



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 4

---

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

***Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush***

Wednesday

31 May 1989

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):  
Order, please!

ooo

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Government House  
Leader. Or Opposition House  
Leader, I am sorry.

MR. SIMMS:  
That is okay, Mr. Speaker. It is  
quite acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a  
point of privilege for Your  
Honour's consideration. It is the  
earliest opportunity I have had to  
deal with the matter because I  
wanted to wait to get a copy of  
the Hansard of yesterday's  
proceedings, which I was able to  
attain late this morning.

I want to say, first of all, Mr.  
Speaker, that I realize that the  
Speaker cannot rule on a question  
of privilege. As Beauchesne's  
Sixth Edition clearly says in  
Paragraph 26 (3), "It follows that  
the Speaker can rule on a question  
of order, but he cannot rule on a  
question of privilege", as he  
knows.

Your Honour's role, of course, for  
the benefit of members, I guess,  
is to decide whether the matter  
that I am about to raise, and that  
I will raise, is of such a  
character as to allow a motion,  
which I am prepared to move, and  
give that motion priority over  
Orders of the Day. In other  
words, whether a prima facie case  
is established.

The matter I want to raise deals  
with a response given to this  
House yesterday by the Minister of  
Forestry (Mr. Flight) in debate.  
With Your Honour's indulgence, I  
will try to summarize it as  
quickly as I can and quote from  
yesterday's Hansard. Yesterday's  
Hansard pages 146, 147 and 148 are  
the appropriate references.  
Basically what transpired is that  
the Leader of the Opposition was  
responding to comments made by the  
Premier in response to questions  
concerning transportation  
projects. They had asked for  
officials in the Department of  
Transportation to provide them  
with a list of priorities and to  
put forth proposals for the  
government - not proposals, but  
actually what the projects would  
be. The Premier was commenting on  
how the government accepted the  
advice of those senior officials  
and the expertise, and the Leader  
of the Opposition made the point  
that he had no problem with that,  
of course, but he would have less  
trouble with it if the Minister of  
Forestry was able to say that he  
accepted the professional advice  
of his officials. That is what  
the issue was all about.

In essence, later on, on page 147,  
after rising on a second occasion,  
I asked the minister the question  
pointedly. The question is: 'Can  
he categorically deny that his  
officials did not recommend a  
program using both products,'  
referring, of course, to the spray  
program? The minister's response,  
'Yes.'

So, Mr. Speaker, he denied  
categorically that his officials  
did not recommend the program  
against the looper using both Bt  
and fenitrothion.' That is the  
point.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my whole argument is that I happen to know, obviously, as a minister in the former administration, exactly what the officials of the Department of Forestry prepared and recommended in a submission that was submitted to Cabinet, to the Executive Council. I happen to know that. That was done just over a month ago. I happen to also know what the views of the professional forestry people in the department are with respect to the program, what the views of the Federal Forestry scientists are, and what the views of people in the industry are, and I can inform this House that the officials' recommendation was that the department be authorized to carry out an aerial program in 1989 against both the budworm, incidentally, and the hemlock looper using, and these are the operative words 'using the registered insecticides matacil, fenitrothion, and Bt on up to 8,000 hectares, and, as I say, this can be documented.

So my point today, Mr. Speaker, is I want to know how, then, can the Minister categorically deny that no such recommendation was made to him. The paper is in the system, in the Executive Council. It would have had to have been withdrawn by the Minister and a new one ordered drafted, which I suspect is the case, telling the officials what to put forward. But that is not the point here, that is a matter for debate. But it is pretty clear from the information and the evidence that I have presented and that I have, that either the Minister misled the House - either that is the case - or the Minister did not mean to state so categorically his denial of yesterday, one or the other. I believe the Minister

owes the House an explanation and an apology, at the very least, and that could very well simplify the situation. However, if he persists, I think he will have to be brought to task by this hon. House, without question, because the evidence can be presented and then he would have to be treated accordingly.

References in Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, page 27 of the new 6th Edition which you were kind enough to send us a copy of only a few days ago, clarify all of these matters. But the most important point on page 27 deals with the urgency and the importance and the seriousness of a question of privilege. I can assure you I would not raise it if I did not consider it a matter of extreme seriousness and importance, and it should be considered and dealt with seriously by this House. If this kind of action is allowed to continue, Mr. Speaker, then the privileges of all members of the House would be brought into question. That is the point of privilege I want to present, Mr. Speaker, without getting into a lot of debate, to give the Minister an opportunity to respond to it. Maybe he can clarify the situation. But I am certainly prepared to present the appropriate motion, suitable for debate, if Your Honour decides or should rule to allow that particular motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, to set the stage, I am willing to accept that the Government House Leader met the

conditions with regards to the immediacy of raising what he considers to be a point of privilege. Also from Beauchesne, page 29, No. 117, I understand, as he pointed out, that the Speaker requires to be satisfied that privilege appears to be sufficiently involved to justify giving such a procedure. In other words, that a prima facie case does exist. And I understand what Your Honour's decision must be. Obviously, the first question we have to ask is what is privilege? What is meant by privilege? We refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, page 11, 6th Edition again, No. 24. "Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by members of the House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions." So privilege is something that interferes with the proper discharge of the functions of the Government House Leader, and so on, and that is the matter on which you have to decide whether there is sufficient evidence that this should go to a parliamentary committee.

So the matter of privilege is understood by both sides. Now, then, let us deal with the specific case in point. Months ago, proposals were submitted to a previous government involving the projected spray program covering 8,000 hectares for both the hemlock looper and the spruce budworm, as admitted by the Minister. Since that time, conditions have changed not only politically but in the forest. The situation has now changed. The projected program for this year will be somewhere between 5,000 and 6,000 hectares, and the spray is to protect against the hemlock looper, not the combination of budworm and looper.

Now, then, in the intervening time various discussions have been held between the Minister and officials.

The exchange in the House, Mr. Speaker, that is being referred to, on Page L146, May 30, 1989, Vol XLI, I believe that is, No. 3, is that a comment was made that "...if the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, who came into the House today, were able to say to us that he accepted the professional advice of his officials on the spray program," and the minister responded, "I did." Then the Government House Leader responded, "No, you did not."

The Leader of the Opposition went on to say that "The professionals in the Department of Forestry did not recommend to the minister the course of action that was taken..." The Government House Leader said, "That is correct." Then there was a point of order and the Government House Leader in speaking to that said, "Can the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture stand in his place today and categorically deny that his officials did not recommend a combined program using fenitrothion and Bt? Can he categorically deny that they did not recommend that course of action?"

The answer given was: "Mr. Chairman, I can categorically say that my officials placed in front of me various options. We looked at the options and my officials indicated that given the scope of the program - which had since changed, since the previous government was involved - given the level of infestation, that Bt was indeed as good an option as any."

Then further on: "The question is can he categorically deny that his officials did not recommend a program using both products that we are talking about?" The minister responded, "Yes."

Now, there are a number of things about that that I want to point out. First of all, in the wording of the question, there are enough hon. members of the House who come from the teaching profession and some other professions who would recognize that when a question is asked, "Can he categorically deny that a course of action was not recommended?" that that means that the course of action is recommended? The double negative there tends to reverse the understanding of the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

So, there is quite a lot of doubt as to the meaning of the question, and I would simply like to point that out. But it is a minor point, Mr. Speaker.

The major point here refers to - I refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, Page 151, No. 495 - the fact that statements by members, particularly within their own knowledge, must be accepted. We must accept the fact, according to Parliamentary procedure, that it was within the minister's field of knowledge to describe the advice given to him by his officials over the last two weeks, and not in the area of knowledge of members opposite. These discussions were private discussions carried on between the minister and his officials and, in actual fact, were not within the area of knowledge of members opposite, and we must accept, according to

Parliamentary precedent, that the answer given by the minister was, in fact, correct. I believe it to be correct.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we are to proceed in this House on the assumption that nothing has changed, if we are to proceed on the assumption that the advice given previous ministers one month, two months, six months ago and, as time goes on, we may be talking about two years ago, if we are to assume that the advice given ministers years before is still operative within the department - in other words, that there are no changes, that circumstances do not change, that everything remains static - then we could get into an endless repetition of these types of spurious, even silly points of privilege that eat up the time of this House. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in this case - Beauchesne, Page 13, No. 31 - "A dispute arising between two Members as to the allegation of facts does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege." It is stated very, very clearly. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is obviously no point of privilege, no prima facie case.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to have a few brief words on the case put forward by my colleague, the Opposition House Leader, the member for Grand Falls.

First of all let me say to the Government House Leader that there is one assumption that we on this side of the House are going to assume to be a fact forever and a day, as long as we are occupying benches on this side of the House --

MR. GILBERT:

That will be forever and a day.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Maybe it will, sir. But if it is, as long as there is breath in our bodies, there is one assumption that we are going to assume to be a fact, and that is that when members, whether they are ministers or members, stand and say something in this House, it is factual. We have to assume that. Therefore, the specious argument put forward by the Government House Leader defeats his own argument, really.

We have to assume, we have no other choice but to assume, we have no other choice but to accept that when a minister or a member speaks in this House, the information forthcoming from that person is correct. Now we have evidence to suggest, evidence which, in our view, proves conclusively --

AN HON. MEMBER:

It was months ago.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Not months ago, submitted to Executive Council April 17, I believe, something over a month ago. We have evidence to suggest the industry in this Province has said clearly today -- there is an uproar in this Province today in the industry, Mr. Speaker, extreme concern, and we have a responsibility as an Opposition to raise this matter, because we have irrefutable evidence in front of

us to suggest that the minister did not accept the advice of his officials. That was the clear unequivocal question put to that minister yesterday by the Opposition House Leader. The clear unequivocal answer to the question was, yes. 'Do you deny it?' 'Yes, I deny it.' In other words, 'Did you accept the advice?' 'No, I did not.' That is the prima facie case, Mr. Speaker, and that is what we will put down the appropriate motion on should Your Honour rule accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair is just about ready to make a decision, but to make sure the decision is as proper as possible, I would like to recess the House just for a few moments, if hon. members would agree.

### Recess

MR. SPEAKER:

As a matter of introduction of this important matter, I want to say that in these circumstances, where we have a change of administration, many rules and regulations will be unlike those where we had a continuation of the same administration, because there is a difference. Many quotations, or many authorities in Beauchesne, Erskin May, and others, support what happens with a change of administration.

In this particular situation, I rule that there is no prima facie case and hence no point of privilege, the situation being that with a change of administration the hon. Opposition House Leader has in his possession certain documents dated at a certain time, and we can only, in

this case, assume that the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture (Mr. Flight) had intervening conversation. I think the Leader of the Opposition, himself, referred to the fact that we must believe the member, and the member indicated that he had discussion with his officials and that he was offered many options. So we can only assume that the options discussed had to do with the statement that the hon. gentleman made.

The essence, I think, of the point of privilege was that the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture did not follow the advice of his experts and that he misled the House in saying that he did not follow the advice of his experts. As I have said, we have no proof otherwise but that the minister did carry on conversation and that what he delivered in the House was, indeed, the result of conversation with his experts.

The only other concluding point that the Chair would make is that obviously with the change of administration there are going to be many proposals made that are going to be changed. Otherwise, a new administration would be completely hamstrung and would not be permitted to do anything. But, that is not the key point. The key point, again, is whether the minister, in answering the question, did not mislead the House. It is the ruling of the Speaker that in view of the information that is available to us, we have to believe the hon. minister in his remarks, that he did, indeed, carry on dialogue and discussion with the experts, and that, indeed, what he presented was the result of that discussion and agreement with his officials.

## Oral Questions

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, I will try it another way now. In view of the fact that the minister did not take the opportunity during the debate on the question of privilege to explain a little further, clarify or elaborate a little further, I will give him another opportunity now in Question Period to do it. The minister has stated yesterday in Hansard, as I said, categorically denying his being given a recommendation by his officials for a combined program using both fenitrothion and Bt. And I want to ask the minister today, does he still stand by that statement, number one? And in responding to that question, can he explain to the House the reason for the very serious adverse reaction by industry spokesman yesterday and today with respect to his announced plans?

