



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 9

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Wednesday

7 June 1989

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is my first Ministerial Statement, and I think it is an important one. We were able to provide the critic from the other side with a copy well in advance so that he could prepare a response, which will signify the importance of this particular precedent, because that is what it is in this particular instance, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. House a matter of significant importance.

As many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are aware, the Phosphorus Reduction Plant at Long Harbour owned by Albright and Wilson Americas, commonly known as the 'ERCO' plant, will cease operation in the near future. This plant closure is a result of the economic realities of declining world markets for phosphorus due to improved technology in the production of by-product chemicals. These realities add cold comfort for the people of this Province and the people of Long Harbour and nearby communities in particular.

Mr. Speaker, among the other initiatives this government is taking to manage this situation, I am pleased to be able to announce that the environmental implications of this plant closure will be dealt with pursuant to the powers available to me under The Environmental Assessment Act. The decommissioning plan will therefore be registered for technical and public review, following completion of which, I shall determine what further environmental assessment, if any, is required to ensure that this shutdown is handled in an environmentally responsible manner.

I should note, Mr. Speaker, that it is important to take this approach to assist the current owner in closing out the plant site in an environmentally responsible manner. This procedure will also ensure that the Province does not bear the costs of clean-up and site rehabilitation that should reasonably be borne by the current owner. Furthermore, we wish to avoid a situation in which a new entrepreneur, who may wish to use the existing plant site or facilities, is discouraged by the need to invest capital in such clean-up and rehabilitation activity.

I would conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying I am pleased by Albright and Wilson Americas' co-operative and responsible corporate attitude towards this initiative that will go a long way to allowing us to deal with the substantial environmental implications of this plant closure in an efficient and satisfactory manner.

Mr. Speaker, I should add, also, that this initiative was undertaken in the first instance

by the former administration, and what we are doing now is a continuation of the intention indicated by the former administration. I think it is a good thing. I think it is a precedent; it is the first time that any shutdown or closure was required to be registered under The Environmental Assessments Act, and it may very well bode improved activities in that area for the future.

Thank you.

MR. HEWLETT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for an advanced copy of his statement. I am pleased that proper environmental procedures will be used in closing the Long Harbour plant. Unfortunately, however, it appears that this government has given up any hope that this operation can be saved and this is in stark contrast to the Liberal election platform. I wonder where the member for Placentia (Mr. Hogan) is now?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear! Well said!

MR. HEWLETT:
I do hope that he will see to it, Mr. Speaker, that the government will take a leading and compassionate role in seeing that the socio-economic impacts on the local population are minimized. It is rather ironic that I have to react to this statement today on the heels of a recessionary budget. Rather than welcoming a new batch of Newfoundlanders home from the Mainland, we will be

sending more up there due to plant closures and higher taxes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. HEWLETT:
Mr. Speaker, this House has two political parties, the Progressive Conservative and the Regressive Conservative.

Where have all the Liberals gone, Mr. Speaker?

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Further Statements by Ministers?

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
His first statement too, I bet.

MR. GULLAGE:
First statement. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members of the House of Assembly:

I am pleased today to announce that government has approved \$50,380,200 for the 1989-1990 Municipal Capital Works Program. This funding will address the most pressing need as it relate to municipal services such as water and sewer facilities and road construction and paving.

The need to provide municipal infrastructure is great as is evidenced by the fact that some \$163 million in funding was

requested by municipalities from my department this year. To address all these needs at one time is beyond the Province's financial capacity, however, I am confident that the funds approved this year will go a long way in addressing our most pressing needs, and the distribution of funding will reflect this. We have tried to be fair and equitable in the allocation, taking into consideration the most severe health and environmental concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to also inform this hon. House that we have initiated a comprehensive review of criteria used to establish priorities for the distribution of funding for municipal infrastructure. This administration has made it quite clear that fairness and balance will prevail in carrying out its mandate, and I can assure this House that these objectives will be my objectives in establishing new criteria.

I wish again to draw your attention to comments made by my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Finance, during his Budget Speech yesterday. I reaffirm my department's commitment to investigate new innovative methods and technologies which can be adapted to this Province's harsh terrain and weather conditions, and the objective of this initiative is to provide adequate services in a more economical manner, thus allowing the installation of a greater number of services for the dollars available. At the present time, the average cost of a water and sewer hook-up in Newfoundland is some \$22,000. This cost per service is one of the highest in Canada, so it is obvious we must

explore all possibilities in an attempt to lessen the financial burden to the taxpayers of our Province. And further to this, Mr. Speaker, my department will be eliminating the duplication of services among the many municipalities throughout the Province - services such as waste disposal, fire protection, recreational facilities and other municipal infrastructure. This will be done through the integration and amalgamation of existing services by means of regional service agencies and/or the amalgamation of municipalities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, another initiative I will be pursuing immediately as it relates to the provision of municipal infrastructure, is a review of the municipal grant system in our Province. This will include an indepth review of the ability of our many municipalities to meet their financial obligations, again, our objectives of fairness and balance will be pursued.

Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way in the provision of municipal infrastructure to our many municipalities, however, we still have a long way to go to complete the job. I want to ensure that every Newfoundlander and Labradorian is treated fairly in the process and I can assure you that my department will take whatever action necessary to bring this about.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to, first of all, thank the minister for a copy of his statement, which came to my office before my coming here to the House. I want to welcome the statement by the minister today; he has come in with a \$50 million capital program. I do not want to downplay the significance of the \$50 million capital program, but I have to say, as well, that I do not know if it represents the large increase that the minister said would be forthcoming to the municipalities all across Newfoundland and Labrador, because the previous government did last year have a \$43 million capital program. It is an increase, and we welcome the increase the minister has brought in here today, but it is not the big, significant increase that municipalities around the Province are expecting from this government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while the statement is positive in one respect, it leaves many, many questions that are not yet answered. The most blaring question that remains unanswered is: Where is the detailed breakdown of the capital projects that the ministers opposite wanted from me last year? Where is the detailed breakdown, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:
We had members opposite crucifying

this member, when I was Minister of Municipal Affairs, on the tabling of the program itself, the detailed program itself, so I want to ask the minister: Where is the detailed breakdown of the capital program this year? Is the minister attempting, Your Honour, to circumvent the House by coming in here today with his funding being announced in a block and no detailed breakdown given to the members, given to the people of the Province?

Members always requested - no, Mr. Speaker, they never requested they always demanded that a detailed listing be given to the House and I would ask the minister to come in here as soon as possible with a detailed breakdown of what the capital projects are. There is no reason why, before the House closes today, Mr. Speaker, the minister should not be able to come back with a detailed listing of where it is. If there is one thing that has been the hallmark and the cornerstone of this government, according to members opposite, it is fairness, reasonableness, equality and openness. How are we as an Opposition, Mr. Speaker, going to make a determination as to whether or not that fairness and balance is here, that the minister and the government said that they were going to have?

We want the list. We have to scrutinize it. We have to evaluate it. We have to break it down and we have to go over it with a fine-toothed comb to ensure that the fairness and equality that the minister has been talking about is present.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time has elapsed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before getting into Oral Questions, on behalf of hon. members I would like to welcome to the Galleries a delegation from the Council of Newtown, in the historic District of Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The Council is represented by councillors Mr. Wayne Perry, Mr. Barry Tucker, Mr. Charlie Norris and Town Manager, William Norris.

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

Even I would have to admit, in hope for favours later on, that they indeed do have a fine member for Bonavista North. My question, Mr. Speaker, quite naturally today is to the Minister of Finance, the wordless numerator and denominator of the Province as of last night.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

I would like to refer the hon. minister to Page 11 of his document where he says: "Mr. Speaker, the unaudited results for the 1988-89 fiscal year indicate that Government ended the year with a deficit on Current Account of \$2.1 million." Indeed, further on in the paragraph, Mr. Speaker,

he says: "The total budgetary requirement was therefore \$34 million less than Budget." The government indeed last year spent \$34 million less than it budgeted. So I want to ask the minister to stand in his place today answer for this House and the people of the Province, why he indeed is trying to mislead the people of the Province and the members of this House by saying that the deficit he inherited was much larger?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

I am not too sure what he means by 'inherited the deficit.' When we were presented with the preliminary budget papers which had been drafted, presumably by the previous group, the current account projected deficit was in the vicinity of \$90 million - \$88.3 or something of that nature, \$90 million roughly. This particular amount was clearly unacceptable to us in view of our determination to be fiscally responsible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, the previous administration had been skating dangerously close to our credit rating, and we had determined that we would take particular aim at not letting that happen. We had decided that we were going to come up with a balanced, or close to balanced budget, and we did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker, indeed what happened was once this government set down its directions, policies, and programs it had a \$90 million deficit. It was short by \$90 million, and what this minister did was inflict \$95 million in additional taxes on the people of this Province. He stripped the skin off them, Mr. Speaker, and what it amounted to was \$300 tax per year per woman, man and child in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:
The hon. gentleman, as well, says in his budget, Mr. Speaker, that we are not the heaviest taxed people in Canada, and then last night, on the public airways of the Province, he said he did not understand the formula for determining the tax burden of this Province when you compare it to all provinces across the country.

Mr. Speaker, why will the minister not stand in his place today and say that the real reason why he skinned the people of the Province yesterday with \$95 million in additional taxes was because he misdirected and misunderstood the fiscal capacity of this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

DR. KITCHEN:
Mr. Speaker, we have to be fairly straightforward in what we say here. Tax effort can be explained in simple terms or it can be

explained in fairly complex terms. The simple -

MR. TOBIN:
I saw him on television last night.

DR. KITCHEN:
Just a second, now!

The simple answer would be that a taxpayer in Newfoundland with a certain income would be paying less overall tax than if he had resided in several other Canadian provinces. As a matter of fact our average was slightly below the national average. Now, in spite of the misconception that many people have that we are the most overtaxed people in Canada, that is simply not so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

DR. KITCHEN:
Mr. Speaker, let me continue for a minute and I will explain it a little bit further. The reason why other people are more heavily taxed has to do with the heavy municipal and school taxes that are levied in other provinces where it is done basically on a property tax. The property tax throughout many provinces of Canada for municipalities is quite large, as it is for school taxes. In this Province, except for some areas, the municipal taxes are not particularly onerous, neither should they be, nor are school taxes. This is the reason for our effort in this Province being somewhat less than it is in the rest of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

For the first time, yesterday, in this Province, we saw this minister read a document here that imposed a growth and a fat tax on the children of this Province through their clothing. A growth and a fat tax, that is what we have, Mr. Speaker. If one child grows faster than the other they pay taxes, and if the other child does not grow as fast, for whatever reason, there is no tax. So, I just want to say to the minister, because he was too incompetent, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have been very patiently listening to the member, giving him great leeway, but as the member knows in a supplementary he should attempt to get to his question as quickly as possible, and that is what I have been waiting for.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. That is exactly what I was trying to do, but I respect Your Honour's view on that.

In view of the fact that this particular minister, Mr. Speaker, was too incompetent, as judged by his Premier and his colleagues, to introduce an Interim Supply Bill in this House a few days ago and then as well, last night he admitted that he did not understand the formula, that he was confused about the numerator and the denominator, will the minister do the honourable thing and go to the Premier's office and FAX his resignation to Montebello?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Are you not going to answer the question?

MR. SIMMS:

You might as well answer, or we will be asking it every day, boy!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious now that the Minister of Finance is inflicted again this week with the same disease he was inflicted with last week when he could not stand and defend Interim Supply.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this infamous budget brought down by the hon. the minister he attacked every child in this Province who was not standard; if you do not come from the same mould now, if you are different, if you are growing quicker, if you grow slower, you were attacked in the minister's budget yesterday.

Now, Mr. Speaker, will the minister today tell this House why he savagely decided yesterday to beat up on the long and the short and the tall, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, the major problem with the tax as it had been administered was the tremendous loss of revenue because of cheating. The way it was administered, almost anyone before-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

DR. KITCHEN:
Hang on now!

