brook ruled, that his particular piece of legislation is a violation of the Charter of Rights? A further part to that question is what is the minister intending to do in order to bring our legislation in line with the Charter of Rights?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. Yesterday he raised the issue as to why tenants living in subsidized rental units of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation were not covered under the Residential Tenancy Act. I was unable to give him the answer at that particular time. I promised to get the answer for him today. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon. member if he would provide me with information privately as to the specific case and I would take a look at it. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did not see fit to do that and I had to go to him looking for the information on that particular case. It shows the interest or the lack thereof, that the hon. member for his constituents.

However, Mr. Speaker, I will not mention the individual's name because I do not think that would be fair, but in answer to the question, the situation, for the benefit of the Legislature, is there was a tenant in the hon. member's district who found himself or herself in an arrears situation and the landlord, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, took the matter to court. A decision was made in favour of the landlord, and in that judgement, as I understand it, the costs also went in favour of the landlord and were passed on to the tenant. That is, I think, the real issue, the problem the tenant has.

I have checked with my officials as to why these people living in subsidized units are not covered under the Tenancy Act and was advised that because their rent is based on income, and part of it is paid by the provincial and/or

federal governments, then the rationale at that time was not to have them covered under the Tenancy Act. And, as I understand it, it is basically the same in just about all similar legislation in the other provinces.

Answering the question, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member just posed to me, in essence the member is right. There was a case in the court in Corner Brook where the judge indicated that not having these people covered under the Residential Tenancy Act may be - not that it was, necessarily - in violation of the Charter of Rights.

I understand the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation is appealing this ruling and, if they are unsuccessful, then, of course, it will have to be changed.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we are presently drafting a completely new Residential Tenancy Act, and if necessary we will include coverage for these people in that new act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:

Do I not get a supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

I recognized the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BARRETT:

Table those questions, boy. Do not be so foolish.

MR. FENWICK:

Members are allowed to ask questions.

MR. BAKER:

I was tempted, Mr. Speaker, to ask the Premier was he is so cranky today, but I will instead go to the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn).

MR. FENWICK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I will make the point of order very quickly, Mr. Speaker. The ruling in this House in the past has always been that at least one supplementary is allowed. All I was asking was a very first supplementary, and that is all I wanted. So I do not see why I was not recognized with a supplementary in this instance.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order. The Chair has control of the Question Period. There was a very long reply to the hon. member's question, and I felt that I should recognize another member who had not had a chance of speaking up to now. I have recognized the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education is aware that sixteen of the Province's School Tax Authorities have not existed in

the legislation for the last eight years, and during that time they have been collecting taxes and taking people to court and so on. My question to the minister is why has he not corrected this serious illegality before this time?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, the question in relation to the legislation concerning the legality surrounding School Tax Authorities, the correction for the legislation has been on the Order Paper for quite some time and will be coming before the House very shortly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander, on a supplementary.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, the order in which legislation is called before this House is under the control of the government.

MR. FENWICK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

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

MR. FENWICK:

If we have changed the rules so that you cannot ask supplementaries, I do not see any reason whatsoever why the member for Gander can ask supplementaries.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I have already ruled on that point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. BAKER:
In light of the fact that the minister and the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) have control of which legislation comes before the House, and because this indicates that the government was reluctant to bring this legislation before the House in the last session, will the minister now agree with the unanimous opinion of the Social Services Estimate Committee that a solution to the problem is abolishment of the rest of the School Tax Authorities? There are only five of them left, I believe.

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

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker, the reason why the bill has been slow coming to the House, undoubtedly is because the part concerning School Tax Authorities is part of the an omnibus bill which is coming before the House and there are a number of corrections that have to be made to a number of pieces of legislation. Undoubtedly that took quite some time to prepare. It is ready and will be coming before the House in a short time.

In relation to the second part of the question, certainly at this time we have no intention of abolishing the school tax authorities.

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

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

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, where are the rights of the individuals who have been taken to court, whose wages have been attached and so on? Have all these activities of these sixteen School Tax Authorities been legal for these eight years?

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

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker, that is a question for the courts to answer. certainly not me, Mr. Speaker. And the legislation that is forthcoming is retroactive.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
My question is by way of follow-up to the previous questions but it is to the Minister of Justice. It is my understanding that this particular case in Corner Brook having to do with the Landlord and Tenants Act is it now on appeal, it is going up through the appeal process. My question is: What is the position of the government with respect to whether it is covered or not since it now appears the Department of Justice is an active intervener along with the defendant, the Housing Corporation, in order to try and keep the bill the same way it is,

so that these 5,000 individuals have no protection whatsoever under the bill?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I was advised today by officials of my department that that case has indeed been appealed to the Court of Appeal and that the position taken by the provincial government, as an intervener, is, of course, to uphold the constitutionality of the Residential Tenancies legislation.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. FENWICK:

Actually, Mr. Speaker, it is a new question and it is for the Minister of Justice. It has to do, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member was recognized for a final supplementary. Now there is another hon. member waiting and I recognize the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. FENWICK:

You got to have a degree of credibility around here. You cannot be.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Forest Resources and Land (Mr. Simms). Will the minister explain to the people of Newfoundland, particularly the people in the Strait of Belle Isle, in view of the fact that while he was accusing me of playing politics yesterday, a

forest fire was already burning in St. Anthony in Unit 18 which destroyed two sawmills and is even now threatening to destroy some cabins as well as some marketable timber? Will the minister explain why the fire patrol in Unit 18, which includes St. Anthony, was not put to work until today?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question and I am pleased that he posed it in a much more reasonable tone than he did his question yesterday. There is a lot of questions included in that one question. First of all, I might point out for the benefit of members of the House and the press and the public, that the two sawmills he refers to, by the way, are two small bench sawmills -

MR. DECKER:

They cost \$10,100 each.

MR. SIMMS:

- of which there are approximately 75 in the area, so they were two of those small, domestic mills, no major job factors or anything like that which would be a major concern. So that is number one, Mr. Speaker. In fact, it might be interesting for hon. members also to note and be aware of the allegation that is being made up in the area, that the fire, in fact, started from a pile of sawdust from one of those same two mills.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

So what?

MR. SIMMS:

It is interesting, I think, to pass it on.

MR. DECKER:

Very interesting.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. member raised it so I am giving information to the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all, may I tell him that the fire in St. Anthony, by the way, is contained at the present time. He will be pleased to know that, I am sure.

MR. BARRETT:

Is it under control?

MR. SIMMS:

No, it is not under control, it is contained.

Now, with respect to the question that the hon. member asked yesterday with respect to the four seasonal staff positions, I am advised, in fact, Mr. Speaker, that my department had already contacted the forest staff prior -

MR. DECKER:

Were they hired?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

No, no. Contacted them and ordered them to report to work. They were in the process of being ordered to work in any event, Mr. Speaker, and this was done, these employees were ordered to work, Mr. Speaker, long before the hon. member raised the question in the House and before the fire started, Mr. Speaker. I point that out too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Will the hon. minister confirm that some of the duties of forest fire rangers are to enforce the fire regulations of his department, for example, the ban on campfires, to ensure that sawmills have the required number of backpacks and pickaxes and spark arresters so that the sawdust could not have started those fires at those mills? That is what those forest rangers are doing, enforcing those regulations. Will the minister confirm that the duties are, in short, to encourage fire prevention. This fire might well have been prevented, Mr. Speaker, if those forest rangers had been hired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

The forest rangers were not hired so could not enforce the regulations.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, for the first time ever, by the way, here we are being harassed and urged by members of the Opposition for a minister to personally get involved in the hiring of temporary staff, seasonal staff -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:
- something they have criticized us for.