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member will know that when I became the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture the department had to prepare and get ready for a forest protection program, using the means of that protection, a spray program. I

spent many hours with my officials asking them their advice, and they have given me their advice, and in exchanging views with them. And my answer to the member is very simple: When I finally made a decision on the spray program that was announced in the House. It was a spray program, given the scope of the program, given the size, the miniscule amount of forest to be sprayed, given the level of infestation, given that my officials and the forest industry agree, based on research, that we may well be looking at a collapse of the hemlock looper infestation next year, given all those facts, Mr. Speaker, then in conjunction and out of the dialogue and out of the conversations and out of the advice and my advice - their advice - we decided that the spray program that I announced was the right spray program for this year, and that it will afford a reasonable and acceptable level of protection to the forest. And that is the decision that was made and that is the way the decision was made.

MR. SIMMS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I noticed in response to my question the minister did not answer either of the two questions I asked. I asked him if he would categorically stand by his statement of yesterday - that is number one - and what is the reason for the serious adverse reaction by the industry people? Particularly in view of his answer where he said that he had discussions and consultations, that forest officials agree that

out of the dialogue came this decision, and so on and so forth, can the minister, Mr. Speaker, tell us why those professional forestry people in the industry are so adverse, so opposed to his decision, if, in fact, he did have consultations with them as he said? And why is Newfoundland so different from, say, the Province of New Brunswick where last year they sprayed with Bt 50 per cent and the results were devastating, and the infestation has seriously increased? This year New Brunswick are going to spray with 16 per cent Bt, the rest with chemical insecticides. Why is Newfoundland so different from New Brunswick? Can he explain why in Hansard on Monday the minister said he was consulting with the industry? What kind of consultation is this that he has described to us today?

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I can only say that for the previous spray program, last year's spray program, it was recommended, I think, that 25 per cent of the spray program would be Bt. We indeed went and sprayed 35 per cent, with relatively good success, with the kind of success that we would have hoped we would have gotten from a Bt program. Given, again, the miniscule size of the spray program, the level of infestation, the decision was to go with Bt, because it was the right and proper decision, given the level, the scope, the size of the spray program, Mr. Speaker.

The member refers to an adverse



reaction from the various industries. Maybe the member would want to elaborate. I am not aware of any adverse reaction from the industry at this point in time.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, all the minister has to do is listen to the news broadcasts. I mean,, industry spokesmen from both Kruger, Corner Pulp and Paper, and Abitibi-Price have been on the airways yesterday evening and today severely criticizing the program, expressing considerable concern because of their fear about the future. So, I mean, all the minister has to do is listen and there are even PR people up in the Premier's Office to monitor those kinds of things.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. gentleman is on a supplementary question. I would like for him to get to the question.

MR. SIMMS:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

I was responding to the question the minister asked me. Can I ask the minister if he would advise the House why he did not announce in his statement yesterday the other recommendations of his officials with respect to the budworm infested areas that still exist in the Province, in excess of 1,200 hectares in a moderate to severe category located at South Branch, Codroy Pond, and Southwest

Brook on the Bay de Verde Peninsula? Was that an omission? Will there be a program? If so, what will the details be? Could the minister advise us of that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I thought I had met my obligation to the House when I stood and announced the spray program for 1989, a spray program to combat the hemlock looper. There is no spray program, as he is aware, for this year to combat the budworm. So, why would it have been necessary for me to include in a statement announcing our 1989 spray program something that we did not intend to do anyway? The level of budworm infestation in this Province is being monitored, as he knows. When and if it is necessary for me to recommend to Cabinet, a spray program against the budworm, I will recommend it to Cabinet and then I will come into this House and advise the House of the decision of Cabinet. It is that simple. I stood up, Mr. Speaker, and I announced the spray program for 1989, Bt only.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, and I want to say this, that I am surprised at the attitude of the member for Grand Falls, and I suspect that he is a little envious to have this government, this minister, announce a program that he would dearly love to have announced in this Province over the years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition Leader.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, what we are envious about on this side of the House is jobs affecting thousands of people in dozens of communities in Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

And we have a minister, Mr. Speaker, who is playing Russian roulette with the lives of the people in this Province.

MR. SIMMS:

Right on. Right on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now let me ask the minister this. Did not the officials in his department advise him that the spray program in New Brunswick last year, using 50 percent Bt, was an abysmal disaster? Did they not advise him not to proceed to use 100 percent Bt in this Province? What advice did they give him in regards to the hemlock looper? Answer the questions?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty answering the questions.

We were designing a spray program for Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, not New Brunswick.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition will know that last year we sprayed in this Province with Bt 23,000 hectares of forest. The total spray program this year is 6,000 hectares. Quite possibly it may only be 5,000 hectares because of evidence coming in day by day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it was okay to spray 23,000 hectares of forest land with Bt last year, pray tell me why is it not alright to spray between 5,000 hectares to 6,000 hectares with Bt this year?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Ask your officials.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Will the minister please get to his feet and tell the House the answer to the question, was there advice from his officials this year to have a spray program against the budworm?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I have spent roughly two weeks as Minister of Forestry, and 90 percent of that time has been spent with my officials receiving advice from every aspect of forestry in Newfoundland, among which were the various ways and means available to us to protect forest industries, to protect the

trees, to guarantee that Kruger, to guarantee that Abitibi-Price will always have a sustainable yield of timber to keep those mills going.

I will do that, Mr. Speaker, and I will use any means available, with Cabinet approval, whether it is chemical spray, whether it is Bt.

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition I have spent 90 percent of my time accepting advice from my officials and formulating policies based on that advice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Before recognizing the member for Humber Valley, may I advise hon. members, just in case everyone is not aware, that today is Wednesday and on Private Member's Day Question Period is to end at 3:00 p.m. I probably should have announced that before.

The hon. the member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. I would first just like to ask the minister what the status of the commission or task force on agriculture is right now?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What a relief, to get a question from a member who is concerned about the issue, Mr. Speaker, not necessarily concerned about the-

MR. TOBIN:  
Tell the truth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Answer the question.

MR. FLIGHT:  
To the hon. the member for Humber Valley, the status of the recommendation on a task force is simply this: I am aware that his administration had proposed a task force, and representative of the industry have met with me since my assuming office and discussed the task force and its possibilities. I personally agree, as a minister, that a task force may very well be a good idea and that is the advice that I am bringing to Cabinet for their consideration.

MR. WOODFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:  
I can understand, Mr. Speaker, where the minister is coming from and I can appreciate that he has just gotten into the portfolio. One of the things I was concerned with was a CBC radio broadcast on May 24, after your meeting with the President of the Federation of Agriculture. There may not be any reason for concern, and I hope not. It is a motherhood issue as far as I am concerned, and something that was recommended by the Commission on Employment and Unemployment a few years ago. In conjunction with some of the things the administration has said in the past few months with regard

to creating jobs in this Province, this is one of the areas that can be looked at, because it has always been on the bottom rung of the ladder, and it has great room for expansion.

The newscast said the minister said a task force had never been appointed and that Flight hopes it will be different now. So do I. Also, the newscast said Mr. Flight said it is the first time he has heard of the task force. That is okay. That is fair enough. The newscast also said he said the high cost of setting it up will be a factor in deciding whether it will go ahead. Could the minister clarify whether there has been anything new on that since that statement?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing new. The member will obviously be aware that the cost of setting up anything in this Province has got to be a major consideration. I simply stated to the industry that I am aware that the recommendation in the House Commission Report was to set up a task force, recommending that we get a map for agriculture for the future. I am considering all the advice from the various sectors with regard to setting up a task force on agriculture. When all that advice is available to me then, I say to the member, I will deal with it and I will make a recommendation one way or the other.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I have a question for the hon. the Premier. In view of the fact that one of the Province's most respected public affairs programs, and I suppose one of the most listened to programs in the Province, and certainly a program that is vital for the information of fishermen in Newfoundland and Labrador, in view of the fact that that program has had an SOS out for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter) for the last three consecutive days, could the Premier tell the House whether or not The Fishermen's Broadcast has been censored by this government and whether or not his minister has been ordered not to appear on the program?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, a question that silly is not really deserving of an answer. I do not know of any SOS out. I do not know what the hon. Leader of the Opposition means. I assume he means they have been trying to contact the hon. minister. Well, I cannot imagine why they cannot contact him. Any news media that wants to can contact me. I do not know why they have difficulty contacting the minister, but I will certainly ask him to find out.

I have been listening to this tripe in the House from hon. members about ministers being prohibited from speaking, that I am the only one who can speak for the government, that only I will speak for the government. Mr. Speaker, the insanity or the stupidity or the deception, whatever the case is, of that is

clear when you recognize that I have not been on my feet in this House, except for opening day. Except for opening day, I have not been on my feet in this House except to respond to a question asked.

MR. WINDSOR:

Has the Minister of Finance (Dr. Kitchen) got laryngitis?

PREMIER WELLS:

All the ministers have been asked. I have not been making any statements. I have answered only the questions asked.

How is it that they can say, with a modicum of credibility, that I am the only one who can speak for the government? What are they talking about? It is silly shenanigans to try and make some kind of a point. Just how silly and stupid it is is obvious when you look at Hansard and see clearly, Mr. Speaker, that in the days the House has been open I have not been on my feet except to answer questions.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I could not care less whether the Premier thinks it is tripe or whatever he thinks it is. We will ask the questions and it is up to the government whether they provide the answers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, let me ask the Premier this: Would the Premier not confirm to

the House that the reason why the Minister of Fisheries for three days in a row, and the Premier for one day, have not responded to repeated public calls from The Fishermen's Broadcast to be interviewed on the Harris Report, a matter of vital interest to the fishery of this Province, is because The Fisherman's Broadcast has been censored by this government because that program stuck to its guns, reported the babbling of the Minister of Fisheries, reported the firing of the former Deputy Minister of Fisheries before the Premier got a chance to do it, and that program has been censored for sticking to its story? Is that not the real fact?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

I am not aware that the program has every contacted me. My number is listed in the book. They can contact me. All news media call me at home, and whenever they want to. No member of the news media who ever wants to contact me has ever had any difficulty. I have not failed to return one single call that I have received from the news media. Now, to the best of my knowledge nobody in my office has received a call that has not been returned, but that is more than I can say with certainty until I check. But I will check, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the second part of the question was was the program censored? Of course not. Any time The Fishermen's Broadcast wants to speak to me, or wants me to go on The Fishermen's

Broadcast, all they have got to do is ask and I will gladly do it. There is no cause to censor any news media, as the former government used to do, and that will never be done. Never!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER:

It now being three o'clock Wednesday, Private Member's Day, I call upon the member for St. Mary's - The Capes to introduce his resolution.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

#### Private Member's Day

MR. HEARN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Before I get into the resolution, let me take the opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Speaker. Already you have established yourself quite well, as we expected, and we look forward to a continuing good governance of this House. I would also like to congratulate the Deputy Speaker and Vice-Chairman of debates on their election, and the Premier and his government upon their election to the House, and I welcome, particularly, the new members who, during the last two or three days, must be getting the feel of what really happens here as the world turns and the Province is governed.

I think you will find that even though there are many times when we disagree upon things, basically

there are many issues upon which we will agree, and hopefully the resolution today is one. Because if you want to follow it a little further, to the second resolution which will be coming up next, one presented by the member for Carbonear (Mr. Reid), you will find that both of them zero in in a positive way, hopefully, in dealing with a major crisis that affects our Province at the present time.

The resolution I am going to propose is dealing with things that can be done, over which we as a Province, or we as a country have some direct immediate control and say. The one that will be coming up next, perhaps we will get some argument from the federal government as to what control they have over the Nose and Tail, but the resolution is asking them to exert some control and press for it, and we will be supporting that resolution wholeheartedly.

