



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 51

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

29 May 1987

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Before calling for Statements by Ministers, I have great pleasure in welcoming to the Speaker's Gallery Mr. Stephen Neary, a former member of the House.

MR. TULK:
We have him on Question - Period today, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, as minister responsible for housing, I would like to take this opportunity to update members on the status of the sale of market rental units in Stephenville which are owned by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

As I informed the House last year, after a number of expressions of interest from private concerns and an examination of the financial performance of the units in recent years, the Corporation placed 535 market rental units located in Stephenville in a sales position. In doing so, it was hoped that the sale of these buildings would promote a more competitive rental market environment. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to inform members today

that this initiative has met with a great deal of interest from local business and individual homeowners.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, details are presently being finalized for the sale of 22 multiple unit buildings which contain 142 units. In addition, there is every indication that 36 other buildings containing a total of 132 units may be sold by the end of June. I will be apprising members of such sales as they are finalized.

The sale of these units is consistent with the mandate of the Corporation to provide a moderating influence in the marketplace. The Corporation has offered for sale similar units in the past and will continue to review its portfolio throughout the Province in an effort to promote a viable and active rental market.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is some anxiety among Corporation employees in the Stephenville office regarding these sales. I would advise members that Corporation officials are aware of this situation and that all employees will be kept informed of any developments as they occur.

I would also report, as I indicated last week, that the Corporation will soon be inviting proposal calls for the sale of 6 apartment buildings in Pleasantville. I would hope that there is the same level of interest in these buildings on the part of the private sector as is now being generated in Stephenville.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would note that the sale of these units is

consistent with plans outlined by the hon. Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech earlier this year.

Thank you.

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 would like to thank the minister for a copy of his statement ahead of time. I was pleased to hear the minister indicate that there is some news forthcoming on the units. I have had some meetings with the employees out there, with the maintenance shop, and they have been very concerned since last Summer when the minister was there and he was assuring the employees of their status and of the future of the Stephenville area. I would ask the minister to look into the situation where there is contracting out of work, outside of Stephenville, which can be done by the maintenance shop employees and which would help ensure their long-term futures and their jobs. I believe they have pointed out to the minister and his officials that jobs are the big consideration there, and I would ask him to take that under consideration.

I am also concerned about the secrecy attached to the sale of these units. We are finally getting some information on it, and I would ask that his officials be a little bit more forthcoming

with their info. I also notice that in his statement he talks about the financial performance of the units in recent years. Now, that financial performance was laid out when the Western Residential Tenancies Board gave NLHC a nice smack between the two eyes with their roll back of rents, when they pointed out that the financial statements presented were not giving exactly the truest picture in the world to the people of the area. I would also ask the minister to take that under consideration.

Looking at the Stephenville office, Mr. Speaker, recently advertising appeared in the Newfoundland Herald which had all the regional offices listed, but Stephenville had been omitted from that list. I have asked the minister's department to look at that as it has created some concerns in the area about the future of the Stephenville operation, and I am still awaiting an answer. I would hope that he takes all those things under consideration, as well as a number of others that I will be pointing out.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
I have two points to make, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the statement. The first is with regard to the divestiture of these apartment units in the Stephenville area: I know last year there was considerable anxiety by the residents concerned and some efforts were forthcoming

to try and put up a housing co-operative in order to put the people there. I would hope that the minister is allowing efforts like that to go forward as profitably as they can and hopefully to a successful conclusion, because it is my feeling that that would be the most appropriate way to divest of them.

The second point has to deal with the profits accrued from the sale of this. In the past, the minister has told us that the profits would be filed into other activities of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation and into providing additional units elsewhere, subsidized housing and so on, and we have accepted the minister's comments on that. But, Mr. Speaker, one point I would like to make today is that we learned several weeks ago that the Housing Corporation is putting \$1 million worth of land into a Sprung greenhouse project. Because it is supplying the thirty acres of land involved, the questions we would have to ask are: Are the proceeds of this sale being ploughed into it? Is the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation being compensated by the joint venture for the land it is giving away, or is the Housing Corporation taking an equity position on this Sprung greenhouse project? Because I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, for the Housing Corporation to give up \$1 million worth of land, or whatever, would be totally irresponsible for the Corporation, given the situation that it has a mandate to provide housing and not to go into harebrained ventures like this.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I just have a brief statement. It is not in writing or anything, and I apologize for that. In response to a question yesterday by the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) with respect to an extension of the deadline for the responses to the Green Paper concerning the outfitting industry, I can advise the House that we have, in fact, now decided to extend the deadline because there is such interest in responding. The new deadline now will be June 22. So any responses dated June 22 will be welcome and indeed accepted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD:

Thank you.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the government has finally twigged to the fact that they could not get away with this, they could not sneak this through. They brought the paper in a couple of months ago, never did any advertising, hoped that they could go through the motions, and then, after the deadline, say with a straight face, 'We gave you an opportunity for input and you did not do anything about it.'

I went to Burgeo two or three weeks ago to speak to a graduation, and I was invited to

meet with a number of men who had concerns about this paper and who had just heard about it a few days before. As a result, I did a Cable T.V. item for Burgeo and it was played a couple of times. Whether as a result is not the question, but following that there was a meeting in Burgeo with 500 people present, which goes to show the kind of concern there is when people are alerted to the options.

I have heard what the minister has said. The government has not decided, the government has laid out some options. Some of the options are downright frightful, and for that reason people ought to have full opportunity. So I commend them for extending the deadline. It is too bad it has come down to the wire before it was done, and it is too bad it got caught up in that little bit of gamesmanship yesterday, because the minister knew yesterday, Mr. Speaker, when he stood in this House that there was going to be an extension. This idea that you can run off and consult your Cabinet colleagues overnight is very instructive for when we are trying to get a decision some other time, when it takes weeks and weeks and weeks to get a Cabinet decision. So this charade was completely unnecessary and it is a bit of an insult to the people who feel threatened by that Green Paper, Mr. Speaker.

The good news here is that there is an extension. Now, could I ask the minister to run some ads in the paper, with or without his picture, and make people fully aware of this particular extension. It should be more than an afterthought written on a bit of paper, an overnight scurrying to consult Cabinet colleagues, and a little bit of gamesmanship with

the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) so he can make his maiden speech to the House. It should be more than that. It should be now a formal announcement through advertisements so that the people of the Province know that this extension is in place and that they can come forward with their concerns.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, I, too, welcome the decision to extend the deadline on submissions to the minister with regard to changes to the rules governing outfitting and so on. I think, though, the whole need for an extension outlines the problems that this government seems to be having with its consultation process. I think it is appropriate that they produce Green Papers like the one on the change to the outfitters rules. They also had a Green Paper on time changes, which the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth has produced. But in a sense it is only half of the consultation process, because very few people who are concerned with it actually get the information and are in a position to act on it.

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to suggest we should strongly look at in this Chamber is strengthening the committee system that we have to allow it to do more of this kind of consultative work. For example, if the Estimates Committee were struck on a year-long basis, then one of them could have held hearings on the changes to the outfitting rules rather than just sort of throwing

a Green Paper into a void and hoping that people would pick it up and do something. Similarly, I think, the Green Paper on time changes also deserved a lot more discussion and debate than it got. I think, again, a House committee would be very useful in this kind of process. I know it is done in the House of Commons on a very frequent basis. It is even done by the Senate, the useless Chamber of the House. I think we really should start looking at using all members of the House in the process of developing policies that there will be a broad consensus on, rather than just throwing the paper out and hoping someone catches it and brings back some comment.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would like at this stage to welcome to the galleries sixteen Grade V students and three teachers, I have just one of their names, Mr. Critch, from the Pentecostal Academy in Botwood.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I notice the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) was not pounding his desk so I have a question for him. In one

of his famous television appearances the Minister of Municipal Affairs, in relation to the community of Benton, left the impression with the people of the Province and with the people of Benton that money would be provided to get a start on a sewerage system for that community so that \$100,000 of federal funding would not have to be sent back and would not have to be wasted. Yesterday officials in his department informed people from that community that in fact the funding would most likely not be there. I ask would the minister today stop playing with this issue, stop playing with the people of Benton and stop playing with television cameras, and once and for all would he please straighten this situation out for us? Are these people going to get their definite answer by the end of May, as they were promised, and are they going to get that \$30,000 to start their sewerage treatment system?

MR. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, we are very well aware of the situation in Benton and the fact that they do have some federal funding to start a much needed sewerage system in that community. We indicated to the town of Benton approximately two weeks ago that we would not see the \$100,000 of federal funding, being sent back simply because they could not get a small supplement from the Government of Newfoundland to help out in putting that system in there. What I indicated was what monies could be made available through the Community Water Service programme. If the hon. gentleman

is following everything as closely as he should within the department, he will know that we have not dealt yet with the Community Water Service programme and, when we do, the community of Benton will be considered.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I suggest the minister check with the officials in his department and find out why they are telling the people in Benton they are not going to get the money.

Yesterday as well, Mr. Speaker, police delivered to nine families in Benton a letter informing them of a court case that was going to take place on Monday in Grand Falls with a view to evicting these families and having them remove their houses or have their houses torn down because the ground was not suitable for proper sewerage treatment and so on. I would like to ask the minister is this now in connection with the sewerage treatment, a new approach of government, instead of solving the problem you force the people to get out?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. DOYLE:
I want to respond first of all, Mr. Speaker, to the first part of the hon. gentleman's question with

regard to officials. Officials do not make the decisions on where the funding goes in this Province. That is number one. So we have made a commitment to Benton that we would not see the \$100,000 of federal funding go back if it means a small supplement coming from the Community Water Service programme to help them out, and that commitment is still very much in place.

With respect to eviction of people, to my knowledge we have not been notified of any evictions at this point in time, but I will be quite pleased to look into it.

MR. BAKER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is the Department of Municipal Affairs that is instituting this action against those families and it is very serious. They have been given only two days notice of a court hearing to be held in Grand Falls, all instigated by the Department of Municipal Affairs, and the minister does not know. I would ask the minister to immediately check into this and to at least put a hold on those evictions until we get the sewerage treatment problem straightened out in Benton, and to do the job that Municipal Affairs is supposed to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Municipal

Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman is saying is quite misleading. The Department of Municipal Affairs do not serve eviction notices on anybody in this Province and that includes the community of Benton. So I would very much like to check into it because I feel very sure indeed that it is not the Department of Municipal Affairs which is evicting people from Benton.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker:

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward). He will know that the appeals tribunal will be rendering its decision today with respect to the appeal from the minimum price on milk. I want to ask does the minister expect a fair and neutral decision from a tribunal that he himself has hand picked and appointed, number one? And, number two, does he expect this decision to be fair in light of his public comment that he expects the tribunal to uphold its original decision?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. The tribunal dealt with the request from Judge Cameron of several months ago last weekend, and

upheld their initial ruling, Mr. Speaker. That was done a week ago.

I expect that all decisions of the tribunal to be fair. The chairman of that tribunal has been a judge in this Province for quite some time and I have no reason to doubt his integrity, Mr. Speaker. The other two members of the tribunal are very honourable people and I have no doubt about their integrity. I really feel ashamed to be a politician when I can hear someone across the way doubting the integrity of Newfoundlanders who are serving this Province and not making any money on it, serving this Province to make decisions that are outside of government's control, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN:

You are getting worse than CBC.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

It is the minister's public comments that I worry about, Mr. Speaker, which could influence the decision.

My supplementary is to ask the minister: Under his own authority and legislation he has an act called The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1973, which enables him to call before an independent enquiry processors who increase prices on natural products, such as milk. I would ask the minister to read his own act, Section 11, paragraph (j) which allows him to look into unfair pricing. I ask will he invoke that legislation to force the processors to come and appear before an enquiry to

justify this six cent increase on a two liter carton of milk, especially in light of the fact that he is already slamming the consumers in the face with a minimum price?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, the minimum price was set by the Milk Marketing Board. It was upheld, Mr. Speaker, by an independent tribunal. Their right to do it was upheld by a court of this Province, Mr. Speaker, and it was reaffirmed by an independent tribunal again. That is why there is a minimum price in this Province.

The Natural Products Marketing Board has its regulations and they can act as they see fit. I am sure if they have any major concerns about the increase in the cost of milk, Mr. Speaker, they will act on that behalf or recommend to me how I should act. Mr. Speaker, I have never had a recommendation from that board to call in any of the processors.

The hon. member on television the other night said I should call in the producers. Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of calling in every dairy farmer in this Province to go before -

MR. FUREY:
Processors, I said.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
He said producers, Mr. Speaker, and I have no intention of calling in every dairy farmer. People

like him got their industry at risk as it is, Mr. Speaker, by complaining about a good marketing system, the same as there is anywhere else in Canada.

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

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, the minister can play verbal gymnastics all he wants, but the fact of the matter is that the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) in this House the other day, on Tuesday - we have not seen him since - said he had already discussed with the Minister of Agriculture this six cent increase.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:
Now, I ask the is minister going to do what is right for the consumers? Is he going to ask the processors to appear under his own enabling legislation to justify this increase or are they going to be a brace of cowards, he and the Minister of Consumer Affairs?

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, I will do what is right to provide a good quality, fresh product and protect the dairy industry and create jobs in this Province to the advantage of farmers and consumers in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). The minister is aware that after Bill C-22 becomes law there is every indication that the price of drugs will go up. I say to the minister that if the price of drugs goes up, the old and the poor, whose drugs are now subsidized, will not have access to drugs or, if they do have access, the supply of other services will have to go down to offset the price of new drugs. I ask the minister what contingency plan has he made to offset the effects of Bill C-22?

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. TWOMEY:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To be quite frank, we do not have a contingency plan at this time. I do not think that immediately the Bill is passed that the cost of drugs is going to escalate to any degree. I think what is going to happen is there is going to be a slow increase in the price. I think a lot of the expensive drugs will come under the new discoveries. I do not believe that there is going to be that price jump on the drug user at this particular time. And it is the new ones that will come on the market that are going to cause the

increased cost of drugs, not that tomorrow morning you are going to have a jump of 10 per cent or 20 per cent on any particular pharmaceutical.