Now I would not dare to suggest that one of the main interests the member has in this situation is because one of his relatives is one of the four employees who are about to be called back. I do not want to suggest that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:
Let me finish, please?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I would not want to suggest that, but I must say it has been suggested to me. I do not know if that is one of the reasons why the hon. member has been pushing as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Yes you do know.

MR. SIMMS:
I do not know. I do not know.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, by the way, that the office of the unit that he is referring is in Roddickton and the fire that he is alluding to occurred in St. Anthony -

MR. DECKER:
You are talking about Unit 18.

MR. SIMMS:

- Mr. Speaker, 100 miles away. The staff at the unit office in St. Anthony are the ones who addressed the fire.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:
The permanent staff in St. Anthony are the ones who addressed the fire that occurred in St. Anthony, not the people in Roddickton.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also want to say to the hon. member that I have every confidence in my staff. They are professional people out in the field, much more professional than the hon. member, and they are the ones who make the decisions as to when seasonal staff are to be recalled. In the case of the Roddickton area, Mr. Speaker, it was their opinion that the timing for the hiring of staff was when it occurred which was in the last couple of days. I accept responsibility as minister but they are the ones that make the decisions. I do not interfere and tell them when to hire staff, when not to hire staff and when to lay them off.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and it is a follow-up to my question to the minister yesterday concerning the sale of \$2 million worth of salt fish to a Portuguese company through a Newfoundland agent. Can the minister tell the House if the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, or

the agent for the Armaport company in Portugal requested a letter of credit from the Portugese company? Did they request a letter of credit, Mr. Speaker, as is, I understand, customary in that kind of a deal? Did they request up-front money to cover the purchase? Did they request any kind of collateral at all from the Portuguese company to which the fish was being shipped?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the particular company the hon. gentleman refers to, in the previous three year period leading up to the sale in 1983, has done \$45 million worth of business with the Saltfish Corporation and that every cent was paid and on time. The parent company Armazans, that he refers to, had a history of well over 100 years in commercial business in Europe, had done business with the Canadian Saltfish Corporation for years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, if the yapping could stop I will try to answer the question. It is difficult enough.

MR. BARRY:

You are not doing a very good job so far.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I only saw one person in my eleven years in this House who could not answer a question, and the same person, when he is

Leader of the Opposition, can not even ask one properly.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that there was a long history of doing business with this particular company, Armazans, and for three years pervious to the 1983 loss \$45 million worth of business had been done between the Saltfish Corporation, Armaport and the parent company. There was no letter of credit, as such, asked for because of the business reputation established in the past between the corporation and the company.

MR. CARTER:

And you are satisfied with that, are you?

MR. RIDEOUT:

I never said that, did I? I was not asked that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By, leave! By Leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave! No Leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave has not been granted.

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, for the record, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) insinuated that a relative of mine is an assistant forest ranger.

That is the insinuation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

He said it. He said it.

MR. DECKER:

The insinuation came clear, Mr. Speaker. I have been racking my mind and I do not know any such relative in the complete Department of Forestry, either in Roddickton, St. Anthony or anywhere in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the minister to tell me the name of the relative. It is totally unknown to me.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

The Department of Forest Resources and Lands do not know how lucky it is, then, if the hon. member's relatives are not working with them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour would take the time to read Hansard you will clearly see that I said, "I would not say that but somebody had suggested it to me." That is what I said in Hansard, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There is no point of order.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, there is a point of order and the Premier knows there is.

We have the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands trying to do by the backdoor what he is not allowed to do by the front door, which is impute motives to the member who asked a legitimate question. It was a legitimate question today and it was a legitimate question yesterday, when the minister said that the member was only asking the question for political reasons when he was pointing out that there was a potential hazard that was not being addressed in Unit 18 because the minister was slack in not seeing that the forest rangers were put in place, who should have been put in place and who might have prevented the fire that started before -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They were in place.

MR. BARRY:

They were not. Even the minister did not say that. The minister said they had been contacted. Mr. Speaker, for the record, as the member has stated, they did not go to work until this morning. The barn door was not locked until after the horse was gone and the minister tried to weasel out, tried to slither out, by a dirty, low insinuation through the backdoor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
It shows clearly the irresponsibility of the Leader of the Opposition to dare suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the hiring of those staff people yesterday may have prevented that forest fire. That is a bunch of nonsense!

MR. BARRY:
Why else do you hire them if not to prevent forest fires?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I have heard enough on that point of order. There is no point of order at all. The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle explained his position about the remarks that were made by the hon. minister.

MR. TOBIN:
Withdraw! Withdraw!

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) raised some questions pertaining to the Canadian Saltfish Corporation. At that time I indicated that I was not fully familiar with the details of the questioning but that I would provide an answer, if at all possible, today. Mr. Speaker, I am now prepared to offer some appropriate comments on the questions that he raised yesterday. However, in doing so I must preface my remarks by putting the whole matter of the corporation and its relationship to the provincial government and hence, to the provincial Minister of Fisheries, in its proper perspective.

The Canadian Saltfish Corporation is a federal Crown corporation. However, the Province of Newfoundland did, indeed, pass enabling legislation and is, in a sense, a party to the activity to the corporation. Furthermore, the Province of Newfoundland is represented on the board of directors of the corporation usually by a senior official of the Department of Fisheries which, at the present time, is my deputy. Bearing in mind the background information, I will endeavour to answer yesterday's question in a general sense since to be entirely specific and up to date, it is most appropriate that questions pertaining to the corporation be answered by either the president, the chairman of the board or the minister responsible in Ottawa, which is the federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon). The questions raised by the hon. member could be answered, therefore, as follows:

I can indeed confirm the fact that the Canadian Saltfish Corporation

was involved in the sale of a considerable amount of fish to the Portuguese company, Armazens Limited. Furthermore, one of the sales, that is the one arranged in late 1983 and early 1984, has not been paid in full. The outstanding amount is in the neighbourhood of \$2 million and will be referred to courts for recovery. In the meantime, I can assure the hon. member that efforts to collect the money has been ongoing for the past two years and, indeed, in 1985 approximately \$250,000 was collected on the account.

The hon. the member for Twillingate indicated, Mr. Speaker, that Armaport Limited, a Canadian/Newfoundland company, was an agent of the Canadian Salfish Corporation. Mr. Speaker, this is entirely incorrect since Armaport Limited is a Newfoundland Company set up approximately five years ago to arrange purchases of fish for three Portuguese companies, including Armazens. It is my understanding that Armazens Limited and its agent, Armaport Limited, has been doing considerable business with the Canadian Salfish Corporation for a number of years. As with any normal business practice, a history of good commercial relations did not necessarily provide detailed security since previous accounts were paid in full on a regular basis. It could be said that full security should have been obtained in all cases and, Mr. Speaker, this would be the ultimate, however, sometimes we are not living in that utopian situation. But I am pleased to report that corporation policy has since been revised to provide full security for all future sales.