In relation to today's resolution, for Hansard I will go through it:

WHEREAS the present crisis in the Newfoundland fishery should now be recognized as a national disaster; and

WHEREAS a special Federal Cabinet committee has been put in place to deal with this problem; and

WHEREAS there is a pending disaster for fishermen, plant workers, trawlermen, and the Province generally; and

WHEREAS the total economy of the Province is going to be negatively affected; and

WHEREAS foreign concerns continue to fish non-surplus species; and

WHEREAS the rapid growth of the seal herds is detrimental to our fish stocks; and

WHEREAS the Newfoundland fishermen have been expressing these concerns for years; and

WHEREAS there is a lack of capability at a provincial level to gather and assess pertinent information relating to the fishery; and

WHEREAS the former Government continuously sought more input in decision making relating to fishery issues; and

WHEREAS the present crisis transcends Party politics;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that an all-Party committee of the House be struck to monitor and have direct liaison with the Federal Cabinet committee; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Hon. House press for a proper compensation package for fishermen, plant workers, trawlermen, and communities affected; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Federal Government be requested to review their licencing policies as they relate to foreign fishing interests; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that immediate action be taken to reduce and control the seal population; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the present Government develop within the Province the capabilities to gather and assess appropriate information related to the fishery that would be necessary for proper long-term planning; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the present Government develop the proper technologies to harvest and market under utilized species; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Province continue to seek involvement in the decision making processes that relate to the Newfoundland fishery.

Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House have changed slightly in relation to Private Member's Day, as we will probably have only one day to debate the resolution, which may be positive, because sometimes when you drag things out they become outdated. The issue is current. If we are all going to take our twenty minutes, it will give only a few a chance to speak. I will try to be very brief. Other members want to get on record, I am sure, as supporting the resolution and commenting on the state of the fishery, especially the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter), who, I know, will want to follow up on this, as well as some of the new members. I saw my friend, the member for Exploits (Mr. Grimes), the great fisherman, who might want to get up and have a few words on it.

One of the most serious crisis ever to face the Province is with us today. Over the years, if you lived in an outport in the Province, and perhaps if you did not, because the major centers depended upon the business from the outports - St. John's grew because of the business that came from the outports, and actually as a fishing centre itself, and as a major supplier to the fishing areas around over the years.

You can look at Gander, in Central Newfoundland, which has grown

tremendously because of the fishery on the Northeast Coast, and you can go on and on, Corner Brook, and what have you. But all of the Province is greatly affected. There was no one who ever thought, as we grew up in the outports, that there would ever be a scarcity of fish, from the days when Cabot is purported to have dropped baskets over the side and collected fish, whether it be caplin, cod, or whatever. Many of us remember being down on the beaches during the caplin schools and seeing the cod fish running ashore in the harbours, in the different inlets around the Province. And when trap fish season came around and you went out and set your cod traps, if you did not haul it and fill at least your own skiff, and a few of the smaller boats that were around, it was considered a poor day.

There were bad years, yes. If you talk to some of the older fishermen they will tell you of years when the fishery was bad. And perhaps the scientists have something when they talk about water temperatures, and what have you, but you will find that the existence of such years will be the exception rather than the rule, and if you had a failure in one part of the Province, several other areas had glut situations.

However, in recent years such is not the case, and despite the fact that we heard about water temperatures, plankton, and what have you, fishermen themselves were saying there was one major reason why there is not as much fish around: the fish are being caught offshore, mainly; it is being destroyed; the breeding grounds are being raped, spawny fish are being caught; the food stocks for the fish are being

eaten up, destroyed, or caught, and consequently the fish are not there. When we had lots, and lots of fish, the fish came to shore despite the great offshore caplin stocks. The fish stock itself, and when I say fish I am talking codfish, when you say fish in Newfoundland I guess you are talking codfish. The codfish came to shore because they were pressed to shore looking for food, following the caplin schools because of the great amount of fish outside. Now, because the stocks are so small that pressure is not there and the fish are not coming inshore. When we talk about the inshore allocation not being caught in recent years it is certainly not because of the effort by the inshore fishermen, it is simply because day after day they are casting out their nets, as they were, and coming up empty handed.

What are some of the reasons? Well, finally, last year, the major scientific report said, We have miscalculated the fish stocks. The fishermen, as I said, have been saying that for years, and other qualified people in the fishery have been saying it for years. The fish stocks have been raped by foreign concerns on the Nose and Tail of the Grand Bank, within our 200 mile limit. They have been raped by our own people. There has been no real regard for management of the stocks. It is only in the last two or three years that, with a lot of pressure, we have seen observers put on boats. We have heard about large by-catches being taken. We have heard about species being caught and thrown away. And you question that, regardless of whether they are, you know, supposed to catch them or not. Once you catch fish and



it is dead and you throw it overboard, it seems to be a tremendous waste. Surely there should be a better way of monitoring and handling the situation than that.

We hear about the tremendous growth of the seal herds. A lot of people take it very lightly. We have our Greenpeacers and other groups who advocate looking after the herds and not harvesting them in any way, whether it be a cull, whether it be a hunt or whatever. But when we look at the tremendous growth, and somebody mentioned yesterday in the House about the amount of food, seal eats .. I understand approximately forty pounds a day. Whether it be codfish or the food that codfish eat, perhaps it is incidental. It would be one or the other. And even at half that amount, estimating that a seal only eats twenty pounds of fish a day, the amount of fish eaten by the seal herds presently comes out to something like fifty times as much as the total allocation to the Province of Newfoundland this year. That is a tremendous amount of product. So, if the seals continue to grow and not only eat the codfish or the food that codfish eat, but also continue to infest the fish, and I can say fish generally here - it was thought that the parasites coming indirectly from the seals affected maybe only codfish. Today we hear of people telling us that you will find them in lobster, you will find them increasingly in flounder, and even, now, some of the hunters in the Wintertime will tell you many of the salt-water ducks are affected by the parasites that come indirectly from seals. So this is an extremely serious matter.

What are some of the things we can do once we move off the beach? The control of the Government of Newfoundland is very, very little. What we can do is continue to pressure, hopefully, the common sense that the Province of Newfoundland, irrespective of parties, has raised. The Province, generally, has tried to have an input into decision making, has tried to, I suppose, implant upon the minds of the decision makers that there is a serious problem, that there was one on the horizon several years ago that nothing was done about. Now it is crisis time, and hopefully we are listened to. When I say 'we', hopefully I am talking about we collectively, members of the House, government and Opposition, industry, fishermen, trawlermen and the Province generally, because all of us are affected. Fewer fish for the fishermen to catch means less work for the plant workers, it means fewer trawlers needed to harvest the stocks on the offshore, it means fewer boats going to make a living, fewer crews on the inshore, it means fewer trawlermen, it means fewer plant workers, it means fewer dollars going around the communities, from the small ones where the fish is landed to the larger centres where they will be spent. So the whole Province is being affected.

And when we talk about compensation, we are saying the government should press, and we know they will and we will certainly support them, for an adequate compensation package, not a continuation of LIP programs to say we are going to bring in a program and give you three weeks work fixing up your wharf. That is not what we are talking about.

We are talking about direct compensation to the fishermen, to the plant workers, to trawlermen, and the communities generally who are affected because of the lack of income caused by a lack of proper management by the federal government over the last number of years.

We, ourselves, have to get more directly involved. Hopefully the RESOLVES here are not considered to be there in a negative sense, such as 'the Province develop the capability to gather and assess appropriate information.'

Up on the hill we have the Marine Institute, a world-class institution that has come a tremendously long way. We have a university that has done worldwide-recognized work in relation to the offshore and the fishery, and so on. Certainly we have within the Province, if we put the expertise together, the capability to zero in on the type of information that we can use. If we had been given the flexibility, perhaps, to do it in the past, and if the Province had been consulted more by federal authorities, maybe some of the information that they now have, if they had opened up their eyes and said, 'Yes, it is there,' they would have seen it quite some time ago and the drastic steps that are taken today and the more drastic ones that undoubtedly will occur next year, would have been averted somewhat. So hopefully we can start building there and using our own expertise, and hopefully we will be listened to. But I think we will only be listened to if the Province presses for a greater say in decision making at the federal level. We have been pressing in this hon. House over the last few years for more say, the Opposition

then and the government now.

I heard the Minister of Fisheries, a few days ago, commenting on a few things that I had said, and saying that the government cannot patrol the 200-mile limit, we cannot take over the jurisdiction. We never asked for that. All we asked for, and all we ask you to look for, is a say, so that you can have some effect upon the decisions that are made at the federal level. Surely, God, no, we cannot, with 22s and dories, patrol the 200-mile limit. But we can have input.

The Minister of Fisheries is an experienced gentleman who not only served as Minister of Fisheries before, he served as a federal MP in Ottawa and I worked hard to get him there. He has familiarity with the federal system, and certainly his expertise and experience can have an effect upon some of the decisions that are made at the federal level, if they will listen to us and if they let the Province have some input. That is what we are asking for in the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

So, hopefully, number one, we will press for greater say, we will press to go on, and ourselves, as a Province, try to develop expertise which will be accepted by those who make the decisions, where we cannot make them ourselves. We will press for a control of the seal herds, we will press for a greater compensation package for those who are affected by the fishery, and we will do it collectively.

That is why the first part of the resolution says that a committee should be set up involving the whole House, so that we could go to Ottawa as a unit representing

the Province and the concerns of the people of Newfoundland on this great issue. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker, I just have a few comments that I want to make with respect to the resolution, most of which we support, some of which we cannot support.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of sessions of the House, when I sat on the Opposition side, it always bothered me that when the Opposition put forward a resolution the government would move an amendment to it and so alter it as to change the character, sometimes diametrically the opposite of that which was intended. Now, while a motion to amend a resolution may well be in order, it has always occurred to me that this kind of a resolution on Private Member's Day is the Opposition's resolution and the government should allow the Opposition to let it stand without emasculating it to try and score some political points.

So I will say to the hon. member that we are happy to support most of what is in his resolution, but there are a couple of things that we cannot support. If he agrees to change those couple of things, then we would be happy to have it changed and happy to have the resolution voted on in its changed form. But we will not move an amendment to change the intention of his resolution. We will let it stand and if we cannot vote for it, then we will have to vote

against it. But, in fairness to him, I will tell him what changes we would require. If he agrees he can do it, and if he does not agree, that is fine. There will be no criticism from us, but he will understand if we vote against it.

The first recital causes me no real problem. I think that that accurately states the situation. So does the second recital. There is a Cabinet committee put in place.

And there is a pending disaster for fishermen, fish plant workers, trawlermen, and the Province generally: That is an accurate statement and we agree with it.

The total economy of the Province is going to be negatively effected: Very substantially negatively effected, and we agree with it.

Foreign concerns continue to fish non-surplus species: To the best of my knowledge that is in fact so. We are prepared to let that stand.

The rapid growth in seal herds is detrimental to our fish stocks: You do not have to be a genius or an expert to readily agree that that is so. That is obvious and that ought to be attended to.

Newfoundland fisherman have been expressing these concerns for years: That is true too.

The next one: There is a lack of capability at a provincial level to gather and assess pertinent information relating to the fishery. I am not sure that that is entirely accurate. There is a lack of capability and a lack of resources that would be sufficient

to enable us to gather information to a level that would enable us to fully manage the fishery. I think that is probably accurate. But, in fact, if we do not have responsibility for the management, or the jurisdiction to manage, I do not see that it would be a good expenditure of public funds to duplicate that assessing capability. Obviously, we should maintain a capability to assess the situation and monitor to the maximum of our limited financial ability, at least to the extent that is necessary to enable us to comment on the way in which it has been managed and what is being done from time to time. But, really, I do not know where that would lead us, where he intends this to go. The word 'pertinent' is a subjective measure; what is or is not 'pertinent' to the Province's role and responsibility in the fishery is the question. That leaves a little bit of uncertainty, but I will not haggle over that recital. I just indicate my concern about that.

The next recital: "WHEREAS the former Government continuously sought more input in decision making relating to fishery issues."

Well, I will not quarrel with that. But I will let it be known that what they sought was legislative jurisdiction. I have four statements issued by the former Premier, Mr. Peckford, where he specifically asked for and stated the government's position to be that they wanted more legislative jurisdiction. That is clearly a wrong approach for this Province. We do not have the ability to exercise the legislative jurisdiction we have now in other fields, such as health and education, let alone seeking legislative jurisdiction

over 400,000 square miles of the North Atlantic Ocean. On the understanding that I agree that by 'more input' what the former government sought was in fact legislative jurisdiction, I do not mind leaving that as it is.

The present crisis transcends Party politics: I agree.