The reason was we estimated we were losing \$5 million a year on the system through people who were abusing the child tax credit to charge fur coats and things like that. You would go into any store and people would ask 'Have you got your MCP card?' Many adults were abusing the child tax credit, one that is why we changed the system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said that I am going to admit because it is true, that this change of policy that we introduced has hurt some children. Now, there is no doubt about that. What we have in effect done is change the definition of child from one based on age to one based on size. That is true and we will admit it. But it is certainly better than the system we had before and, if we can find a better system, then we shall implement it.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister of Finance is not blind and dumb, let him look around the galleries today and see that everybody is different. It is not according to age, it is according to size and standard; now everybody has to fit that mould.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the minister wanted to close loopholes and save on the child's exemption for sales tax on clothing, why could the minister not find a fair way of doing it? Why could the minister not do it fairly, instead of

beating up on those people who grow slower, or grow faster than others? Why did the Minister chose to do that, Mr. Speaker?

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

DR. KITCHEN:
Mr. Speaker, if you look at it rationally, you will realize that infants and children of one year, two years, three years, four years, five years, when the children are in the fast changing size mode of life, they are protected under this new system. What has been eliminated are adults, which this group opposite let get away with let live for so long, going in and abusing the system, adults using the child tax credit system to evade taxes. We have stopped tax evasion. Unfortunately, as the member has quite properly said, we have not found a way yet to help some people, but we will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, it is too bad that the Minister of Finance cannot take a dose of his own medicine and mature accordingly. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Finance this: When is the Minister of Finance going to live up to the buzz words of this administration - fairness and balance - and scrap this unfair discriminatory tax against the large and the tall and the fat and the husky and the chubby of this Province? When is he going to do that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No answer? No answer?

MR. RIDEOUT:
The Wordless Wonder.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Shame! Shame!

MR. LANGDON:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LANGDON:
My question is also to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. At the recent leaders' debate at the university, the students were adamant that there be no increase in tuition fees, and the Premier, along with the other two leaders, gave every indications that status quo would be maintained. Well, he has formed the government. Now, Mr. Speaker, will the minister tell this House, tell these students and the parents of this Province, why the sudden reversal of commitment by this government where they now have hit these students with an unprecedented increase of 10 per cent in tuition fees for the 1989-90 university year?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

DR. KITCHEN:
Mr. Speaker, I take no joy in that particular point. But I would like to make certain points with respect to the question raised by the hon. member. The tuition fees at Memorial are the lowest in Atlantic Canada and, as we go West across Canada, they are lower than

they are in most provinces, and not only low, but much lower. That is something to be taken into account. They have not been raised that much and they are still lower than they are anywhere else in Atlantic Canada.

MR. LANGDON:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LANGDON:
In light of the recent royal commission report that indicated that well-educated people in Newfoundland and Labrador had a comparably equal chance of employment with their Canadian counterparts, is this government advocating the Trudeau philosophy, that students who attend university should pay 100 per cent of the cost since, when they graduate, they would be the ones who would have the highest paying jobs and reap most benefit from university graduation?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

DR. KITCHEN:
The answer is no. But at the same time I think we better face a true fact. The true fact is that the people who come out of university are in a much better position to get whatever jobs there are than people who do not. So in a sense what we are saying is that the education of university students helps them secure good positions in society. And it can properly be said that people should pay to some extent for the cost of the benefit that they receive in later

life.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LANGDON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. LANGDON:

After the minister has admitted that this is indeed the Trudeau philosophy that you are expounding, is the government saying to the sons and daughters of ordinary Newfoundlanders that the university is no longer open to them, that its doors are just to the rich? Is that what the minister is saying?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

No, Mr. Speaker, we are not saying that at all. This government is committed to extending university facilities across the Province, and we shall do so. We have made that quite clear in our Throne Speech and in our Budget Speech and everything that we stand for. So there is no question about that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations (Ms Cowan), and I hope she does not classify Newfoundlanders as tax evaders and cheaters in her answer, which is what he called them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Budget Speech the minister indicated that there was an evaluation of the Private Sector Employment Program undertaken. Having left that department just two months ago, every indication I had as minister, from the people in the department and the private sector of the Province, was very positive. I want to ask the minister was there a proper evaluation done of the program? Who did the evaluation? Has the minister seen the evaluation? And will the minister table the evaluation in this House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Private Sector Employment Program is a program that we want to replace with something that is more appropriate. We have some very, very fundamental questions about that particular program in that it did not provide long-term

relief to people who need employment. It was only short-term employment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MS COWAN:
A study of the statistics, if we look at the clients of that program, show us that the employment rate of those people remains as low now as it did in the beginning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Not true! Not true!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. WARREN:
You are getting coaching from the Minister of Education.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker, we still do not know if the minister saw the evaluation, who did it or if she will table it. But I would just like to inform the minister that 65 per cent of those employed in the Private Sector Employment Program were employed beyond the subsidy period, and 30 per cent of those employed turned into full-time jobs.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I again remind the hon. member that the hon. member's job is to ask the question, and the hon. member is not doing that. So in the supplementary I would ask the hon. member to please get to the

question.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I guess some of us adjust to our roles quicker than others. Being a minister I was used to being asked long questions from over here. So I would have to say to the Speaker that he has probably adjusted to his position quicker than I am adjusting to mine.

I would just like to repeat again that 65 per cent of those employed were employed beyond the subsidy period, and 30 per cent turned into full-time. So I want to ask the minister: Does she know how many applications are on file? Would she tell this House how many applications are on file right now for the Private Sector Employment Program in her department? How many?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:
I cannot give you that answer with any assurance now. I have one in mind but I would be hesitant to give it. I certainly can find that out for you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:
With your permission, I will tell the hon. minister and everyone else in this House and in the gallery that there are 1,534 applications on file today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
What!

MR. MATTHEWS:
Fifteen hundred and thirty-four applications from private sector small business in this Province.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Too bad their program is not working.

MR. MATTHEWS:
I guess my question, Mr. Speaker, is: What better evaluation of a program do you want when you have over 1500 small businesses in this Province apply to take advantage of a 50/50 subsidy?

MR. SIMMS:
Would she table her report?

MR. MATTHEWS:
I already asked that and she did not answer it.

I also want to ask the minister: Will she stand in this House today and confirm or deny that the Occupational Integration Program for Women has been cancelled by this government, and that what we saw in this budget yesterday was deception because all that is being funded is a number of carryover projects that were funded last year?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:
The program is going to be evaluated when it is completed as of September, 1989. We may go ahead with it if we find that it meets the type of criteria. We may modify it to make it a better

program. We may scrap it and put in something that is better.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker, there is only one thing that should be scrapped very quickly in this Province and that is this administration right here. There is no question about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:
Would the minister stand in her place and tell this House if people in the Employment Services Division of her department were given notices this morning - staff reduced from twenty-two to ten; cut in half - of layoffs for the last of this month? How ironic is it and how hypocritical that people in the Employment Services Division, the branch that creates employment in this Province, are being laid off while this government claims it is going to create jobs? How can you do that, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:
Mr. Speaker, I believe that was the gentleman's fourth question, was it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
He was recognized.

MS COWAN:
He was recognized.

I am not aware of whether or not that has taken place.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Twelve people fired today and the minister does not even know about it!

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia.

MR. TOBIN:
I have a few questions, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. I just want to put them very bluntly.

Has Cabinet set up a committee to investigate all aspects of the Fogo Island ferry operation, including the **Beaumont Hamel**, and has an MC been issued to that effect?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, no.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Let me ask the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, Mr. Speaker, who

is responsible for transportation and who should know what goes on - he is the Minister responsible for transportation, and responsible for the MCs that come out of Cabinet as a result of papers that he put into the system - has Cabinet issued instructions to recover and stop any financial commitments related to the second ferry for Bell Island and has there been an MC issued to that effect?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, over the last two weeks I have had many questions concerning the ferries and the vessels that are going to operate between Bell Island and Portugal Cove, between Fogo and Mainland, and my answer has been consistently that I have asked officials in my department to have a look at ferry operations in Newfoundland, to have a look at the operation of the total ferry service in Newfoundland. I will go back now to 1979 and talk a little about the ferry service and how we got in the position we are in right now.

In 1979, Mr. Speaker, the then provincial government signed a deal with the federal government to take over the operations of the ferry system in Newfoundland.

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

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to anybody who is watching the

performance of the minister here that he is deliberately trying to run out the clock on Question Period. The minister is not answering the question. There was nothing in the question or in the preamble on 1979. The question had to do with 1989 and Minutes of Council that were issued or not issued by this government. That is what the question is about, and that is what the minister should be about in his answer.

MR. SIMMS:

That is right.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To that point of order, the minister was asked a question that obviously required some background.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BAKER:

The minister was obviously laying a little bit of background before he either answered or did not answer that particular question.

I would also like to point out to the Government House Leader -

MR. SIMMS:

You are the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

- that it is customary during Question Period that points of order, when they are raised, are usually held until the end of Question Period. This is a common practice in other Houses, so that points of order do not interfere with the natural process of

questioning during Question Period.

So I would have expected, Your Honor, that the Leader of the Opposition would have waited until the end of Question Period, pointed out the fact that ministers were giving answers that were too long, and ask Your Honor to look into the matter. I would have expected that that was what he would have done instead of trying to kill the time of Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, it has been the custom for the last little while that we certainly try to keep all points of order until the end of Question Period? - this is what we have done in the last Session - to try as much as possible not to cut into the Question Period.

In any event, I rule that it is not a point of order. But I would ask the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation to get into his answer quickly, please. Before the minister rises in his place, I do want to say that answers are every bit as important as questions, and I would like the minister to clue up his answer quickly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Well, Mr. Speaker, to give the answer to the question, I must explain to the member what is causing the financial crisis that we have in the ferry system in Newfoundland right now. To do that I have to go back to the point, when, once upon a time in Newfoundland, the intraprovincial ferry service was operated by the federal government. However, the

previous administration took over administration of the intraprovincial ferry system in 1979; hence total responsibility for the operation of the intraprovincial ferry system is now the responsibility of the Government of Newfoundland, and hence the taxpayers of Newfoundland.

To answer the member's question, the provision for a second ferry for Bell Island is still in consideration. Whether it is a new one or one presently in operation in some other place on the Island is still a possibility. I do not yet have the information from my officials, but there is no doubt about it, Mr. Speaker, as I told the member last Monday and this Monday, it is still under consideration and there will be a second ferry for Bell Island when we make a decision on it sometime in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

My line of questioning to the minister has been dealing with an MC and that has nothing to do with the intraprovincial ferry service, but it has a lot to do, Mr. Speaker, with the credibility of the Minister of Transportation. That is what we are dealing with here.

Mr. Speaker, in light of what he

just said and has said before - and I have asked him about two questions, have already put them to him - I will go so far as to ask the minister are they included on the same MC?

On Monday past, regarding this, I asked the minister whether or not an MC existed dealing with the ferry services and cancellation of the second ferry for Bell Island, and the minister said, "The answer to the hon. member is no", that no MC existed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to give a final opportunity to the hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation to come clean with this House of Assembly. I hope the hon. minister realizes what happens if he is not truthful with this House. Does an MC exist, Mr. Speaker, with items on it dealing with the approval for the first ferry for Bell Island, the cancellation of the second ferry for Bell Island to recover the funding, and with setting up a committee to operate the Fogo Island ferry service? Will the minister come clean and be honest with this House? Mr. Speaker, I hope he realizes what he is putting on the line here. Does an MC exist, Mr. Speaker, cancelling the second ferry for Bell Island?

MR. WARREN:

Yes or no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have been honest with this House. For

the hon. member's information, as I understand it, Minutes of Cabinet are sort of confidential documents until such time as they are made public.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker:

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, this has nothing to do with a discussion in Cabinet. This has to do with a Minute of Council that outlines the policies of this government to deal with the people of this government, and every minister who sits around that Cabinet table, including the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, has a responsibility to be honest with the people of this Province and this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, laying it on the table, is there an MC existing cancelling the ferry services, that he has already denied in this House, and we will deal with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, no.