MR. DECKER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle.

MR. DECKER:
The answer is in tune with the crisis management aspect this government has been using. The minister attended Senate hearings on Bill C-22 yesterday, Mr. Speaker. Now in all honesty the minister will have to admit that that is like closing the barn door after the horse has run away. Will the minister explain to this House why his government did not take more aggressive action to stop this bill while it was before the Commons - not now that it has gone to a Liberal Senate - which is controlled by his Tory friends and buddies and where this government has all of the influence, as we were told in the last election? Why did the minister wait until Bill C-22 came before the Senate before he acted? Really it is just a formality anyway, no great action could be taken. Why did he put it off until the last minute, like he is going to do about making a contingency plan when the price does go up?

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker, how does one answer that question? It is like asking

how high is high? It is a perception of which each and every one of us has. How do we approach it? How much love is love?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:
What is one supposed to do as a minister other than communicate with one's opposite minister at the federal level? Beyond all shadow of doubt, I announced in this House previously my communication, my meeting with the Minister of Health (Mr. Epp), and my communication with the various Ministers of Consumer Affairs. Not alone has that been done, but the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) in this Province has met with his opposite, has communicated with his opposite. Each of us have letters to these respective ministers, each of us have replies from these respective ministers. I understand that the Premier has discussed it with the Prime Minister of Canada. What more can one do as an elected representative other than perform your duties to the best of your ability? Quite honestly, I do not hang my head in shame.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:
I speak for myself: I have done everything that any human being or any minister can do.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. In a previous answer

the minister said that the minimum retail price for milk was in line with practically all the provinces. My question to the minister is this: In Prince Edward Island there is not a minimum retail price, there is a minimum wholesale price; in Nova Scotia there is not a minimum retail price but a minimum wholesale price, and there is not even a minimum wholesale price the province of New Brunswick. How can the minister say that our practice of having a minimum retail price for milk is consistent when the three other Atlantic provinces have no minimum retail price for milk?

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:
The NDP governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan brought in minimum pricing of milk in both their provinces and that answers his question, Mr. Speaker. I make no apologies for what the Milk Marketing Board is doing in this Province. In 1983 this Province was producing 12.5 million litres of milk a year; as of December 31, 1986 we are producing 17,754,000 litres of milk, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Since the establishment of the Milk Marketing Board, Mr. Speaker, we have increased local production of milk by 42 per cent, and not another industry in Canada can claim that, Mr. Speaker, and that was caused because of the good management of our Milk Marketing Board. We now have a \$12.5 million business employing about

1000 people in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. I make no apologies for minimum prices or anything the Milk Marketing Board is doing.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
We accomplished all of that without a minimum retail price for milk, so why do we need one now? My question to the minister is this. As he knows, our minimum retail price for milk is considerably above the minimum wholesale prices in the Atlantic provinces.

MR. MORGAN:
There is a big difference between retail and wholesale, is there not?

MR. FENWICK:
It is my understanding that his Milk Marketing Board, or one of his agencies, has now done a study of the dairy farmers in the Province in order to establish a reasonable minimum farm gate price to the producers - the producers and not the processors. The question I have for the minister, Mr. Speaker, is: Is the minister willing to release the results of that survey, or that study, in order to give us an indication of why we need a minimum retail price for milk which is considerably above that which has been set in the other Atlantic provinces?

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, there was a study

done. Some time last Fall, I believe, there was a study done by an independent consultant from New Brunswick and the purpose of that study was to get good, up-to-date figures on the cost of fluid milk production in this Province. It is the property of Ag Canada and the Milk Marketing Board. My staff has a copy of it now, we are doing an assessment of it, Mr. Speaker, and I have no problem in releasing it. When I get my assessment and get briefed on it, I have no problem in releasing that study, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
My final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is: Could the minister give us an exact date on when we can get a copy of that study? Also, could he show us why we need a minimum retail price,, since he says all we are trying to protect is the producers, when in fact the minimum retail price protects only the processors, three dairies, two of which are not even owned by Newfoundlanders?

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, from the information that I have I am not sure that the statement the hon. member made about minimum prices elsewhere in Canada is true, Mr. Speaker. The information I have now is that there is a minimum retail price in effect on milk in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Quebec,

Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, not only for two liters of milk, Mr. Speaker, but also for 250 milliliters of milk. I do not know the exact date, but I certainly will undertake to get that report made available to hon. members as soon as I can get it and as soon as I get a good briefing on it.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). A couple of days ago in response to a question on the review committee, and in trying to rationalize why he decided to usurp the function of the Auditor General the minister said, and I have Hansard and I quote, 'The Auditor General has his proper function in assessing things after the fact.' Now I ask the minister what is a review committee supposed to be doing? The very definition of the word 'review' is to examine things after the fact, to look into things that happened in the past, which is exactly and precisely the role of the Auditor General. So I ask the minister to explain that.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. It was a good, nicely worded question, it was not like the unduly provocative questions that were coming previously that raised the ire of my honourable friend in the Department of Health and the

attack on the Minister of RAND and so forth. It was a nice, quietly worded question. So, Mr. Speaker, my answer to it, though, is that this is a much broader process and much broader exercise than just reviewing what went on in the past. This is a group working for government and government have a lot of input into it, and it will not be just confined to the particular individuals announced to date, it will be a broader thing than that, and it will actually forward plan also. It will evolve, I suppose, at least a three year plan, probably a five year plan, and probably even more than that. This is an indepth review, at this particular stage in the life of this government, as to what programmes in the past have done in terms of effectiveness, which is only one aspect of it, but also what we are doing now and what we can do more effectively in the future.

So it is not just a review. As I mentioned earlier, Auditors General, even if they go into this new thing that Auditors General tend to go into, this effectiveness thing, that is all review and assessing effectiveness of what went on previously. As far as I know no Auditor General has any mandate to lay out the direction that government should go in the future.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, the minister again alludes this morning to the fact that this is a government review. He says, "The government is in

control of this review process." Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the problem. Maybe the minister has misnamed the committee. Maybe this is just form. Maybe this is just window dressing to impress the financial institutions of the world that the government is doing something about its fiscal mismanagement. Now I ask the minister this: What kind of solid, frank, objective evaluation is the minister expecting from a review of itself. What kind of a frank, honest, objective evaluation is the minister expecting from this kind of process, one similar, I would say, Mr. Speaker, to locking the fox up in the coop with the chicken?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I have to pick up on the hon. member having some misgivings about the government being in charge of this. Who is elected to run public affairs in this Province at the present time? Surely it is government. We cannot hand the mandate that has been given to us by the people over to some third party. I mean, we should resign if that was the case. We have to be in control of these matters.

In terms of what are we expecting from this review process, in many respects that is what the review process is all about. We are going to be very firmly involved and very firmly in control of the process, but we are not in any way tying the hands of those actually doing the work of the review in any area that they can look into. They can suggest, and I am sure they will, and make recommendations on all the programmes, be they Health, be

they Social Services, be they Forestry, be they Fisheries, whatever. They will be free to look at all the programmes and see how we can more effectively direct the public monies - it is not government monies, it is public monies - to the welfare and the good of the people.

MR. LUSH:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
I would suggest to the minister that the process now in effect is like putting Dracula in charge of a blood bank. Now, Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is this: In view of the fact that these senior civil servants now on this review committee have to have staff and office space, and in view of the fact that there have to be replacements found for their positions while they are serving on this review committee, can the minister indicate how much this boondoggle is going to cost this Province?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, at the present time there is only one of the deputy ministers assigned to this on a full-time basis, and indeed he will need a replacement in the department that he is temporarily leaving. When I say temporarily, that is presupposing he is going back there. I think he may well be, but he may not be, I suppose. Anyway, there is only one full-time person assigned from the Public Service at the present time who will have to be replaced.

Others will serve while continuing their present duties. We may well have to get in some outside people, and that was stated in the budget. We may get some management or efficiency people involved in this as the process unfolds and as plans are made. There certainly will be a research group. Whether they are going to be made up of public servants or people in the private sector and so on, will be determined as the process moves along.

There will be some additional costs, but I think it will be money well spent. I do not think there will be very large costs. I am quite sure that as the plans are put on the ground much more firmly than they are at the present time, we will be able to assess the costs more clearly and inform the House at that time.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Could I put a question to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development? It is about his Sprung proposal, the \$13 million pickle he has got himself into. Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate to the House whether, as part of the deal - as soon as he finishes getting educated by his colleagues around him -

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Ask your question.

MR. SIMMONS:
- with Sprung, he has an undertaking from Sprung that their technology will not be used

elsewhere in Atlantic Canada? Has he that kind of undertaking from Sprung?

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, I never said that at any time. As a matter of fact, there are two other Atlantic Provinces - except they will have to come up with their own money because they wanted federal money - who desperately want this technology, Mr. Speaker. I have knowledge now that Alberta is so desperate to keep Sprung out there, Mr. Speaker, they are after offering them a deal that was three times as good as ours, I think, Mr. Speaker, or somewhere in that vicinity.

MR. SIMMONS:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister. He indicated that there are possibilities for other Sprung developments in Atlantic Canada. Would he now relate this to the Province's proposal that 80 per cent of the Sprung output be exported? Would he not see the problem for market availability if Sprung becomes as successful as he projects it will be, not only here but in other developments in Atlantic Canada? If the government has not nailed down some restriction -

MR. DINN:
Now it is going to be too successful.

MR. BARRETT:

It will be too successful now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

No, Mr. Speaker, we do not know what it is going to be. We know the offshore is going to be a flop thanks to the idiot who is running it. We know he sold the shop on that. We are trying to see we do not have a shop sold agriculturally as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, what kind of a guarantee do we have now that the great export markets that have been projected will be there if Sprung gets to the point where it has competing operations in Atlantic Canada?

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural Agriculture and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

What a change, Mr. Speaker! They finally got to the right people and someone must have informed them that this is a good project, Mr. Speaker, and we got the first one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

What a change in attitude, Mr. Speaker. Yes, there are people interested in the Atlantic area. There are opportunities in the rest of the Atlantic Provinces for

Sprung. There are also other opportunities in other parts of Newfoundland for Sprung, Mr. Speaker. That is where we are going to develop them and that is where they will be if we get the first one, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) and it concerns the Pippy Park Commission. As I understand it, the Chairman of the Pippy Park Commission has resigned, there is a police investigation into the affairs of that Commission, and there have been records seized and so on. I would ask the minister is there a connection between the two events, between the Chairman resigning and the matter of the police investigation? Is there some connection between the two?

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, as there is a police investigation going on I do not think I can make any more comment on it. But, yes, there is a connection.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I do not expect the hon. gentleman to get into the legalities of this matter. I ask would the minister now inform the House, in a general sort of way if he cannot get into the specifics, just what the general nature of that investigation is? In other words, what are the police investigating? Are they investigating theft, or just what are they investigating? Are they investigating grand larceny or murder? What are they investigating? Could he give us the general nature of the investigation?

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, there is a police investigation going on and when it completed I will give him the details.

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will recall that the Opposition in the Legislature last year warned him that there were certain things that were not right with the Pippy Park Commission. Let me ask the hon. gentleman if indeed the problem that now exists in Pippy Park might very well have something to do with his being lax in following up what the

Opposition proposed to him? Again I ask would he tell us, since we have a right to know in this Legislature in regards to the Pippy Park Commission, just what the general nature of the police investigation is into this thing? Is it caused by his incompetence in administering and not listening to the Opposition of this Province as he should have done?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to the hon. Opposition House Leader that Pippy Park is an autonomous body and I do not have much control over it, only just report to the House. And it is unfortunate that if the hon. member knew something last Fall he did not bring it to my attention. But, Mr. Speaker, this has nothing to do with last Fall. This happened recently. When it was brought to my attention I acted. I have no further comment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

I have a question for the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power). It is to follow up a question I asked yesterday in which the response given suggested that the concerns about the problem of battered

women in this Province were shallow and narrow-minded. I would like to say to the minister that my question concerns two basic issues, that women in this Province who are battered need assistance, and that all people in this Province need a public education programme on the problems of family violence.

My question to the minister is: Will he consider taking money that is left over from the \$4 million for his Private Sector Employment programme that is waiting for applications to come in -

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. J. CARTER:

This has nothing to do with the hon. gentleman, it has to do with something else entirely. Would the Leader of the Opposition care to say again what he just said quite clearly in my hearing about the Speaker?

MR. SIMMONS:

You are a fool!

MR. J. CARTER:

Would you care to say the same thing, repeat what you said?

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am flattered that

the member for St. John's North would want to put questions to me. I tell him that it is only appropriate to do so in this Chamber after the next election when I will be in a position to answer some questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

I would like to point out that the time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the Visitors' Gallery fifty-five Grade IX students from Assumption Junior High School in Avalondale with their teachers Miss Dunphy and Miss Tilley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to welcome forty-two Grade VI students from Davis Elementary School in Carbonear with their teachers Mrs. Tilley and Mr. Lambert.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Petitions

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise here today to present a petition on behalf of twenty people from the Bay St. George area in connection with the recent layoffs by the Department of Social Services and the problems which these particular layoffs have put on the social workers, not only in the Bay St. George and on the West Coast of Newfoundland, but all over Newfoundland in the Department of Social Services where these layoffs have taken place.

In connection with these recent thirty-five layoffs - Mr. Speaker, I see that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) has now left his seat. I ask him to come back in because there is a major concern that on top of the thirty-five layoffs that have presently taken place in the Department of Social Services, there is strong talk among the social workers that there will be another thirty layoffs take place. If that happens, Mr. Speaker, on top of what already has taken place in the Department of Social Services, as we pointed out in petitions that were presented yesterday and the day before, and in fact every day this week, it is going to cause a lot of mass confusion and frustration along with that which has already been taking place in the Department of Social Services.

One of the major areas that this is having a great effect on is where the social workers have expanded into child abuse and working with the mentally handicapped children. Those people require a lot of special attention and a social worker's case load has to be small in numbers in order for them to do

the proper job that those type of people require in attention and time. You do not just walk into an office or walk into a home for a visit in four or five minutes and expect to complete something as serious as this. Each social worker cannot have a case load of ten, fifteen or twenty individuals or families that they have to see in one day. Last year, when the people were hired on in the Department of Social Services, it was because of the study that was done and the investigation that was done by the Department of Social Services where the social workers themselves could not pay attention and properly give the attention required by these people who needed this type of service.