Then comes the resolution: "BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that an all-Party Committee of the House be struck to monitor and have direct liaison with the Federal Cabinet committee." The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is no. We object to that and we will not have an all-Party Committee of this House take over the responsibilities of government. It is the Liberal Party that has been elected to govern this Province and it is the Liberal Party that will do it. A Committee of Cabinet has been struck to carry out this direct liaison with the Federal Cabinet Committee and it will not be an all-Party Committee of this House.

So if the hon. member is prepared to remove that first resolution, that would go a long way toward solving our problem in terms of supporting the resolution.

The second one: "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Honourable House press for a proper compensation package for fishermen, plant workers, trawlermen, and communities affected." We endorse that. We are happy to participate in that precedent.

The third one: "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Federal Government be requested to review their licencing policies as they relate to foreign fishing

interests." We heartily endorse that as well.

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that immediate action be taken to reduce and control the seal population." We heartily endorse that as well. That is consistent with a resolution that I believe we introduced and put forward in the last session of the House, or at least a resolution that we supported. I do not remember which now.

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the present Government develop within the Province the capabilities to gather and assess appropriate information related to the fishery that would be necessary for proper long-term planning." I have to say yes to that, on the understanding that the word 'appropriate' is, again, a subjective test and what I have in mind is capabilities within the limits of our financial resources and capabilities designed to place us in a position to play the proper role that the Province should play. So I would endorse that on that basis.

The next one "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government develop the proper technologies to harvest and market under utilized species." While I can sympathize with the intent of it, the wording of it is too all-encompassing. Will it cost \$20 million? \$200 million? \$500 million? I do not know. I am not prepared to give a blanket endorsement to it without that kind of knowledge. I would be prepared to make it somewhat more limited and if the hon. member were prepared to change it to BE IT RESOLVED that the present Government promote or do all within its means to promote the harvesting and marketing of

underutilized species, I would have no problem with it.

The final recital: " BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Province continue to seek involvement in the decision making processes that relate to the Newfoundland fishery." We endorse that. That is consistent with our position that this Province should have a greater say in the management of the fisheries.

We should have a greater say, and we can achieve that by working toward a joint federal/provincial management program that would manage the entire fishery in the waters off Newfoundland. But I cannot, Mr. Speaker, agree to endorse the first resolution. That cannot be. And I would like that change in the second last resolution.

Now, in general, just to demonstrate the position that I have taken with respect to the recital relating to more input, here is what the former government saw. Here is there program, Managing all our Resources, that was produced by the former government and here is what it says. "The objective towards which this Government will work over the next five years is to achieve provincial legislative and regulatory control in the following areas of fisheries management:

- \* Determination of specific fleet and area quotas within federally established global quote.
- \* Division of quotas among fleet components.
- \* Harvesting plans.
- \* Licencing of fishing efforts."

Then they go on to spell out the targets associated with this objective. You cannot do that unless you are prepared to pay the policing cost. And when you think about legislative jurisdiction we can only thank our lucky stars, Mr. Speaker, that we were not the ones that had the legislative jurisdiction sought in this document when this disaster hit. Because, you see, the reason why the federal government is moving so quickly to acknowledge its responsibility and to put in place a compensation package is they recognize that it was their jurisdiction and their responsibility, and it was the federal government that failed to do it properly and they have responsibility for the consequences.

If it had been our legislative jurisdiction and our responsibility, we would probably have taken precisely the same advice that the federal government took from the same scientists and made the same mistake, and we would have financial responsibility for the consequences. And that responsibility we are not able to meet. So we are fortunate, Mr. Speaker, that we did not have what the former government was seeking when this disaster struck, because with those rights would have gone responsibility for the consequences of the bad management or the mismanagement or the negligent management or the bad luck, or whatever it was, that caused the disaster that presently exists.

So without keeping the House further, and making sure I allow as much time as possible for other speakers, Mr. Speaker, I say if the hon. member is prepared to

make those adjustments we will be happy to support the resolution. We do not, however, think it right for government to alter the resolutions put forward by the Opposition on Private Member's Day, and for that reason we are not making the proposed amendment ourselves. But if they will agree with it, we will gladly support the resolution as changed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to take the opportunity to have a few remarks on this resolution as well. I certainly agree with the Premier and the mover of this resolution, that this is a very, very important resolution. I believe, without being picky or partisan, if we can find some common ground, the more common ground we can find the better in dealing with what in anybody's view, I think, without being alarmist, is a very, very difficult time facing the Newfoundland fishery certainly for the next five or six years for sure. I think all of us who have some insight into the fishery would recognize that.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me say that if we were to follow the Premier's argument in terms of concocting a reason to be against further jurisdiction for the Province then, of course, the same argument that the Premier just articulated would apply in agriculture. The same argument

would apply in transfer payments for education. The same argument would apply for any number of areas where there is exclusive provincial jurisdiction yet a significant amount of federal financial participation.

I am not going to spend a great deal of time today arguing who is right or who is wrong, whether we should have more jurisdiction or less jurisdiction, but I simply want to say that in years past, in the agricultural industry in Canada, and anybody who knows anything about the Constitution at all knows agriculture is strictly within the provincial domain, yet year after year, after year, more specifically over the last two or three years, years of great crisis in the agricultural industry in Western Canada, there have been significant amounts of federal financial assistance to overcome what is a national problem in an industry that is so basic and so important to a large part of the country. That is the point, I guess, that we want to make here. Leaving aside legislative jurisdiction for the moment, we are facing in the fishing industry in Newfoundland and Labrador a crisis that has national overtones. It is true to say, and it is in fact true, that the mismanagement, management, good management, bad management, whatever it might be, has to come back to the doorstep of the Government of Canada. They are the managers of the resource. That is true. That is not arguable. You cannot argue against that.

But, having said that, it is also true to say, Mr. Speaker, that this problem is so important for Newfoundland in particular, and Atlantic Canada in general, that

in order for it to be attacked it has to be attacked with a national determination. Therefore it is incumbent upon this government to ensure that the Government of Canada, and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador co-operate.

The Government of Canada, I suppose, could take the attitude, but I hope they will not, I certainly would not advise them to, but I suppose they could take the attitude that, yes, we are responsible for the management and we will continue to improve our management techniques, rebuild the resource, and all that kind of thing, but the economic destiny of Newfoundland and Labrador is your problem and you solve it. I hope that that is not the attitude. I hope that the attitude is one of co-operation. We have a problem here that affects tens of thousands of people. It will, over the next five or six years, affect the livelihoods of tens of thousands of people. It will, over the next five or six years, Mr. Speaker, affect hundreds of communities. It will, over the next five or six years, affect dozens and dozens of processing operations in this Province. It will affect hundreds and thousands of fishermen. It will affect hundreds of plant workers. So the magnitude of this problem is one that is unique in Newfoundland and Labrador. It is a problem, of course, in other parts of Atlantic Canada, but by far the most significant economic impact is going to be in this Province, and, therefore, it is absolutely essential, in my view, that this Province have its act together. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is really, in essence, the spirit of this resolution.

We are ordinary, sensible, sane individuals, and we know we are not the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. We know that we do not have the right, as a government does, to liaise with the Government of Canada. We are not that stupid. We know that. But we do also know, Mr. Speaker, that as concerned Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, as elected representatives of people in twenty-one constituencies in this Province and, collectively here in this House, elected representatives of fifty-two constituencies in this Province, that this problem is of such a magnitude that it is incumbent upon all of us to work together to try to lessen the burden as much as possible for this particular industry for the sake of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. That is the intention of this resolution.

Now, if there are some words that just do not happen to fit, then we are prepared to look at that, but we are not prepared, Mr. Speaker, to have the substance of the resolution watered down to a point where it means nothing just for the sake of having it accepted. That is not the purpose of this resolution. It is not the purpose of generating this debate. If the only purpose were to have the resolution accepted and then gather dust here or in Ottawa or in somebody's office, that does not serve any of our purposes any good. The debate, I hope, will, but to have it accepted just for the case of being accepted is not the point.

We are prepared to look at a couple of those preambles and other parts of the resolution that might cause the government some difficulty.

For example, in the first "BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED", where we indicate the desire to have an all-party committee to liaise with the federal Cabinet committee, what about if an all-party committee of this Legislature were struck on fisheries? I do not believe that that is a bad idea, by the way, to have a Standing Committee of this Legislature that is responsible for monitoring, on a day-to-day, month-to-month, year-to-year basis the development in our most important industry.

There are many other legislative jurisdictions which have far more Standing Committees of the Legislature than we have. I believe, in the sense of Parliamentary reform that the Premier talked about in the Throne Speech, it might well be that we could have a number of Standing Committees of this Legislature, obviously on which members from both sides sit, because it is not a Committee of the Legislature if it is all from one side that has any input or any significance, but we could have a number of Standing Committees of this Legislature that would be working committees. Not just committees to be struck, again, for the sake of being struck, but would have a mandate similar, but different obviously, to the mandate of the Public Accounts Committee, that would have a mandate from this Legislature to oversee and to have input into and to monitor various areas and issues and sectors of the Newfoundland and Labrador economy that are vital and important. Certainly no one can think of anything that is more important, more vital to the future of Newfoundland and Labrador, than the prosperity, or lack thereof, of the fishery.



So we could have, in my view, a substantive working Standing Committee of this Legislature on the fisheries. We could have them, perhaps, on other matters as well, but certainly on the fishery. If the Premier and the government would concur, that Standing Committee on Fisheries would be what could be substituted here in this particular "BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED", and it could be a committee that from time to time would be asked by the government, by the House, but particularly by the government, to look at various issues that the government and the House wants it to look at, to study various issues that the government and the House might want it to study, and to make recommendations. Obviously the recommendations of a committee are never binding on the government, but it would be a way to utilize the productivity and the innovativeness and the hard work of members of this Legislature on behalf of the people who sent them here.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should perhaps look at that. As this particular crisis is on the horizon, one of the new and innovative and productive approaches we can take is striking an all-party committee of this Legislature, a Standing Committee of this Legislature, on fisheries, something that, as far as I know, we have never had before. Certainly we have never had it in the time that I have been here. I believe that would be a good signal. It would not be the 'be all and the end all' and it would not be expected that this group would provide all of the answers, but it would be a good signal, I believe, from this Legislature to the fishing industry of Newfoundland and Labrador that

their elected representatives are genuinely concerned about the most important resource industry we have in this Province. It would be a signal to fishermen and plant workers and communities, to Newfoundland and Labrador society at large, that we are prepared to be working, productive legislators, that we are prepared to roll up our sleeves and, if there is a particular area of the economy that this year or next year or the year after is facing a particular crisis, that we are prepared as a group to act. Sure, there will be a partisan split in the Committee, obviously there is, we are a partisan Chamber, but we can work together, we can co-operate together, we can be productive together and, hopefully, bring forward some solutions together that just might be sensible, that just might be sane, that just might be implementable and just might make the fishing industry in this Province a little bit better. If we can do that, Mr. Speaker, then this resolution will have achieved something. If we do nothing other than the debate, I suppose the resolution will have achieved something, but with a resolution of this magnitude, it would be sad, in my view, if it were to be a two or three hour debate today and that would be the end of it. So we would be prepared to look at that, if the government were interested.

The other recital that the hon. the Premier referred to, that he appeared to have not a lot of difficulty with, but some difficulty, was the business of the Province lacking a capability to gather and assess pertinent information relating to the fishery.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is absolutely elementary and it is fundamental - jurisdiction aside, control aside, shared jurisdiction aside, Fisheries Management Board aside - it is absolutely fundamental that there be a group to reassess and to look at all over again the facts that the scientists placed before the federal government. I do not believe for one minute that we would be facing the present crisis we are facing in the fishery of this Province today if we had decided ten or fifteen or twenty years ago to have our own, not separate assessment capability, but to have a capability to be able to technically assess what the scientific community puts before the decisionmakers. I mean, as Minister of Fisheries for four or five years, and I am sure the present minister would have had the same experience in his day, you go to the Atlantic Council of Ministers meetings and here are the CAFSAC documents, that thick. And you have no scientific capability in the Province in the provincial Department of Fisheries, other than your own ability to digest it and the ability of your senior good advisers, who are not scientists in Newfoundland and Labrador at the moment. You have no alternative but to accept the advice of the experts. The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans himself normally is not a scientific expert. Certainly, the ministers provincially are not. And the odds are, Mr. Speaker, that you will be overcome by all of this data and all of those statistics that those experts will place in front of you. You might be able to zero in here and there and say, well, 'look, the fishermen down in Twillingate tell

me that this does not make any sense' and the person over in Harbour Deep tells me, 'You are full of you-know-what when you come on about this water temperature and all that', but you cannot argue against it. You cannot sustain a technical defensible argument against whatever their position is. And I believe that we should have in this Province, in this industry in particular, not a huge empire, but the ability to be able to assess what the scientific community is telling us. If we had had that for the last ten years or so, if we had had that before the Alverson Report, I believe that we would have been in a position of strength to be able to go to the Council of Ministers meetings or the CAFSAC meetings or the AGAC meetings or to whatever meetings there are where the management decisions are made on the fishery and argue from a position of strength that, yes, this makes scientific sense. No, it does not. Here is why it does not. And here is where you should be going.