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

If the hon. member will allow me, before getting on to the next point of business or recognizing the Opposition House Leader, on behalf of hon. members I would like to welcome to the House of

Assembly 47 Grade U students from the W. E. Cormack School of Stephenville, accompanied by their teacher and chaperones in the persons of Mr. Angus Sheppard, Selma Stiles, Eileen Gale, Betty Vokey, Jeff Cook, Ruby Bentley, Carol Shave, Norma Chapman, Stephen Penney and Wanda Daley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Just to clarify a matter now that was raised during Question Period so that we all know what the rules of the game are. The Government House Leader indicated, in I do not know what kind of fashion I would describe it - it was rather surprising to hear it come from the Government House Leader. He talked about the practices and traditions of this Legislature and Oral Question Period, and he tried to make the point that it is normal practice in Question Period not to listen to points of order but to rather have them raised at the end of Question Period.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House ten years, and I can bet the hon. member that I can show him more precedents set by members on the opposite side, set by the members over on that side, where points of order were raised on numerous occasions during Question Period. It is not out of practice. It is not necessarily a fact that points of order should be raised at the end of Question Period. That is not necessarily a fact. There are thousands of precedent. Beauchesne says in the 5th Edition at least, says, "A

point of order raised in the Question Period ought to be taken up after Question Period unless the Speaker considers it to be serious or an extremely grave matter." That is what the wording says. So, if you look at the precedents of our House, it is clear that points of order have been raised, Mr. Speaker, during Question Period and have been dealt with by the Speaker during Question Period, and the precedents and practices and traditions of our House supercede Beauchesne, as the Government House Leader should know. If he wants me to get all kinds of precedents I will, but I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, for us to clarify this matter now. I raised it after Question Period. It is important that we clarify the matter so everybody knows what the rules of the game are. Either points of order can be raised during Question Period or they cannot. That is the important question to be addressed. The reason I raise it now Your Honour is that you might wish to save it for Speaker's corner, or whatever, I do not know. But I think it is an important matter which you might wish to give some serious consideration to.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

To that point of order. It is obviously not a point of order, Mr. Speaker, but simply to clarify a matter. I do not know why the Opposition House Leader is getting so upset about this. The fact of the matter is, I believe what he said, I understand what he said, and I agree with what he said. I agree that in this House in the past there have been too many

points of order during Question Period, far too many. I agree with that, Mr. Speaker. One of the problems is that in order to have a functioning Question Period we should have followed the rules outlined by Your Honour and have short questions, questions of immediate importance, questions designed to illicit information, and from the Ministers the answers should simply be answers to the questions. I understand all that. I also understand that during the past number of years the decorum in the House has sometimes, perhaps, not been what it should have been, and part of the reason for this was because of the kinds of things that happened during Question Period. I would agree with the Opposition House Leader that Beauchesne indicates that unless it is of pressing importance that it should be left over until the end of Question Period. The House of Commons in Ottawa, the procedure there the rulings have been made and actually very rarely do you ever see a point of order raised during Question Period in Ottawa and this contributes to a more civilized exchange. So in summary, Mr. Speaker, I totally agree with what the Opposition House Leader said. I simply wanted to point out in my response to the Leader of the Opposition when he rose on this point of order that the give and take during Question Period is controlled by Your Honour and at some point Your Honour if he recognizes the questions too long will bring the member to order, Your Honour if you recognize the answer as being too long will bring the member to order, and if the members opposite have a problem with that or if members on this side have a problem with it then after Question Period you raise the point of order. I was

simply pointing out that the point of order was perhaps better raised at a different point and Your Honour was in control of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order. First of all I would advise hon. members that I will take it under advisement. But just as a matter of dealing with it now, to be sure that I make clear to all hon. members the procedure in the House, quite obviously the Opposition House Leader was right when he mentioned that it has been the precedent of this House to rise on points of order in Question Period. That is absolutely correct.

Secondly, the Government House Leader, by the same token, alludes to some expression, somewhere along the line, that there is some propensity, some feeling that we should not rise on points of order during Question Period. The Chair is not certain of whether or not that was something practiced by the party of which he was a part last year, or whether indeed it did happen in the House. I do know that it is a matter of what the House itself wants: whether the House wants to have a rough and tumble Question Period, in which we rise on points of order all of the time and in which very little work gets done, or whether indeed we want to have a Question Period that is characterized by precision, crispness, and good, quick intelligent debate. But I think, in having said all of that, that both hon. members were to a degree correct.

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, as required by Section (14) of the Liquor Control Act, 1973, I formally present to the House the annual report of The Newfoundland Liquor Licensing Board for the year ended 31, March 1988. As you will see, Mr. Speaker, the Board has had another very demanding year and the licences issued continue to increase. As all hon. members know, the licences issued by the Board are very important in enabling these small businesses and businessmen and women to earn a living and generate employment in the retail sector.

MS COWAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am tabling today, as minister, the Legislative Report of the Minister of Labour to the House of Assembly 1988. Program Planning and Review.

Orders of the Day

Private Member's Day

MR. SPEAKER:

It being Private Member's Day, I call on the member for Carbonear to introduce his motion.

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. REID:

If you would permit me, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments leading up to my presentation. I am sort of, as some of my hon. colleagues have noticed across the way in the past little while, or the last hour or so, disappointed with some of the comments that have been coming across at some of the questions that were put at our minister. One in particular, the fun-making word used by some of the hon. members when the hon. the Minister of Finance rose to his feet, and some of the members called out 'child abuse'. Now, Mr. Speaker, I, personally, do not appreciate that particular type of comment in this hon. House because of the seriousness nature of the problem that is going on in this Province at the present time.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my resolution is taken a little bit more seriously, and hopefully before I am finished today we can get some consensus of opinion between both parties in the House. I hope the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) and I can come to some agreement on passing a resolution that will, maybe, combine both his resolution and mine.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the resolution as such, run down through it as quickly as I can, and make some general comments on the resolution.

As we all know, the hon. the Premier for the past couple of weeks or so has been making some general comments to the press on

behalf of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in relationship to our input and pressure that the Government of Newfoundland, and all of Newfoundland can put upon the EEC to try and encourage them to come to some reasonable agreement on the question of overfishing on the Grand Banks.

If I am allowed, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to read a quote from the hon. Premier, who is not in the House today but off doing, I guess, governmental business. He was quoted just recently as saying that "When the Prime Minister says that this is a matter of priority for Canada, and when the Prime Minister speaks to it in international circles, then we will get a good response."

Mr. Speaker, as far as this government is concerned, the whole of the caucus of this party agrees that in order for us to secure proper negotiations from countries like Spain and Portugal and a number of others we have to come up with some reasonable, logical way to approach those people and impress upon them that what they are doing off the Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador is detrimental to them as well as to ourselves.

Some recent events, Mr. Speaker, have shown some encouragement along this line, I guess, with the Prime Minister meeting just recently with the Prime Minister of Spain and also Mr. Crosbie has met with a number of EEC people to discuss the question. I am pleased, and I think on behalf of this House I can honestly say that at least that is a step towards the right direction. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that we do not look upon the super-committee of the

federal Cabinet as being of much consequence. We are hoping, of course, and praying that they will do something to help us down here in Newfoundland, but we are skeptical. There have been too many committees of federal Cabinet Ministers put together to look into questions in Atlantic Canada over the last number of years that have resolved very little.

Mr. Speaker, it is my personal belief that Newfoundland and the Newfoundland fishery does not hold a high enough priority with the federal Government of Canada. We only have one spokesperson in the Cabinet, who does not represent fisheries as such but another department, I am led to believe by people who have worked in the federal civil service and some who have been close to the past Ministers of Fisheries in Ottawa that when at the Cabinet table the question of fisheries arises all you hear is, 'It is unimportant'. That sort of reply and answer is basically my perception of how the Government of Canada looks upon the fishing industry on the East Coast.

I was earlier on in our new term, I guess it was late in April or early in May, surprised to hear that the hon. Leader of the Opposition was off to Ottawa to speak to, I guess, the Prime Minister and whoever else he could possibly speak to. I noticed that for a couple of days the hon. leader got a fair amount of press coverage. In fact I think on one particular day **The Evening Telegram** published the fact that he was going on the front page and said a few things about what he was going to do while he was there.

I have been looking ever since, Mr. Speaker - I am serious about

this - to hear his report, to see some results of the meeting that he had with the Prime Minister and what exactly the Prime Minister or any member of the federal Cabinet has done as a direct result of the hon. member's visit. I have yet to see anything. I will say that I have been looking at **The Evening Telegram** for some time to come up with answers and I am sure that maybe someone in that well-known Newfoundland paper may go back and ask the hon. member what exactly he was doing in Ottawa and what success he had, because I would like to know, if I did I might be able to speak to this question a little easier.

The hon. Premier called it a grandstanding trip to Ottawa, which, by the way, the people of the Province have not had a report on yet. I am assuming, Mr. Speaker - I do not know, I am probably a little naive here - that the people of Newfoundland paid for the trip. If we paid for the trip, then I think we deserve to get some results or something back in return.

That brings me back, of course, to a trip that was taken some time ago to Europe by an hon. ex-member of the House, that ended up costing him something like \$600 for a breakfast for him and his wife, which was never explained to the House, Mr. Speaker.

The Prime Minister, as well as the hon. federal member for St. John's West, has been talking of late about a compensation package. And this party has commended them on that, I suppose, because to a certain extent we cannot close our doors before know exactly what is coming through.

The compensation package, Mr.

Speaker, we hope is not one of job development. I am afraid that the Federal Government of Canada will compensate the fishermen and the fish plant workers who will suffer in the next little while because of the reduced quotas, will probably be given a compensation package that will basically be the same as what they have been getting for the past twenty years or so, I guess, from the federal government, a compensation package that will probably involve job development grants or make-work jobs, or the LIP program, or something similar to that that we had years ago.

I for one, Mr. Speaker, and I am certainly not speaking on behalf of this entire caucus, am sick and tired of hearing and seeing money being wasted in this Province, in my district and all over Newfoundland on schemes that create no initiative, that provide little if anything to the person who works on the projects other than to provide them with ten weeks of unemployment insurance stamps. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the fishermen and the fish plant workers of this Province do not want that, or that type of program.

Just this past weekend I had the opportunity to sit for some time with a young trawler captain, a young chap who comes from the District of Trinity South. I sat and I listened to him and I had some questions. He had heard that I had raised the question of overfishing in the House, and was keen to discuss the problems of overfishing with me.

Mr. Speaker, in order for me to get up and make comments, and I guess for any member to make comments on a subject in the

House, it is important that people know what they are talking about, so in the last two or three weeks I have done some investigation into the question of overfishing.

Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning the scientific reports, I am not questioning the Harris Report, I am really not questioning anybody. I have problems with some of the statistics that have been provided by Federal Fisheries as well as some of the statistics that are being provided to us by Provincial Fisheries.

On one hand, Mr. Speaker, the scientists will say that we are overfishing certain areas of the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks, that is certain zones. Trawler captains who fish these areas, Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker, are just as concerned about what happens out there as we politicians are, and I guess maybe even more so than some of us politicians. They do not say that sort of thing. They agree that in certain areas on the Grand Banks off the coast of Newfoundland that the fish supply is lesser now than it was ten years ago, but they cannot agree in certain instances, in certain zones, in certain places, to the fact that federal scientists have said that just about every area off the coast of Newfoundland, on the Banks, in all zones the fishing stock is decreasing. This young chap, Mr. Speaker, told me that this year, in particular, he has seen more cod in certain areas than he has seen in the last six years he has been fishing on the Grand Banks. It makes me wonder, Mr. Speaker, if there is not something wrong with our scientific data, scientific analysis, or whatever. I often have said, Mr. Speaker, before I got elected to the House,

that maybe government scientists, the bureaucrats and people related to the fishing industry, I guess, should maybe pay more attention to what the fishermen themselves are saying and not necessarily to those people who profess to be experts on given subjects. I tend to agree, Mr. Speaker, because if we, as members of the House of Assembly, or, I guess, as Newfoundlanders want to know what is going on in a certain area of the Province, the best place to go is down there to the grass roots where we can talk to people who understand and know, who have been in the industry for years and generations. Maybe we are not doing enough of that, Mr. Speaker.

I wonder sometimes if we do not, in our positions of - I do not know what word to put on it, I would be afraid to use it because maybe the Opposition would use it against me - but maybe in our positions we sometimes think ourselves to be experts in every field and basically to be masters in none. I think that both this government and the Opposition, this government in particular, should pay attention to what the local fishermen are saying, the local trawler worker or dragger captain, ask those people what they think of what is going on out there, because they have a story to tell and sometimes maybe a different story than what we are hearing from the professionals.

Carbonear district is not necessarily relying upon the fishery to survive. But, Mr. Speaker, if you go to Carbonear on any given day during the Summer, and go into either one of the malls there, and there are not too many, you can see a difference in the number of people shopping, you can see a difference in the number

of people who are using the banking services or the post office, and I guess this is true of every district. And you wonder what is the difference in today and yesterday, and people will say to you, 'The fish plant is not operating today and that is why there are not so many people moving around the community.'