The hon. the member for

Twillingate presumed that the approximately \$2 million loss would have to be made good from the earnings of Newfoundland fishermen. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly not entirely correct since we cannot at this point in time correctly say that a debt of approximately \$2 million is, indeed, a complete loss. The final amount considered a loss will only be determined after the corporation has recovered on its mortgage security. This security has been obtained by placing the mortgage on considerable Armazens property in Portugal. It is anticipated that the final loss will not be determined for another year or more but it is assumed that it will be considerably less than the \$2 million indicated by the hon. member. Final disposition of the bad debt will presumably be a policy decision for the corporation and/or the owners of the corporation, the federal government.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that that is the sort of statement the minister should have made at Statements By Ministers, thereby enabling members on this side to respond to it. Mr. Speaker, I think he deliberately held off from making the statement when he should have just to head off any rebuttal from members on this side. That is the only conclusion that one can come to under the circumstances.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. RIDEOUT:

Under the rules of this House, I do not think the hon. gentleman can accuse me of doing something deliberately to circumvent the rules of the House. The fact of the matter is, those answers are as a result of questions the hon. gentleman asked yesterday, and the appropriate place on the Order Paper, as I understand it, to do that is in Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given. It is done every other day in this House. Now there will be another Question Period tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, and another one the next day and another one for days after that. You know, it is not as if the House is going to close in five minutes time and the hon. gentleman will not get a chance to ask any more questions on that matter, if he is still interested.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I must rule there is no point of order. It appears to me that that was an answer to a Question for which Notice was Given.

This is Private Members' Day and I would like, first of all, to welcome the Local Service District of Gander Bay to the galleries, Mr. Blake, Mr. Gillingham, Mr. Bown, and Mrs. Laite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I call on the hon. member for Placentia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to introduce this resolution which has been very

close to my heart ever since I became involved in the political process over forty years ago. Mr. Speaker, living in a land as rich and diverse as Canada, it is both disturbing and perplexing to see the gap between the rich and the poor grow so rapidly.

If I may, I would like to read into the record of this hon. House the text of my resolution which I feel must be addressed in a meaningful way by our national government:

WHEREAS disadvantaged Newfoundlanders and Labradorians continue to suffer the indignity and ravages of real poverty; and

WHEREAS poverty is oftentimes an inherited problem amongst our disadvantaged, and

WHEREAS the increasing cost-of-living continues to be an insurmountable burden and places poverty stricken families at a level below subsistence, and

WHEREAS poverty contributes to a host of social ills affecting the entire community, and

WHEREAS our National Income Security Programmes are administered on an equal universal basis which fails to address the greater need amongst our disadvantaged citizens,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House urge the National Government to review its present policy of universality in the administration of the income security programmes with a view to channelling a greater proportion of the funding to those in real and urgent need.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

All we are doing here, Mr. Speaker, is asking the federal government to review its position on universality. We are not attacking the federal government, we are not attacking the Liberals opposite, we are not attacking the provincial government, all I am doing is putting forth this resolution, with some facts pertaining to it, so that you can make a fair judgement.

Mr. Speaker, a French philosopher once said that the rich and the poor Frenchmen have every right to sleep under the bridges of Paris at night. While this is surely not an appropriate comment on the plight of our poor, it does dramatically make the point that while the economic and social rules apply to all, only the real players at the table are privileged, those few who are masters of their own destiny.

Since statistics have been kept on income distribution in Canada, some thirty-four years ago, the bottom 20 per cent of Canadian households have taken home only 4 per cent of the nation's income, whereas the top 20 per cent have taken 42 per cent, or ten times as much.

This relationship has not changed since 1951, but what has changed is that the poorest 20 per cent of Canadian households have only managed to maintain their real 4 per cent share through increased government involvement and not through the market process.

Mr. Speaker, when we speak of the poor we speak of two main poverty groups: the welfare poor who depend upon government support

payments, and the working poor who depend upon low incomes and UIC benefits.

If I could, I would like to review some rather startling statistics on poverty in this country, statistics which have human tragedies written all over them.

The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development has indicated that Canada spends far less of its national wealth on social security programmes than other Western nations. Apparently, we spend 11.8 per cent of the Gross Domestic Product compared with 25.8 per cent in France, 12.1 per cent in the US, Britain 13.9 per cent, Germany 17.6 per cent and Italy 18.1 per cent.

It is estimated that 4.5 million Canadians struggle to survive on incomes below the official poverty line defined by Statistics Canada. The poverty line varies according to area and family size. In 1985 it ranged from just over \$10,000 per year for a single person, in a large city, to \$20,000 for an urban family of four.

Mr. Speaker, this daily struggle is for the basic subsistence, food, clothing and housing. Luxuries such as insurance, entertainment, travel, simply cannot be envisioned let alone afforded. Various church groups and relief organizations in Canada feed hundreds of thousands hungry people every day. One hundred thousand children go to bed hungry every night in Toronto, and in Vancouver nearly 150,000 adults and 50,000 children visited food banks in 1985.

While we, in Newfoundland, have

nothing to compare with tragic stories, it is a national disgrace that a country as wealthy as ours has such an epidemic of poverty.

Another serious concern is what some people are calling feminization of poverty. In 1969, 16.6 per cent of low income families were headed by women. Today that figure has more than doubled. Lone parent mothers constitute 30 per cent of all families living in poverty and they have almost a 50 per cent chance of remaining poor.

One of the main barriers to their labour force participation is the issue of proper caring for their children. Thus, day care is a central issue for 275,000 single parents living in poverty, yet only six paragraphs were devoted to day care in the MacDonald Royal Commission on the economy. There are estimated to be at least 300,000 elderly people living in severe poverty, and another million in serious financial difficulties in Canada. A single person receiving just over \$7,000 a year in old age security and guaranteed income supplement is well below the poverty line.

Mr. Speaker, if these statistics paint a bleak picture, the reality is that, yes, we have a crisis of poverty in Canada. I need not look to the streets of Toronto or Vancouver to see the ravages of poverty, for I have to deal with it on a daily basis for those poverty stricken families in my district of Placentia. I am sure that each member here faces the same distressing, unfortunate cases in their districts.

In many situations, we, in Newfoundland, are more fortunate than those mainland centers. Many

people in rural Newfoundland own their own homes and cut their own wood to supplement their heating, and look to the land and sea to help feed their families. Despite this, however, I know of people who are living in dire circumstances, battling on a daily basis to keep their homes, put food on their tables. Ofttimes, their struggle is impossible and something must suffer.

In Newfoundland today, we, unfortunately, have children going to bed hungry and going to school without adequate food. Mr. Speaker, we are doing our best as a government, given our provincial economy, to assist those dependent on our social system. I am sure the minister will address his department's efforts to improve the standard of living for our poor.

However, I put the question to all members, How is it possible for a family of four to live on \$510 social assistance per month? Out of this \$510 comes light, heat, food, clothes and other basic necessities of life. Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way; but we have much to improve on. For example, should the basic social assistance rates apply to all equally, or should those receiving long term assistance, who are sick or disabled, get a greater share? I think they should. These individuals cannot cut wood, shoot moose, catch a rabbit, jig a fish or otherwise contribute to the household. Those in greater need should, I feel, receive a greater share of the available assistance.