I believe it is vital that we have that. And I do not think that that would take the building of a huge expensive empire. It might take the hiring, perhaps, of two or three or four scientific experts in assessing biology and fish migration patterns and fish growth and what water temperature does to Northern cod, vis-à-vis what water temperature does to the growth rates of 3NO cod, those kinds of things. It might take an expertise in that area, but I do not think it takes reinventing the federal scientific wheel. That is not what I am talking about. I am talking about the ability for this Province to be able to have some kind of an independent assessment

for its government, for its minister, for its people, for its industry. That, in many respects, Mr. Speaker, is the position taken by NIFA two or three years ago, for example, that we cannot afford forever and a day to be in a position where somebody else - granted, they may be right sometimes, but they can be wrong sometimes too, as we now see - where somebody else is always telling us that this is what is happening, here is what you can do, here is the way you should go, and have no technical expert capability of being able to assess that advice. That, I believe, is the real crux of what the hon. gentleman who put down the resolution is talking about when he says that we should have a greater ability at the provincial level to be able to garner and assess pertinent scientific information. I think that is absolute vital for this Province. I really do think it is absolutely vital.

The other area where the Premier had some minor concerns, and I think it can be erased very quickly, was with calling upon the government to develop proper technologies to harvest and market underutilized species. For the next five or six years, Mr. Speaker, and then once it is done, of course, it is here forever, but it absolutely vital for the next five or six years that there be a diversification of usage of fish species. Absolutely vital! And there are presently species like Greenland halibut, grenadier and redfish and 2GH cod and so on, that are not being utilized, for whatever reason; the fact of the matter, the reality of the matter is that there are certain species of fish left in the water.

And the present international set up, of course, is such that if you have a species that you are not utilizing and therefore are determined to be surplus to your needs, under the International Law of the Sea Convention you have no choice, you cannot take a dog in a manger attitude, you have no choice but share that resource with the international community. But we have another choice, Mr. Speaker, and that is the choice to utilize the species. That is the choice we have. We do not have the choice to tell somebody else they cannot touch it, we do not have the choice to be dogs in the mangers about it. The choice is simply in our lap to do something about utilizing the resource. That is our choice. If we do not do it, if we do not have the will and the commitment and the finance commitment to back up that, then we fail and we can only blame ourselves for that failure. Now what more opportune moment, Mr. Speaker, I say to you and say to this House, to break out of that mode once and for all?

We have a crisis facing us because of the cutback in total allowable catches for that great commercial species, cod. And it is incumbent and desirable that that species be built back to a sustainable renewable resource and properly managed forever more. That is all our goal. But in that period of time, what a great opportunity - perhaps for the first time in our history, certainly for the first time in a long time - when we can encourage, financially and otherwise with incentives, the development of technologies in using other species that for centuries and centuries upon until now have been left in the ocean, or left to others to catch. And if we do it now, if we are

successful in attracting that technology, developing that technology if we have to, if we are successful in diversifying our effort into what are presently underutilized species, then we will have that capability forevermore. And when the Northern cod stocks rebuild, as they will, - I am confident of that - instead of going back to that great dependency on the one species, as we have been for 400 or 500 years, he can have a diversified fishing economy in all parts of Newfoundland and Labrador. While the problem that faces this Province in the fishery is great there is also an opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I do not like to stop the hon. member in high flight, but I have to remind him that his time is up. With consent of the House if you need a few minutes or so to clue up, that is fine.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I will only be a minute or so, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentlemen do not mind I will clue up.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, just let me say while the economic picture on the horizon for the fishery in the Province at the moment is not good, and there is going to be a lot of howling and screaming because there is going to be a lot of belt tightening, there is no doubt about that. There is a silver lining. There is an opportunity for us to expand and diversify the fish resource

space of this province. If we lose that and concentrate totally on solving the other problem, then this Province will be worse off for it and we will have learned nothing for the experience.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. REID:

Mr. Speaker, let me first of all say how honoured I am to sit in the House and represent the historic district of Carbonear. I think I have already gotten my feet well wet somewhat in the last couple of days, and hopefully in the next three to four years I will not drown, - but anyway.

Let me say first of all, Mr. Speaker, that I commend the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes for his resolution, and the fact that my resolution that follows his is basically the same with the few exceptions that the Premier has outlined. I want to make a few brief comments today on the resolution and on the state of the fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, I am a little perplexed at the comments that are coming from the Opposition. The problem on the Tail and Nose of the Grand Banks of Newfoundland and the whole overfishing question, is certainly not something that has been created since April 21. This problem has been with us, we have been debating the problem, the previous government has debated the problem, and we have talked about it for years. By the way I thank the hon. member for making the comment and suggesting maybe this new Liberal government may be able

to succeed in getting some negotiated package with the federal government to solve this problem, because this other government, previous to this one, had seventeen years to do it and they could not succeed. So thank you very much gentlemen and ladies. Just let me back up what I am saying here with some information here that I received this morning.

MR. RAMSAY:

Is it backable?

MR. REID:

It is not backupable, no.

I have the figures here for 1985 to 1989, Mr. Speaker, on NAFO allocations, EC unilateral quotas, the actual catch, and the amount of overfishing. And let us go back to 1986. In 2J+3KL in 1986 the NAFO allocation, which by the way, Mr. Speaker, Canada is a member of, was 9500 metric tons. The EC unilateral quotas which they set for themselves was 68,500 tons. The actual catch that year was 59,336 tons. The overfishing in that particular area of the Grand Banks, on the codfishery for that one year, just in one area codfish alone, was 49,000 metric tons. That, Mr. Speaker, was back in 1986. In 1987 basically the same thing happened again. We set the quotas, being a member of this international committee, we set the quotas for 9,500. The quotas were then set unilaterally at 84,000. The actual catch was 19,000 which was an overfishing at 19,000.

I have the information here, Mr. Speaker, that shows that the EC overfishing from 1985 to the present time. The actual catch has been diminishing substantially even though the quotas that they

are setting for themselves are higher, higher and higher. That says to me, Mr. Speaker, that the problem we are faced with today is not a problem, like I said, that was created on April 21. It is something that Newfoundlanders and the previous government had to deal with, and apparently have not been able to deal with.

Let me go back to a government document, Mr. Chairman. I did some research on this in the last couple of days. I do not know if I have enough or not, but I am assuming that some of the material that I have in front of me is authentic. The problem of foreign overfishing of Canada's Atlantic Coast The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, August 1986. The previous, previous Premier agreed, when he made this statement, that "The solution to the foreign overfishing problem requires a strong expression of national political will in the international community."

This government, Mr. Speaker, believes in that, believes strongly in that. It has to be done in the international community.

The Fisheries Council of Canada also published, just last year, a statement on the same thing, overfishing on the Grand Banks. 'We believe that the full concerted action plan is required involving the direct participation of the Prime Minister and other senior Cabinet Ministers.' My leader, the Premier of this Province, has suggested that the right route to take on this particular issue is to ask and request the Prime Minister of Canada to get involved in the question of overfishing.

The second resolution, Mr. Speaker, that we will debate later on, basically calls for that, even though the hon. member's resolution as submitted, has part of the guts of what we are trying to discuss here.

I do not agree, by the way, Mr. Speaker, in what the hon. Leader of the Opposition suggested in setting up a House committee to deal with the question. Where was the House committee last year? Where was the House committee for the last seventeen years? Where was the Opposition? Were they asked to sit on a House committee to discuss the problems of the fishery? No, Mr. Speaker. It is being ludicrous as far as I am concerned. The only way that we, as a government of this Province, can negotiate with the Prime Minister of Canada and with the Canadian Government on the fisheries is to do it in a gentleman-like manner, and persuade the Prime Minister of Canada to get involved. I do not know, maybe it is just by luck, or fluke, or whatever it was, Mr. Speaker, but I got up in the House last Thursday and moved a resolution that the Prime Minister immediately get involved with negotiating on foreign overfishing, and he must have heard me because on Saturday morning he met with the President of Spain to discuss the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. REID:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the problem of overfishing is a political one or not. We have reached a crisis in Newfoundland right now. Basically, if the Prime Minister of Canada and the Government of Canada do not take

fishing in general, not necessarily the problems of the fishing industry but the fishing industry in general more seriously at the Cabinet table, if we do not get recognition from the Prime Minister of Canada and from the Government of Canada that we down here in Eastern Canada live, we survive, on the fishery -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. REID:

- we do not get that recognition, Mr. Speaker, we are doomed. To get the Prime Minister of Canada to recognize our plight in Eastern Canada, argumentation, pressure and the other things that some people have been suggesting to us, as a government in recent weeks, is the right method. We have to make it known to the Prime Minister of Canada, and to the Government of Canada, that, look, we need your help. And it has to be negotiated in such a way that we do not alienate them. Even though the Government of Canada represents the opposite party, or a party other than ours, we cannot go after them. We have to wine and dine, and encourage people to understand that we are part of Canada and we must remain a part of Canada.

The Government of Canada has a major problem, and I understand it. Believe it or not, I understand why the Government of Canada has got this problem. It is not only this government in Ottawa that had the problem but the previous government had the problem, and the previous government before that. How does a government in Ottawa deal with this problem? The Japanese, Mr. Speaker, are taking excessive amounts of caplin around the Grand

Banks area of Newfoundland, without licenses, without proper permission from the various authorities and we are complaining about it. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, last year, in the ports and harbours around this great Province of ours, Japanese boats came in and picked up 34,000 tons of caplin and brought a revenue of \$70 million into this Province. So, how do you, on one hand, tie the arms or the hands of a country which is taking from you, stealing from you, and then on the other hand coming and giving you \$70 million? It is a dilemma. The same thing applies, Mr. Speaker, to the United States. The United States this year, illegally as far as we are concerned as Canadians, will take approximately 30,000 metric tons off the Nose and the Tail of the Grand Bank.

They will take it, and they will go on with it, and we will complain about it.

We will complain about it and then 75 percent to 80 percent of every bit of fish that is processed or caught in this Province will be shipped out of here by tractor-trailor or by ships and sold in the United States.

How do we win? It is the dilemma, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly am not able to solve, and I doubt very much if there are too many of us in this House or any of us in Ottawa who are able to solve it either.

I heard some comments a few minutes ago from the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes about how a few years ago we could go and haul our traps and fill our boats and maybe fill someone else's.

Mr. Speaker, I was born in Carbonear. Carbonear is not considered a fishing village by any means, but there are a few fishermen there. There have been a number of fishermen living there who did not fish out of Carbonear. I had a gentleman say to me just a couple of days ago, "Mr. Reid, do not think for one minute that the overfishing on the Grand Banks is having a drastic effect on the fish in Conception Bay that we are catching." And I said, "Why, Sir?" He said, "Why would thousands of us have to make the annual trek for the last one hundred and fifty years to the Labrador Coast?" An interesting statement: maybe he is right, I do not know.

Mr. Speaker, the answer to our problem, as I see it and I do not by any means claim to be an expert, is that we have to negotiate, convince the Prime Minister of Canada, and Mr. Clark, too - by the way, in the last few days, gentlemen, you heard what Mr. Clark has done, and I think we all appreciate that he has done as well - we have to try to convince the Prime Minister and the Government of Canada to negotiate reasonably and responsibly with the various heads of government that are involved in fishing on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland and around our Coast. That is the only way that we are going to succeed.