The fishery, Mr. Speaker, I do not have to tell any member of this House, I am sure, is probably the backbone of this Province, and unless we take the backbone of this Province seriously then we are going to be in trouble. We are not going to have the opportunity in years down the road to get up and criticize a budget statement because there is not going to be a budget statement. This Province is in a situation right now where we have to, under every circumstance, try to maintain what we have, and one of the most important things that we have in this Province is the fishery.

My resolution, Mr. Speaker, basically calls upon the Prime Minister of Canada himself. We can appreciate that Mr. Crosbie is trying his best, Mr. Siddon is trying his best, and all the others that are on that Committee, but we feel strongly that both parties of this House should together go to Ottawa, or send to Ottawa, our request that the Prime Minister take the initiative at this particular time to head up that Committee himself to lobby with the necessary leaders of countries around this world that are using our fish stocks on the Grand Banks, and it is only through the Prime Minister and the pressure that he can put on other countries, other Presidents and Prime Ministers of various

countries, that we can, Sir, get some sort of an agreement between Canada and the EEC, or other countries that are overfishing.

Mr. Speaker, to clue up, I believe that the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) feels exactly the same as I do about this. I will be honest and say that when he made his presentation last week in this House, when he moved his motion, that I agreed, not in total with his motion, and I do not imagine that he will agree in total with mine, but I hope that both the Opposition and the government side of this House will agree with this motion and if we can agree with this, I am sure the Prime Minister of Canada will take it a lot more seriously than if just the government side of the House was presenting the motion.

I thank you for the opportunity again, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that this House will respond favorably to my motion.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HEARN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, let me say that it is delight to stand to support the motion as put forward by the member for Carbonear. We support the motion thoroughly, completely, without reservation, without amendment. I say to the hon. member that he also, as did many more over there, undoubtedly supported the one that we put

forth last week, except the Premier, who wanted to control everything himself, as he always does, and was not satisfied to have an all-Party committee of the House to deal with such an important issue as the fishery, and the cutback in quotas in the fishery, and the effect it will have on Newfoundland, and consequently the resolution was not passed as we submitted it. I do not blame the hon. gentlemen for that, they will get used to that, and the time will come, perhaps, when they will stand on their own feet and not have to worry about what the leader always says. We will support his motion completely, without, as I say, amendments, because we agree with what the words of the resolution say.

We have had a discussion on overfishing on the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks. One thing I pointed out last week as I presented our motion, which encompassed several other problems related to the fishery and the present crisis that we face now, is that it cannot be blamed thoroughly on overfishing. Even though the raping of the stocks on the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks certainly is a major factor and a major contributor to the decline in cod stocks, but that it cannot be blamed for the complete collapse of the fishery in the Province of Newfoundland.

We have to look at, as we mentioned last week, the seal herds. We have to look at mismanagement over the years. We have to look at the methods of fishing we have used. We have to look at the by-catches that have been caught and discarded, caught and unreported, and we can go on and on. There are several factors

involved in the decline of stocks. Maybe because of the present crisis an awareness has been created, certainly here in Canada, but that may not have any great affect unless we can spread that awareness around the world.

Now, when the Harris Report was presented the federal government set up a special Cabinet committee immediately to deal with it, one made up of some extremely high-profiled ministers, perhaps the highest-profile Cabinet committee ever set up by the federal government. However, when they went to Europe last week the first indications were that they were received very favorably by the EEC authorities and that they were considering looking seriously at the overfishing on the Nose and Tail of Grand Banks. However, today's reports, if they are factual, say that even though, the Spanish authorities appreciate what is happening and have a concern for overfishing, yet they fail to adhere to the suggested quotas that they have been given.

So it is great to be sympathetic to our cause, but if the EEC countries and the other countries which fish the Nose and Tail and within our two hundred mile limit, do not adhere strictly to the quotas set out by our management people then we are in for hard times down the road, because we ourselves cannot control the stocks and build up of the stocks if we have others who continue to overfish. Unless we do, perhaps, what the words of the present resolution suggests, and we exert control or try to exert control or at least press for control over the Nose and the Tail of the Grand Banks, and we get the Prime Minister involved. Now to some degree he has been involved, he

has made some contacts and has raised the issue. But unless the federal government takes initiative to address not only what is within their own control, and practically everything as it relates to the fishery is in their control, and after looking at yesterday's budget I am not sure whether that is a bad idea - last year we said we wanted more say in what was happening; today I am not sure whether or not we should have more say with the little attention that is paid to the fishery in yesterday's budget as presented in the House, but I will get to that in a minutes - but if government has the intestinal fortitude to make the decision over the areas that they control right now and press for further controls over the areas which they do not, and they do have a lot of levers - they give you all kinds of excuses of why they are not using them, but they must - because otherwise we Newfoundlanders are paying and will continue to pay the price for their mismanagement over the years. So consequently we certainly support the RESOLVES in the resolution that is on the Order Paper.

The Member for Carbonear when presenting his resolution mentioned the trip that the Leader of the Opposition made to Ottawa shortly after the special committee was set up, and he did that basically out of frustration, frustration with the fact that the provincial government sat there and did not move on this important issue. It said one of those days some of those members will come down and we will talk to them, and that is the attitude that the Premier of this Province has, 'Everyone must come to me.' And he is going to find out in dealing in international circles - the

member used the word 'circus', and perhaps 'circus' is more applicable than circles - that everyone is not going to come to the King of Newfoundland. He must sometimes go to the mountain.

AN HON. MEMBER:
He is gone today.

MR. HEARN:
He is gone today. Yes, he is gone to Montebello.

But it is a long time after the committee was set up, when we could have had some input at the start. One of the biggest criticisms we have had over the years is that federal authorities make decisions and we had no input. And after they made the decision we then start reacting.

MR. DECKER:
You fellows (inaudible).

MR. HEARN:
It is not hard to know that he is gone to Montebello, because if he were here the member for the Strait (Mr. Decker) would be sitting there piously with his hands joined, nodding in his direction and not saying a word. But I respect the hon. member's right to interject because, being a very vociferous person, it must be very, very hard on him to sit there day after day, especially when his area, St. Anthony and all the Northern Peninsula, is so affected by the present crisis in the fishery, he is not able to really get up and say and do what he wants to say and do about it, but anyway.

If we are going to have any affect on the decision made by the federal government, then we must have input and we must have it early. And that is why, when the

committee was struck, immediately the leader of our party, at his own expense, was to Ottawa. The government and the people of Newfoundland do not pay for the transportation of Opposition members, as some of you over there know, and some of you will know four years down the road. He went up at his own expense to meet with the Cabinet committee, to stress to them the economic effect, the social effect that this overfishing is having on the Province of Newfoundland.

MR. EFFORD:
Sure, he was the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. HEARN:
Exactly. The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Efford) will be a very busy man in this Province over the next few years after yesterday's budget. He knows something about the fishery, and he knows that the leader was a Minister of Fisheries, a person who knows more about the fishery in the Province than the collective wits of all the gentlemen opposite and lady opposite, who probably knows more than any of them. But that is why he went up, so that he could give some firsthand information, some solid suggestions based upon fact and experience, to the Cabinet Committee so that in making their plans - not in making their final decisions or in their reaction to them - we, as a Province, should have some input, because the present government said, 'We are not interested.' One of those days they will come down to us and then we will make a few suggestions. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, that is why the leader went to Ottawa and he went at his own expense.

One of the 'WHEREASES' in this resolution worries me. It is the third one and it says, "WHEREAS the fishing industry is facing considerable uncertainty as a result of major quota reductions." True! However, taken out of context, the first part, "WHEREAS the fishing industry is facing considerable uncertainty," there is more than the fishing industry facing considerable uncertainty in the Province: Rural Newfoundland in total is facing considerable uncertainty.

I mentioned earlier the entire lack of recognition of the fishing industry, the main industry in the Province, the lifeblood of rural Newfoundland, and a fair amount of blood from it flows into urban Newfoundland to keep it alive. There is one meager mention, and what is it? Another study. An evaluation initiative of the Fisheries Response Program, \$500,000. That is the only highlight in their Budget highlights about the fishery. Yet we can have numerous Highlights about incidentals. One highlight about the fishery, a study. Some highlight! There is absolutely no attention paid to the fishery. The answer, of course, is we have no control over the fishery. The fishery is controlled by the federal government. The fishery off our shore is controlled by the federal government, our licensing policies, our quotas and what have you, but on land we have a tremendous amount of control, in the licensing of our plants, in our infrastructure, our slipways, our marine centers, our fish plants, many of which we own as a Province, yet very little attention is paid to the fishery. Yet many jobs can be created.

Where is Mr. House now? He suggested a few things like that in his Royal Commission Report and he suggested many of them because he sat around and talked with some of us who know something about rural Newfoundland.

Many jobs can be created in the fishery in many of our communities, and all you have to do is look at the record of what has been done over the last few years. I can give you many examples very close to home where hundreds of jobs were created, where the federal government said, 'Too many plants. Too much freezing potential,' but where we, as a government, when we were in power had faith in rural Newfoundland and tried to build it up instead of tearing it down and put some attention and some money into the fishery, but that has been reversed with yesterday's budget.

It is not only the lack of attention to the fishery that we should be concerned with in rural Newfoundland. Many of the members over there representing rural Newfoundland should be concerned also. What about the Premier's own quote, 'Too many fishermen chasing too few fish'? Even your friend at the Liberal Telegram had an editorial that tore into it, that said he was wrong, that he should try to build up and create jobs in the fishery, the potential is there, not tell fishermen to burn their boats and go away, which is what he said right in this House. Take out Hansard and you can see the quote for yourselves.

The Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs (Mr. Gullage), following along on his master's suggestions, talks about

consolidation. It is great to consolidate and centralize, but if we are going to forget the small rural areas that cannot benefit from centralization and co-operation and co-ordination, then we are singing a different tune.

We have seen the rural development movement in this Province completely and utterly ignored by the present government, not only in the sense of rural development where we think of associations dealing with certain projects, and many of them are directly involved in the fishery. Many of them are into aquaculture projects where there are all kinds of possibilities for Newfoundland in the future. Many of them are encouraging industry built around the fishery in their areas. Many of them have used projects to repair their fishing facilities, to encourage operators to come in and create jobs. They have basically been told, 'Well, too bad! We cannot get an agreement.'

We not only could have, we had one. We had an agreement with the federal government and you could not follow up on it, and have not been trying very hard, either. What are you going to do, let the Rural Development Associations die in the Province? If you do, it is going to have a drastic affect on job creation in rural Newfoundland. It is amazing that we can look at the lack of attention to the fishery, the lack of concern for rural development, the closedown of our small rural hospitals, and hear talk about centralization. Move out of the small areas, move to the large centres if you want to get attention from this government, centralize or perish. It is going to be an extremely interesting few

months in this House discussing the budget, Mr. Speaker.

What has all of this got to do with the fishery? A tremendous amount, because all these people who are out in Newfoundland trying to benefit from the Rural Development Associations and trying to save some money by having medical attention close to them, by being able to buy clothing for their children with a tax exception, as they did when we were there, make their living mainly by fishing, or working in the fish plants. As our stocks are depleted, these people suffer, and they will suffer more if we do not provide the extra services that are needed, the services which this government has now made quite clear to them they are going to ignore.

Collectively, as I mentioned last week, we have to deal with this very, very serious issue. On overfishing, over which we have very little or no control, we have to hope that the major federal committee, that is over in Europe right now dealing with the EEC countries, can educate them enough to see that they are also going to be hurt by this overfishing. Maybe when they realize they are hurting themselves they will be a little more attentive to our needs.

However, there are many more things we have control over, and we have to make sure that we do our part collectively, not fighting each other, but collectively, to make sure that the Province does not suffer any more than it has because of serious overfishing and the lack of management. Our best way to do that is to collectively create an awareness within our Province, and within the circles of the federal

government, the major decision makers, and hopefully our concern which may not be at the federal level, will then translate to the other countries that are fishing off our shores.