Mr. Speaker, poverty brings with it a number of negative stigmas. We live in a society where those disadvantaged, poor citizens are relegated to the fringes. Poverty

also breeds a host of social ills which affects all our lives: Alcoholism, drug abuse, drop-outs, domestic violence and crime are oftentimes a direct function of poverty and the stresses it forces upon its victims.

Mr. Speaker, when people live in constant despair, the family suffers and our society suffers. Growing divorce statistics, violent crime rates, particularly armed robbery violations, child abuse, and alcoholism, have their roots in poverty.

While I do not wish to suggest that poverty is the only cause of antisocial behavior, I can say that the constant stresses of poverty, which robs people of hope and dignity, does lead people into desperate actions.

Of particular concern is the unavoidable cycle of poverty. Parents cannot afford to provide the wherewithal to educate children. These children, already disadvantaged in the labour market, fall back into the pit of poverty. Low self-esteem reinforces the ongoing poverty cycle which has afflicted generations of our people.

Yes, determined people can improve their living standard and the quality of their lives, but for many the thought of acquiring a well paying job is simply a dream. There are rags to riches stories but they are all too few. For every talent that poverty has stimulated, it has blighted 1,000.

We all were shocked and horrified by the recent deaths among the young Indian teenagers in Manitoba. Living without purpose or hope, they led lives that were

a constant struggle to escape their depressing reality. Their deaths indicated the price poverty demands from society which failed to address their serious plight of chronic unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, there are solutions to tackle poverty.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

It is a very interesting speech. I wonder if the member is going to table that?

MR. PATTERSON:

I am sure that when you went into court on the Ocean Ranger case, where you made \$750,000, you did not bring it all in in your head, did you? You went in with loads of papers, wheelbarrows full of paper. That is what you went in with, and you ripped off the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

I have it right here, \$750,000.

MR. BARRY:

You are the only rip-off in this House.

MR. PATTERSON:

Did you table all you went in with and where you got all the information on the Ocean Ranger? Did you do that?

MR. BARRY:

You are the only rip-off. You are ripping off your constituents.

MR. PATTERSON:

Now, look, you are not concerned with the poor, because you are representing a party that was in power when Newfoundland went through the most devastating depression in our history, the Liberal Party that was in power in Canada. Now, do not think you are going to throw me off from what I am saying, because I would demolish you if I got into a debate with you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Away you go, 'Bill'. Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what, I will make a deal with the member. If he will go back to reading his prepared speech, I will withdraw that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, he is just a rich, young brat, holed up in his office down on Water Street ripping off the people at \$500 a hour. He knows nothing of poverty, therefore, he cannot get up and make a speech about it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. PATTERSON:

I could spend the balance of my time here reading from *The Canadian Lawyer* of April 1984, I could read to you the letter you sent out to constituents giving

your phone number away so they could phone you.

MR. BARRY:

Go ahead.

MR. PATTERSON:

It is all here. I will table that.

MR. WARREN:

On House of Assembly letterhead.

MR. PATTERSON:

I will table that for you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

You are dealing with the wrong cat now, boy. You will be given an opportunity. You can get up next. If you want to get up and make a speech on it go ahead and do it, and we will just see what you really do know. I will tell you what you know about it.

MR. TOBIN:

What does he know about poverty?

MR. PATTERSON:

He knows nothing about it and he is not trying to do anything about it. Universality, my son, is a very, very serious thing.

MR. BARRY:

The Premier was ignoring you on the railway, is he ignoring you on this as well?

MR. PATTERSON:

Do not worry, the Premier and I are on the same wavelength, and I will be elected in Placentia East as long as I want to run there.

MR. BARRY:

He does not listen to you and you do not listen to him, is that it?

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. member is making one of the better speeches that has been made in this House for a long period of time and he should not be interrupted. The only thing I will say to the hon. gentleman is that the only thing he is wrong in is where he says the hon. gentleman knows nothing about poverty. He knows a lot about poverty, poverty of humility. The hon. gentleman should be allowed to continue with his speech uninterrupted, because it is one of the best speeches that this Assembly has heard for a long time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order but I would ask hon. members to please be silent while the hon. member for Placentia is speaking.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say all hon. members is fine, but there is one hon. member of this House who is interrupting the speaker. The speaker is making a good speech, and that hon. member has to be called to order.

MR. PATTERSON:

If he thinks that I can remember all the statistics and the percentages, and what the gross national produce of France is, what the gross national product of Germany, Bolivia and Ecuador -

MR. BARRY:

I am just asking you to table it, that is all.

MR. PATTERSON:

Well, we are not going to table it. You listen to it. You listen to it. But if you are in here to start trouble you are going to get trouble, because I can assure you, my son, you are not interested in the poor people of this Province. You are not going to throw me off, son. It will be up to you to get up and tell this House how we would make universality work.

MR. BARRY:

You are running out of time now, hurry up.

MR. PATTERSON:

I wish you would run out of time. Mr. Speaker, there are solutions to tackle poverty. Now, listen and you will probably learn something. To alleviate the suffering of our poor -

MR. BARRY:

Change the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

- we must realize that the privileged must relinquish some of their benefits. Now, I know you do not want that, you do not want to lose some of the \$750,000 you took off the Ocean Ranger people. That is why you are concerned, you stand you lose. I have nothing to lose but my chains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

We must realize that the privileged must relinquish some of their assets so that the needy are afforded a greater share of Canada's wealth. There will be those, no matter how wealthy they are, and we have one right across here, who will demand that social benefits be distributed equally, thereby perpetuating the poor's

dependency on a society that grudgingly maintains them at poverty levels. Therefore, the federal government must take the bull by the horns, as it were, to channel a greater proportion of our national security programmes to those in greatest need.

MR. CALLAN:

Who wrote that, Cabot Martin?

MR. PATTERSON:

I can assure you that I was writing letters to The Evening Telegram years and years ago. Look, I can bring you in a book that length. I would almost give them to you. I was the very man who brought about the defeat of the Liberal government in Newfoundland, if you want to know that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

- when you were kowtowing over in the university with the Liberal student union. Do not tell me! Therefore, the federal government must take the bull by the horns, as it were, to channel the greater portion of our national security programmes to those in greatest need.

I believe that Canada has long passed the level of wealth necessary to provide all Canadians with a level and style of living. For our working families living below the poverty line, a review of universality would be a beginning. However, there are many other mechanisms to assist our poor, such as improvements in the unemployment insurance programme, tax reforms, greater flexibility in the administration of our social assistance benefits to permit additional income

support, and the development of a guaranteed annual income.

The MacDonald Royal Commission proposed a very innovative scheme coupled with social assistance benefits and national universal social programmes to increase the incomes of most Canadians below the poverty line. Our task is to begin to question the established distribution of our national security programmes, to seek those new approaches and options which will finally address the plight of our poor in a real way. I look forward to an interesting and productive debate on this resolution which, I believe, will be receiving more attention by national parliamentarians in weeks ahead. Universality is not a sacred cow, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) would like you to believe. It is our responsibility to examine every opportunity to improve the living standards of our disadvantaged - we cannot do much better than that - senior citizens, single mothers, unemployed, our working poor and those on social assistance, Mr. Speaker. I look forward to productive debate on this pressing tragedy which demands our attention and compassion and our collective will to make badly needed and tough decisions on behalf of those in real and urgent need.