Now, a year later, with the minister, as we said yesterday, admitting himself that there are more people, as many, or as he said, even more people than last year depending on the social service system in 1986-87, why he sees fit to cut back thirty-five people and cut back the services by the Department of Social Services and by the social workers not only in the district offices but also in the regional offices?

The minister alluded very clearly to the fact that his department spends more money on social services than any other department of any other province in Canada.

MR. FUREY:

That is shameful.

MR. EFFORD:

As my colleague for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) points out, that is shameful because what it is doing is admitting that the people of this Province, through no fault of their own, only the fault of the

government not creating jobs, are not given any other alternative but to survive on social assistance. So, it is not the fault of the people of the Province that they are going to Social Services. The greater majority are going there because there is absolutely nowhere else to turn. If that type of environment has been created by the present government, then it is the responsibility of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) at least to give them enough to live on and keep them away from starvation.

Now, aside from the people who have to depend on the small amount of money that Department of Social Services hands out to buy groceries or to survive on, we have the people who are handicapped, disabled, and the senior citizens of this Province who require, and have nowhere else to turn for assistance, not only financial assistance but the daily assistance they require to enable them to get along in live. The few problems that they do have needs the advice of social workers.

So, Mr. Speaker, we, as the official Opposition, have to keep presenting these petitions that are being sent to us. I think the numbers are growing and growing. We are now up to over 1,000 names that have come to us on different petitions sent to us by people around the Province who have no other alternative but to put pressure on the government and to implore the Minister of Social Services that he cannot layoff these people and expect the same service to be given out. He must immediately reconsider and admit that he made an error, and he must rehire those thirty-five people.

If the trend continues where more people are depending on social services, he is not only going to have to rehire the thirty-five, he is going to have to hire more people. Get the word out that the rumor is not accurate that there are going to be another thirty layoffs and the service will be further cut back because this is the word the Social Services offices, regional and district, are getting, that there are going to be further layoffs.

If he needs to save money, the \$700,000 that he indicates that he is going to save by these cutbacks, I suggest to him to look to other areas where the government is wasting money in patronage appointments and this special committee that they have set up to monitor government spending which is going to cost the taxpayers of this Province a minimum of \$500,000 a year.

It is not hard to figure that out. You do not have to be a great mathematician to figure that out. You have four deputy ministers who are receiving approximately \$60,000 to \$65,000 a year each. So that is \$300,000. Each one of them is going to need a secretary, they are going to need office space, and they are going to need office furniture. So it is not hard to come up with a minimum figure of \$500,000 that the government is spending to set up a committee to tell them how to spend money.

It is absolutely ludicrous for any government to expect the taxpayers of the Province to pay this when we hear the Minister of Social Services laying off thirty-five people to save \$700,000. It is absolutely ridiculous, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we ask the Minister of Social Services to take this under serious consideration and to rehire those thirty-five people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in my place to support the prayer of this particular petition so ably presented by my good colleague and friend from Port de Grave (Mr. Efford).

It is interesting to see, Mr. Speaker, that government, right now, has terminated thirty-five jobs in an area and in a department that ought not just be sensitive, Mr. Speaker, but ought to be super-sensitive to the needs of people who are less fortunate, and through no fault of their own, are relegated to this particular department of government to seek help and assistance.

Mr. Speaker, if you listen to the minister's comments and if you listen to commentary generally, we are led to believe that these thirty-five jobs or positions will be terminated because there was no work for them in the first place. This leads one logically to ask

the question, if there was no work for them in the first place, what were they being paid for for the last five years? Why pay somebody for five years if they were not doing anything?

Now if that were a reflection upon certain Cabinet ministers, that would be understandable throughout the Province that we terminate certain Cabinet ministers because they are doing nothing. For example, the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) and corporate affairs, what a telling lame duck department that is, Mr. Speaker, when they cannot do anything for the very people that this department was initiated and put into place for - to protect the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad reflection on the government because what the government has said to the people of this Province is that, in the name of restraint and in the name of cutback, we are going to reduce the costs of this department by \$700,000. Mr. Speaker, that in itself is not a bad thing but when you line it up against the priorities of this government, you are left scratching your head and you are left wondering just what are their priorities. Let me offer an example, Mr. Speaker. They want to save \$700,000 so they chop and cut and dig into the most sensitive portfolio over there, the Department of Social Services. They want a cut so they cut where it hurts most.

Why did they not cut back on their travel, Mr. Speaker? Does this House know that Cabinet ministers in their jet setting role last year spent \$3 million - not \$1 million or \$2 million - \$3 million jet setting around the planet.

Mr. Speaker, if you line up on the left side of the ledger against the expense on the right side of the ledger and ask yourselves how many jobs have these people brought back from Norway and Germany and the Scandinavian countries and South America and all across the United States and all parts of Europe and Moscow even, how many jobs did they bring back, Mr. Speaker, for that \$3 million expenditure?

MR. DECKER:

Not one job.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, if you look in the estimates, these are not my figures, Mr. Speaker, these are their figures, the government's figures. On the cocktail circuit alone last year they spent \$250,000. Mr. Speaker, again, not my figures, their figures. Eight ministers hired eight press secretaries at a cost of \$250,000 when we already have a global press secretary called the Newfoundland Information Services. So add that up, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, \$3,500,000 and they want to cut back on Social Services.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is getting away from the petition. His time, in any case, is now up.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House would allow me leave to conclude.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave. By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there any further petitions?

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 620 residents of Airport Heights.

Mr. Speaker, the petition reads, "To the hon. members of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland, in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned, representing the citizens in the area known as Airport Heights, St. John's, is humbly submitted sheweth:"

I am going to read the prayer, Mr. Speaker. "Whereas the Province of Newfoundland unilaterally annexed in 1980 without public hearings, a local vote or any transitional funding the area known as Airport Heights to the City of St. John's.

"We, the undersigned, petition hon. members to request the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs to initiate immediate action within sixty days of the tabling of this petition to ensure that Airport Heights either receives fair treatment within the City of St. John's on taxes and services, or failing that, that the minister be requested to conduct a feasibility study and related local area elections to decide on the future local government for Airport Heights."

Mr. Speaker, in essence what the people of Airport Heights want, under the guidance of the Airport Heights Citizens Committee, a very

fine committee, a responsible committee, is they are trying their utmost to have better services in their area. In essence, Mr. Speaker, what they are saying in the people's prayer is before taxes, services.

Mr. Speaker, before the City of St. John's took over Airport Heights, legislation was brought into this hon. House whereby people not receiving full services could receive a lesser mil rate than those people serviced. The city council stayed within the guidelines of that legislation but almost in an insulting way. The City of St. John's did not take into consideration the inequities or the minuses that prevailed in the area known as Airport Heights.

Mr. Speaker, they have no buses. They have no recreational facilities. They have no water and sewerage. Their streets are in a deplorable, in many instances, condition. Mr. Speaker, at that particular time, if the mil rate had been substantially decreased from the prevailing rate, which was 10 mils, then we would not have this petition today. But again, Mr. Speaker, the city council did not say minus 6 mils, nor 5 mils, nor 4 mils, nor 3 mils, nor 2 mils, but 1 mil. Last year, to add insult to injury, they assessed the property again increasing the value and thereby even erased that one 1 mil rate.

Mr. Speaker, the Airport Heights people in there, I have spoken to a number of them, are not looking for any great things. All they want is to be treated fairly. From where I sit, the provision of a water and sewerage system is essential. Over the years in many of the places within Airport

Heights there were small lots. In any area, land can only sustain a certain amount of fluids, and I am speaking about septic systems. That has been in there for a great number of years. This situation will have to be addressed because, if not, you will eventually see a health problem.

The Airport Heights Citizens' Committee received a mandate to circulate this petition. In this petition, 98 per cent of the people elected to sign it. Mr. Speaker, in their petition they ask that if nothing can be done as far as the mil rate is concerned, as far as their overall taxation position is concerned, if there is not some kind of a guarantee from the city that they will accept the proposal from this government to cost-share water and sewerage, then what the committee asks is very simple. They feel they have been unjustly treated. They want this government to reassess the whole situation, and in saying that, give them a chance to look elsewhere outside the City of St. John's where they will receive better representation and better services.

Mr. Speaker, I support this petition, but in supporting it I will have to point out to this House that in the interim, since this petition had been circulated -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:
By leave!

MR. PARSONS:

In the interim, since this petition had been circulated, I have met with the Mayor of St. John's and, at a later date, the Mayor of St. John's, the Deputy Mayor, and four of his staff, met with the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) and his staff, and at that time, we agreed upon or formulated a package. In that we suggested, and it was acceptable to both parties, that a five year plan be brought into place.

At that time we were also advised even before this date, Mr. Speaker, there was a TAC, a Technical Advisory Committee in place. At the present time I would certainly like to impress upon the people from Airport Heights that these meetings are ongoing. Why this committee had to be in place, Mr. Speaker, is because the cost of water and sewerage in Airport Heights is tremendous. We are talking about a lot of dollars, millions upon millions. There is no way that this government would have the finances to complete that water and sewerage in any one year. That is why we proposed the five year plan, and that five year plan was accepted.

Again, I want to reiterate what I said previously, that these meetings are ongoing and we hope to have a submission to the members of the Airport Heights Committee in the near future. I cannot be specific in saying it is going to be tomorrow. There is a lot of work that has to be done but the work is ongoing.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for leave and its indulgence, and again I want to say that I support the petition wholeheartedly.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the Official Opposition, I take pleasure in rising to support the prayer of the petition presented by the gentleman for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons).

I am not particularly looking for an argument with him. He is a gentleman whom I respect greatly, but I believe the support he gave to the petition then must classify among the more stranger occurrences in this House. You either support a petition or you do not. I thought the member was somewhere in between.

Once he was saying I am one of the petitioners, and in the next mouthful he was saying, we, meaning the government, and I do not believe he can speak for both in the same sequence, Mr. Speaker. It is up to the minister to justify what is clearly unjustifiable. The member does himself an injustice, subtracts from the cause that he says he is supporting by trying to in any way give any semblance of fairness to what the minister has done.

What the minister has done here is blatantly unfair. Raming this down the throats of those people without consultation, without plebiscite, this whole thing is sour because it was done wrongly

in the first place because a group of people out there were told what was good for them. That is the problem. That is where the whole problem arises from.

It is the same issue that I have been fighting for fifteen years out in the town of South Brook, under Section 141 (a). They talk about it here as taxation without compensation. It is the same old issue.

People of this Province are not unreasonable people. They do not mind paying taxation. They do not mind being included in a local municipal unit, Mr. Speaker, as long as there is some sense of fairness, as long as there is some return on the tax money they are paying in, as long as they can get some services.

Mr. Speaker, they are asking for a firm commitment on a water/sewer installation. They are asking for a firm commitment from the Province to provide an equitable settlement to St. John's insofar as busing is concerned. These are two of the requests they are putting forward. They are saying very directly, 'Either give us some fair treatment here, give us some justice here, or cut us loose and let us decide our own destiny insofar as the municipal government is concerned.' Now that is not an unfair request, Mr. Speaker.

As it has come to the point where more than 600 people living throughout this Airport Heights area have had to affix their signatures, have had to establish a committee structure, have had to meet again and again, why? They have put forward some of the most basic concerns that anybody has to deal with as far as municipal

government is concerned.

Concerns about road paving, about recreation, about fire protection, land assessments, water and sewer, I mentioned earlier, and busing I mentioned earlier. All these concerns, Mr. Speaker, are concerns that people who live in a democracy, who live under the aegis of a constitution such as we have in Canada should not be put through what those people have been put through for the last six years.

Mr. Speaker, I see some dismay on the face of the gentleman for St. John's East Extern so I will read to him a sentence from a press release put out by the Airport Heights Concerned Citizens Committee a short while ago. It says in part, Mr. Speaker, 'The people of Airport Heights, having lost all patience with their non-voluntary inclusion in the boundaries of the City of St. John's six years ago, in a virtually unanimous vote in a local area plebiscite conducted by the Airport Heights Concerned Citizens Committee, have endorsed a petition seeking to end this injustice'.

Mr. Speaker, first in their words and in mine what has happened is an injustice. Secondly, in their words and in mine it was an involuntary inclusion six years ago in the City of St. John's, and thirdly, in their words, they have lost all patience, and in mine I can understand their losing all patience. They have had one complete runaround on this.

MR. J. CARTER:
Your time is up.

MR. SIMMONS:
I know the gentleman for St.

John's North (Mr. J. Carter) does not want to hear about the concerns of the people in Airport Heights. For him that is foreign territory. What would he know about Airport Heights, Mr. Speaker? What would he care about Airport Heights? But I assume, Mr. Speaker, that my friend for St. John's East Extern (Mr. K. Parsons) does care and does want to hear, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's North on a point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:

I realize we should be reasonably indulgent but the member is being abusive and his time has long since elapsed. I think he should sit down.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. The hon. member has about a minute and a half left.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have also given the member for St. John's East Extern the benefit of our indulgence of a little extra time and I was assuming the same privilege would be accorded, but I keep forgetting that the gentleman for St. John's North has two rules, one for himself and one for everybody else. I can say what I want to say in the next minute or so, and I will say it otherwise outside this chamber.

Those people in Airport Heights should not be inflicted further with the notion that taxation

without compensation can be allowed to go on indefinitely and the onus on the minister, Mr. Speaker. The onus is on him to see that the denial of these people's constitutional rights does not continue. It is on his shoulders, he is party to it, he is the headwaiter on this particular one and that might be a more appropriate term than he thinks. He is the headwaiter on this one, and he ought now, Mr. Speaker - this has festered too long, those people are beginning to use terms such as, 'lost all patience', and they use those phrases with justification. They have been pushed to the limit, their backs are against the wall and they are getting no substantive response, no sensible response from those people, and now their own member almost abandoned them right in the full view of all.