What the hon. the Prime Minister said the other day to the Spaniards basically was true, that if they do not stop overfishing on the Grand Banks, then there is not going to be any fish left there for them to catch.

The idea, Mr. Speaker, is to extend our jurisdiction to the

Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks. Mr. Speaker, it has only been the last three or four days that I actually had a chance to sit down and look at the maps of the Grand Banks area and see where the division is, because I did not know where the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks was, but now I know. I think there are a lot of hon. gentlemen and ladies in this House, Mr. Speaker, who know little about it as well.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the answer to it is that we, as Newfoundlanders, and we as elected representatives, have to make ourselves more knowledgeable, have to undertake the idea of fishing on the Grand Banks and what exactly constitutes the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks, what is it, where is it, where does it lie off our coast and what affect is it going to have on it.

It is not very much either, Mr. Speaker. When you look at the maps you are not talking about a very big area. I am not talking about the federal government going, Mr. Speaker, and taking full control over it and not letting anyone fish it. But if we were allowed to manage it, Mr. Speaker, and we had some control over it, I think then that we could regulate the supply of cod and the fish that is in our Province.

Let me finish off, Mr. Speaker, by making a few brief comments about the Harris Report, if you will allow me. The hon. Leader of the Opposition called for more investigation and more input into scientific proof and data as it relates to the overfishing. I thought, Mr. Speaker, that the Harris Report was a creation to look a second time at what the

scientists were saying. Now, maybe I misunderstood the hon. leader, but I am of the opinion that the Harris Report was basically what he had suggested, to create again. Now, I am not sure if he meant to create something else now that would investigate the Harris Report, but I am lost on that one in particular.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that the body of the motion that the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes put forward is certainly commendable and I do not have any problems with it personally. I concur with my leader, the Premier, as well as other members, hopefully, who will probably speak on this, and I concur with the idea of making this resolution one that is acceptable to both the government and the Opposition, being it is an Opposition motion.

Let me finish by saying also, Mr. Speaker, that for me to stand here as the member for Carbonear and have you, as Speaker, an adjacent member and a good friend of, I guess, a lot of people in Carbonear, and I think in the beginning from the district of Carbonear, it is certainly an honour for me today to be able to get up and make what I would call my maiden speech, and having you, Sir, sitting in the Chair as Speaker. I thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I am delighted to have the



opportunity to say a few words in the next twenty minutes. May I take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to you on your election as Deputy Speaker. I am sure that the way you have handled the Chair, Mr. Speaker, in the past few days is a clear indication of the type of commitment that you are going to be making to this Chamber.

I want to, as well, avail of the opportunity, in his absence, to congratulate the Speaker. I have had the opportunity now to serve in this hon. House with him for the past seven years and I have always found him, as I think most people did, to be a very honourable gentleman, who will bring a lot to this House in his position as Speaker. No doubt he will certainly leave a very distinguished mark. We all hope he will have the honour to be the last Speaker to be hung in this Assembly, and the new Speaker to be hung in the next Assembly, when we move to the new House of Assembly. That is quite an honour for that distinguished gentleman, and I feel very proud for him.

As well, I would like to commend the member for Bellevue (Mr. Barrett), who is not in his seat right now, on his election. I have known him personally for the past several years. He is a very fine gentleman, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, his brothers make great poll captains in my district during election time. So he is a great fellow.

**MR. HOGAN:**  
(Inaudible).

**MR. TOBIN:**  
I will get to the member for Placentia (Mr. Hogan) a little later, Mr. Speaker.

Now, let me say to the member who just spoke in this House, it was his maiden speech. I, too, had the honour of making my maiden speech on the fisheries on November 17, 1982. Much of what I said at that particular point in time, Mr. Speaker, I provided a copy of to the member for Placentia, as a matter of fact. He was not overly knowledgeable on the fisheries, and I understand that, as well, so I provided him with this so he could take some notes when he is allowed to get up and speak in the debate.

Mr. Speaker, having said all that, I want to commend the member for Carbonear (Mr. Reid) for getting up today and speaking in this debate. I think it was very genuine on his part; he firmly believed in what he was saying as it relates to the fisheries. He made a lot of reference to the past seventeen years, and I would suspect that while he was talking about the past seventeen years, somehow he was trying to look at the Government of Newfoundland that was in power for the past seventeen years. But I am sure, as all hon. gentlemen and ladies in this House will understand, that the biggest problem in the fishing industry in Canada today is jurisdiction, which presently lies within the court of the federal government.

I, too, as I said, Mr. Speaker, said in 1982 basically what he said today. He said, in the postwar period, after Newfoundland's entry into Confederation with Canada, control of the fishery was transferred from St. John's to Ottawa and, unfortunately, the significance of this industry was not recognized by the Canadian government and the fishery was totally neglected. It

was not long until hordes of vessels, Russian, German, Polish, Japanese, Spanish, Portuguese, British and others, swarmed onto our traditional fishing grounds and began to rape the fish stock. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is what I said on November 17, 1982 in this hon. House, and that is exactly what we are all saying is happening here today. And when we went on and got the 200 mile limit, Mr. Speaker, a lot of things still remained to be done.

There are those of us who grew up and lived in fishing districts. I grew up, Mr. Speaker, in a community, Trepassey, that depended totally on the fishing industry, and I know how important it was for the people there. After I got out and became a social worker, working in Marystown for ten years and throughout the entire Burin Peninsula, with all the fishing communities, I, like all people, I am sure, in this House, realized that there is no other industry that means as much to this Province as the fishing industry. I say that very sincerely. Mr. Speaker, like the member for Bellevue, my forefathers came from the islands of Placentia Bay, where they grew and did not know anything else. My people came from the lower end of Merasheen Island and from Port Elizabeth, as did the forefathers of other people, and they depended totally on the fishing industry. They did not know anything else, my grandfather and my family. Mr. Speaker, my uncle was a fishing captain for years, and my first cousin is right now. I have brothers, and my father, who were for many years involved in the fishing industry. And the importance of that industry was what put bread and butter on our

table, Mr. Speaker, and bread and butter on the tables, I am sure, of many distinguished people who sit in this House today, and it has to be looked at as a strictly non-partisan issue. It has to be done like that. We have responsibilities.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, while we were debating this today, and while I heard the Premier up speaking on it from the government side, and I heard the member for Carbonear up speaking - is the debate on this issue going to be clued up today?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. TOBIN:

If that is the case, I must say that I am a little disappointed that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) has not been on his feet yet.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You got up.

MR. TOBIN:

No, no. The member for Carbonear went first. It was our turn. Mr. Speaker, with that being the case, the Minister of Fisheries will only have about five minutes to speak on this resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The member for St. Mary's - The Capes (inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

The member for St. Mary's - The Capes has twenty minutes to clue it up. Is that the situation? If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, I do not know. That used to be the rule. Probably they have changed.

If that is the case, Mr. Speaker -

MR. RAMSEY:

Do not be wasting time.

MR. TOBIN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the member for LaPoile. He finally spoke, and I give him credit for that. It was a good speech. Probably the best one he will ever make. Having said that, I am a little disappointed that the Minister of Fisheries has not been involved in this very important issue and will probably only be allocated five minutes. That causes me some concern.

As I have said, I have in front of me the campaign policy manual for the Liberal Party, 1989, 'A Real Change.' As I read this, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that it is not all new, some things there have been said before. 'When a Liberal Government would recognize the Department of Fisheries as a key industrial division of government with increased budgetary resources.' So we can assume that there are going to be increased budgetary resources, Mr. Speaker, in the upcoming provincial budget to address that. I commend the government for that, Mr. Speaker, commend them very highly.

'The Liberal Government will greatly increase research and development efforts in aquaculture and provide assistance and encouragement to inshore fishermen to enable them to take advantage of the many opportunities.' So we can look forward to seeing that as well, Mr. Speaker. Probably that gets back to what the Leader of the Opposition was saying today, that we could have someone to deal with the pertinent information. So probably we should look at researching that, as well.

'The Liberal Government would work to develop and implement a workable catch failure assistance program to relieve the hardships suffered by those who work full time in the inshore fishery that experience poor seasons and substantial reductions of income and, sometimes, even the total loss of income.'

And, Mr. Speaker, 'The Liberal Party would establish holding facilities in various regions of the Province where fish from the glut area can be stored.' That is good, Mr. Speake, and I commend the government for that.

But I happen to have another document in front of me, Mr. Speaker, a document written in 1985 called Fish Is The Future, written by the present Minister of Fisheries who was then Minister of Fisheries, and I can say that some of that stuff was said then. It is basically the same thing. You know, we can talk about it, Mr. Speaker, we can go into this document, the strategies on what is happening, the inshore/offshore balance. It is very interesting, Mr. Speaker.

The near-shore fleet, again another very interesting thing. The longliner fleet. I wonder what happened to all the longliners that were going to be constructed, according to this here? The middle distance fleet, Mr. Speaker. That is a very interesting one. I heard some comments on that during the past few weeks. The middle distance fleet: The then Minister of Fisheries and the present Minister of fisheries said, 'A major opportunity exists to expand middle distance fishery operations in Newfoundland and Labrador waters. The Province will be

actively promoting the evolution of the harvesting sector component concurrent with the revitalization of the fishery as a whole. This fleet component will enable the adoption of many promising harvesting technologies which will further promote harvesting sector efficiency.'

Mr. Speaker, we have a couple of middle distance vessels which are already involved in it. I do not know if the government still supports the middle distance fishery. I am sure the present Minister of Fisheries does, Mr. Speaker. If not, this would not be here. So I think he should check with some of his colleagues.

We can go on to fleet support, processing, marketing, infrastructure, social development, and the role of the government. All good stuff, Mr. Speaker, all excellent stuff. The harvesting, Mr. Speaker: The Liberal Party, the same Minister of Fisheries, 'Will establish holding facilities in various regions of the Province.' Mr. Speaker, let me say that here they are establishing a primary landing and distribution centre. There is a big picture of it there. 'The primary landing and distribution center will revitalize fish plant operations on the Avalon, East and Northeast Coasts.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there was a big study done. 'Harbour Grace is a deep-water, ice-free port which is strategically located to serve fish plants along the Northeast Coast.' Probably the member can tell us when the official opening took place, Mr. Speaker. I am not aware of it, but the Minister of Fisheries was certainly building it.

Fish procurement and distribution corporation: 'The new primary landing and distribution center will operate as a provincial Crown Corporation and will be responsible for the procurement of offshore landings, their distribution primarily to plants with available production capacity but lacking in offshore harvesting capacity. Activities of the corporation will include: Acquiring fishing vessels by charter, purchase or construction; chartering vessels to fishing companies; buying fish under both short and long-term contracts; selling fish to processing plants; arranging for unloading, handling, storage and distribution of fish operations, and primary landing and distribution center.'

Mr. Speaker, I do not know where that is right now. We could go on. There is some great stuff. It says a lot about the foresight of the minister, and the marine service center improvements which were done this year, I believe, under the inshore restructuring agreement.

Working capital for fishermen: 'If career fishermen are to have the independence and business stature that they deserve, every effort must be made to end the practice of fishermen becoming financially indebted to firms who buy their catches.' So, they were going to do all that, Mr. Speaker. I do not know what was done there.

Assessment of fishing ports: 'In addition to the central port concept, the Department of Fisheries determined that serious studies should be given to the present status of the Province's fishing ports and their requirements for improving fishing

operations.' It was never done, Mr. Speaker.

The gear insurance plan that the provincial government is going to bring in. That is a good question, Mr. Speaker. Will the provincial government have in their budget this year a gear insurance program? 'Every businessman needs insurance protection for his equipment and supplies, and a fisherman is no exception.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that was never brought in and I call upon the government today, if they are sincere, honest, and committed to the fishing industry of this Province, to include in their budget this year a gear insurance program. It is right. The former Minister of Fisheries, who is the present Minister of Fisheries, was right. He was right, Mr. Speaker, and now, hopefully, he will be able to fulfill that commitment that he had made there.

We can go on, Mr. Speaker. There are several pages here stating what the Minister of Fisheries was going to do. Nothing was done, but that is beside the point. But we can go on through that, and we can look at it. I read this, by the way, not in a derogatory sense. I think the concept and the wishes and the foresight of the Minister of Fisheries is to be commended. I hope now that he is starting off in a new term that this will be something that he will keep close and that he will have a sincere, honest, hardworking look at it.