Now, get up and let us hear your position on it, taking into consideration here what the American lawyer says about you. It would appear to me that you could lose a few dollars. And I can appreciate your point. I sympathize with you right from the bottom of my heart, because I am all heart. I would hate to see some of your income siphoned off and sent down to some of the poor

people who are trying to make it, with four in family, on \$510 a month.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, you know, one of the things that Newfoundlanders, generally, have not been afraid to accept is that when they do an honest day's work they are entitled to an honest dollar.

MR. PATTERSON:

Five hundred dollars an hour?

MR. BARRY:

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am proud of the work that I have done as a Newfoundlander, I am proud of any money that I have made and I do not, Mr. Speaker, believe that the people of this Province, in deciding whether an individual's ideas should be considered, whether his suggestions for law reform, whether his suggestions for income security reform should be considered, I do not think that they are going to ask members in this House to line up and reveal the contents of their bank accounts. It might be an interesting exercise, Mr. Speaker, if that were done, and perhaps I will be prepared to participate in that and compare the state of my finances with the state of the finances of the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) and some of his colleagues. Perhaps that

would be a wise approach for all members to take but, Mr. Speaker, it tells us a little bit about this approach to a means test. If we listened to the member for Placentia, not only would he have us apply means tests to individuals in deciding who should get assistance from government, with his antiquarian, dinosaurian thinking, he would apply a means test to individuals before deciding who would be allowed to speak in this House, who would be allowed to participate in this debate.

MR. PATTERSON:

I would do a mental test on you, arguing against garnering income for poor people.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

That is very interesting, because, Mr. Speaker, the member for Placentia, I think, has already given his position on our proposed amendment.

The member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) is going to be proposing an amendment to this resolution and he is going to be, Mr. Speaker, asking this House to urge the Government of Canada to implement a guaranteed annual income and to avoid tinkering with family allowances, unemployment insurance, avoid destroying the principle of universality before we have a universal guaranteed annual income programme in place.

All we can assume from the member for Placentia's (Mr. Patterson) statements is that he is going to be prepared to support our amendment and we are very pleased to hear this. We are delighted to hear the member for Placentia

confirm that he believes in a guaranteed annual income and, therefore, we must assume that he will be voting in favour of the amendment when that is proposed by the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

Regrettably, Mr. Speaker, we cannot support the resolution as it is now worded.

MR. PATTERSON:

We do not care whether you do or not.

MR. BARRY:

One of the main reasons we have to take this position is to keep the member from further embarrassing the party to which he belongs, because he has obviously forgotten the commitment of his federal leader who committed himself to the principle of universality of income security programmes as, and I quote, "a sacred trust."

Surely the member for Placentia would not have us throw a slap in the face of the Prime Minister of Canada and assume that the Prime Minister of this great nation would go back upon a sacred trust and question the universality of income security programmes.

I wonder if the member for Placentia would indicate, or if his colleagues when they stand in debate would indicate whether the member for Placentia has the confidence of the Premier in this position? Is the Premier and are members of the front benches going to listen to the backbenches on this occasion? The Premier has indicated that he will not listen to the backbenches on questions such as the railway.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

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

MR. PATTERSON:

I do not think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition should be allowed to lead this House astray. We can have a guaranteed annual income without destroying universality. There is no question at all about that.

MR. BARRY:

Exactly. Exactly.

MR. PATTERSON:

We can have that without a deficit. We can have that without increasing taxes.

MR. BARRY:

Exactly. Exactly.

MR. PATTERSON:

We can have all that. Do you think a person who is getting \$40,000 a year should get the child tax credit? Do you think people making \$50,000 a year should get that?

MR. BARRY:

The member is debating.

MR. PATTERSON:

No, he is not getting into debate at all. What you are concerned about is that you are going to lose something out of your rich, fat, income.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The member is obviously listening into our caucus discussions again and he is trying to jump the gun and get the credit for the member for Fortune-Hermitage's amendment because that is exactly the point that we are making, Mr. Speaker. It is a universal programme that is needed, a universal programme of a guaranteed annual income. That is exactly what we are saying, Mr. Speaker, preserve the principle of universality but in the form of a guaranteed annual income. What the member would have us do is throw out the notion of universality. That is what he is asking the Government of Canada. Now, maybe somebody prepared this resolution for him also, as well as his speech, in which case he should have read the resolution more carefully before standing in his place.

Now, let me read it for the member in case it was not read carefully by him after it was drafted for him and given him to present. This is what the resolution says. It is becoming apparent that the resolution that the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) really wanted to present is the one that will be carried once the amendment of the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) is passed, namely, that there be a guaranteed annual income. Because here is what the resolution says:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House urge the National Government to review its present policy of universality in the administration of the income security programs with a view to channelling a greater proportion of funding to those in real and urgent need." In other words, do away with the principle of universality, that is what the Tory line, as espoused for the

member for Placentia, would have us do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are very glad to see that the member was under a mistake, I would have to say of law as well as of fact when he got up and presented this resolution; that he was deluded by whoever asked him to present this resolution. He thought that he was actually going to be fighting to preserve universality. He did not read the resolution carefully after it was drafted for him and before he presented it. I ask him to give very careful attention to the resolution as amended by the member for Fortune - Hermitage, when that amendment is proposed. I am delighted now to know that the member for Placentia is going to be standing in his place to support our amendment.

MR. TOBIN:

May we see the amendment, 'Leo'?

MR. BARRY:

Yes, the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) will be glad to deliver that amendment to you in a moment.

Here is the problem with the simplistic logic of what the member for Placentia has so far delivered. One of the very real concerns of those who are, as the member says, in real and urgent need, is that they not be the only ones in receipt of a particular programme, because there is greater chance of that programme being slashed if there is only a small group and not all Canadians in receipt of it. The ordinary person who is in need of family allowance or unemployment insurance says it is better if these programmes are available to everybody. In that way there will be less chance in a time of fiscal

restraint of seeing that programme cut.

There is also the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we have in Canada a group of people known as the 'working poor', we will say, the middle class and the lower middle class, and they are the ones that the member's friends in Ottawa and the member's friends on that side of the House are continually shafting. They are continually putting the boots to the 'working poor', to the middle class, and this puts the devil in the middle class as they see themselves being dragged down closer and closer to the poverty line -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

- or below the poverty line. It puts the devil into them and they say then, 'Why should my tax dollars be going to pay those lazy people receiving social assistance or those people getting family allowances or those people getting unemployment insurance?' The devil is put into the lower middle class, the 'working poor' who are every day with every new budget that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the colleague of the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), seeing themselves being hauled closer and closer to the poverty line or below it. They say, 'Enough of that! Enough of that!'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Now that is what the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is forgetting. He is also forgetting, Mr. Speaker, that when we start talking about doing away

with universality we then get into the degrading concept of going back to the dole days of having to get a slip. Probably the member for Placentia was one of the ones who was giving out the slips.

MR. PATTERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

Watch your blood pressure.

MR. BARRY:

He would like to go back to giving out those dole slips in Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

The only slips the hon. gentleman saw were possibly pink slips.

MR. FUREY:

He is confused.

MR. PATTERSON:

When the Liberal Government took over in Newfoundland it was all chits, it was all slips to go and get your welfare, but that is not so today, thanks to the Conservative Government, thanks to Brian Peckford, where they can walk in with dignity for their money and spend it wherever they want to spend it.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) would have us go back to the days that he loved when he saw people having to go through a means test to get

their slip to get a few groceries to feed themselves and their families.