He comes in today and says, 'I support the petition but'. I hope he will clear up the record on that, Mr. Speaker, because either he supports this thing wholeheartedly, and he said that these people have been hard done by; he says there has been an injustice; he says he is prepared to help them correct that injustice; or he is against the petition. He can not have it both ways.

What I would like to hear, Mr. Speaker, is what the Minister is prepared to do to address the grievance in this particular petition which we on this side wholeheartedly endorse.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal

Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the Member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons), on behalf of 650, I believe, people in the Airport Heights area. Now, in supporting this petition, Mr. Speaker, I first of all have to make one correction in the prayer of the petition.

The first part of the prayer states, 'Whereas the Province of Newfoundland unilaterally annexed in 1980, without public hearing, the area known as Airport Heights.' Now, I think, there has to be a little bit of confusion in that statement because back in 1980 there were indeed public hearings. Before Airport Heights was annexed to the city of St. John's, there was a feasibility study and a public hearing process.

Now, it very often happens, as we are all aware, that sometimes in that public hearing process a number of people object, and object strenuously, to the inclusion of their particular area within another municipality.

That is fair ball. But no one can say that there was not a public hearing process, because there was a public hearing process in which residents of the area did make representation to the Commissioner. Mr. Speaker, that is one small correction. It might be irrelevant at this point in time, but that is one small correction I would like to make.

I do support this petition, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Airport Heights and rightly so, because the people of Airport

Heights do have a very, very legitimate case. They are certainly an area of the city that should have services. We have made some effort, a great deal of effort, as a matter of fact, over the last couple of months to see that this particular problem is addressed in some substantive manner.

As the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) indicated a few minutes ago, meetings did take place, initiated by the member for St. John's East Extern, the Citizen's Committee of Airport Heights, and myself with the City of St. John's. At that time we agreed that we would put in place our own Technical Advisory Committee from the Department of Municipal Affairs, along with the City Manager, who would look into the costing, if you will, of service in the Airport Heights area. That Technical Advisory Committee is in the process of conducting these meetings and these engineering studies to determine what the cost is and, hopefully, we can come up with some kind of a five year plan.

I think this was the intention of the mayor of the city of St. John's and the committee and my own department when we met with the member for St. John's East Extern. It was our intent, and still remains our intent, to come up with a five year plan to address the problems in the Airport Heights area.

This is not a small job. This is not a small job at all because to address the immediate needs in Airport Heights you are talking about an expenditure of approximately \$10 million. You are talking about the Penetanguishene trunk sewer which

will have to be addressed, the upgrading of the Winsor Lake area, a reservoir to be built, and the roads that will be torn up in the process of doing all this work. All of this will have to be addressed in that Technical Advisory Committee study that is presently ongoing right now. Hopefully, some kind of a cost-shared agreement can be worked out with the City of St. John's and my own department to try and address, in a meaningful manner, the problems in Airport Heights.

I would like to address myself for a moment, Your Honour, to the tax rate that everyone keeps talking about with respect to the right of the city to reduce the mil rate in areas where they do not have services. Now, it should be clearly understood that this House passed that legislation back a couple of years ago which would give the right to the municipality to make that determination as to what reduction in the mil rate should take place.

We cannot, as a Province, and we cannot, as a department, go to every municipality and say, 'Well, we want you to reduce the mil rate by one here, two there, and three somewhere else.' The mechanism was put in place by the House of Assembly to give that authority and that jurisdiction to the municipality who would make that determination as to what the mil rate reduction should be. The people of Airport Heights obviously feel that a one mil reduction is not enough and they could very well be right. Hopefully the City of St. John's will address that problem with the people of Airport Heights but the fact of the matter remains, we are making progress on this particular

issue because we have the technical advisory committee in place working with the engineering staff in the City of St. John's. Hopefully -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. DOYLE:
By leave, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
By leave.

MR. SIMMONS:
(Inaudible) we do not play. No.

MR. DOYLE:
And hopefully we can come up with a five year plan.

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

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, earlier in this petition - and this is an important petition it is an issue that I would like to have debated - but we are not going to sit here and have games played. When the gentleman for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) was speaking, he knows the subject well and we wanted to hear what he said, so we gave leave.

When it came time for me to get a bit of leave, the galoot from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) was there to prevent leave. So, Mr. Speaker, no, there is no leave for the minister. I am sick and tired of his words anyway. Let him go out and act on this particular

issue.

I want it made clear the only reason we are refusing leave, Mr. Speaker, is because, as I said in my speech, there are two rules here. When I was speaking, the member objected that my time had expired. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of our getting it straight that if we want some civility in this Chamber, the people on the other side of the House are going to have to chain in that irrational being from St. John's North, chain him in somehow and then we will have a bit of civility in this House.

MR. DOYLE:

It would take only a minute to clue up my remarks.

MR. SIMMONS:

Not a second.

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I think it has been a well accepted tradition in the House that if time runs out when an hon. member is in the middle of a sentence, or really in the middle of a thought, he is allowed to very quickly complete that sentence or complete that thought. I think that is all the hon. minister is asking for.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am quite prepared to rule on that point of order. There is no point of order and I understand leave has not been given for the minister to continue.

MR. J. CARTER:

To a further point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I object to my actions being misinterpreted. Hansard will bear me out. I did suggest that the hon. member's time was up and that I might not give leave but when his time was eventually up after that minute and a half; I paid no attention to him and if he had asked for leave he might have gotten it. He certainly was not refused and I would like to set the record straight.

He delights in insult, invective and assertion, but he is completely wrong in this instance and I think he should apologize to Your Honour and to myself and to the House.

MR. SIMMONS:

I would apologize to Your Honor, if necessary, but I will not apologize to the House.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs is a good and decent man and we, under different circumstances, would have allowed

leave. Now, we sincerely on this side apologize because I know that the government members would not want to do it because it would be embarrassing to them. So we will apologize for the member for St. John's North who continually sits there and just interjects with silly comments and absolute arrogance and ignorance and destroys all the credibility of people who are credible on that side. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) is a good and credible human being and a decent person and we would give leave, Mr. Speaker, under normal circumstances, so we take it upon ourselves to apologize for the government for his childish behaviour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Orders of the Day

DR. COLLINS:

Motion 10.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law," carried. (Bill No. 43).

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 11. Before we get to that matter, I just want to point out that I made an error yesterday. I have had a chance to look at the Hansard: Towards the end I recognized the hon. member for

Menihok (Mr. Fenwick) and he said, "I adjourn the debate. We will pick it up tomorrow morning." I then continued on and said, "It is 5:30 p.m. We will adjourn this debate. If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would like to move that." Now that was an error on my part. The debate had already been adjourned. I apologize to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition for that. I suppose to err is human and no doubt I will again. Anyway, the last comment I made was, "The hon. the Leader of the Opposition adjourned the debate," when, in fact, I was in error in saying that.

I will recognize the hon. the member for Menihok.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

I submit there may have been an error, but I think that is irrelevant to what happened yesterday. What happened was this, Sir: I was watching the clock. The minister sat down and the hand had gone past five-thirty, it was ten or twelve seconds past, and I did not rise because I fully expected the Speaker would trigger the five-thirty action.

MR. TULK:

Which he has to.

MR. SIMMONS:

Which he has to at that time. So, I did not rise for that particular reason. So, I submit to you, if you want the accurate version, that nobody adjourned the debate

because it was improper for anybody to adjourn debate after five-thirty.

I was invited from the Chair to adjourn the debate, I thought nothing of it and said okay. But the point of the matter is, the reason I did not rise, because I was fully intending to respond to the minister and say some things we want to say to him, is that the clock had passed five-thirty and therefore it would have been improper for me to adjourn the debate because the five-thirty business had been triggered by the clock. It was in that spirit I did not rise. It is not a life and death matter, but for future reference and for future instruction, I would hope we have recognized that the onus should be not on individual members to make time determinations, that if it is five-thirty the Speaker will say so, and if it is not five-thirty, we can get on with other business that relates. But it was in that spirit that I did not immediately rise.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I think this is somewhat of a unique situation. I think Your Honour has extremely, graciously acknowledged an error that I am afraid I do not have the reference to right with me, but my understanding is that if the Speaker acknowledges an error, it is in the possession of the House as to what to do with it. Normally speaking, I think it would be accepted that on a substantive bill, such as the

aquaculture bill, the Official Opposition could be expected to want to respond to it and to respond to it by one of the senior members of the Opposition.

I guess the House has to dispose of this, but I would suggest, if the hon. member for Menihek would accept considering Your Honour's gracious acknowledgement of an error, that the easiest way of disposing of this would be to just go by what would normally be expected, have the hon. the Leader of the Opposition make his response to the bill. The hon. member for Menihek can certainly respond to it. It is not really taking away his opportunity, it is just a matter of timing. I guess the House can only dispose of this either by leave or by some substantive motion, and I would say that for everyone's peace of mind and getting on with business, perhaps we could dispose of it by leave. I would therefore ask that the House give leave to allow the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to make his response, if he should wish to do so, and then, of course, the hon. the member for Menihek would carry on.

I think this was just a clear mix up of signals in the House, Your Honour has very graciously accepted blame for it, and I think it is up to the members now to dispose of it in the most amicable way possible.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Menihek to that point of order.

MR. FENWICK:
To the point of order, Mr.

Speaker, if the Acting House Leader is asking for leave, I am not going to give it. One of the problems of sitting this far away from Your Honour is that it is difficult to be recognized and I accept that. I realize that it is a problem, but I do not believe there is any ironclad law which says that the official Opposition should respond to bills first. All we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is following a rule of the House which is: The next person to stand up is recognized. You graciously admitted you did not notice me and you did not hear me say that I had adjourned the debate, which, indeed, I did say. Quite frankly, I am ready to address the second reading of the bill. I do not give leave to do anything different, unless the Acting House Leader wishes to make a motion to take away my rights. If he does and if that is what is going to happen, then that is fine.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, two points: First of all, the Leader of the Opposition, when he rose in his place, was being, I suggest to Your Honour, very, very, very gracious in the way that he approached the subject. Under the Standing Orders of the House, at five-thirty on Thursday there is no requirement for anybody to adjourn the debate. I refer Your Honour to Standing Order 31, subsection (h), "At 5:30 o'clock p.m. on any Thursday the Speaker may, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 14, deem that a motion to adjourn the

House has been made and seconded." So the procedure that went on yesterday evening, regardless of who adjourned the debate, was not necessary and is not proper.

Having said that, I would say to you that that gives the Leader of the Opposition the right to respond to what is a government order. I refer Your Honour again to 49 (1) and to a long standing tradition in this House, that a minister introduces a government order and then the official Opposition has the right to reply. So while Your Honour was gracious in admitting his mistake, I would submit to Your Honour that the member for Menihek does not have the right to refuse leave. It would have been far simpler, as the Acting Government House Leader said, if he had given leave and that it had been understood by all of us that we were not setting a precedent.

The hon. the member for Menihek has not granted leave. I would submit to Your Honour that he does not have the right to withhold it, and that indeed the Leader of the Opposition, or whoever the spokesman is for the official Opposition, now has the right to reply. As a matter of fact, there is no point to move the adjournment of the debate at five-thirty on Thursday. Because if I am in the middle of a sentence at five-thirty and Your Honour so chooses, he can interrupt me and say, 'A motion to adjourn the House is now in order.'

What we are saying is absolutely correct, that the Leader of the Opposition now has the right to answer the government order that has been proposed, no leave required.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have heard the hon. member for Menihek. There are a couple of points I would like to make: If one refers to our rules of debate, in Standing Order 49 (2) there is no mention here that the Leader of the Opposition, as such, has the right to speak first.

The other point I would like make, and I accept what the hon. Leader of the Opposition says about time, but I would like to point out to him that as far as I understood about time, and again I may be wrong, in Hansard the hon. member for Menihek said, 'I adjourn the debate. We will pick it up tomorrow morning.' I said, 'It is 5:30 p.m.', not that it was after five-thirty, 'it is 5:30 p.m.'

So, unless the hon. member for Menihek gives way, I am forced to recognize him by right to speak to the debate now.

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I do not have a huge amount of comments substantially about the bill itself. The first thing I should say is we certainly support the setting up of legislation to regulate the aquaculture industry in the Province. I think probably the only negative thing we could say about the legislation itself is that perhaps it should have been in place several years earlier, and I do not think that that is a major criticism of it. It is an industry, as all members know, which is growing, and growing at an explosive rate,

perhaps. It is certainly legislation that we will need over the next the number of years, because I think myself as well as all members of the House, are very much looking forward to aquaculture being one of the major growth industries for the Province.

There is one point which I think should be made about it, Mr. Speaker: In talking to the manager of fish hatchery in Bay d'Espoir, some of the points that he made to me about the aquaculture industry are that we are in a position to be playing catch-up now. Quite frankly, we are considerably behind industries in Europe and we are behind industries in other parts of Atlantic Canada. I have been told by Jim Maine, who is the Provincial Leader of the New Democratic Party in Prince Edward Island, that the mussel farming industry in Prince Edward Island has now advanced so substantially that the equivalent Department of Rural Development is no longer in the business of lending money to the industry, that the commercial banks see it as such a viable operation that all funding that is necessary can now come from regular commercial sources.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday or Wednesday of this week, I was fortunate enough to talk to a gentleman from the West Coast of our Province who is also into mussel farming and this year intends to start marketing his first mussels from his operation on the West Coast. I am not sure if it is Flat Bay or one of the other areas, but it is in the Stephenville area. Quite frankly, I was quite surprised that he had the operation going, but was very pleased to hear it, because I, like all members of this House, am

eager to see this kind of an appropriate industry and appropriate technology take off in our Province.

But having said that, Mr. Speaker, I think there is a caution that we should put in here which is, that because the industry is growing so substantially across the world, especially in the Scandinavian countries, it now starts to threaten some of our traditional industries. I have been told by individuals in the industry that our commercial salmon fishery is quite frankly under attack by the domestic salmon farmers in the sense that they can produce a superior product, a high quality product on a regular, year round basis, and have developed a market so that the wild catching of salmon, if you want to put it that way, may suffer substantially as a result and we may have a difficult time marketing salmon in the future, whereas it was one of our high value species in the past.