Mr. Speaker, we will certainly support the resolution. And, as I mentioned last week, then we incorporate it with the one we presented last week and we would have a tremendous resolution encompassing all the different aspects of the fishery, the different ways we, through our own means and methods and our contacts with the federal government, can address the various concerns. We will cover all the bases. It is unfortunate that we could not do it collectively as an all party Committee of the House, because then I think we would have real clout and we would show that Newfoundlanders, all of us, standing together, would be fighting for the good of the people of Newfoundland.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MURPHY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a pleasure for me, the member for the district of St. John's South, to have an opportunity to say a few words of support for the resolution put forward by the hon. member for Carbonear.

However, before doing so I am quite surprised to hear the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes alluding to the hon. Leader of the Opposition as knowing more about the fishing industry than any of the government members on this side. I am amazed. I am amazed because seventeen years of continuous Tory administration in this House produced not the problem of the fishery of this Province, not the problem of the fishery, but the tragedy, Mr. Speaker, of the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) spoke on the fishery and he alluded to the inshore aspect. I suppose, in all fairness to the hon. member, if I only had constituents who dealt with the inshore aspect of the fishery, that is where I would end my comments. I would remind the hon. gentleman that when he alluded to and talked about the 1972 treaty between Canada and France, which was done by a Liberal administration, that opened the door for our friends in France to come over and fish our Continental Shelf, he forgot one very important part. He alluded to the fact that he was a fisherman and fished out of that wonderful community of Flatrock, so scenic, down in the East end. But I would like to remind the hon. member, how many nights or early morning did he look from his window and see trawlers from foreign nations raping and disturbing gear and taking the inshore fishery right from under his nose?

And it would seem as a point of convenience, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members opposite forget the late hon. Don Jamieson, who was so adamant and such a spokesman not only for Newfoundland but for

Canada, the single individual who introduced the most positive thing that has been done in the fishery in this Province since Cabot's landing, and that was the 200-mile limit, Mr. Speaker. How soon we forget!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:

Mr. Speaker, I suppose it may be classified as a little unusual for a member for St. John's to speak on this very, very important subject. However, I would want to inform this hon. House that St. John's South is one of the largest fishing districts in this Province. In St. John's South we have a fish plant that deals with both offshore and inshore species, all species, on the South side that employs a tremendous amount of people from the district of St. John's South. We also have in excess of a 100 inshore licensed fishermen who fish out of the district of St. John's South. So it is with great concern that I rise to speak on the resolution as put forward by the hon. member for Carbonear.

Mr. Speaker, when you consider that we have today in this Province 15,000 licensed full-time inshore fishermen, 16,000 part-time inshore fishermen, 1,600 offshore fishermen and 8,000 plant workers, we are dealing with direct jobs that total in excess of 40,000 in the fishery. Considering that and the spinoff that takes place at the corner garage, or the corner mall or the corner store that people who depend solely and wholly on the dollars that are extracted from the fishery to support secondary industry, you are looking somewhere in excess of 40 percent

of the total employable population in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy. Some time ago, Mr. Speaker, we were cautioned not only by the scientists, by the people who regulate our resource, namely Ottawa, but probably by the greatest scientists who exist in this Province, and that is the fishermen of Newfoundland, and they know, and well know that our stocks are depleting, and they know it because of the empty nets, the reduction in income that they see week in and week out.

When we talk about the mighty codfish, Mr. Speaker, the mainstay of the fishing industry for most of our forefathers, we know what has happened to the codfish, but there is more to it than just the fact that we have lost an amount of tonnage from the TAC. We have also lost the type and quality of fish that makes the fishery a success. If you or any other hon. member in this House had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to walk into a fish plant today, you would see the size of our fish greatly reduced. That has a serious consequence, also, Mr. Speaker. It brings down the size of our profitable export product, commonly known in the industry as specialized packs, that go into the United States, and to our friends in Europe and in Japan. That brings up our lower priced commodity, such as fish block, and the whole industry, consequently, suffers. Even though the pounds may still be there, the yield is down. It affects income. We have to grasp that it is not a simple industry but an extremely complex industry.

Years ago, Mr. Speaker, we put no valuation on so many species of

groundfish that today offer Newfoundlanders a tremendous source of income. We talked about the codfish and the salmon industry and, of course, crustaceans, such as lobster and crab and shrimp. We have gone into the world market place with a quality product, and fought hard to do that, because we had to change attitudes from pronging the fish to proper icing, proper quality control, and all other sound aspects that make the fishery such a viable and worthwhile industry in this Province.

We are now into, Mr. Speaker, such species as caplin, commonly known forty years ago as the fertilizer of Newfoundland, today a multi-million dollar industry. We are also into redfish, and other species of different types of perch.

I would suggest to you today, Mr. Speaker, that the flats, sole, yellow tail, flounder, is the saving species on the Grand Banks today in retrospect to the two big companies, Fisheries Products International and National Sea.

We have to consider, Mr. Speaker, all aspects. And as complex as the fishery is, this government, in its wisdom, has put together a sound committee of the hon. the Premier, the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter), and the hon. Minister of Development (Mr. Furey), to bring forward a plan to convince the highest government position in this country, the Prime Minister, to take our action plans as his goal - and not without action plans, Mr. Speaker, but with action plans, because no goals are attainable without action plans - to hand him the torch on behalf of the 600,000-odd

souls who live in this Province and to go forward internationally, Mr. Speaker, and tell the world that Newfoundland needs its resource on its own Continental Shelf. It is ours, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:

If a foreign country, Mr. Speaker, walked into the wheat fields of Saskatchewan or Alberta tomorrow, there would be revolution. There would be rattling of cannon, Sir. I have been told by our deep-sea trawler captains that the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks might very well remind us all of the skyline of that great city of Mount Pearl on any given clear night, with the lights from the foreign trawlers and draggers.

There is no way possible, Mr. Speaker, that our stocks 2J, 3K and even the even the stocks off the Northern tip of Labrador that have not yet been studied, can possibly last because they are all a migratory stock, Mr. Speaker, that move about. The sad part about it is that the fish do not carry any flags on their sterns, as do the trawlers, as they rape, as they take away the bread and butter of the people in this Province, while your supposed friends in Ottawa do nothing, the hon. the Prime Minister of Canada and his senior Cabinet ministers, including the parliamentary member for St. John's West, who told us yesterday that he was making some progress in Brussels.

Mr. Speaker, this is a tragedy. It is a tragedy for many reasons. The previous administration, every time a little thunder struck, rose and ranted 'Somebody stole the shop. We know who stole the shop!'

It was the inconsistency of the government on this side at that time and point that sold the shop, Mr. Speaker. That is who sold the shop.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who was the Fisheries Minister of this Province for four years, had ample opportunity to put together a team, a set of action plans, and a goal -- because, Mr. Speaker, his own Tory friends were in Ottawa at the same time -- and address this tragedy. Surely heavens, we knew about it. When I say we knew, I mean our fishermen knew and they warned the government at that time what was taking place, that the size of all species was reducing. They had ample opportunity to sit down and arbitrate and conciliate and negotiate with the foreign countries of the world to put in place a progressive reduction of taking of stocks on the Grand Banks in 3K+3KL, to reduce that taking of fish. It was not done, Mr. Speaker. There were no action plans.

When the federal government went off to France, again I am sure at that time the Newfoundland Government were much involved, and it is my understanding, Mr. Speaker -- I stand to be corrected -- that the hon. minister of the day had a spokesperson who went along during those negotiations and, as the allocation of Northern cod was dished out to France, I think it is fair to say that everybody sounded surprised that Ottawa had given away fish out of 3Ps, which they said they historically owned and were going to take as much as they wanted --

no quota, they set their own quota. To try and resolve the terrible catastrophe that was taking place in 3Ps --

MR. WARREN:
They were only there for a short time.

MR. MURPHY:
You know, Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled with the hon. member opposite. He believes so much -- I hate to digress from such a serious subject? -- the hon. member opposite was such a supporter of Newfoundland Hydroponics. Tomorrow that hon. member, Mr. Speaker, will have a chance to show his support as that goes on public auction. You should go and buy it, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:
Bring along some of your sincere friends. If you believe in it, Sir, you have an ample opportunity to grow cucumbers for the rest of your natural life.

Back to the more serious subject, Mr. Speaker, the fishery. Mr. Speaker, we have discussed the fishery at great length in this House already in this sitting, and I have heard some very serious concerns from the hon. member for St. John's East Extern for whom I have total admiration, and from the hon. the member for St. Mary's -- The Capes, with whom I share that admiration. I certainly concur with a great many of the points that the hon. members made. But one particular subject that has not been brought to this House is that the regulators of Occupational Health and Safety concerning the safety and health of our fishermen has not been

addressed.

Every year we read about the terrible carnage that takes place in the waters off our Coast. I would suggest to you, Sir, in the last ten years the annual average is between ten and twelve lives lost. The regulators of the waters of Newfoundland have thrown some kind of an aspiration at both the inshore, the mid-water and the offshore fleets in retrospect of their safety. I say to you and suggest to you, Sir, that it is time the regulators had a good, serious look at what is taking place with respect to safety. It is not only the responsibility of a regulator to regulate or to police.

Our federal counterparts in Ottawa need to come into this Province and change an attitude towards Health and Safety to make sure that all our fishermen have the opportunity for training, education and a better and safer way of fishing.

I am sure we all agree on the importance of the stock. We cannot disagree that our fishermen need also to be protected.

Mr. Speaker, not only is that support required in education and training, but in a more tangible way, Mr. Speaker, to offer flares, flotation vests, lights. The day has come, Mr. Speaker, because of the circumstance, the tragedy of overfishing, that we have many vessels that are without question undersized. It is not only the two new mid-water vessels that are fishing the extremities of the Continental Shelf, it also includes some very small vessels, Mr. Speaker, forty-five to sixty foot vessels, not equipped to go that far afield, with four and

five crew members. And when there is a tragedy - and there have been tragedies - and you look at the accident investigation reports, they are loaded up and proceed with greed on behalf of the Newfoundland fishermen. But the reason the tragedy occurred was because of greed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not a fault-finding venture but a fact-finding venture to pass on to our Newfoundland fishermen a safer way, a more equitable way to harvest the fish stocks of this Province without endangering their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you and this hon. House that I support wholeheartedly the resolution put forward by the hon. the member for Carbonear and, in doing so, recommend that all members of this hon. House support the initiative of this government in its tripartite committee to advance the action plans of this government and the action plans, dreams and aspirations of our fishermen to ensure that the fish stocks have a chance to recover, Mr. Speaker, and while that takes place, that our fishermen can still procure a living. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

It is a privilege for me to have the opportunity today to rise in my place and speak to the resolution put forth by the hon. the member for Carbonear.

Before I get into the text of his resolution, I would like to remind the hon. member that while he was speaking - I cannot quote him verbatim - he said Carbonear really was not dependent upon the fishery. I would like for the hon. member to go down and tell that to the Earles who, with their fish plant over there, at peak season employ 700 people, and with their meal plant employ 25 employees year round; the Harbour Grace Fisheries, at peak, employs 1,000 employees, half of which come from Carbonear, and Pat Quinlan employs another 1,000 employees, almost half of them from Carbonear.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is a hell of a lot of jobs..

MR. PARSONS:

Well, the jobs are there, and it can be proven that that is where they come from.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is false information.

MR. PARSONS:

No. I know that is factual. That is where the people come from.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do not let them interrupt you.

MR. PARSONS:

They are not interrupting you.

If Carbonear is surviving, tell me what industries are over there, if they are depending, the same as the rest of Newfoundland, primarily on the fishery.

MR. WARREN:

Let a guy who knows about the fishery tell you about it.

MR. PARSONS:

I would also like to comment very,

very briefly on my good friend, the member for St. John's South (Mr. Murphy). He mentions my looking out through the window and seeing some foreign trawlers when I was fishing. Well, I was one of the culprits, but not in these years when there is a lot of competition, who fished part time.

I must say that on occasion I did see a trawler, but I did not see it from the window because we went fishing at 3:00 o'clock; there were no lights on the boats, and we had to be back to go to work at 8:00. Any time I saw a trawler it was between daylight and dawn, and I was in the area that the trawler was in. I will reminisce a little bit and tell him that, yes, at one time we were close to the land going down one morning and we did see a trawler close. But I want to remind the hon. gentleman as well that that day is over. You know, we cannot look to the past. That has been remedied.