MR. FUREY:
Shameful.

MR. BARRY:
He would now want to put all Canadians through a means test before they are entitled to family allowance or unemployment insurance or social assistance. That is the Conservative, Tory philosophy that spits itself out with venom.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, we saw the reaction of the people of this Province and the people of Canada when we had our grey power, when we had our senior citizens put the hon. member's friend, the Tory Prime Minister to the test. They said, 'Where is your sacred trust now? You dare tamper with our old age pensions, you dare tamper with them' and they backed off, Mr. Speaker. That is why the Premier has his running dog of Tory dole slips, the member for Placentia out running this trial balloon, because the Premier of this Province has the same Tory philosophy as the Prime Minister of this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
He would like to see means test applied to individuals, the degrading means test, the means test that has that great potential for corruption as people try to weasel their way in to get qualifications so that they can get their social assistance, their

family allowance and so forth.

The senior citizens will not put up with it, Mr. Speaker. Just like all those on pensioners who are being shafted and having their unemployment insurance reduced and the member for Placentia going along with that. I say shame on him! I say shame on his Tory colleagues in Ottawa!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
He is forgetting, Mr. Speaker, that if we had a guaranteed annual income the students who are now being forced to go through this degrading student aid process, that they would have a guaranteed annual income, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
We would not see his colleagues across the House being put in a position where they can divert money from post-secondary education and spend it on car allowances and on trips for the member for Placentia, taking it out of the pockets of students.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:
On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is referring to car allowances. I asked him this question before, does he not have a car provided by the provincial

Government of Newfoundland?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. PATTERSON:

Is there a car assigned to the office? Is there one car assigned to the office?

MR. BARRY:

Sit him down, Mr. Speaker, sit him down.

MR. FUREY:

One car versus 22 for the members on the government side.

MR. PATTERSON:

Well, if you ever become the government, which I doubt very much that you ever will, then you possibly will have the same benefits as ministers.

MR. BARRY:

Sit down, boy! Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Placentia is ignoring the fact that money is being diverted from education and health and being spent to renovate the Premier's Office, to go for car allowances, to go for trips for the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson). It is money that is taken out of the pockets of students. It is money that is taken away from the sick of this Province, from nursing homes, Mr. Speaker, for a few perks for his Tory colleagues. One hundred and eighty-seven million dollars, Mr. Speaker, will be lost to this Province over the next five years because of his

Tory colleagues in Ottawa cutting back on the Established Programme Financing, \$187 million. A lot of poor people could do well with that, Mr. Speaker.

What do we hear him say about that? The lapdogs over there, they kiss the behind of their friends in Ottawa and they go along with this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

The member for Placentia is also forgetting, Mr. Speaker, that the women of this country are the ones who benefit most from family allowances.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

And he is forgetting, Mr. Speaker, how important it is that we listen to the women of this Province, that we do not take away from the women of this country, that we give to the women of this country.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Leader of the Opposition I am quite happy, I have no trouble with women and I do not make any tape recordings.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Oh my! Oh my! No wonder, Mr. Speaker, they are getting wiped out in the polls! No wonder, Mr. Speaker, when he would have the family allowances that the women of this country rely on taken away from the women of this Province, Mr. Speaker, when he would have the women, have the students, have the sick -

MR. PATTERSON:

(Inaudible) women on your mind.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have silence please?

MR. BARRY:

We now see the member for Placentia, Mr. Speaker, making his contribution to this debate. Now I understand, Mr. Speaker, the frustration that he has when the Premier tells him that he will not be listened to on any important issues. Whether it be the railway or any important issue, he will not be listened to. The Premier has done that, Mr. Speaker, in broad daylight, in living colour on television and in the media of this Province.

Now it says something about the principles of the member for Placentia, that he would stand up in this House on such important matters as family allowances, old age pensions, unemployment insurance and income security generally and expect us to believe that the Premier is going to listen to him on those issues. The Premier has already told us that he does not listen to the member for Placentia. In fact he has said, he does not listen to

backbenchers, including the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird). He does not listen to backbenchers generally on important issues.

Mr. Speaker, I have to go down and welcome our colleagues from the Canadian Parliamentary Association. I have ten minutes to get to the Colonial Building. But let me say to the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), when the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) stands up and recommends that this House support a guaranteed annual income, I do not want to see the wimp from Placentia wimping out on that issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

I want to see him stand in this House and, if he has the guts of a ten cent cod fish, support guaranteed annual income when it is presented by the member for Fortune-Hermitage. If he does not have the guts to do that, resign because if he does not resign, he is going to be turfed out after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

What a fabulous speech!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make

a few comments in this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, I hope I can make my few comments in silence. It is not my intent to engage in a political discussion this afternoon but I feel very strongly about the resolution brought forward by my colleague, the member for Placentia.

It is an issue, Mr. Speaker, where hon. members can become very emotionally charged, as we have just heard, and it is one that can be clouded by this emotion, Mr. Speaker. But for all of that, there lies within this resolution a very serious issue and one, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that should grab the attention of all hon. members in this Chamber and, indeed, across the country. All the rhetoric in the world by hon. members on any side, adhering to any political party, will not eradicate poverty, and will not make the problem go away. It faces this country.

Mr. Speaker, poverty will never be wiped out as long as there is mismanagement in the home, as long as there are people who need assistance in managing their affairs, but that, Mr. Speaker, is no reason why more money cannot be put into the hands of those who need it most.

Mr. Speaker, because this matter is a national issue, the provinces, and especially the one that we live in, does not have the capability to eradicate poverty and it will not have it for a long time to come. Mr. Speaker, to give an example, this government has increased the budget of Social

Services by over 100 per cent since 1979. I do not think there is anyone who will make the statement that there is not some form of poverty still existing in this Province. So, Mr. Speaker, where then lies the answer to at least bring some semblance of cure to this national problem?

Mr. Speaker, the answer lies in the national government because it is only the national government that has, number one, the jurisdiction to bring about an all embracing national policy; and number two, that has the national wealth to bring about the answer or at least a good part of the answer to the issue we are debating here.

Mr. Speaker, at the risk of sounding political, which is not my intention, but this debate, at least for my part, could not go by without reminding myself of what I witnessed during the last federal election campaign.