Mr. Speaker, what that seems to indicate to me, and I have no severe argument from individuals to suggest that is not the case, is that we are forced to go into aquaculture. Because if we do not, we will lose the markets for the natural fishery that we have right now.

The other points that I would like to make about it, Mr. Speaker, are with regard to the provincial government's specific initiatives with regard to aquaculture which, several years ago, were highly lauded by myself and my party and other members of the House. The specific venture, of course, was the salmon hatchery put in place in Bay d'Espoir and which has been operating with the Development Association for the last number of

years and which is, I think, the classic model of development that this Province should follow. It is a high tech industry, it is at the leading edge of the kinds of industries that are being developed in the country, and it is a place where we are developing the kind of expertise we need in order to become world leaders in salmon farming and, indeed, in the farming of other species.

One of the things I should mention to members of the House is that the Bay d'Espoir salmon hatchery is now interested in moving into Arctic char. The intention there is to look at Arctic char as a species that can be farmed as well to produce the smolt, or whatever the small Arctic char are called - I believe smolt is probably the correct term - and then to farm them also in the Bay d'Espoir area and other areas.

In talking to knowledgeable individuals in this industry they also inform me that there are many other sites, including sites in St. Mary's Bay and other parts of the South Coast and the Southern Section of our Province, which also show extreme promise for farming various kinds of species.

I think one of the things that is a problem in our Province is that on other shores we have waters that are a little bit too cold in order to enable us to raise salmon, for one thing, on a continuous basis, but even in places on the East Coast and the Northeast Coast we have seen experiments to heat the water slightly in order to try and obtain those objectives, and maybe we will see more when this legislation is enacted.

Mr. Speaker, having said those

good things about the government's project - and indeed they are - I would have to say that the events of the last three or four months have become virtually a disaster and an example of the way in which you should not continue to develop. Instead of going ahead with the fish farmer's co-operatives which were being put together on the South Coast, this government, in a monumental example of lack of faith in Native Newfoundlanders and rural Newfoundlanders in particular, decided to bring in National Sea in what can only be described as a major takeover of the resource down there. Mr. Speaker, what they did is say to National Sea, If you come in and set up a salmon farming operation there, we will give you 60 per cent of the smolt being produced at the Bay d'Espoir salmon hatchery. Of course, giving them 60 per cent meant that there was only only 40 per cent left for the farmer's co-operatives which were being established there. Mr. Speaker, this was the wrong way to do it. It clearly indicated a bias on the part of this government for large companies they perceive to have some natural advantage over the individual producers and the co-operatives.

Yet, if you go back and look at the House Royal Commission, you will see that at the basic heart of the philosophy of that Commission is that we Newfoundlanders live a pluralistic lifestyle in rural communities that should be supplemented by enterprises like this. Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about the 252 individual recommendations, what I am talking about is the heart of the perspective of that royal commission. And the perspective

it was coming from and the thrust it wished to see advanced, were much more consistent with cooperatives and with small scale operations like that on a larger basis than with having a National Sea come in and gobble up - to use a fishing term - 60 per cent of the smolt coming out of that operation, virtually making it impossible for any more than one or two other ventures to succeed in that area when we could have had a half a dozen or so.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that difficulty was resolved, because it came to some sort of a head when National Sea said that they would pull out, that they would not go ahead in this particular operation. As a result of not going ahead, of course, we have the whole works now in slings. But some initiative was taken in that area and the 60,000 smolt that were ready to go out and had to go out in salt water, were taken out and put in the cages that were necessary in order to keep them living. But we now have an extremely precarious position where the individual farmer's co-operatives, which are going ahead with this development, do not have the financial resources to keep the salmon in place for the next twenty months in order to bring them to the seven pounds that are required for marketing, and unless there is provincial government help in that area, we have some major problems. And, Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about grants, I am talking about guaranteed loans. It seems to be the only help that is necessary now. There is a commercial viability to this project that is extremely important to recognize. The seven pound salmon, of course, once they are grown to full size, will be an excellent high quality,

high value product which will continue to keep the farmers in place. What is needed, if you want, is bridge financing for the next two or three years in order to get them going. What has happened, of course, is that we now have the whole thing in slings; we do not know where it is going to go, we do not know what the progress of it will be, and primarily this government's total incompetence when it came to setting up the next stages of this operation that has been the problem. Of course, Mr. Speaker, if we get a major negative experience in Bay d'Espoir it will put a damper on the entire aquaculture industry, an industry that in the future, I believe, will provide more jobs than our entire agricultural industry - quite frankly, that is not a very difficult thing to do at this point - and will start competing with our primary fishing industry and our fish processing industry in terms of the number of people who are capable of being employed.

Mr. Speaker, aquaculture is the industry we should go into for the number of reasons that I will put forward:

First, we have natural advantages in that industry. We are surrounded by sea water. Sometimes that is a major liability when it comes to transportation, but other times it is a major advantage when it comes to being able to use that resource in order to farm fish.

Secondly, we are familiar with fishing and we are familiar with the kind of rural lifestyle that is necessary in order to feed fish in cages that are in the Bay and so on.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, we are used to marketing fish. We have companies that have done that for years.

We have, in short, Mr. Speaker, all the kinds of things that will make us world class fish farmers for the next hundreds and hundreds of years, and it is, Mr. Speaker, in that area that I believe some of our major development efforts are going.

I want to talk for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, about the other projects that this government has been pursuing and why I think they are making a mistake in doing them versus more in terms of aquaculture. In the aquaculture industry I believe we have a winner. I believe and most economists believe that we have a winner, so do the biologists who are working there. Every one of the specialists in the field believe that we have the resources necessary to be world class leaders in aquaculture.

We are substantially behind the Scandinavian countries and behind other Atlantic provinces, but we have such major natural advantages, that somewhere along the line we may be able to catch up and indeed by-pass them in the future. We have, as everybody knows, the Marine Institute here which is developing the expertise in terms of fish farming and will hopefully be a major resource to be used in that area.

Mr. Speaker, what are we looking at in terms of development projects from this government? Well, we are now looking, believe it or not, at an 8.4 acre greenhouse project that the provincial government has put forward in the interest of

creating 150 permanent jobs - admittedly, a couple of hundred reassembling the project, but at least 150 permanent jobs afterwards. Mr. Speaker, how much money are we putting into it? Well, that is a question of debate. We are certainly liable for \$11.4 million if it collapses, and on that basis, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about incredible amounts of money for the 150 jobs we are talking about. My estimate is that it is somewhere in the neighbourhood of at least \$75,000 per job.

What are the other development alternatives? Well, Mr. Speaker, looking at the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, we have found in recent years that in their sawmill programme they are capable of producing jobs for a little over \$1000 each. In other words, if every job produced by Sprung was put into sawmilling, we could produce seventy five. In the loan and grant programme operated by the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development \$5000 to \$6000 is necessary in order to establish a new job. In other words, Mr. Speaker, for every job that is created in this Sprung greenhouse project, we could create fifteen in these areas. What I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, is if we were to take \$11.4 million in equity and loan guarantees and divert them to aquaculture and the generating of aquaculture industries in this Province, it is my guess that we would produce thousands of jobs, not the mythical 150 that the government says. Mr. Speaker, when all the arguments about the greenhouse project are finished, this is what it comes down to: If it is successful - I say if because I do

not believe, not for a minute, that it will be a success in the long-term - we have invested or exposed the credit of the Province to the tune of \$75,000 for each job. If we were to take that \$11.4 million and pour it into aquaculture development, we would make long strides in catching up with the Scandinavian countries and other Atlantic provinces in an industry that we know we have all the advantages in, not some, quite frankly, harebrained scheme that does not look like it has any chance of success whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, we just got a bit of additional information this morning that I would like to read into the record today. We have been told by the media -

AN HON. MEMBER:

A good source.

MR. FENWICK:

Well, it is an interesting one. We have been told by the media that the Sprung greenhouse project that we are going to work on now has some major financial problems back in Calgary. We understand that the city of Calgary has now seized the assets of Sprung, and the greenhouse, for non-payment of \$350,000 in back taxes. The question, Mr. Speaker, is this: If they have seized the greenhouse structure that they were dismantling to bring here, what will be the progress of the Sprung greenhouse project if they cannot bring the structure here and it is tied up in litigation for perhaps six or eight months? So, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying to you is that not only -

MR. FUREY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. FUREY:

I wonder if the Leader of the NDP would care to tell the House which media it was that gave that information?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

It is not exactly a point of order, but the fact is it came from Broadcast News. It was on the radio this morning, but we just have gotten the information, otherwise, we would have asked about it in Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

The point is what does that prove to you? Here we have a company that allegedly has a 100 year history of producing all sorts of stuff, that has been purported to be by our government a strong, financially successful organization with all kinds of competence and \$35 million worth of research, and now we find for the lack of a mere pittance in comparison to the \$18 million, it has its whole project up in slings. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, it starts to smack of an adventuring company that was in major financial difficulty in Calgary and luckily had our provincial government to bail it out under the most generous terms possibly imaginable.

But, Mr. Speaker, in order to

bring it back to the bill that we are discussing, since we want to make it reasonably relevant, what I am saying to you is that aquaculture is the kind of industry that the House Royal Commission pointed out we should be developing.

Aquaculture is something that we have a natural advantage in. We know where the ocean is. We know how fish swim in the ocean. We know how to feed them in the ocean. We know how to grow them in the ocean. And, Mr. Speaker, once it is over, we know how to market fish, which is what we have been doing for hundreds of years, and that is another advantage we have over trying to market cucumbers God knows where. Mr. Speaker, all of the elements required to produce a successful industry are there. What is lacking are the funds to do it properly. If we were to take the \$11.4 million that we are frittering into this incredible project and put it into an aquaculture industry, we would make major strides in catching up with the industry in the rest of Atlantic Canada, with the Scandinavian industries and with putting us on the road to creating not just a couple of hundred very temporary jobs in this greenhouse project, but thousands of jobs that will see in the long term in an industry that we are good at, that we will develop, and we will eventually be able to bring ourselves to a degree of prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself, on behalf of my colleague here, and on behalf of our party on both levels, we heartily endorse this legislation to establish an aquaculture industry in this Province. We believe that if the

government was not so foolish in its other projects, we would actually have enough funding to do something, and that in the long run we would be able to produce the thousands of jobs we need in order to employ Newfoundlanders all across the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I sit down saying that I think it is a great piece of legislation and hopefully we will be able to use it to do the things we want to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a point of order -

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

- so that the hon. member's time will not be taken up with the point of order. The point of order deals with the matter that was dealt with earlier in the House by the Speaker with reference to who should be acknowledged as the replier to the bill presented by my colleague the Minister of Fisheries. I will not go into that dispute because the Speaker has already dealt with that in a way that I understand was more or less an anomaly in which the Speaker more or less indicated that there was an error on his part. So that has been accepted and understood.

My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that we have to ensure that what transpired today is not seen as a precedent setting ruling by the Chair. Even if the rules do not specifically say that a member of

the Opposition would be the official replier, it certainly has been the practice and the tradition that a member of the Official Opposition be the official replier to a government bill. I would not want the member for Menihek, for example, to get up on some future occasion and be recognized and argue that it is no longer the practice and tradition because, in fact, 'you recognized us on May 29, as the official lead off responder to a government bill.'

I want to raise the point of order in the hope that Your Honour will confer with the Speaker and with others and give us a ruling, perhaps on Monday or whatever, to ensure that the ruling or what transpired here today is not accepted as a precedent setting ruling, that, in fact, the correct practices and traditions of this House for the last many, many years has always been that the member responding to a government motion or a government bill is, in fact, a member of the Official Opposition, notwithstanding what transpired earlier today. That is the reason I raise the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I think if you go back and check Hansard you will find that whoever the Acting House Leader is today is not quite correct. If you look back you will see previous examples, where actually there has been a budget debate where the Minister of

Finance presented his budget and the initial response was not by a member of the official Opposition but by an independent member, at that time, who not only got to respond to it but got the unlimited time required. You are obviously going to have to check the precedents and so on, but I think you will find that the rules of order are quite clear that it is the next member to get up from the Opposition, - and that is generically the official Opposition and what other caucus and what other independents are there. The hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) is trying to establish a precedent if he is asking you to rule that it has to be someone from the official Opposition when, indeed, the precedents very clearly state that it does not have to be, it is whatever other member is recognized next, whether they be from the official Opposition or any other caucus in the House.

MR. TULK:

Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I am glad to see we have become the third party in the House when it comes to replying to points of order and so on, regardless of who is involved in them.

Mr. Speaker, let me, first of all, support the Acting Government House Leader, the member for Grand Falls, who is absolutely right. The precedent that the member for Menihek refers to is a budget debate, it is not a government bill. I would add to what the member for Grand Falls has said by

saying that it is the practice in this Legislature, it is tradition in this Legislature, it is a precedent of this Legislature that when a minister, whoever he happens to be, speaks in introducing his bill - he has an hour to introduce it - not only do you recognize the official Opposition, you recognize the official spokesman from the official Opposition.

I believe the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) was out of the House, he could not be here, so the Leader of the Opposition rose in his place, which is also normal practice, to speak in reply to the minister. It is very important, as the member for Grand Falls says, that even though we have had this ruling this morning that it not be established as a tradition, and that whoever chooses to rise on the Opposition side of the House, regardless of whether he is official Opposition or not, has the right to be recognized over the official spokesman for the official Opposition, or the Leader of the Opposition, or a designate of the official spokesman.

So I would ask, as the member for Grand Falls has said, that we not establish this as a precedent and that Your Honour would consider the matter and bring us back a ruling at the earliest possible opportunity, whether that be Monday or Tuesday.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I will take it under advisement and I will rule on that at my earliest convenience.

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands to a point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I shall have to rise on another one now in that case. I want to make just one final contribution to it with respect to the comments made by the member for Menihek on a so-called precedent that occurred many moons ago, I suspect. I do not know when it was. When did we have independents? Back in 1974, or something?