I am not going to be critical of the member, but he mentions me talking about the 1972 agreement and how the Prime Minister of the day, the hon. Pierre Trudeau, brought in the 200 mile limit. The expedience of it prevailed at that particular time, but what he should have done was go for our territorial rights in the fishing zone rather than go for the 200 mile limit, because what he did was take the precedent set by Iceland and by the States, where 200 miles cover their fishing zone. But 200 miles did not cover the Nose nor the Tail of the Grand Banks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

And that is where he erred. He

was in a rush. It was political expedience. At that particular time there was going to be an election called and those things happened. But that really was the fault there.

MR. WARREN:

You can always learn something from an experienced person.

MR. PARSONS:

The other thing I would like to touch upon is 2J+3KL. Because of pressure from the past government most of our local trawlers were fishing in 3KL; 2J was almost non-existent as far as they were concerned. It was a rougher area, it was further North, more ice conditions and worse conditions weather-wise. But it was because of this government's pressure and because Ottawa did come in and say, Okay, we are going to have the three parts equally fished, that is 2J+3KL. That is what is happening today. And that helped the stocks. Because the fish down North, if it is true what Alverson said, and if it is true what the Harris report states, then there is more than one biomass. So that stock could be separate, to itself down in 2J. But at least now they are fishing that stock proportionately, and it was the present Opposition Leader, who was then the Minister of Fisheries, who brought this to fruition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Looking at the hon. member's resolution, the fishing industry is the most critically important industry to our Province. I have stated over and over, every time I get on my feet, that if the fishery dies so will not only rural Newfoundland but all

Newfoundland. Some people have a feeling that the only part of Newfoundland affected by the fishery is the rural part. You know, about 75 per cent of that is correct. But we are here in St. John's and, believe it or not, there are a lot of fishermen in St. John's; there is a lot of fish landed here in St. John's. The economy of St. John's is subjected to the fishery, not to a great extent but to an extent that is really visible. I mean, you have the Saltfish Corporation on the Southside, you have National Sea, you have the people who bring the salt, which is used all over the Province, so it is an industry that is dependent on all areas of Newfoundland. I can support that WHEREAS.

'WHEREAS the fishery plays a key role'. We just stated the role the fishery plays. There is no parallel to it. It is why our ancestors came over here, and it will be until times eternity.

'AND WHEREAS the fishing industry is facing considerable uncertainty.' The fishing industry was always uncertain. There was an old gentleman down in Flatrock and I often used to hear him say 'it carries no bells.' It did not then and it does not now. But at this present time, we are involved in and part of a dilemma. Over the years, fishermen, in particular, have been stating that the fish are not out there. They can only be caught once. If we had listened to some of the fishermen over the years we might be better off.

Another important aspect of this: The offshore is comparatively new, but the technology that was used in Newfoundland, believe it or not, came from fishing experience

in North Sea, and it is only now because of the difference in the climate and the difference of water temperatures, and whatever, that we have an infusion of our own technology. We are not there by any means, but we are getting there.

The other thing that surprises me, and I have heard about it recently, is that we have people on one of those commissions at least, or a person, who implied that perhaps some of the blame should be laid on the inshore fishermen, the trap fishermen. Now, let us go back in time a little and find out about the trap fishery. The first trap was made by Sir William Whiteway, and William Whiteway was not a Newfoundlander. William Whiteway came from Boston and settled on the French side of Labrador. He made the first codtrap in 1871. Before that he fished with salmon nets, so he used to take so much of the cork off the salmon nets and sink it with sand bags or rocks or whatever. This was the way they fished. In 1871, he fished with the first codtrap. As we all know, Sir William Whiteway became a politician and he served this House from 1889 to 1893. Now that is how long the trap fishery has been in existence in Newfoundland - a long, long time.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. member also mention the numbers of inshore fishermen as compared to the numbers of offshore fishermen. That is the crux of it. That is totally we are all looking at. When I speak about the inshore, when I speak about the devastation caused by the trawlers, I am looking at all those people. Sure I come from an inshore district; all the fishing that takes place there is

completely inshore. I go down on the wharf in the morning now and I see what comes into Torbay, and I see what fish is coming into Flatrock, and what the Tuckers are getting down in the gut, on the Southside. I mean, it is small fish. What they are saying is that it is small fish because the traps are catching all the small fish. Traps do not catch a great amount of fish anyway, but, by the same token, what we are saying now has to be true because the fish out there, the three and four year old fish, is not coming into land, it is not there to come in; it is caught, it is murdered out there where they are spawning. I mean, that is our problem, as far as I am concerned, and it is the opinion of a great number of people besides myself.

Fish come together to spawn. How many people in this Hon. House have been on a river when the trout were spawning? They are dead, they are not lively, they are together. And the same thing holds true for the cod stocks. The cod stocks, for one reason or other, all come together to spawn and we just let people go in and throw down those dragnets. We all understand what those dragnets are. They can devastate the stocks. Can you imagine what is happening to those fish in that area when all this is happening? What is not killed, is maimed, destroyed, and we just cannot bring the fish into being, we cannot have the fish born as quickly as they are being killed. It is just as simple as that. We have people today who say that the inshore fishery should take a cut. My goodness, what will happen to the communities around Newfoundland if the inshore fishery has to take a cut? It could never happen. It is

ridiculous!

We have to look at overfishing by foreign countries. The experts, the scientists tell us there is about 20 per cent involvement in the offshore that relates to our reduction in the cod stocks. In other words, we have 80 per cent control. I have said it and I will say it again, if we can control that 80 per cent, then we should be able to sustain that cod stock. It has also been asked, and I have asked myself on occasion, can we ever expect to have that stock replenished to the 1960 status? I was told by a scientist in BFO that he did not believe that it could ever come back to that healthy state. So what we are saying is, we have done a mammoth job, we have really done a job on ourselves and on our own stocks, and we do not know if it can ever be remedied.

The stocks are in trouble, they are declining. Dr. Keats told us that in 1986. He told us that the stocks were not out there, that people were not sure, that the methodology we used was insufficient and they did not know if the stock was there or not. One study after the other is reasserting what he told us in 1986. We can have all the studies done, or whatever, study after study - we are studied to death. If we keep on studying, by the time the studies are all finished there will be no fish to catch. All we have to do is be sensible and realistic. I agree that there is going to be hardship in the fishery, Mr. Speaker, but remember that the inshore fishermen always had hardship. It was never provided year-round employment; it was always a seasonal thing. Again, someone is going to have to bite the bullet, and perhaps some

areas in the offshore will have to do just that. There has to be a reduction in the quota, but certainly none of that reduction should be in the inshore fishery.

I went down yesterday morning and watched the fishermen come with their catches of salmon. One gentleman had seventeen salmon and two of those were in excess of ten pounds. The others were what we used to call caplin salmon. The days of the salmon have passed. They are gone. There is a month of the salmon fishery gone, so it seems like everyone is trying to take something away from the inshore fishermen, even the salmon, which was supplementing their salary. There was a lot of money made in salmon - a lot of money - right along the Northeast Coast. Those dollars are not coming in now, and we all know why. We are small, there are only 500,000 of us, and the dollars that come from the commercial fishery are not great. But, still, can you look at the fishery in that respect and say this is great, there are so many people involved here, there are so many dollars involved here? What you have to do is look at the Newfoundland fishery and say, this is a fishery of the people, this is a fishery of every community and every cove in Newfoundland.

You know, we talk about jurisdiction and the French right to fish in 2J+3KL. The French would have been out there fishing before, because at that time in Ottawa, in 1972, the Canadian government did give the French the right to fish. Now they are looking for that right because they have squandered, they have destroyed the cod stocks in 3PS. I do not know the answer to it.

I would like to be able to say that I have an answer to it. You see out there the stocks declining, the increase in seals and the potential the seals have, and what can you do? Can you go out and use gunboat diplomacy? Can you bring out our Navy, which means spreading it over that vast area out there, and shoot them if they come in.

MR. WINDSOR:
Nuclear submarines.

MR. PARSONS:
Well!

AN HON. MEMBER:
It floats.

MR. PARSONS:
It floats, yes. It may be good fish food.

But I do not know what the answer is. I mean, I do not think Canada as a country has the answer to all of it.

But going back to the Nose and the Tail of the Grand Banks, it has to be handled with diplomacy. It certainly cannot be done by force. We do not have the force to do it with. We do not have the wherewithal to accomplish that. I think it can be done through negotiation. Everyone saw as well as I did that the Prime Minister did meet with the President of Spain and they did speak about the problems over here. I think he realizes, as does the Prime Minister, that there is a problem, Mr. Speaker, and hopefully something will come from it.

But when I heard that they were pointing a finger at the inshore fishermen as it pertained to the reduction in the cod stocks, trap fishermen, boy, did I get some

charge out of that. I was in the police force. I always think about things that happened and that, to me, is like when a person breaks into a store, knocks the window out, and the man who owns the store is charged. It is as simple as that. The perpetrator is personified and the victim is told, 'Well, now, you caused this.' It is just as foolish as that. If the Minister of Fisheries were here now I would be speaking directly to him and saying, I hope that great emphasis is placed on the inshore fishery as well as the offshore fishery. As I have said, people are going to be hurt. We do not have the fish. The fish is not out there, so we just cannot catch it. And present circumstances will dictate our future; the circumstances of the day, the way we act, what we do, will be the essence of our future.

I have no objection to the resolution as presented by the hon. the member for Carbonear. I think, again, that we should all co-ordinate our effort and bring it to bear on the powers that be, federally and locally, and I think common sense will prevail. I think people out there realize the cod stock is dwindling. I hope we can come to a satisfactory conclusion. Again, I will certainly be supporting the resolution put forward by the hon. the member for Carbonear.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Eagle

River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DUMARESQUE:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

It is certainly a pleasure to rise in this House again and debate this important subject. It is certainly a pleasure to rise as the son of a Labrador fisherman. It is certainly a pleasure to rise representing one of the great fishing districts of our Province, Eagle River.

Mr. Speaker, over the next number of minutes I would like to address a number of things. First of all, I would like to talk about a number of the problems in my district it relating to the fishery. I touched upon a number of these things in a broad and general manner in my maiden address last week, but I would certainly like to touch a couple of them again to bring the problems of the fishery into their proper prospective for all members and certainly to try to get the necessary concurrence of my colleagues if there are changes to be made.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that I am very encouraged by two members from St. John's, the member for St. John's South and the member for St. John's East Extern, whom I would like to congratulate them on their speeches and their insight into the fishery, I look forward to

having more conversations with and hearing more from these gentlemen to see that they put forward their support for the proper direction of our fishery.

Now, Mr. Speaker, last season the fishery in the Strait of Belle Isle was one of the worst that we have seen in the last twenty five years. We have never seen such a devastating fishery. There were times up to around the August 1 of last year when there was not \$100 made by any fishermen from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay, Mr. Speaker. That was the plight of the Labrador fishery in the Strait of Belle Isle last year. The historical problems are always there. There is certainly no doubt that there are some harsh realities, but people have got to get together to recognize some of the problems.

This season we have seen another development, Mr. Speaker, that I think is going to add more harshness to our individual fishermen along the Labrador coast and, indeed, dramatic impact upon the Coastal Labrador economy. This year the Canadian Saltfish Corporation had decided two things: One, that they are not going to buy any fresh fish under eighteen inches in length. They will not buy any fish under eighteen inches in length. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this will mean that hundreds of people along the Labrador Coast will either not qualify for unemployment insurance benefits this year or, if they do, their benefits will be drastically reduced from what they got in previous years. Now the Saltfish Corporation says that they cannot buy that particular fish because they are having problems getting that particular fish to the market-place in the European

countries.

However, I could certainly understand the problems that any fish company would have trying to sell their products. But, Mr. Speaker, when it comes down to fish or people, when it comes down to profit or loss, when it comes down to dignity or no dignity, I do not believe there is any dispute about what the answer should be.

I do not believe that there should ever be a point, Mr. Speaker, a Crown corporation of the federal government, the great moneybags of the federal government, when it comes down to a couple of million dollars, Mr. Speaker, and they say to us: "No, people, no, Coastal Labrador. There has to be a break-even in the Saltfish Corporation and, therefore, you have to suffer the impact of that."

Let those people come down, Mr. Speaker, to the Coast of Labrador next Winter and see what affects that particular decision have upon them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DUMARESQUE:

I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that not one of these decision makers, not one of these experts in the fishery will ever come and take part in the fishery on the Labrador Coast under these conditions and certainly, if they ever do, will never live there because they will never be able to cope with the economic repercussions of the present situation.