I do, as well, Mr. Speaker, know him quite well. I probably worked closer with the Minister of Fisheries than most people in this House. As a matter of fact, if there is anyone responsible for

getting me into politics, it is the Minister of Fisheries. We go back a long way, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
What did you do?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Do you know what you have done?

MR. TOBIN:  
As a matter of fact, he called me to express his delight that I had finally decided to enter provincial politics; he has commended me several times on my performance in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:  
I thank the minister for that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WINDSOR:  
He cannot be all bad.

MR. TOBIN:  
No. I worked on several campaigns for him. I worked on every campaign he ever ran in St. John's West, when I was living in Trepassey. I was his poll captain, Mr. Speaker. I say he was a good member, when he was the Member for St. John's West.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
He ran up there (inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
Yes, I worked for him when he ran in Burin - St. George's, at the time. And, Mr. Speaker, I was a civil servant. But that was before civil servants got fired for their political affiliation.

In any case, we have to deal with an important issue here. As has been said today by the member for St. Mary's - The Capes, who

introduced the resolution, as has been said by the Leader of the Opposition, by the Premier, by the member for Carbonear and now by myself, and I am sure by whomever else may speak, this issue has to be addressed and it has to be addressed now. It is an issue, Mr. Speaker, where the federal government has to play the lead role, there is no question. The federal government has to get involved and treat this as a national disaster. There is no other way for them to treat it. There is no other way for this issue to be dealt with and dealt with in an effective way but as a national disaster, with the federal government getting actively involved in protecting the fish stocks that are there and telling the foreigners who are overfishing to fly straight to hell. Let them go, Mr. Speaker. The federal government is going to have to get tough, tougher than they have been. For too long now this Province has sat by. We sat by when the Liberals were in power and we can go through it again. Now that the Conservatives are in power, exactly the same thing is happening.

I will tell you what I said in 1982 about that, and it is still happening today. 'Having declared the 200 mile limit, the government immediately allocated substantial quantities of fish to foreign nations. This was a trade-off to ensure markets for western grain and Ontario and Quebec industrial products. The traditional Gulf of St. Lawrence' - I cannot say this, Mr. Speaker, because I was a making a comment to the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), who was on the other side at the time.

'The fishing grounds for the trawler fleet and the Southwest

coast of Newfoundland, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were placed out of bounds. The consequences of this action was all the vessels gathered on the Grand Banks where the quota became exhausted very quickly. Even before the advent of the worldwide recession two years ago, fishing companies were finding it difficult to make ends meet.' That is exactly what is happening today, Mr. Speaker, our stocks are being traded off.

But, Mr. Speaker, we can look at that and we can address it, and we can talk about it here in this Assembly. I am sure everyone here is committed to seeing the fishing industry in this Province improve and become, once again, a very strong, vibrant way of life for the people who work in the fishing industry, and the entire economy of Newfoundland and Labrador which depends on that fishing industry.

Now, I had the opportunity, and it is an opportunity that I do not look on very favourably, Mr. Speaker, but back a few years ago, the fishing industry in this Province had to be restructured, and that was something, Mr. Speaker, most of us were involved in, people like myself who represented a fishing district that was dying. Burin, Mr. Speaker, was the first frozen fresh fish plant operation in Newfoundland, in the 1940's. That is where it started, in Burin. And the federal government of the day, and I will never forgive, as long as I live, Mike Kirby, for the callous, arrogant attitude that he displayed toward Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

The man should never, ever, ever be forgiven for the way he treated Newfoundlanders, no matter what your political persuasion is. That man did a report - and I do not think the Minister of Fisheries supports the way Mike Kirby treated Newfoundlanders either.

But the federal government of the day came down here, the Minister of Fisheries was Romeo Leblanc - no, it was DeBane, and he held a press conference, here is St. John's, and announced their policy for the fishing industry, which was to close Burin, lock stock and barrel, forever, close Grand Bank, Ramea, Gaultois, four or five places. But this government, Mr. Speaker, at the time the Conservative government, took it upon themselves to address the needs and had put in place the Burin Peninsula Development fund, a fund that did an awful lot, Mr. Speaker to improve the way of life, a fund the money came from to construct a secondary processing plant in Burin. That is where most of that money came from, and my colleague and friend from St. John's South (Mr. Murphy), the man with the biggest victory here -

MR. WARREN:

Short lived, though. Short lived.

MR. TOBIN:

He is here, Mr. Speaker. He is here.

- he can attest to that, being a former employee of FPI.

I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that one of the bright spots in the operation of FPI today is that secondary processing plant in Burin. And that is where that

came from, as a result of funding that was put in place for the Burin Peninsula Development Fund.

We can go on to other projects: The St. Lawrence mine, the major development in Cowhead, where we will see great activities when we get on with further expansion there in the next few months. I am sure government will not change that commitment that has been made. That money was put in place so that government could get on and do what needed to be done for the people of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, he is a friend, but he is not in the Chair.

That is the reason why it is so important that the federal government address this in a meaningful way, so we can put in place not just a program of make work, nobody wants that. That is no good to the fishermen. That is no good in this situation. There has to be some sort of system struck whereby the best economic development can take place to ensure, Mr. Speaker, that we get on and do what needs to be done for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

I have had the opportunity to be involved. The other day I heard the Premier make reference to getting involved in fishing gear and having it manufactured here in the Province. That is great, but, let me say to hon. members opposite, we tried that some years ago, when the fishery was being restructured, but the major offshore companies in this Province, who would be the greatest purchaser, the people who

depended on that equipment said, We have our markets, friends. We can get it a lot cheaper offshore and we are going to have it. So, I think you will be faced with the same situation in that regard. But I think it is very important that we take a lead, Mr. Speaker, in ensuring that the workers who are involved in the fishing industry in this Province are protected, and that the economy of Newfoundland and Labrador is never permitted to erode any further than it has, and that we get on with doing what has to be done.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. TOBIN:

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

I want to, first of all, thank the hon. member for the confidence that he has shown in me. I must say I appreciate his choice of reading material. He takes some credit, I think, for getting me in politics, and I believe he gives me some credit for getting him in politics. I suppose I have to take some of that credit, Mr. Speaker, but I do not know what kind of effect that is going to have on me in my future relations with my colleagues on this side. I suppose when you start somebody off in the right way you try to keep them on the straight and narrow and teach them the right things, but when they get in with bad company, then, of course, you cannot be held responsible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

I have had the honour of raising eight children, and I did the same thing there. I tried to teach them the right things: to be courteous to their elders, to say thank you, and to be very charitable, sometimes, when dealing with cases where charity is needed. Luckily, my children have stayed on the straight and narrow, but I cannot say the same for my political child. Mr. Speaker, I have known him for a long time and I can say that he comes from an outstanding Newfoundland family. His father and I are very, very close friends. I had a very good relationship with his parents, and with a deceased uncle who was a great Newfoundlander; he was one of the finest fishing skippers, I suppose, who ever sailed out of a Newfoundland port. It gives me some pride being associated with the hon. member and his family for a number of years, but I take no responsibility for what happened when he left my care.

Before I get into the meat of my few remarks, I should, maybe, make a comment on the statement made by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition during Question Period, when he posed a question to the Premier with regard to my not being available to appear on The Fishermen's Broadcast. Mr. Speaker, I do recall having gotten, I believe, one or, maybe, two messages from that gentleman, Mr. Wellman, and in both cases it was not possible for me to call him back. I can tell you now, as hon. members in the press gallery know, and as their directors know, that there is nobody on this side of the House more accessible to



the press than I am. In fact, I can tell you now, that the day after I became Minister of Fisheries, I took the trouble to write, personally, every single news director in this city advising them that I would set aside two hours every Friday afternoon to enable them to come to my office to question me on any matters pertaining to my department. I must say that they have taken me up on that offer, and I look forward to a continuation of that kind of relationship with the press. Press members will have to understand that these are busy times, especially in the Department of Fisheries.

My working day, as those who watch my parking lot in front of our building will tell you, starts at about 7:00 a.m. Never later than 7:30 a.m. they will see my car parked there, and it never leaves there before 6 or 7 o'clock in the evening, and I do not go home to lunch. So it is not a normal time. And if we cannot respond to all the calls we get immediately, then, I think, they will have to understand. It is not that we do not want to, and it is certainly not because there is a muzzle put on me by the Premier. The fact of the matter is, the days are only so long.

I would remind hon. members opposite, by the way, seeing that they raised the matter, that I have been sitting here now since Monday and there has not been one question asked of the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. WARREN:  
You are not allowed to answer.

MR. W. CARTER:  
No, no. There has not been one

question asked. I have not been given a chance to answer a question. As a matter of fact, maybe now what I should do -

MR. TOBIN:  
You answer (inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:  
Well, that is not my fault. I am prepared. In fact, I enjoy questions. As a matter of fact, I am feeling rather let down. I have almost been tempted to maybe get one of my colleagues here ask me a question just to get me in practice. I am becoming rusty, I think.

MR. WARREN:  
Yes, it is a pity (inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:  
It has been ten years since I had the opportunity to answer questions on fisheries, and I am itching for the opportunity.

But let me now give the hon. members opposite a few ideas for, maybe, tomorrow.

MR. WARREN:  
A few questions?

MR. W. CARTER:  
A few questions - a few suggestions for questions.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Write them for them.

MR. W. CARTER:  
No, I do not have to write them. I think they are able to do that. Why not get up tomorrow, one of you gentleman who has a fishing district, and ask me, for example, what the situation is now on the caplin fishery: Have prices been negotiated? Have quotas been established?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Have they?

MR. W. CARTER:  
At what time will the fishery open? What are the prospects for a good fishery?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) buy them (inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:  
I can give you another question. Get up tomorrow, if you will, and ask me a question on the Province's position on overfishing on the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks. A good question, a very important one. Ask me tomorrow, maybe, a question on the Province's position on the harvesting, and hopefully processing, of underutilized species. These are just a few. You know, there are a number of very important questions.

And when I saw the Leader of the Opposition today, with the fishing industry in such disarray and facing such critical times, getting up and wasting the time of Question Period and the House and asking the Premier was it true that the Minister of Fisheries is not allowed to talk to Mr. Wellman, the Director of Fishermen's Broadcast, I do not know, but it just does not look too well. There are a number of questions that can be asked.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, though, for his suggestion. He mentioned that we should investigate the possibility of organizing, or establishing, or striking a parliamentary committee on fisheries. I think that is an excellent idea, and I thank him for the suggestion. I think, maybe, that kind of a committee

would be good, as it would, of course, in other sectors of the economy, maybe a parliamentary standing committee on Forestry and Agriculture, or on Education, or Labour, or any other sector of our economy. I thank him for it, and I can tell him now that we will be looking at that very carefully as we take a look at the whole structure of the House and the operation of the House. But it is certainly a very worthwhile suggestion.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition made, I believe, another very worthwhile suggestion, having to do with providing some kind of a resource assessment capability. I know, yes, the embarrassment, I suppose, of being at meetings, conferences, where other ministers are and when you have to compete in terms of expressing an opinion with a federal minister, who has almost unlimited scientific assessment capability, it is a difficult situation. I can understand what he says. Certainly, it is one of the things that we will have to look at, providing that kind of a capability, where, when we go to a minister's conference, we are required to study and digest volumes of scientific data. I personally am not qualified to do it. And I do not suppose very many ministers are, except those with the background in science. Certainly, it would be a big help if that kind of capability were available.

Mr. Speaker, during the past week I have had meetings with the Directors of Fishery Products International; we had a two hour meeting yesterday. I am not going to reveal some of the things that we discussed, but I can tell you now that we discussed a number of

items, Mr. Speaker, a number of problems that more than likely will appear over the next few weeks and few months and few years. We talked about the possibility, for example, of another cut in the total allowable catch. I think Mr. Young and most Newfoundlanders will now accept the proposition that the best we can hope for in the year ahead is a 190,000 metric ton quota. That is not definite. It certainly was recommended in the Harris Report, and I think we can be pretty safe in saying that that is what we will end up with. Of course, if that happens, then it will have a serious economic impact, especially on the offshore plants.