MR. SIMMONS:

Steve Neary was the one.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes. That would have been back in 1974 or 1975. So that is ten or twelve years ago.

I want to point out to him, Mr. Speaker, that we have Standing Orders now that were revised and amended in 1979. These are the Standing Orders of the House of Assembly that we go by. Certainly, to my recollection, there has not been a breach from that practice and tradition that I referred to earlier, certainly since 1979, in the last eight or nine years. I want to make that point.

The second point I want to make is whatever he is referring to referred to a budget speech. I am talking specifically about government bills right now, this morning, with reference to the bill we have before us. I just want to make those two points.

MR. FENWICK:

One final comment on that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I think the precedent is clearly established in the case which the minister has mentioned. He also should mention that although the rules of order were adopted in 1979, they were adopted in a condition in which there were only two parties in the House of Assembly. I think it is very important to recognize that as of November, 1984, that situation changed, and as of, I think February or March of 1987, it changed with the Speaker's ruling that there was another legitimate caucus in this House. So, on that basis I would suggest that he not rely too heavily on the rules of order. Besides, the rules of order support our position, that it is any member, so I am not worried about that particular part of it. But I would suggest that a lot more be taken into account than just the simplistic rationalizations from the member for Grand Falls, because, in fact, situations have changed.

The rules, themselves, are clearly supportive of our position. But I think the precedent should not be delved at too quickly, because to look at precedents at a time when there was only a government side and an official Opposition and nobody else in the House clearly does not give any instructions whatsoever to the Speaker, so it should be a case of only situations since there has been another official caucus here that one should look at.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I must rise once again.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

Just to pick up on what the member for Menihek said, that as of November there was recognition of his party, or a third party in the House. My recollection of the ruling of that day was simply that members in that caucus would have the right to respond to Ministerial Statements. Now, that is the only recollection I have, nothing more, nothing less. The hon. member for Menihek obviously wants to give that a broader interpretation to try to give the public the impression that they are fully recognized and all that stuff. That is not my recollection of it and I do not think that is the case, they are simply recognized to respond to Ministerial Statements.

With respect to his other point, the fact that the Standing Orders were developed when there were only two parties in the House, so what? That is irrelevant. These are our Standing Orders of the Legislature. The hon. members are members of the Legislature and they should respect the Standing Orders the same as every other member does. My point is: Since the Standing Orders - the first time ever - were brought in, upgraded, revised and amended, there has not been any precedent setting ruling whereby a member other than the official Opposition has responded to a government motion or a government bill. There has not been an occasion such as that.

What happened today, as the Speaker himself said I believe, there was an error on his part which he admitted to and we just decided to proceed along. I just want to make sure that it does not become a precedent setting ruling, and I ask the Speaker to look into

that.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, it is amusing to listen to the member for Menihek, because he is the person who made the following statements: One last June on the NATO thing, "We have had time enough on this, let us get on with it", then this Spring he got up and said, "We have not had enough time, let us slow it up some more." So his record on consistency is not one that we should spend much time on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he may say that it is snowing out there, but that does not make it snow, and he may say there were only two parties in the House. I remind him that in 1975 we had three separate parliamentary groups recognized here and Mr. Smallwood led one of those groups, the Liberal Reform group. Before that we had Mr. Martin from the New Labrador Party sitting here, down in the Corner, and years before that we had Gus Duffy and the boys sit down there in the United Newfoundland Party, going back to 1959. So this idea that somehow creation began the day a bunch of transient people up in Menihek made the mistake of sending the tourist from Port au Port here -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I think that that is a gratuitous

insult to the people of my district.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The Leader of the Opposition is on a point of order.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, it is not appropriate for the Leader of the Opposition or any member of this House to insult the constituents of a district. I consider calling my constituents 'transient people of Menihek' to be an insult to all the people of my district and I am asking the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that.

DR. COLLINS:
To that point of privilege, MR. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Again the hon. member gets up on a point of order. He is quite out of order in doing so, so he says, "I will make it a point of privilege." A point of privilege is not a frivolous thing. If the hon. member has another point of order to bring up, he brings it up after the point of order on the floor is disposed of, he does not then turn it into a point of privilege.

Now, I am quite sure that the hon. member for Menihek thinks, oh, well, that is all right for

everyone else but not for me, because that is the way he thinks. Rules, regulations, laws, nothing applies when he wants his own way and it is ridiculous that he should be allowed to carry on like that in this House.

MR. FUREY:
To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the New Democratic Party is reacting with a knee-jerk reaction once again. Nobody in this Chamber need take lessons from the Leader of the New Democratic Party about responsibility and attacking the person or persons of people in this Chamber. We only had to see on CBC television a week or so ago a letter which was made public attacking the very institution, the very dignity of the Chair, where this particular leader called into question the Speaker as Chairman of the Internal Economy Commission, but went on to talk about the Speaker throughout the letter, about the Speaker being a private doctor and about the Speaker having private land holdings, as though there were some crime in that. I have never heard the Speaker or any member here attack him as a teacher, or attack his greenhouse in Port au Port. So nobody in this Chamber has to take lessons from that socialist about attacks on people's person.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of privilege, there is no prima facie case.

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition, on a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I was saying, and Statistics Canada will support me - now this does not mean that the member for Menihek is aware of this, because basic information is not his stock in trade. But, Mr. Speaker, Statistics Canada quite recently indicated that the population of Menihek district is quite transient. I do not think he can argue that point.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is true. That is true.

MR. FENWICK:

Maybe because a thousand of them got laid off.

MR. SIMMONS:

He does not object to the fact now, he wants to rationalize why it happened. I never said why it happened. I think what he wants to say is that it did not happen because he became the member. That may well be the case. Perhaps they left for other reasons. I would suggest that his becoming their member would be a fairly powerful reason for leaving, but that is another issue altogether.

What I want to do, Mr. Speaker, in rising to my point of order, is first of all dismiss the notion that somehow these rules are for a two-party House. They are for a House. There are no parties in this House. It talks about two sides of the House, and I think anybody who understands basic architecture will recognize that there are two sides to this House. I think that is a fair comment on what is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I refer hon. gentleman to page 49 of

Beauchesne, Paragraph 157 (1), because this supports, I would submit to the gentleman for Grand Falls, the point he has been making this morning in his point of order, Paragraph 157 (1), found on page 49 of the Fifth Edition of Beauchesne. And I will not read the whole thing, but if you come down towards the end of that Paragraph you will find this sentence: 'The Leader of the Opposition is, by custom, accorded certain particular rights in asking questions of Ministers.' And then this sentence, Mr. Speaker: 'Official Opposition spokesmen are also given some precedence in asking questions and in debate - and in debate.' Now, Mr. Speaker, there is the Beauchesne authority right there. As much as the gentleman for Menihek would like to think he is the Official Opposition, etc., he is not part of the Official Opposition. We would entertain his application, though I cannot guarantee what the - yes, I can guarantee what the results will be. On second thought, I can.

One of the criteria that we insist on for people coming into our caucus is that they stand somewhere, and I can tell him now, before he submits the application, that it would be an invalid application on those grounds alone. We need somebody who stands somewhere.

Mr. Speaker, the point of order that the gentleman for Grand Falls just raised relates to the precedent -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Could we have order, please.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

The point that the gentleman for Grand Falls was making is the concern he has about the precedent that is being set here. Now, I would rather be saying the following things when the Speaker is in the Chair, so I shall say them very gently. One of the things we have to do to avoid what happened here yesterday evening is have a clear-cut procedure, and I think the procedure is in the Standing Orders. I do not think we have to write new rules. Mr. Speaker, I cannot seem to put my hand on the Standing Orders now, but in 31 (h) of the Standing Orders it provides that 'At 5:30 P.M...' Now, that presumes that the gentleman sitting in the Chair has a clock in front of them - which he has - and that he is governed by what that clock says. At 5:30 yesterday afternoon, Mr. Speaker, the minister was still talking but he then clued up. It being 5:30, I did not interject. When the Speaker announces in the transcript that it is 5:30, it is, I submit to him, two or three minutes past 5:30. So if the error was committed - and this is not to be unkind to the Speaker. All of us can commit those kinds of errors - it was that at 5:30 he did not direct the House to that fact and get on with the next item. There is nothing in the Standing Orders saying that anybody has to adjourn the debate at 5:30. That is point number one.

Point number two is this: When a government minister has introduced a government order and it is then time for a person to respond, Standing Order 157 (1) clearly indicates that it is a spokesman for the Official Opposition who

shall have precedence in that matter.

I submit to you that two errors were made yesterday: One, in not changing the order of business at 5:30 p.m. as required by the Standing Orders; and, two, the error that was compounded today by not recognizing that it is the spokesman for the official Opposition who has precedence in responding to the government order. Now, that second one is important, Mr. Speaker, and I am delighted with the comments that have been made by the gentleman for Grand Falls; because it is very important or else we are going to undermine the whole rules of this House if we allow this to become a precedent. So I support him in his point of order.

MR. FENWICK:

Just a final comment, Mr. Speaker, just to respond to the points that the Leader of the Opposition raised.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this a point of order?

MR. FENWICK:

I am not going to enter into the other part of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

What I just wanted to remind the Speaker of, prior to making his ruling, is that we obviously know that the precedent of the documents in terms of setting the precedent is, that the Standing Orders are first, precedents of the House of Assembly, second, and Béauchesne is third; I believe there are some others after that but I do not think I have to remind the Speaker or the Chair of

that at all. Even given that, if you look at Beauchesne, on Page 49, you will see clearly that the official Opposition spokesmen are given some precedence in asking questions and in debate. Some precedence does not define it, does not say that they have to respond immediately, so it is undefined in that sense. So from that point of view I suggest that the official Opposition's argument is not particularly relevant.

The other thing is that I think that the ruling is Standing Order 49 (2), where it says, 'The Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, a minister moving a government order and a member' - with a small 'm' in the front - 'replying thereto and immediately after such minister.' It says a member. It does not say a member of the official Opposition, and I think that very clearly establishes the fact that the response can come from any member, obviously of the Opposition but any member, whether it is an Independent, a member of a caucus or not. So on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I await your ruling with a considerable amount of confidence.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I really cannot rule on the last point of order without ruling on the previous point of order, which I said I would rule on at my earliest convenience.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a

few words on this Bill No. 11, "An Act Respecting The Encouragement And Regulation Of An Aquaculture Industry In The Province."

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be perfectly in order for me to offer my compliments to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) for what I consider the excellent job which he and his department are doing in the promotion of aquaculture in this Province. Mr. Speaker, I have often said that I have to think twice if ever perchance I were offered the job as Minister of Fisheries, because I believe it is probably the most difficult portfolio that is in this government today - the most difficult portfolio. Quite honestly, and I genuinely mean this, I say that the minister is doing what I consider to be an excellent job as Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, just last Summer I was steaming up Canada Bay after dark in my boat and as I was getting closer to the wharf in Roddickton, I turned on my searchlight to scan the shore to make sure I was not going into anybody's nets or not going to strike some object, and in a cove just outside of Roddickton I saw what looked like hundreds of sea gulls on the water in this little cove. I said that is a funny thing for sea gulls to be out after dark, and I attributed it to the fact that offal from the crab plant was being dumped there. So I did not go in close, I did not have time. But the next morning I enquired around. I was told that what I saw was a mussel farm of some local people in Roddickton, which has not been known at all as a fishing community. Traditionally it has been a logging community,

and I believe there is a future in logging. But here is an opportunity, that I am speaking highly of, for another industry to be introduced to what has traditionally been a one-industry town. Since last year I have had opportunity to speak on several occasions to the person who is carrying out this experiment in Trap Cove, near Roddickton. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this fellow is going somewhere. I believe that he is going to bring his first harvest in, I think next year. He will get his first harvest of mussels. I think that he is onto something.

I also believe that Canada Bay is probably one of the better bays in this Province to carry out aquaculture farming as is Hare Bay, which is also in the Strait of Belle Isle district. For the benefit of members, who I am sure already have some knowledge of this industry, it is important that there be no drift ice. If your gear is put up and the drift ice comes in, of course you have ruined your mussel lines totally, and everything else. Canada Bay and Hare Bay very rarely, almost never, get any drift ice because both of these bays are far enough North that they freeze solid during the Winter, and they have to thaw out, Nature has to thaw them out. So, therefore, there is no danger that the mussel lines will be dragged away or that the gear will be torn up. I would caution the minister, though, that maybe the day is going to come when Hare Bay and Canada Bay, and any other of those bays around the Province where mussel farming is going on, that such bays be not cut out by icebreakers in the Spring of the year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I wish the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands would not disturb the Minister of Fisheries, because I think there are a lot of points I am making that I think he should hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

What has been happening to Hare Bay and Canada Bay, Mr. Speaker, over the last few years is that the icebreakers have been going in and cutting out the bay and, when the bay ice is cut out, this allows the drift ice to come in and to destroy some of the gear which normally would not have been destroyed. So I would caution the minister that maybe in years to come, as the industry increases, that we be a little more careful, a little more cautious, in just allowing the Canadian Coast Guard to go in and indiscriminately cut those bays out.

Now, it was quite alright a few years ago when people wanted to get out. But in Canada Bay, for example, mostly it has been just for pleasure they want to get out. In Hare Bay it is mostly just for pleasure. There was no great hardship going to be imposed on people because the bay was not cut out. But if there is an aquaculture farm there, if there is mussel farming there, then we have to be very careful that these bays are not cut out and drift ice is not allowed to come in.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is indeed a bright future for aquaculture in this Province. I do believe that the day will come when there will be hundreds and

even thousands of farmers in Newfoundland, but they will be fish farmers. They will be farming salmon, they will be farming mussels, and I suppose maybe the minister can tell us about that when he gets up. I do not know what is going on with the farming of lobsters in the world but I would assume lobsters can be farmed. We saw what happened to the salmon industry. Last Summer I bought salmon in St. Anthony for \$1.25 a pound - fifteen to twenty pound salmon which came down from Labrador. The reason it was so cheap, I understand, is because the market for salmon has been interfered with because of salmon farming around the world. But this is nothing for us to be afraid of, Mr. Speaker. We can farm salmon as well as New Brunswick, as well as Norway. So let us not think that because some other people in the world are farming salmon it is going to ruin us totally. No. We will get on with their technology, we will farm salmon as well.