The other thing the Saltfish Corporation this year has decided not to do is put on a collector

system this year to bring fish from the Black Tickle - Batteau area of Labrador. We had a glut there last year, Mr. Speaker, we had hundreds of thousands of pounds of fish thrown away, hundred of thousands of dollars put over the side of the boat, Mr. Speaker, because there was no proper collection system in place. There was nothing put in place by the provincial or federal governments that would ease the burden and take the fish the fishermen so desperately wanted to sell, and either have that money put into their own pockets or that fish brought up to the resource-short plants in the Labrador Straits.

That was what happened last year, Mr. Speaker, and this year the Saltfish Corporation are refusing to put on any type of collector system. Therefore, if there is a glut in the Black Tickle area again this year, you will see that a number of the communities in the Labrador Strait - Red Bay, Pinware, West St. Modeste, Forteau, L'Anse-au-Clair, in particular - will be hit dramatically, Mr. Speaker, and adversely affected by all stretches of the imagination. Certainly, these kinds of decisions cannot be allowed, it cannot be permitted to continue.

Another problem, Mr. Speaker, that has always come up on the Coast of Labrador, as I am sure it comes up in different parts of the Island, is their problem with unemployment insurance and the present system of unemployment insurance relating to fishermen and their workers. Fishermen on the Coast of Labrador are not allowed to draw unemployment insurance benefits before November 15 of every year and that has to end, Mr. Speaker,

on May 15 of the following year. I pointed this out earlier and I want to re-emphasize it again, because nobody here, Mr. Speaker, can understand the extent of the damage it does to individual families along the Coast of Labrador when you have to go the two worst times of the year, just before Christmas when you look forward to having cash available to buy things for your children, when you cannot have that bit of cash coming into your household to be able to give them the benefits of this wonderful season of Christmas.

But on the other side of the coin, Mr. Speaker, you cannot imagine the despair, you cannot imagine the feeling of uncertainty, the feeling of frustration, the feeling of being left out on the Coast of Labrador on May 15 of every year when you know that you will have to go for at least a month or up to two months without a dollar coming into your house. You cannot understand the uncertainty, Mr. Speaker, of the people there, on May 15 of every year, especially from the Lodge Bay area North to Cartwright and Paradise River. All these communities, about 14 communities, Mr. Speaker, move outside in the Summer. Where we have 11 or 12 permanent communities in the Winter, we now have about 60 small communities in the Summer; people move out so they can go where the fish are. But every year to get into the fishery they have to come in and buy their supplies, buy their groceries and buy their nets, and they have to do all this on a gamble, on a total gamble, that, yes, there will be a fishtail come ashore. That is unjust. I believe there should be great recognition of this particular situation, and it

should be borne upon the federal government and decisions certainly taken to rectify the problem.

In the next few minutes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about the problems in fishery in a more general nature, in a more mackerel sense, I guess. First of all, I think everybody acknowledges that there is a constitutional problem. In this country of ours, in this great federal state of ours we have a Constitution that runs our particular daily affairs. In the makeup of that original Constitution certain powers were given to the Provinces and certain powers were withheld by the central government. Now, unfortunately for us, I believe that there was not any substantial power given to the Provinces as it relates to the fisheries. There is no real provincial power over the direction of fisheries policy in this country, and I believe that essentially affects the well-being of our management of the resource in our respective provinces. I believe that certainly this is one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that the Meech Lake Accord cannot be signed as it presently exists. This is one of the reasons. Because if we are to ever have any change in this federal state, if we ever are to make the federalism in this country work, if we ever are to have an opportunity to make regional disparity non-existent, if we ever are to have an opportunity to reduce the have-nots of this great country, we have to make sure that the constitutional mechanisms are in place that gives the have-not regions, the poorer regions of our country the respective powers to have significant impact upon the decision making.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DUMARESQUE:

There are a number of ways, obviously, that this can happen. One of the ways that this can happen is through Senate reform and this, indeed, is another reason why the Meech Lake Accord should never have been pushed through the system when it was. Right now, if this Meech Lake Accord goes ahead, you will have to have unanimous consent, all ten provinces of this great country will have to consent if we are ever to change any of the constitutional makeup, and, in particular, make any changes to the Senate. One of the things that I believe is recognized by all academics of the political system in Canada, and they recognize the virtues of the American system, is that there is that check and balance in the system to be able to see that certain powers are not misused, to see that there is appropriate leverage to lesser beings in the whole Federation to see that they are exercised and see that the people of their respective constituents benefit. And I believe that senate reform is fundamental; Senate reform has to take the shape of equal representation so we in Newfoundland can have the same impact as the people in Alberta and the people in Ontario. We can see a situation where the Senate will also be given greater leverage as it impacts upon particular policy directions of the government. Again, if there are comprehensive fisheries policies that would come forward, that would be presented to such a Chamber, if in fact we had our representation there we would have some significant impact upon it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think the constitutional reality has to be paramount in our minds, but certainly I do not think all is lost. I think that we should all come together on this important realization and see that we get the most out of the time we have left, I think up until June 30th of next year, to see that the Government of Canada recognizes the important oversight they made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another apparent and evident problem with our fishery, apart from the Constitution, is jurisdiction itself. As the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern pointed out, in the Government of Pierre Elliot Trudeau there was the bringing in of the 200 mile limit, and we are all proud of that, Mr. Speaker. I think it is recognized all over that such a move was in the greater interests of all, and such a move indeed protected a lot of livelihoods in this great country.

Everybody recognizes that we have no particular ability right now to set the quotas and to control the areas in which the foreign vessels fish, which is, indeed, outside the 200 mile limit, so certainly there is a lot of effort these days to see that there is an extension of the limit to the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks. Certainly I do not believe that when we get up here in this House we should always be negative with regard to what approaches and what moves the federal government or the provincial government are making, whether you are in Opposition in the provincial situation or whether you are of a different political stripe than those at the federal stage. So certainly I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, at least as far

as I am concerned, that Mr. Crosbie and the federal government have made moves in the right direction. I believe they have moved in the right direction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DUMARESQUE:

By taking the fishery to the international stage, Mr. Speaker, by taking the issue of overfishing to the European countries, and by bringing in the federal committee to act upon this important issue and to react to the crisis that we see in our fishery, I believe this is a move in the right direction and I believe there is potential for some promising results from this particular initiative, and I believe we should recognize that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe there are other things, obviously, that have to be looked over. As I pointed out, yes, indeed, I have problems in my district as it relates to the fishery, yes indeed there are constitutional problems, yes indeed there are jurisdictional problems, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the main problem we have with our fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador today is the lack of political will on the part of the Prime Minister of this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DUMARESQUE:

Mr. Speaker, sure we all remember, sure we all know, sure we all associate different speeches and different lines with the great, honourable Prime Minister of this country. Sure we know he is the man who said, 'You dance with the lady that brung you,' but, Mr. Speaker, there is another phrase

that the people of Newfoundland heard. There was a time, not too long ago, when that great Prime Minister came here to St. John's and he said, 'We are not afraid to inflict prosperity on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.' That was another one of his sayings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DUMARESQUE:

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that he has indeed done the opposite, he has indeed said no to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. He has cut back regional development funding to ACOA, he has reduced our transfer payments, he has reneged on our ERDA agreements, he has reneged on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador by saying no to the Tourism Subsidiary Agreement. He is saying no to the people of Labrador by not signing that agreement. He is saying no to the people of rural Newfoundland by not signing that agreement. Is that inflicting prosperity, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DUMARESQUE:

I think it cannot be overlooked, Mr. Speaker, that there is a number one sin this hon. gentleman committed, and that was to sell out our Northern cod to a foreign country, to sell out our Northern cod when it was our justified resource.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, when our Northern cod stocks become a chip in the bargaining process of international trade in this country that is wrong, that is a shame, and the people on the other

side of the House should get up and say so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DUMARESQUE:

I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for St. John's East Extern said, that in the beginning, when the 200 mile limit was brought in for the fishery off our coast, that was brought in by Mr. Trudeau and in his haste, in his political expediency he signed it and introduced it without looking at the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks.

Well, I say now, Mr. Speaker, there is no election on. We have three more years now. I say to the great hon. Prime Minister, do not be politically expedient, do not be looking for votes three years before an election, do what is right and proper right now, extend the boundary to the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DUMARESQUE:

I say, too, Mr. Speaker, do not use our cod in the next round on international trade so that we are used again and drawn up as bargaining chips in the process, recognize individual hardships on the coast of Labrador and, indeed, all over Newfoundland and Labrador. Bring in a guaranteed income for fishermen, bring in something so that the fishermen will be able to get up every Spring and have some sense of security, where they will not have to go out there with that feeling and have to go to the merchants and say, Give me \$500 for my groceries, not knowing if there is going to be a cod tail come ashore

this coming Summer. That is not the proper way to do it. I say do not be politically expedient, recognize those hardships, bring in this security. Mr. Speaker, if these things are done, as I said a couple of minutes ago, we will not be always here criticizing the Government of Canada or, indeed, any government of the day, we will be here justified, I think, in saying, alleluia! thank you very much, Mr. Prime Minister, for bringing back the dignity of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

At the beginning I want to say, naturally, as all of us on this side have said, that we will support this resolution. It is a good resolution.

Mr. Speaker, listening to the hon. member for Eagle River I must say that I am a proud man today. I am a happy person because, Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House for ten years and it is the first time yet I have a colleague from Labrador who has really spoken up on behalf of the Labrador people. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a fact, and now we have two, the hon. member for Eagle River and the member for Menihek.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

But the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) is still very quiet. He is still very, very quiet. He still will not speak on behalf of Labrador. Now it is most interesting, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman speaks about Labrador being neglected. I notice in The Evening Telegram today, Sir, if you will allow me to read from it, what transpired on June 7, 1974, Sir. It says: "Labrador is an area which has been the 'most neglected' of all areas of the province, Premier Frank Moores said in the legislature yesterday as he tabled the Royal Commission report on Labrador."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. gentleman because that is true, not only in fisheries but in every other thing. Governments since 1949 up to today have not recognized Labrador for what it is worth. That is a fact. I am glad to know that we finally have a member over there, on behalf of the Liberal party, the first member since 1949, including myself, who has really spoken up on behalf of the people of Labrador. So I want to give him credit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me also say at the same time that this hon. gentleman during the past election went into the community of Black Tickle and said to each individual person that longliners from Newfoundland, longliners from other parts of Labrador should not come into Black Tickle and take your fish away. Now, Mr. Speaker, how could the hon. gentleman say to the people of Labrador, all

along the Straits - something like thirty-three longliners fished in the Black Tickle - Domino area last year - so from door to door and tell them, 'If I am elected, none of those longliners will fish there this year.'

MR. DUMARESQUE:

Not true!

MR. WARREN:

It is true, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DUMARESQUE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. PARSONS:

Come on! He only has five minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. DUMARESQUE:

I know there are privileges in this House, and everybody recognizes that. I hope I do not have to stand up many more times in this House, Mr. Speaker, to correct something that another hon. gentleman is saying. My integrity, I think, is there for all good people to come and acknowledge, but also, I think, we have to be honest and sincere in this House. The hon. speaker says I went to every house in Black Tickle and said that I would stop particular vessels from coming into that port. Mr. Speaker, I got 88 per cent of Black Tickle to come and vote for me, but I certainly did not do it on the back of other people. I submit that if the hon. member can provide proof that I went to every one of these houses and said this, I would be more than happy to stand up and acknowledge it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. Your Honour knows it is not a point of order but just a blatant attempt by the hon. gentleman to interrupt the member for Torngat, who is making a fantastic speech. The hon. gentleman should learn something in this House. If he cannot take the heat then he should get out of the kitchen.

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:
Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

Let me say further to the hon. gentleman, this Summer let the hon. gentleman go on the wharf in Black Tickle, like I was there last Summer, when all the fishermen were fighting with the longliners from other parts of this district, and if the hon. gentleman will go in this Summer when there is a fish glut, then the hon. gentleman will know that the people of Black Tickle voted for him because of what he said. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that. And let me say one other thing. Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman started his speech he said he was the son of a fisherman. Let me tell the hon. gentleman I am also the son of a fisherman, a fisherman who fished on the Labrador Coast, a fisherman

who fished in Black Tickle, fished in Forteau, fished in Mary's Harbour, and, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of that.

MR. NOEL:
They will vote for you after this.