The national leader of the New Democratic Party went across the country portraying the national leader of the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party as the Bobbsey Twins from Bay Street who represented the large corporations and the wealthy, while he had the only licence in representing the common, ordinary citizen and poor of this country. No sooner had the dust settled, Mr. Speaker, on the election, and the issue of universality arose in the House of Commons when that same hon. gentleman did an about-face, got up in the House of Commons, attempted to ostracize the government for daring to look at universality and, in so doing, came down square on the side of who, the poor that he championed the cause of during the federal

election? No, Mr. Speaker, he came down squarely on the side of the presidents of the banks, of the former Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Trudeau, and a lot of the other wealthy people who were drawing old age pensions and who did not need them. There is a case, Mr. Speaker, of political hypocrisy at its finest.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say the national leader of the Liberal Party did not do something like that. I will have to be fair and say that he did not go as far as Mr. Broadbent went but, to set the record straight, Mr. Speaker, the national leader of the Liberal Party attempted to ostracize the government as well for daring to look at universality. That hon. gentleman, who had just been Prime Minister, was well acquainted with the deficit that faced the nation of some \$30-odd billion and that hon. gentleman was also aware of the horrendous costs of social programmes in the country continuing to rise, as well as being aware, having just come off the campaign hustings, of the tremendous needs yet to be addressed in the social area across this country, be it day care, be it transition houses, be it the guaranteed annual income that so many people talk about. Yet, even an attempt by the new government to address the issue of the deficit on the one hand and bring about some semblance of order in an ever rising costly social programme did not even meet with an ounce of support from the national leader of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, enough said about political parties. I do not claim for a moment that the present Prime Minister had all the answers, nor do I claim to support

all of the initiatives. The de-indexing of old age pensions, Mr. Speaker, was a colossal mistake. It is not the de-indexing of old age pension that needs to be done to reduce the deficit, it is taking the money from the wealthy that do not need it and contributing it to lowering the deficit while, at the same time, increasing the money in the hands of the poor and the poverty stricken who need it most. That is what I interpreted the new government as attempting to do until the de-indexing issue arose.

Mr. Speaker, anyone in this House can talk about a guaranteed annual income and so can anyone in the House of Commons and straight across this country. I will be either bold enough or foolish enough - I guess history might well decide which is appropriate to label me - to make the statement, Mr. Speaker, for posterity, that no one in this House today will live long enough to see a guaranteed annual income. It is pie in the sky, Mr. Speaker, because this country, in its present state, cannot afford it. A guaranteed annual income would not necessarily only address the poverty stricken but would cost horrendous millions of dollars that the country, at this point in time, does not have.

Mr. Speaker, Canada has a population of something in the order of 27 to 28 million people. It is one of the last frontiers of natural resources. It is termed one of the wealthiest nations in the Western world and yet there is poverty. I wonder why. The present government, Mr. Speaker, inherited a colossal financial mess. That seems to be the history of the Tory Party. If one

wishes to look at history since Confederation, they will find a Tory Party in office from time to time after the other party got out and put the country in a colossal financial mess. Any attempt to find a cure for that mess found the Tory Party turfed out of office. Mr. Speaker, there must be a message there. I hope history does not repeat itself but certainly the present situation demands attention if the national government is to get its financial house in order.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding I want to say a couple of things on the local issue of this matter. Hon. members can become emotionally charged, as I said, and interpret what my colleague from Placentia is saying to mean he wants family allowances wiped out. That is not so, Mr. Speaker. Or that he wants old age pensions wiped out, that also is not so, Mr. Speaker. It matters not to the hon. gentleman from Placentia or myself or anybody else how it is done. We can tax it back if we want to.

The question is, Mr. Speaker, to find money which is not readily available and put it in the hands of those who need it most. Any hon. member, Mr. Speaker, who does not support that should rethink what he or she is doing in this Chamber? Any hon. member who cannot stand in his place in this House and say from personal knowledge that he or she is aware of cases where more money is needed, even with the best management, should rethink their whole situation. So where is the money going to come from? How then, Mr. Speaker, if one has to acknowledge that, and I submit to Your Honour we all have to acknowledge that, how, then, do we

explain our support for wealthy people who have no need for old age pensions getting them, for families who have no need for family allowances getting them? How do we explain and justify that?

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that if you look at how a country treats its people, its most important resource, there is nothing else to find out about it, you have then found out all. Any country which does not look after its most important resource, its human resource, is not really worth talking about.

Mr. Speaker, the family allowances cheque to a lot of women across Canada, who are part of wealthy families I submit, Your Honour, is the only cheque that some of those women get. I do not accept what my colleague is saying that family allowances should be wiped out. They do not need to be wiped out. They can be taxed back so that that mother still has that cheque coming in. So could the same system be applied to the old age pension to safeguard those people who planned retirement and, as an intricate part of that retirement, had the old age pension cheque included. There is still a way to do it, Mr. Speaker, through taxing back.

How can we support a system the country cannot at this stage in its history afford? And that clearly, Mr. Speaker, is the situation. I am in favour of universality of social programmes as long as the country has enough money to improve the lot of the poor and the disadvantaged. But as long as the disadvantaged and the poor go unattended, I certainly am not prepared to say there should continue to be this universal programme which puts

money into the pockets of people who do not need it at all.

It might be interesting, Mr. Speaker, for hon. members if they were to remember, before they vote on this resolution next Wednesday, that I could tell them that the Province in Canada to benefit most by the destruction of universality in social programmes is Newfoundland and Labrador. And the reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is simply this: More than 80 per cent of old age recipients receive GIS, therefore, only 15-odd per cent, give or take a few points, would be affected, but much more transfer payments would come into the Province as a consequence of such a change. Equally, Mr. Speaker, any formula to change the family allowance system would affect the least number of families in this Province, as compared to any other Province in the country, because of the economic state that we are in.

So hon. members will have to do a little bit of soul searching before they just, by some cavalier attitude, strike down the resolution as brought forward by my hon. colleague. As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, it is an issue which needs attention. This resolution is not a government issue, it is not a government measure, it is not a government proposition, it is a proposition by a private member of this House. Let us not forget that. Let us not try to tar the hon. gentleman with being against this or that and, in so doing, tar the administration. That is not so, Mr. Speaker. That is not so.

Hon. members have independence of mind, they have their own position on various issues, and I am sure they have it on this issue, both

sides of the House. Mr. Speaker, the important aspect of this whole issue is that some way be found to respond to the real needs of the Canadian people, especially our own Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, that scarce money be found to create more day-care seats, to create more transition houses, to provide a better form of social assistance, to provide more money for the disabled, the mentally retarded, the mentally ill, the physically handicapped and all of those people who come under that target group called the disadvantaged.

Where is the money going to come from? Mr. Speaker, it is clear no new dollars of any great amount can come from Ottawa. It is not there to be had as long as there is a \$30 billion deficit to deal with. No great infusion of money can come from this provincial treasury, Mr. Speaker, when the budget, just in one department alone, Social Services, has already gone up by more than 100 per cent since 1979 and, as I said earlier, still there is poverty in the Province. So where is the answer? Where does the money come from?

Hon. members might be tempted to get up and talk about cutting out this or cutting out that or cutting out something else. There might be a great temptation for them to bring in individual issues which might tend, in their minds, to be embarrassing to the administration. I would urge hon. members to have the courage to stray away from that when dealing with this issue. It is a far more important issue than petty politics. It transcends politics because we are talking about bread and butter, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about clothes on the backs

of children. That is what we are talking about. Maybe it is a great opportunity for hon. members to rise above the political argument and deal with the issues.

Mr. Speaker, there is obviously only one real answer that will provide some help, some very much needed help to those who have the greatest need, and that is a redoing of the whole social programme.

Now, Mr. Speaker, whatever way one wants to slice the cake, as I said before, it is very unfortunate, to my mind, that the official Leader of the Opposition in the National government and the Prime Minister cannot come to terms on some kind of remedy for this situation.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. HICKEY:
Mr. Speaker, let me then conclude by saying that I find support for the resolution as brought forward by my hon. colleague and, in finding support for that, it is not necessarily to support the resolution in total of every word as contained. But what I am reading into his resolution is he wants a review of the income security system. I am interpreting it that way. If that is what he means, if that is what is there, I am in favour of that and I will vote for it.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the hon. member I believe it has been agreed that we would

perhaps -

MR. TULK:
We did not agree to anything.