But the thing I would also like for the minister to consider, and I am sure he will, is that when we see all those farms around Newfoundland - the mussel farms, the lobster farms, and the salmon farms - that we not send out raw materials, that we not send out mussels in the shell or mussels that are taken out of the shell, but when we ship out from this Province we should be shipping out a finished product. In keeping with the mussel farm which is now in Canada Bay, the mussel farm, which I understand, is out in the district of my colleague, out in Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), and the other mussel farms which are around this Province, when they begin to come onstream, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that there

would be encouragement there so that they can be processed to the final stage where they are ready for consumption. Now, that is what has to be done with the mussels, with the lobsters, and whatever we send out of this Province. It has to be processed to its final stage and I would so encourage the minister. I am sure that this could be taken care of so that there will be encouragement there to process what we produce.

I understand my time has pretty well run out and having said these few words, I thank this House and the Speaker.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

I regret not having been here yesterday to speak on behalf of the official Opposition when the minister introduced this Bill. I would like to complement the minister on the presentation of this Bill, Bill 11. I think that aquaculture is going to add an entirely new and a very exciting dimension to fisheries in this Province and in this country. I am glad that Newfoundlanders and Newfoundland will be, hopefully, in the forefront of helping to develop that new technology and to be able to take advantage of the results. I do have some reservations, Mr. Speaker, about the Bill. It is certainly not a reflection on the principle of the Bill or the intent, but having read through it just a few minutes ago, and having just scanned over it previously, I am a little

concerned that maybe it is has become almost bureaucratic, and we all know, of course, what happens if you allow the bureaucracy to run rampant. Then, sometimes, even the best intentions can be strangled.

We all know, of course, that in Newfoundland today we already have too much bureaucratic red tape that is having a strangling effect, especially on small businesses. That is the only fear I have, that the Bill is in fact a bit too bureaucratic, that the regulations are too rigid, and that it will become a nightmare for some of our young and maybe less experienced entrepreneurs who want to get involved in that sector of the fishery.

For example, I notice in the Bill here that the minister talks about aquaculture inspectors and giving those people the right to enter a facility in which aquaculture is being carried on. Now, I, Mr. Speaker, am not so naive to think that you can administer this sort of thing without having regulations and inspectors. I do not know what it is, but I have a fear of bureaucracies. Maybe having served in the capacity that my hon. friend is now serving I have reason to make that statement. I know how overbearing bureaucrats can pyramid, can create little empires for themselves, and I have seen it happen. I think that is one of the nightmares of a minister, especially in fisheries, who must contend, and not allow that to happen. I can see this as being a real dream for the bureaucracy, and I hope the minister would, maybe, take a look at some of these requirements.

I notice in the bill too, page 10,

section (4), Mr. Speaker, requires people engaged in aquaculture to 'provide information, documents and samples and carry out the tests and examinations that an aquaculture inspector may reasonably require.'

Well, of course, with people involved in aquaculture, I suppose there is a certain degree of confidentiality expected. They are in some cases developing new technology and they will want to be reasonably well assured by the government, by this House and by the minister, that any information gathered by one of these all-powerful inspectors, will not be passed on to competitors, for example. I imagine there is a certain amount of technological intelligence that goes on. I know in industry you have industrial spies who are endeavouring to get information concerning the product and then maybe pass it on for one's gain to another such enterprise. I think that people involved in aquaculture will want to be reasonably well assured that these inspectors can be trusted with that intelligence, with that information, and they not end up, for example, on the desk of a competitor. Because under this act an inspector does have substantial power.

For example, I said a moment ago they can enter a aquaculture facility, except for a dwelling house, for the purpose of inspecting the aquaculture. They can enter lands, buildings, or other enclosures on that land, and they have a lot of authority and a lot of power. Therefore, I believe that the type people we employ as inspectors will have to be beyond reproach in terms of their commitment to their jobs and to the people whom they are

serving.

I, too, Mr. Speaker, as does the hon. the member for the Straits, have an aquaculture facility in my district. In fact I am rather proud of it, although I have not had any real opportunity to assist the operators, but they are doing well. I understand that they have already harvested one crop of mussels. It was a successful harvest and they are looking forward to another harvest soon.

So it is a technology that is going to catch on in this Province. I have had the privilege of visiting for example salmon farms in Norway and Denmark. I believe maybe the Treasury Board Minister (Mr. Windsor) was there at the same time. But, anyway, I was very impressed with the scope of those projects and I thought then, and I continue to believe, that there is nothing they are doing in Norway for example, or Denmark that cannot be done in Newfoundland in terms of aquaculture. So I think we are onto a good thing, Mr. Speaker, and I think the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) also made a good point in that once we develop this kind of technology and this kind of aquaculture fishery, then we should almost make a law that will be concomitant with this one, that the produce from these farms be brought to their final processing in this Province.

In recent years we have seen a lot of promise, for example, with respect to lump roe, and today the lump roe fishery has become a very lucrative fishery. In fact I believe the price being paid fishermen this year is three or four times what they were used to getting for lump roe, \$1.90 a

pound or something.

MR. RIDEOUT:

It is \$2.00 now.

MR. W. CARTER:

Two dollars a pound the minister tells me. Well, I recall last year there was a price war in my district, in Twillingate district, where one lump roe buyer wanted to pay seventy-five cents a pound, and the other buyer felt that he was being taken unfair advantage of because he could only afford to pay fifty cents a pound.

MR. TULK:

The strange thing about that is that the same people are trying to take advantage all the time.

MR. W. CARTER:

That is right. But now they are getting \$1.75 and \$2.00 a pound for lump roe.

MR. RIDEOUT:

\$1.70 is probably the lowest.

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, \$1.70 is about the lowest. That figure was being bandied around about two weeks ago.

The unfortunate part about it, Mr. Speaker, is that while lump roe has become an important sector of the fishery in Newfoundland there is very little employment created by virtue of its processing. I see no reason, for example, why lump roe could not be processed in this Province. They tell me that it is taken to other countries and processed. A little one or two ounce container of lump roe today sells for a very handsome sum of money. Surely we have the wherewithal in this Province to be able to come up with the technology that is necessary in order to bring lump roe to its

final processing. The same thing can be said for mussels and other things that will no doubt be harvested by virtue of this new act that we are debating here this morning.

My colleague here mentioned about lobsters, and the possibility of having lobsters, for example, raised under aquaculture conditions. I can tell him now that there is a pond in the district of St. Mary's - The Capes a magnificent body of water, called the Holyrood Pond, that is probably one of the biggest inland ponds of its kind in the Province. It is a salt water pond with a very small inlet in the community of St. Vincent's. I am told that maybe 100 years ago a certain gentleman, who came over here from Europe, was engaged in the raising and harvesting of lobsters in that lake of salt water. I think that that area would present excellent opportunities for anybody who wanted to get involved in aquaculture. It is an ocean of water.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is fresh water now, is it not?

MR. W. CARTER:

No, I think the further inland you go the fresher the water is. It is a lake about twenty miles long and I am told that it is very, very deep. It is almost bottomless. A lot of fishermen in St. Mary's Bay, for example, harvest a lot of herring there. Herring comes in through this very narrow inlet. When the herring is in then they bar off the inlet and keep the herring in until it is harvested and then they dreg out the inlet and allow others to come and go as they see fit. But certainly, to my way of thinking,

is has a lot of potential. I think the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn), the Minister of Education, should maybe give some thought to having some studies undertaken that would indicate what I consider, at least, to be the fantastic potential of that particular area in terms of aquaculture.

So these are my only comments, Mr. Speaker, concerns that maybe the minister can address when he closes the debate on the bill. My concern is that maybe it a bit too bureaucratic. I can understand the need for regulations, keeping a tight control on what is happening, but sometimes I think we overdo it. If I were a young, rural Newfoundlander today wanting to get involved in aquaculture, I would, having read that bill, be somewhat discouraged, because there are some far-reaching regulations in the bill itself.

I did not get time to digest all of it, Mr. Speaker, but certainly I think in some cases it is a bit too rigid and it can very well be abused if we are not careful. Nevertheless, it is a good bill.

Like I said, I think aquaculture is the new dimension that is upon us in fishery development, and I am glad that the department is now taking it seriously and starting to do what has got to be done. Again, I compliment the minister for what he is doing in that respect.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question? Question?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! All those in favour of -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just some short comments, Mr. Speaker, on the bill. I echo the sentiments of my colleague and the fisheries critic for the Opposition, the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) about welcoming the bill, but also some concerns that he has expressed about maybe too many regulations. That is always a concern when you bring in legislation and bring into the act of a new industry where people are looking to get into the industry, looking to expand and looking to start businesses. I share the sentiments of my colleague.

In Section 9 (2) on page 12 of the act, it talks about the different regulations you have to meet. I would hope that, while we have to make sure that those regulations are met, the paper work is kept at a minimum so that these people who are going to be attempting to get into the business will be able to go on and promote it and get into it without having to hear the age old story of getting into the battle of the bureaucracy and not getting the business of the ground.

In looking it over I do not think that will be a major problem, but there is always a chance in dealing with the different departments, the more departments you have to deal with, sometimes the more difficult it gets. I

would ask when the minister is promoting this type of business activity that people should get into that promotes the energy that they should take on and that they should seek and if they have any problems, to call the minister and his officials directly so that they can undertake and get into this business.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up listening to a song by Dick Nolan and the song was 'By the sea, the sea, the wonderful sea,' thank God we are surrounded by water. I want to say, when welcoming the bill, the Prairies have land to farm, Mr. Speaker, and many times they are always screaming for help and they are always screaming for monies to bale them out and so on. We have in Newfoundland and Labrador, in Atlantic Canada, we have the sea to farm and water to farm.

I would ask the minister when we are pumping money and we are trying to get as much funding as we can into the aquaculture industry that presentations be made to the federal government so that they are aware that the opportunities presented by aquaculture are numerous, are large and can mean much economic development to rural Newfoundland and to the Province. They should look at providing financial resources to that effect. Many times we are down here and our sea resource is not looked upon as the priaries are in Western Canada.

So I bring this to his attention because I think this is an opportunity for the Province and people around to develop an industry which has great employment opportunities, which has an opportunity to see the development of an industry which can keep people in rural

Newfoundland and which can create a great deal of employment. But it has to be promoted in the right manner. The proper mechanisms have to be set up so that the accessing of financial support for the business enterprise can be followed through. I would ask the minister that these concerns be addressed.

I looked at terms in the act such as sea ranching. That is a very interesting term. It is a new term that is being put on the horizon of the Province for people to digest and take on. I think it is a welcomed terminology and it is a new type of business opportunity that people should be going after. We welcome the act in many ways.

But the concerns of dealing with the bureaucracy have to be stated as strongly as possible because too often people do not go as far as they should and carry on their will power to put the business in place because they run into too many hassles. I hope the minister will try to make sure that that does not occur.

Also, in looking at the bringing in of the act, it is really the first piece of legislation in the last few weeks that I have seen that has really been something concrete that is going to address the problems out there in rural Newfoundland and will try to create some opportunities. It is also from the House Royal Commission were many recommendations were made on aquaculture. At least this is one example of where that is being followed or being looked upon as a good, possible future employment sector, and the government has taken some action.

So I look forward to seeing the aquaculture industry move ahead. I know in visiting the Port au Port Peninsula, as I do many times, in talking to the Port au Port Economic Development Association, they are getting excited about some future employment opportunities and businesses in the aquaculture field. I look forward to seeing the minister's department helping these Economic Development Associations around the Province to get this industry off the ground, because I feel it is the major route to go, getting the Economic Development Associations totally involved. Co-operative Development is also a route I feel, Mr. Speaker, that should be looked upon as one way and one mechanism to get more people involved in the development of the resource.

I do not have too many other comments, Mr. Speaker. I welcome it and I echo the sentiments of Dick Nolan, 'Thank God we are surrounded by water.'

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take any longer than perhaps three of four minutes.

MR. POWER:

Thank God.

MR. TULK:

Oh, darling, you are back! Where have you been?

MR. SIMMONS:

Out selling off his skidoo.

MR. TULK:

No, he is still down trying to get the nomination in St. John's East opened up.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask the minister - perhaps he addressed it yesterday, I was not here in the House when he introduced the bill - if he would address a couple of issues in regard to aquaculture when he is closing the debate on the bill. I say to him, I support the bill, but the bill is a piece of legislation which highlights the aquaculture industry and the potential it has for Newfoundland. It will not guarantee, as the minister knows, and as I am sure he will admit, that there will be an aquaculture industry developed to its fullest potential in Newfoundland.

One of the arguments of contention and one of the things that people are not so sure about, Rural Development Associations and so on and people who are interested in this industry - take, for example, the mussel industry, they are not so sure, and there has been no clear indication, as I understand it, made, of natural areas of the Province where certain things can be carried out.

I would ask the minister if, in his reply in closing the debate, he would indeed point out to us just what the bent of the government is, the Department of Fisheries and the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, in pinpointing natural locations around the Province where certain types of aquaculture - the minister is going to be the dirt Fisheries Minister, he is going to grow fish. I almost said agriculture. Would he say if the government intends to set out and pinpoint

the locations, through studies, of various areas in the Province where certain types of aquaculture can be carried on?

I will give the minister an example. I have carried on an argument with the Rural Development Association in my area that there is one area of my district where they could do mussel farming. They tell me the area is not there. I was ten years old when I knew the place, when I knew the depth of water and so on, and the shelter that was around that piece of water. What I am saying to the minister is that it would aid people tremendously, private investors, co-ops, Rural Development Associations, if around this Province we said, 'All right, here are the natural areas where it is possible to do certain types of aquaculture.'

There is also another important issue that the minister will have to face, and we will have to face, in this Province in aquaculture, and that is the relationship - my friend from Stephenville mentioned to some extent with the bureaucracy - between the Department of Rural, Aquacultural and Northern Development, the Department of RAND and the minister's own department, that relationship. Often times the Rural Development Associations in this Province find themselves in the position where it is completely unclear as to who has the final say about certain developments.