MR. WARREN:
Let me just say one other thing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:
Where did you get your trap in Mount Pearl?

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, my trap in Mount Pearl is where I am going to put all the stoves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
All the what?

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I will leave that to the hon. gentleman to answer because he knows where all the stoves came from from Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the hon. gentleman for Carbonear (Mr. Reid) that a number of his fishermen, a number of people in the Carbonear district have travelled to the Labrador Coast for hundreds of years, and people from all over Newfoundland, and they have, with all due respect, come back with loads of fish. But, Mr. Speaker, at the same time and I think my hon. colleague for Eagle River will agree with this, they have left very little behind. That is the problem. We go up to Labrador and we take things out, but we leave very little behind.

I am a little bit concerned about the hon. member's expressions during the provincial election.

The hon. member said that he will do what he can, he will make sure that the fishermen from the Island portion of the Province will not be reaping the benefits from Labrador as they did in the past. I agree with him to a certain extent, but I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the fishermen in Carbonear, the fishermen in Twillingate, and the fishermen down in Green Bay, who travel to Labrador year after year after year, may have gotten a message from this government that: 'You better not come up here this year.'

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman from Carbonear for giving me an extra few minutes. I have a feeling this year that the member for Eagle River has set a tone with the people of Black Tickle. Last Summer, because of the good graces of the Leader of the Opposition, who was the Minister of Fisheries at the time, the waters in Black Tickle were calmed. Mr. Speaker, let me say I hope that the Minister of Fisheries this year will be able to calm the waters again because, if not, with the comments that the member for Eagle River made during the election, you are going to see, after 400 or 500 years of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians working and fishing together, fishermen fighting fishermen. I do not want that, Mr. Speaker. I would think that the hon. member for Eagle River would not want it either. I think that is what he has advocated, that is what he has said, that was said in Black Tickle, and the hon. gentleman cannot deny it. The hon. gentleman can get up here and try to cut off my time but he cannot deny that it was said in Black Tickle, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MITCHELL:

He wants a revolution.

MR. WARREN:

Sure! That is true.

MR. MITCHELL:

A civil war.

MR. WARREN:

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this House should go on record as saying that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians can still fish and work together.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in closing that this resolution is missing one very important segment. It was in last week's resolution and the government opposite voted against it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this very, very seriously. I say to the hon. gentleman, because he is concerned about all the fishermen in Carbonear, that one section, in particular, in the resolution that we brought forward last week, the resolution that they destroyed, should have been included in this one. I was surprised when the hon. member spoke first that he did not ask to add an additional clause to it, that this government should immediately take steps, with the concurrence of the federal government or not, to make sure that there is a seal cull this year in the Province, because that will assist the fishermen throughout Newfoundland and Labrador.

I am surprised that not one member on that side agrees with that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No way!

MR. WARREN:

You voted against it last week. You went against the resolution last week.

As I am closing, Mr. Speaker, I will call upon the hon. member for Carbonear to ask the House to include the last 'THEREFORE' in the resolution, to have an immediate seal cull of the seal population in this Province.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. REID:

Mr. Speaker, if I am allowed to clue up as quickly as I can, I do not think I will use my full time. I will do it very quickly. This has been a long debate, a very serious debate, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned and, I guess, as far as every member of this House is concerned.

If the hon. member for St. John's East Extern is correct, let me apologize to the residents of Carbonear if I said that, because I certainly meant to say that they were not totally dependent on the fishery, but they are certainly dependent on the fishery to a large degree.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment on another comment that was made about rural Newfoundland and the impact that the fishery will have on rural Newfoundland in particular. We are all educated and experienced enough in Newfoundland to know that the fishery, and I said that in my opening words when the resolution was presented, will affect the total body of Newfoundland and Labrador - not only the rural Newfoundland area but the urban areas as well. I am certainly sure of that even in St. John's, when you look across that harbour and see the draggers, trawlers and boats that use St.

John's Harbour, and that wonderful plant that we have on the Southside.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an argument between the Opposition and the government over who is qualified to get up in this House and speak on the fishery; whether your father fished in Labrador or your mother fished in Labrador, or where you fished in Newfoundland, or what connection each member in this House has with the fishery, is immaterial. I have listened to this from both sides on this particular argument, and I think we have come to a point where it does not matter if we are involved in the fishery, it does not matter if there are members in this House who do not have fishermen in their districts, that this is a question that we as Newfoundlanders as a whole should deal with and take seriously, and this bickering and arguing over who fished where on the Labrador, and who said what during an election, as far as I am concerned, is nothing only pure malarkey.

I respect the two hon. gentlemen from Labrador who are here, and there is another one not sitting with us right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Four.

MR. REID:

Four. I apologize. The member for Menihek - am I correct? - a good friend of mine, is the fourth.

Stationers for example, from the Carbonear area and the Conception Bay North area, and I mentioned that early in my speech, if you will remember, Mr. Speaker, travelled to Labrador and they have been doing so for the last 150 years. I am familiar with

these people because I was brought up in a part of Carbonear where the majority of my friends and my family's friends were stationers. They left each Spring, and I remember them going. I am 41 years old and I can remember a long time ago that these families, the Forwards, the Penneys and all the other groups of people, trekked to the Labrador Coast each year. I thank the hon. members for Labrador for allowing these people to go up and fish up there, because I am sure that if they could not go up there to fish they would not be able to fish at all because Conception Bay cannot provide a sufficient amount of fish to them.

Mr. Speaker, to clue up let me say this. Let us not be concerned about what was done in the past. Let us not be concerned about what the previous government has done, or what the previous Liberal administration did in Ottawa under Mr. Trudeau, or what this administration is doing under Mr. Mulroney. Be it good or be it bad, it really does not matter. This is a pressing and immediate problem in this Province, and a problem that has to be rectified. I think, Mr. Speaker, that both sides of this House, all this House believes that. It is a problem that every man, woman and child has to address, regardless of political stripe or belief, and they must pull together as one to save the basic fabric of Newfoundland society.

I will entertain, Mr. Speaker - I do not know if I am doing this properly or not - but I will entertain to be included in my resolution that part that the hon. member for Labrador suggested.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. REID:

Mr. Speaker, we did not vote against that particular part of the resolution last week. If I remember correctly, and I would have questioned it, the hon. the Premier did not mention in his comments, because I wrote them down here myself, anything about the seal fishery. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that part of the resolution of the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes that talks specifically about the seal fishery, I would be willing to include into my motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Was there an amendment?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader inquires as to whether or not there was an amendment. I think the amendment was made in a rather informal manner, in that the member for Torngat Mountains in speaking just said that he would like to make a suggestion, and it is my understanding that the member for Carbonear is accepting that suggestion, rather than a formal amendment as has been the situation, and I will be directed by the House as to the procedure.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, to a point of order, probably, just so we will know with clarity what we are doing. I guess we will have to check with the Clerks at the Table to find out how this can be done appropriately, although we

understand what the purpose of the amendment is. If you are going to have a vote in the House of Assembly, obviously, you need to be absolutely clear and, generally speaking, amendments would be done in a properly and orderly fashion, but we understand and we accept it. So maybe we can do it by agreement, because when we vote we will have to vote on the amendment first and then on the resolution, and then maybe the Clerks will make sure that is properly recorded, or something like that.

They are nodding so I assume it can be done.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to understand what is happening here. We have gone through a process and the member is making a speech. I understood that he indicated that he looked favourably upon suggestions and the members opposite and so on. I did not hear any amendment, you know, it was just a normal speech and so on. There were no amendments. The member was speaking, but I do not understand on what basis this is happening at this point. He was not finished his speech. He was simply talking. It is not normal for a member to move an amendment to his own resolution.

MR. SIMMS:
The member for Torngat said he would like it done.

MR. BAKER:
My understanding in referring to

hon. members opposite, is that there was no amendment made. There was a speech being given. The member is now summing up in support of his resolution, and my understanding is that is what is happening. I do not understand how all of this arose, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, to clarify what was said, I said I would suggest to the hon. the member for Carbonear that he would include a last THEREFORE in his resolution, that this government would immediately have a seal cull in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. That was my recommendation, the hon. said he agreed with it and he would include it in his resolution.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, I think there is a proper process involved with bringing amendments to the House, and while the suggestion in the verbal amendment has merit, I think that we would be straying outside the boundaries in creating a precedent here, Mr. Speaker, that it would be wise for Your Honour to look at. While we accept the verbal recommendation, and while we are prepared to look at that, if the hon. member believed so deeply in it he had all week to prepare a written amendment and bring it in in the

proper fashion and apply it to the Table for our consideration, and we would have appended it to the main body of the resolution and, indeed, accepted it.

Your Honour, what I am saying is that we have to be very careful here that we do not set a precedent based on a verbal amendment. Anybody could come forward with a verbal amendment on any particular resolution at any time then, so I would ask Your Honour to consider that.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, just a final comment on this without making it much more complex than it has become. The member indicated that he was quite prepared to introduce a verbal amendment. There is no question about that. A verbal amendment is quite acceptable. There is no precedent, nothing wrong with a verbal amendment. The hon. member might need to do a bit of review.

The second point is that a member can amend his own resolution. I would not want the hon. Government House Leader to suggest that that cannot be done, because that can be done. Clearly, there is no difficulty with that.

So what this is all about simply is that the member has verbally said that he would like to amend his resolution to include the last THEREFORE from last week's resolution, that is all. And we have simply said, trying to be co-operative, if that is what he

wants to do then we are quite prepared to accept it. But we just make the note of the fact that it was not done properly, it was not written, and that is no big deal. We are quite prepared to support the amendment. If you do not want to put forth the amendment then do not put it forth. No problem.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I find it highly unusual. As I pointed out before, the member was in the process of giving a speech and all of a sudden for some reason there was an interruption. I fail to understand the reason for the interruption. If the member wanted to make an amendment to the motion, he could have. But I fail to see the interruption in the normal process where the member is summing up his resolution and it will be voted on. If there is a particular concern that another issue be added, members opposite, I understand, introduced a resolution previously including that, but also including some other things that were unpalatable to the government, then members opposite can easily introduce the resolution and it can be debated and voted on.

Any member can introduce an amendment to a resolution but this has not been done. I am simply questioning the process, Mr. Speaker, whereby a member speaking is interrupted, then this procedural rangle occurs. I do

not believe this has ever happened before, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Could I just have a word or two? Because it is obvious what is happening here, Mr. Speaker. There is a private member on the government side of the House who indicated - it is in Hansard, it is easily available - that that hon. gentleman wished to amend his own resolution. There is nothing wrong with that. The hon. gentleman clearly indicated that he would take the suggestion put forth by the member for Torngat Mountains and was prepared to amend his resolution accordingly.

Now, here is what happened, Mr. Speaker - this must be understood quite clearly - the ministry is now trying to stifle the backbench on the other side.

MR. SIMMS:

Hear, hear! That is exactly what is happening. Do not let it happen, Art.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The ministry now wants to ensure that the private member from the government side, who can vote for a government resolution or vote against it he is a private member, does not bring forward something that might tie the hands of the government or embarrass the government, and in doing that they are trying to blind side their own colleague, they are trying to muzzle their own colleague and not allow their own colleague to bring forward an amendment to his own resolution that he wanted to bring forward. That is what the Government House Leader is trying

to do and let us be clear on it.

MR. SIMMS:

It is very clear, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, it is most unusual that an amendment be introduced in the manner that it was introduced. Normally it is done in the proper way, with an amendment written and with the appropriate mover and seconder. I would think, I suppose by agreement, the House can do anything. But there seems to be some disagreement and we will just leave it, again, in the spirit in which the member for Torngat Mountains amended the motion. I took it to be simply a suggestion, and by agreement the member for Carbonear was just in compatibility stating that he did not disagree with the suggestion, but no amendment was made. We just call the resolution as is, so the hon. gentleman may conclude.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. REID:

Mr. Speaker, I will clue up by saying this particular resolution deals with the overfishing on the Nose and Tail of Grand Banks. I do agree with the hon. member's suggestion and I would like now to suggest to the House Leader that this caucus, possibly with help from the Opposition, could put together a further resolution dealing with the seal fishery at some later time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. REID:

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to now move my motion as presented, and move to suspend

debate, and the motion to be voted upon.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the House ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question!

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? All those in favor, 'aye', contrary minded 'nay'. The motion is carried.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until Monday, June 12, 1989, at 2:00 p.m.