MR. MARSHALL:
Nobody on this side has spoken to the hon. gentleman?

MR. TULK:
No.

MR. MARSHALL:
Well, do not get upset now. Just relax. There is the opening of the Commonwealth Parliamentary meeting down at the Colonial Building, now, this afternoon. It was thought that we might take an early adjournment, as a matter of courtesy, to enable all members of the Legislature to go down there and observe it. I think it would be a courtesy.

MR. TULK:
We never heard of it.

MR. MARSHALL:
I thought the hon. member had been advised of it by all the people after my job.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Yes, there may be a number of people after the hon. gentleman's job on the other side. We regret very much that we have not been consulted on this matter, but since it is the type of institution that we are talking about here, the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, we, of course, will agree. This is a pretty important Private Member's Resolution. I wonder if the hon. gentleman, if so requested, might

take an hour, by leave, out of the time for legislation tomorrow to fill up the time that we are now taking?

MR. MARSHALL:

We could probably fill the time in some other time. At another time we could, perhaps.

MR. TULK:

Before next Wednesday, when debate on this resolution closes off?

MR. MARSHALL:

All I can say is I will consider it.

MR. TULK:

We will agree anyway, since it is the type of institution it is. We regret the kind of stuff that has gone on here, but we will agree to call it six o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it agreed to call it six o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House will now adjourn until three of the clock tomorrow, Thursday.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

May 28, 1986

*Tabled by the Hon. the
Min of Fisheries May 28/86*

MR. SPEAKER:

YESTERDAY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR TWILLINGATE RAISED SOME QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO THE CANADIAN SALTFISH CORPORATION. AT THAT TIME, I INDICATED THAT I WAS NOT FULLY FAMILIAR WITH THE DETAILS OF THE QUESTIONING BUT THAT I WOULD PROVIDE AN ANSWER IF AT ALL POSSIBLE TODAY. MR. SPEAKER, I AM NOW PREPARED TO OFFER SOME APPROPRIATE COMMENTS ON THE QUESTIONS, HOWEVER, IN DOING SO, I MUST PREFACE MY REMARKS BY PUTTING THE WHOLE MATTER OF THE CORPORATION AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT AND, HENCE, TO THE MINISTER OF FISHERIES, IN ITS PROPER CONTEXT.

THE CANADIAN SALTFISH CORPORATION IS A FEDERAL CROWN CORPORATION. HOWEVER, THE PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND DID, INDEED, PASS ENABLING LEGISLATION AND IS, IN A SENSE, A PARTY TO THE ACTIVITY OF THE CORPORATION. FURTHERMORE, THE PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND IS REPRESENTED ON THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION USUALLY BY A SENIOR OFFICIAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES WHICH, AT THE PRESENT TIME, IS MY DEPUTY. BEARING IN MIND THE BACKGROUND INFORMATION, I WILL ENDEAVOR TO ANSWER YESTERDAY'S QUESTIONS IN A GENERAL SENSE, SINCE TO BE ENTIRELY SPECIFIC AND UP TO DATE, IT IS MOST APPROPRIATE THAT QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO THE CORPORATION BE ANSWERED BY EITHER THE PRESIDENT, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OR THE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE IN OTTAWA, MR. SIDDON.

THE QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER COULD BE ANSWERED AS FOLLOWS.

1. I CAN INDEED CONFIRM THE FACT THAT THE CANADIAN SALTFISH CORPORATION WAS INVOLVED IN THE SALE OF A CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OF FISH TO THE PORTUGUESE COMPANY "ARMAZENS LIMITED". FURTHERMORE, ONE OF THE SALES, THAT IS, THE ONE ARRANGED IN LATE 1983 AND EARLY 1984, HAS NOT BEEN PAID IN FULL. THE OUTSTANDING AMOUNT IS IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD OF \$2 MILLION AND WILL BE REFERRED TO THE COURT FOR RECOVERY. IN THE MEANTIME, I CAN ASSURE THE HONOURABLE MEMBER THAT EFFORTS TO COLLECT THE MONEY HAS BEEN ONGOING FOR THE PAST TWO YEARS AND, INDEED, IN 1985 APPROXIMATELY \$250,000 WAS COLLECTED.
2. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR TWILLINGATE INDICATED THAT ARMAPORT LIMITED, A CANADIAN/NEWFOUNDLAND COMPANY, WAS AN AGENT OF THE CANADIAN SALTFISH CORPORATION. MR. SPEAKER, THIS IS ENTIRELY INCORRECT SINCE ARMAPORT LIMITED IS A NEWFOUNDLAND COMPANY SET UP APPROXIMATELY FIVE YEARS AGO TO ARRANGE PURCHASES OF FISH FOR THREE PORTUGUESE COMPANIES INCLUDING ARMAZENS.
3. IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT ARMAZENS LIMITED AND ITS AGENT, ARMAPORT LIMITED, HAD BEEN DOING CONSIDERABLE BUSINESS WITH THE CANADIAN SALTFISH CORPORATION, FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS. AS WITH ANY NORMAL BUSINESS PRACTICE, A HISTORY OF GOOD COMMERCIAL RELATIONS DID NOT NECESSARILY PROVIDE DETAILED SECURITY SINCE PREVIOUS ACCOUNTS WERE PAID IN FULL ON A REGULAR BASIS. IT COULD BE SAID THAT FULL SECURITY SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBTAINED IN ALL CASES AND, MR. SPEAKER, I GUESS THIS WOULD BE THE ULTIMATE, HOWEVER, SOMETIMES WE ARE NOT LIVING IN A UTOPIAN SITUATION. BUT I AM VERY PLEASED TO REPORT THAT CORPORATION POLICY HAS BEEN REVISED TO PROVIDE FULL SECURITY FOR ALL FUTURE SALES.

4. THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR TWILLINGATE PRESUMED THAT THE APPROXIMATELY \$2 MILLION LOSS WILL HAVE TO BE MADE GOOD FROM THE EARNINGS OF NEWFOUNDLAND FISHERMEN. WELL, MR. SPEAKER, THIS IS CERTAINLY NOT ENTIRELY CORRECT SINCE WE CANNOT, AT THIS POINT IN TIME, CORRECTLY SAY THAT A DEBT OF APPROXIMATELY \$2 MILLION IS, INDEED, A COMPLETE LOSS. THE FINAL AMOUNT CONSIDERED A LOSS WILL ONLY BE DETERMINED AFTER THE CORPORATION HAS RECOVERED ON ITS MORTGAGE SECURITY. THIS SECURITY HAS BEEN OBTAINED BY PLACING A MORTGAGE ON CONSIDERABLE ARMAZENS PROPERTY IN PORTUGUAL. IT IS ANTICIPATED THAT THE FINAL LOSS WILL NOT BE DETERMINED FOR ANOTHER YEAR OR MORE BUT IT IS ASSUMED THAT IT WILL BE CONSIDERABLY LESS THAN THE \$2 MILLION INDICATED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER. FINAL DISPOSITION OF THE BAD DEBT WILL PRESUMABLY BE A POLICY DECISION FOR THE CORPORATION AND/OR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.