I say to the minister that we should be very, very careful as to whether we leave this to the bureaucracy that is now contained in the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern

Development or whether his department takes it over or whether we end up in a complete shemuzzle. There must be established, if aquaculture is to have the potential that it needs, a clear relationship, a clear structure put in place for decision making and for funding for private individuals or co-ops again or whatever. That relationship must be clearly established.

Of course the other thing, as the minister is well aware of what has to be found, is the cash. I am not going to ask him to comment on that because I know he is aware of it. But, I would like for him to comment on those two issues, specifically whether the government intends to move around the Province to identify various locations where aquaculture might be carried on and the second issue is the relationship between the two main departments, his department and the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK:
I will be very brief. I have said, and members said it before me, aquaculture could have great benefits as we have seen with the trout farm in Trinity, mussels, and the salmon farm in Bay d'Espoir. I want to point out to the minister that in the BC the federal government, the past Liberal administration anyway, and the BC government got into over \$100 million of a salmon enhancement programme for BC

because the stocks were going down and to keep future stocks up.

I would ask the minister when he is replying whether his department is negotiating with the federal PC government to get a salmon enhancement programme of the magnitude here in Newfoundland and Labrador like they had in B.C. because Atlantic salmon are down. Last year we had the federal government cut off the date arbitrarily in the Spring as well as in the Fall thus taking from the pocket of fishermen extra earnings.

Another thing they also did was not extend the UIC programme so fishermen would normally make income in early Spring but they cannot put their nets out for salmon until June 5, whereas in other years, depending on the part of the Province, you could get some extra money and in the Fall you could get some extra money. So, if the federal government realizes that they want to save the stocks and think that by letting the fishermen bear the brunt of it by cutting off the dates in the Spring and in the Fall, then hopefully the federal government will also realize that the salmon can come back on their own only so much, so they will get into a salmon enhancement programme.

The other thing I would also like to ask the minister is, seeing it is a fishery bill, would he look into the federal government with regard to the concern of full-time fishermen who have licenses and who have a boat. They are having trouble. Some fishermen around the Province are having trouble getting a groundfish license because the federal government, for the next four years, have a

freeze on groundfish licenses. In many cases this is denying a license to our fishermen that are full-time but, because they fished with another person before and now want to go on their own, can not get a license. This is especially true for younger fishermen. The opportunity of pursuing the fishery on an individual basis is being lost. Some fishermen's sons are getting older and want to go on their own. They are now married. Some of the other sons are getting older and are not going fishing with their parents or grandparents.

So I would like for the minister to address those two things. Are we getting into a salmon enhancement programme? And, will he look into the fact that some fishermen that are full-time with boat licenses cannot get ground licenses and the ground licenses are now going to be frozen for four years? Those are the two main things I want to bring up.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, the House will be aware that because of a set of circumstances that I hope will not become the order of the day in this House, I am obliged to speak in this debate much later in the debate than I had intended to.

It is normal with a bill like this, which has two types of considerations for Opposition members, first of all, the broadly based political concerns and then

the substantive concerns of the legislation. The normal progression is for us to address our political concerns and then get into the nitty gritty of the substantive concerns, the kind that my friend from Eagle River has just addressed.

Given the evolution of this debate, I am going to revert to what would normally be done early in debate, and that is to address two or three of the political concerns. I apologize to the House to the extent that it is kind of out of step in that it should have been done earlier in the debate but I do not take the blame for that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister in introducing the debate said, and I believe I quote him correctly, "We are among the first." I think he was talking about we, the Province, are among the first. Well, he should realize that it is not necessary to play foot loose and fancy free with the truth to make an important point, the important point being that this is a good initiative, it is good for the government to have taken the initiative to legislate matters relating to aquacultural development. That is a good initiative.

To make that point it is not necessary to get a flowery and to take certain licence with what are the facts of the case. The facts of the case, and the minister will know this, is that far from being among the first, we are well behind on this particular issue, well behind in terms of jurisdictions around the world, and well behind in terms of jurisdictions in Canada. I will not argue with him because he would have the resource to find

out who has got legislation on the books. If he is talking narrowly about who has got legislation, he may well be among the first. But if he is talking about having the foot in the door on an important economic development called aquaculture, I tell him that we are well behind.

Indeed, I recall as far back as 1975 or 1976 visiting a full-fledged aquaculture development in Port Alberni, British Columbia, which at that time, ten years ago, was sufficiently well advanced that it was exporting on a regular basis to the San Francisco and Los Angeles markets pan size trout in little cellophane packages and so on. But the point is, they were marketing. They were at the point where they were into commercial development, into actual marketing of the product. Indeed, their markets were well in place by that particular time. I could of course take the minister to Scotland, to Scandinavia, to parts of Asia, where this development has been ongoing for many, many years.

Indeed, if I have one political criticism to make of the government on this issue it is that they have sat so long on this particular issue. I know something, Mr. Speaker, of the difficulty I had when I was a federal member convincing anybody in the provincial government that this was a worthwhile endeavour. The federal government, under my auspices, if you like, at my insistence, was putting money into Bay d'Espoir long before we could get anybody in the provincial government to recognize it as a viable proposition.

Even before that, I take the

minister back to November 1973, and he will remember that as the date of a by-election when I came into the House. During that by-election, the government of the day, led by Mr. Moores, announced a study to be conducted by the Research and Productivity Council of New Brunswick. That council, known as RPC, presented the government in January, 1974 - we are talking thirteen years ago - with a report containing many, many recommendations and one of the recommendations was that Bay d'Espoir be developed in terms of agricultural possibilities.

Despite that recommendation, and despite several efforts by the Government of Canada to inject funding into Bay d'Espoir, it took the government, Mr. Speaker, another ten full years to come to the reality that there was potential here.

So I say to the minister, first of all, and to his department and to the government, insofar as aquaculture is concerned, welcome to the Twentieth Century. I would say likewise to the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) but the welcome would be much premature in his case. I would first start by having him enter at least the Eighteenth Century, but look at the damage that would do the Eighteenth Century.

Mr. Speaker, we support the bill, we support the initiative that is embodied in the bill. We take umbrage, we take exception, to the minister's apparent need to misrepresent the circumstances because the circumstances are that we are coming quite late to this endeavour, but we are coming nevertheless and for that he is to be commended.

In political terms I see a certain pattern here. I could recall examples like Come By Chance where for some time the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the Premier said there was only one solution here dismantle, dismantle, sell it as scrap. One day a crowd that become known as Newfoundland Energy read a paper in Boston and they decide they are going to buy the refinery and then suddenly the Premier is out there saying well we have got the jobs, we have done all this. In other words the crowd who wanted to dismantle is now taking credit for rejuvenating that particular refinery.

The Premier who said on national television that some fish plants had to close is now taking credit for keeping them all open. The Premier who refused funding to the fish plants in Grand Bank and Fortune back in 1980 and 1981 is now taking credit for their rejuvenation. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, who was going to have the world stop before FFTs would be allowed has now gone meekly and allowed FFTs to be used on our shores.

The Premier who is going to have unbridled offshore development a day or so after the Tories took office in September 1984 is now three years later still fumbling the ball, still trying to find a way to get it going. He has had to send his Minister of Energy down to New York to get updated. Mr. Speaker, this government, if you believe its past utterances on the subject, should be well updated on offshore because it is supposed now to be in charge according to the utterances you get from them.

I see a pattern here with

aquaculture. I see the hon. crowd that for years did not see the particular advantage of aquaculture now trying to claim credit for something that they almost blew by coming so late to the endeavour.

Mr. Speaker, another item of really good news in this bill is contained on the bottom of the cover page, and it reads as follows: "Honourable Thomas Rideout Minister of Fisheries." Mr. Speaker, that is about the best news in this bill because if you relate that to the title, which says "An Act Respecting The Encouragement And Regulation Of An Aquaculture Industry", you have there an important development. The government has decided in its wisdom to take the aquaculture industry out of that bungling hands of the Minister of Rural Agriculture and Northern Development and to put them into the competent hands of the Minister of Fisheries.

The minister, because he has loyalty to his colleagues, will want to skate around that when he gets up, and I will understand all that. But I say to him and to his administration, that is the best news I find in the bill because you see what has been happening in Bay d'Espoir these last few weeks has been absolutely frightful with the Minister of Rural Agriculture and Northern Development, who has bungled the Sprung deal, has not been able to sell it to the public, is now in the process of bungling the Bay d'Espoir possibilities, and there are real possibilities in Bay d'Espoir. When he is not around to bungle they bring in the supreme bungler, the gentleman for Torngat, and I understand he has been involved in some shuttle diplomacy between

here and the Head of Bay d'Espoir. He has been wiping in and out of there, Mr. Speaker, giving his two cents worth as to the solution to the problem.

The solution to the problem is contained in this bill, put it in the hands of a man who by inclination and philosophy is a Liberal to start with, the gentleman for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), put it into his hands and let him be responsible for the encouragement of that industry. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, he is no longer a political soul mate of mine in the label sense, he is in a philosophic sense.

MR. BAIRD:

Call it one o'clock.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I want for the record to show that the clock is now coming up nine, eight, seven, six, five, four, three, two, one, I want to adjourn the debate under circumstances that are not misunderstood so nobody can get in before me or after me and adjourn the debate. Is it clearly understood that I have adjourned the debate, that I am not the member for Menihek, that I am the member for Fortune - Hermitage? Have I adjourned the debate, is that agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The debate is adjourned by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition made some vague remarks on some matter or other which we will have to study in Hansard to see what he meant by those remarks. I move that the House adjourn and adjourn until the 3:00 o'clock on Monday.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until Monday, June 1, at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, would you permit a question?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. J. CARTER:

By leave.

MR. SIMMONS:

Could we know what the Order of Business is? It is normal on the adjournment motion to -

MR. SPEAKER:

The House adjourned, but -

MR. J. CARTER:

By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

- if the hon. member wants information, that is fine.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows but we did send word over on the order of the ones that we are going to do. It is still the same thing.

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. P.J.McNicholas, Speaker

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C., Premier

Hon. Roger Simmons, P.C., Leader of the Opposition

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Aylward, Kevin (Lib)	Stephenville
Aylward, Hon. Robert J. (PC)	Kilbride
Baird, Raymond J. (PC)	Humber West
Baker, Winston (Lib)	Gander
Barrett, Hon. Harold (PC)	St. John's West
Barry, Leo (Lib)	Mount Scio - Bell Island
Blanchard, Hon. Ted. A. (PC)	Bay of Islands
Brett, Hon. Charlie (PC)	Trinity North
Butt, Hon. John (PC)	Conception Bay South
Callan, Wilson (Lib)	Bellevue
Carter, John A. (PC)	St. John's North
Carter, Walter C. (Lib)	Twillingate
Collins, Hon. John F. (PC)	St. John's South
Dawe, Hon. Ron (PC)	St. George's
Decker, Chris (Lib)	Strait of Belle Isle
Dinn, Jerome W. (PC)	Pleasantville
Doyle, Norman E. (PC)	Harbour Main
Efford, John (Lib)	Port de Grave
Fenwick, Peter (NDP)	Menihek
Flight, Graham (Lib)	Windsor-Buchans
Furey, Chuck (Lib)	St. Barbe
Gilbert, Dave (Lib)	Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir
Greening, Glenn C. (PC)	Terra Nova
Hearn, Hon. Loyola (PC)	St. Mary's-The Capes
Hiscock, R. Eugene (Lib)	Eagle River
Hodder, James E. (PC)	Port au Port
Kelland, Jim (Lib)	Naskaupi
Long, Gene (NDP)	St. John's East
Lush, Tom (Lib)	Bonavista North

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

...2...

Member

Matthews, Hon. William (PC)
McNicholas, Hon. Dr. P.J. (PC)
Mitchell, Calvin (PC)
Morgan, James (PC)
Ottenheimer, Hon. Gerald R. (PC)
Parsons, Kevin (PC)
Patterson, William G. (PC)
Peach, Milton (PC)
Peckford, A. Brian, P.C. (PC) (Premier)
Power, Hon. Charlie (PC)
Reid, James G. (PC)
Rideout, Hon. Thomas G. (PC)
Russell, Hon. Maxwell James (PC)
Simms, Hon. Len (PC)
Simmons, Hon. Roger P.C. (Lib)
Tobin, Glenn (PC)
Tulk, R. Beaton (Lib)
Twomey, Hon. Dr. Hugh Matthew (PC)
Verge, Hon. Lynn (PC)
Warren, Garfield E. (PC)
Windsor, Hon. H. Neil (PC)
Woodford, Rick (PC)
Young, Hon. Haig (PC)

District

Grand Bank
St. John's Centre
LaPoile
Bonavista South
Waterford - Kenmount
St. John's East Extern
Placentia
Carbonear
Green Bay
Ferryland
Trinity - Bay de Verde
Baie Verte - White Bay
Lewisporte
Grand Falls
Fortune-Hermitage
Burin - Placentia West
Fogo
Exploits
Humber East
Torngat Mountains
Mount Pearl
Humber Valley
Harbour Grace

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C.	Premier
Hon. Robert J. Aylward	Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development
Hon. Harold Barrett	Development and Tourism
Hon. Ted A. Blanchard	Labour
Hon. Charlie Brett	Social Services
Hon. John Butt	Environment
Dr. The Hon. John F. Collins	Finance
Hon. Ron Dawe	Transportation
Hon. Jerome W. Dinn	Mines and Energy
Hon. Norman E. Doyle	Municipal Affairs
Hon. Loyola Hearn	Education

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

-2-

Hon. William Matthews	Culture, Recreation and Youth
Hon. Gerald R. Ottenheimer	Energy President of the Council Government House Leader
Hon. Charlie Power	Career Development and Advanced Studies
Hon. Thomas G. Rideout	Fisheries
Hon. Maxwell J. Russell	Consumer Affairs and Communications
Hon. Len Simms	Forest Resources and Lands
Dr. The Hon. Hugh M. Twomey	Health
Hon. Lynn Verge	Justice
Hon. H. Neil Windsor	President of Treasury Board
Hon. Haig Young	Public Works and Services