This morning I met with the Fishermen's Union and spent two hours discussing certain matters concerning the fishery problems and prospects, and what have you, in the fishing industry. That, too, was a very informative and a very interesting meeting. I have had meetings with other groups in the past few days. I am trying to meet all of the groups connected with the fishery to get a good, broad opinion, if that is the word, of what their thinking is, how they view the problem and what they hope to be able to do about it.

I am not too concerned. I think there is reason for concern. Of course there is. But certainly it is not the end of the line. I do not view this downturn in the fishing industry as the end of the line. In fact, I think there are a lot of positive things that can come out of it. I think one of the positive things was alluded to by one of my friends opposite, the Leader of the Opposition, when he talked about the possibility of maybe examining ways and means of

utilizing so-called underutilized species.

I do not know if the House knows it or not, but right at this point in time there are approximately anywhere from 500,000 to 800,000 metric tons of underutilized species swimming in our waters that are not being harvested by Canadians. A small portion of that -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
And much more.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Well, let me come to that.

A small portion is being harvested by foreigners. I believe the Russians have a small quota on round-nosed grenadier. I believe they are looking at silver hake. They are looking at the possibility, for example, of fishing in the far North, the 2GH area. That is another interesting story, by the way.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I have to remind the hon. gentleman that we have now arrived at the time when the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes should speak and clue up the debate.

MR. HEARN:  
Mr. Speaker, I would be willing to give the hon. the Minister of Fisheries another five or six minutes.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Thank you very much.

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

MR. W. CARTER:

It was my intention to wind up the debate for this side. That is why, in reply to my friend from Burin - Placentia West, I was not the first speaker. I wanted to be the last one.

Anyway, another interesting statistic, Mr. Speaker, is that we talk about fishing in 2GH. In 1968, for example, the West Germans fished that area and harvested 92,000 metric tons. Ninety-two thousand metric tons of ground fish were taken from the area 2GH, an area where we do not fish. In fact, this year there is a quota there of 20,000 tons, which does not really mean anything. That quota could just as easily be 120,000 metric tons.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What kind of fish?

MR. W. CARTER:

Cod mostly. That quota could be much higher, but they do not really have a handle on the size of the stock and, consequently, they have put that 20,000 ton quota as a nominal quota. Despite that, the French this year will be harvesting 5,000 tons from that area and the Russians, I think, will be harvesting about the same amount.

Now, the problem, Mr. Speaker, is that it is like everything else: if you can catch fish on your doorstep, where it is easier and cheaper, then why travel in Northern Waters to fish. That is one of the problems. Thank God, that is the something good that will come of this crisis that we are in now; it will teach us that we have taken things for granted too long. God has indulged this planet and this part of the planet on which we live with an overabundance of resource, and

sometimes I think that maybe he has had some second thoughts as to just how capable we are of really utilizing that resource. Because, in my view, we have not done a very good job of it. We have seals dying of old age; we are not able to catch them. In fact, they are eating the fish that we should be catching.

We have species like silver hake, we have flounder, we have red fish in some areas, grenadier, halibut, turbot, herring, you name it, that are not being properly utilized.

In cases where we are utilizing huge quantities of groundfish, we are probably throwing away a lot more than we are using and that, in many respects, comes from habit. Years back, when fish were plentiful and when the cost was 2 cents or 3 cents a pound, it was cheaper to just slash it and take off what you needed, and throw the rest away, rather than have to pay the labour in trying to get the extra bit of meat off the bones. It is a habit that we got into and now we are paying the price for it.

I learned the other day, going through some papers, that in a four to five year period - we talk about overfishing and its effect on the Newfoundland fishery, the Canadian fishery - believe it or not, 240,000 metric tons of codfish, groundfish, were overfished on the Southern Grand Banks, 240,000 tons! Just think about that for a moment. 240,000 tons of cod represents ten or twelve person years of employment, and that, of course, would translate into anywhere from \$50 million to \$75 million a year that was lost to this economy by virtue of that fish being - well, stolen is the word, I suppose - overfished by foreigners on the

Nose and Tail of our Grand Banks.  
It is going on all the time.

MR. TOBIN:  
(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:  
The people I have talked with, including those I have talked with in the past four or five days, people who are well versed in the fishery, including Mr. Gus Etchegary, Mr. Richard Cashin, Mr. Vic Young, and fishermen who have come into my office, I put the question to them, what is the biggest single contributor to the crisis we are facing now in the fishery? Invariably the answer comes back, overfishing on the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks.

I ask, what do you think is the solution? Again, almost invariably they will say, Canada must extend its jurisdiction. I put the question to them, how can we make it stick? How can we enforce it? I get back a variety of answers to that question. There is nobody silly enough to think that Canada can just extend its jurisdiction and not at some time have to challenge it, and to challenge its right to do it. But, certainly, in all cases the answer comes back, the Prime Minister of this Country must be encouraged to become very much involved in the problem.

I think it is pretty well agreed now that the present Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Siddon, a fine fellow, means well, but I think he has gone the limit as to how far he can go in terms of negotiating some kind of an extended jurisdiction. I believe the Prime Minister must now become involved. The Prime Minister is a popular man. He is popular with Margaret Thatcher, for example,

with George Bush, with the President of France, and, now, the Prime Minister of Spain and others. Surely, if he were to approach these people and explain to them the problem - because this is not just a Newfoundland problem. It is not simply a problem that besets Newfoundlanders or Canadians, it is a world problem. Out there we have one of the last greatest resources of food protein in the world.

MR. TOBIN:  
Have you met with Cabot Martin, yet?

MR. W. CARTER:  
Cabot Martin? No, I have not, but I will be meeting him soon.

We have one of the last greatest resources. We cannot afford the luxury of having that destroyed.

If that resource were being threatened by acid rain or pollution or an oil spill, then, of course, you would have everybody, from movie stars to presidents, demanding that action be taken.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I am encroaching upon the time of my colleague who wants to wind up, so I shall bring my few remarks to an end.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, like my Leader, will support the motion with a few exceptions. I would ask the mover of the motion to, in a spirit of co-operation, and I think you will agree that that is what you will see coming from this side - we have avoided having the motion amended, and then voting for our amendment and voting against your motion, so if you could find it possible to make the

few changes there were suggested, then I do not think we will have any problem at all voting for the motion. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes will now close the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I must say it was a pleasure to give the extra few minutes to the Minister of Fisheries, who, in a very serious way, addressed a very serious problem.

I was a little bit amused when he was talking to the member for Burin - Placentia West, each one wondering who brought whom into politics. I guess the question is, who should be shot first?

However, I must say that I had something to do with bringing both of them in. I will never admit it outside of this Chamber, but I did. And maybe, to some degree, both of them had something to do with bringing me in. But it is like the position we are in now, where we are all in the one boat.

The Minister of Fisheries, when he stood, wondered why no questions had been asked. Perhaps a more pertinent question would have been whether or not any questions had been asked on the fishery. Yes, there had been, and they were directed to the Premier, maybe for one reason or another. But questions were asked on the fishery. In fact, the very first

questions raised in the House were on the crisis in the fishery, as they should be. So I would not want the record, in being read in a different context, to appear as if the Opposition had not asked any questions on the fishery.

We will be asking the hon. minister plenty of question on the fishery. Perhaps not about the caplin fishery, because everyone knows that the Japanese have not set a price yet and until that is done, the companies and the unions will not agree to a price, or cannot agree; until they get a price on caplin, they will not agree with a price on cod. All that will fall in place, hopefully, at the start of the season, as it does every year. Hopefully it will. If not, we could be into more serious shape in the inshore fishery than we are right now.

However, in relation to the resolution as is on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, we will leave it as is and we will ask hon. members opposite to support it simply because of concerns we have in making sure that the Province benefits to the utmost from any plans that the federal government might have to deal with the present crisis.

Let me say, however, that we would have no problem at a later date if the government wants to vary that a little bit, but because of the way resolutions have to be addressed and written up and all of that stuff, it could be rather complicated at this time. But we would have no reservations in supporting a select committee of the House to deal with fisheries matters, where we would have liaison with everyone involved in the fishery, hopefully. But at

the present time, there is not a mechanism in place. And to make sure that the House is involved in such an important matter, then this is the only leverage that we have and, consequently, that is why we ask to have some involvement.

The other reason we ask for involvement, Mr. Speaker, is quite obvious. If you look at the people who sit on the different sides of the House and you look for experience in the fishery, certainly with the exception of the Minister of Fisheries, on the other side, it is pretty slim. I do know, of course, that members like the member for Exploits have all kinds of experience in mussel farming. You have the member for Humber West (Mr. Dicks) who, undoubtedly, is an ardent salmon fisherman, and the member for Waterford - Kenmount, and the member for Windsor - Buchans. All are experienced in the fishery. I forgot the Minister of Labour (Ms Cowan), who will be extremely concerned with the fishery, and has all kinds of experience. But on this side we do have ardent fishermen, right out of the boats, like the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) -

MR. SIMMS:

He has the hands to prove it, too.

MR. HEARN:

- the member for Burin - Placentia West, the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews), the member for Fogo (Mr. Winsor), the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Langdon),

MR. SIMMS:

The member for Grand Falls.

MR. HEARN:

- the member for Grand Falls,

where they do have a fish plant.

MR. DOYLE:

In Harbour Main they have three fish plants.

MR. HEARN:

And the member for Humber East (Ms Verge). I should not leave her out.

So the experience in the fishery is on this side of the House, and we would like to have some involvement because of our concerns, especially in the composition of the compensation package. We do not, by the way, advocate that the provincial government get involved or have any responsibility for the compensation package. We will not be saying you should pay your share. We will say up front to you that it is a federal problem; it should be addressed by the federal government. They should be 100 per cent responsible for any compensation package, and they should not draw you into putting in your 20 per cent or 30 per cent or anything else. And we will support you if it comes to an argument over the input, because it is a federal problem and they should accept full responsibility for it.

But, Mr. Speaker, we will leave the resolution as is. We think it is extremely important, and we feel that the total House - this is an issue that is much too big for one party or another, even though they are the government. The government every now and then needs somebody to help them out, support them. We are in this only to help, support and strengthen their cause. And hopefully, for the sake of the many people in Newfoundland affected by the present crisis, they are not going

to be small enough to say to them, We want to carry this ball all by ourselves. It is a pretty heavy ball, and we do not mind being there if you stumble a little bit. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair is assuming that the resolution is before the House in its pristine state.

All those in favour of the resolution, please say 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against the resolution, please say 'Nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Division.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Just to remind new members, at this particular point we are supposed to wait for ten minutes. The House can waive that, of course, so the Chair will await the decision of the House. Normally, according to our Standing Orders we are supposed to wait ten minutes.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, everybody on this side is present.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to waive.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is the consensus of the House that we are now ready.

Are all members ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ready.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour, please rise.

Mr. Hearn, Mr. Doyle, Mrs Verge, Mr. Simms, Mr. R. Aylward, Mr. Matthews, Mr. N. Windsor, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Woodford, Mr. Hewlett, Mr. A. Snow, Mr. S. Winsor, Mr. Langdon, Mr. Parsons, Mr. Warren, Mr. Greening, Mr. Hodder.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against, please rise.

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter), the hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation (Mr. Gilbert), the hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands (Mr. Kelland), Mr. Hogan, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Crane, the hon. the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Baker), the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. Decker), Mr. Walsh, Mr. Noel, Mr. Gover, Mr. Penney, Mr. Barrett, Mr. L. Snow, the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture (Mr. Flight), the hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs (Mr. Gullage), the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dicks), Mr. Grimes, the hon.



the Minister of Finance (Dr. Kitchen), the hon. the Minister of Education (Dr. Warren), the hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations (Ms Cowan), the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Dr. Gibbons), Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Dumaresque, Mr. Short.

MR. SPEAKER:

The vote is as follows:  
Twenty-seven against and seventeen for.

I declare the motion defeated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow, and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a point.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

To save the Government House Leader time and energy in the future, it is not necessary for him to move adjournment on Wednesdays, it is automatic. Probably the hon. member might want to brush up on Beauchesne when he goes home tonight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

The House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 1, 1989, at 2:00 p.m.