



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 37

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Tuesday

[Preliminary Transcript]

21 November 1989

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
Order, please!

Oral Questions

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Mr. Dicks). The Minister, no doubt, will be aware that within recent weeks the Department of Finance caused a company named Latern Wholesalers Limited to be put in receivership because it owed a significant amount of retail sales tax to the Province, and the Minister will also be aware that his Department through the Sheriff's office engaged an auction company, an auction firm to auction assets of Latern Wholesalers on behalf of the Crown. Could the Minister tell the House why, in view of the fact that officials in his Department, as I understand it, were aware two weeks ahead of the set auction date that a second auction company in this Province was interested in placing a bid to carry out that auction, his Department did not call for public proposals for this activity, for this work?

MR. DICKS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DICKS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In response to the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Rideout) question, it did recently come to my attention that essentially what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has described did in fact take place. I met with the Sheriff briefly on Friday, and will again this week, to determine what the appropriate thing to do in the circumstances would be.

MR. RIDEOUT:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that as I understand it the going Government rate and the going industrial rate for carrying out auction services in this Province ranges from 2.7 per cent to 2.9 per cent of the appraised value of the assets to be auctioned, can the Minister tell the House why the Sheriff's office would have awarded this work exclusively to one firm, at a rate of 15 per cent, without calling for public quotes for the work involved here?

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

MR. DICKS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Really, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's question raises several matters which I think need to be addressed. First of all, is whether or not the Sheriff's office is subject to The Public Tender Act. That is something on which I am requesting a legal opinion. And for hon. Members'

benefit, the Office of Sheriff is a traditional office of the Crown, one that, according to one of the judges of the Supreme Court, has many particular powers associated with it. So, first of all, we have to determine whether or not the Sheriff, himself, is subject to The Public Tender Act.

My personal information from the Sheriff is that when he contracted for the services, and it is indeed 15 per cent as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, he was not aware that there was another auctioneer in the Province. I would also point out that 15 per cent is, by and large, the standard auction rate, and it is only since we have gotten some competition in that sector that that has been reduced.

As for Fitzpatrick Auctioneers, which I believe is the company, they had bid and did have a standing offer with Government for approximately 2.9 per cent. So I am also investigating the circumstances whether or not this particular auction will be subject to the 2.9 per cent standing offer. So I do plan to make a further statement, and I will clarify these matters raised.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the value of the goods to be auctioned in this particular auction, as I understand it, is about \$400,000, in other words, the auction company stands to earn about \$60 thousand as a result of the 15 per cent levy, five times what the industrial and Government

rate is in this Province, can the Minister tell the House why, when there were other auction firms in this Province, the Sheriff's office would have taken the unilateral decision to award this to one company without seeking at least public quotes, if not public tenders?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. DICKS:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I cannot speak as to why it happened. I can convey to the hon. Leader of the Opposition what the Sheriff has told me. My understanding is that at the time he entered into the contract, he understood there was only one auction company in the Province providing this service, and that has been the case for many years. I believe the second auction company is a recent entrant into the field. As far as what the standard rate in the industry is, it is only recently, as a result of the competitive nature of having two people in the field, that the amount and percentage given an auction has been reduced from 15 per cent to a much more competitive rate, somewhere in the vicinity of anywhere from 2.4 or 2.9 and upwards, and this has happened through several government agencies.

But what I will do - it has come to my attention recently. It is a matter I am investigating. Obviously there are some legal issues that have to be settled as to whether or not the standing offer presented by this auctioneer is one that he, himself, was bound by, or would be bound by, or his particular company, and whether or not the Sheriff has an ability outside Government to contract

separately and would or would not be subject to The Public Tender Act. These are not straightforward issues and ones I do plan to address, and it may, in fact, be that some adjustments will have to be made one way or the other. But, at this point in time, I have to frankly say that we do not have full and sufficient information to do a proper legal opinion, and be able to answer the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's questions fully. But it is certainly something Government is aware of, something we are addressing, and we will, indeed, deal with the matter expeditiously.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to see how the Minister discounts totally the fact that his officials were aware two weeks before this auction took place of the interests of another company in bidding on this work.

But, Mr. Speaker, as a final supplementary let me ask the Minister this: In view of the fact that the owner of those assets stands to lose, will in fact lose, \$48 thousand as a result of the levy put in place by the Sheriff's office of 15 per cent rather than the 2.9 per cent, which is the Government and industrial norm, can I ask the Minister whether or not because of the blunder made by his Department the Province will compensate that particular individual for the unusual, the unnecessary, and, I say, the extraordinary loss that that particular individual is

going to incur because of what has happened here?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. DICKS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition's question is really in three parts. The first is, and I did not mean to not answer him on the previous occasion, but my understanding from the other company that did not have anything to do with this, is that my officials knew of it two weeks previously. I have not gotten a full report yet to determine that being the case, but I can confirm that it was brought to my officials' attention prior to the auction taking place, and I think that is a more relevant issue. Whether it was two weeks or ten days, I think may not be material.

Part of the reason, I understand, as well, was that the other thing, Mr. Speaker, that is raised by this is that the contract at 15 per cent was signed previous to this coming to my departmental officials' attention, so that may, in fact, be a binding contract. That is something else we have to look at.

The third thing, whether or not it constitutes a blunder, is something that has to be determined based on the governing law. With all due respect to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I do not have sufficient information, nor have we done the necessary legal research, to say that is in fact the case. Therefore, it is probably a little premature to call it a blunder.

But the other part of his question

is fair. As to what the Government's responsibility will be, I do not think it is appropriate to say at this time, not knowing how much the auction will realize, and whether or not any compensation is due back to the owners of the goods, Lantern Wholesale. My understanding is that it was being carried out to satisfy an outstanding amount due to Retail Sales Tax, and, in effect, sufficient monies may not be realized to satisfy the Government. So, in fact, it may be the Government who is, in some sense, the loser, it is also paying more for auction services than otherwise. Whether or not the owner needs to be compensated, I do not know. However, the Leader of the Opposition has touched on issues and I think I have essentially addressed them, and will do so more fully in the future.

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl

MR. WINDSOR:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the absence of the Minister of Finance, I will direct the question to the hon. The Premier. The Minister of Finance yesterday tabled the Annual Report of the Pooled Pension Fund which showed that the Teachers' Pension Plan at the moment has a balance, I think, of 90.6 million dollars, and we all know, of course, that unless action is taken, that balance will be eliminated by 1996 or thereabout, so some action has to be taken; and negotiations have been ongoing with the NTA.

The previous Administration agreed

to accept responsibility for all unfunded liability up until last year, and the Premier confirmed that this Government has agreed to accept that responsibility. Also, have they agreed to set up a special fund, which the previous Administration had agreed to set up, or a special stream of funding from current account to eliminate that deficit position, Mr. Speaker, over a period of certain years; and will the Premier confirm that an amount has been set in the Budget to do that; and how much was allocated in the Budget?

PREMIER WELLS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
Let me make clear, Mr. Speaker, that at no time did the Government indicate that it would accept responsibility for everything prior to last year. That is not accurate. What the Government did.

MR. WINDSOR:
(Inaudible) the previous Administration (inaudible).

PREMIER WELLS:
It may or may not have, I do not know. I do not see any formal indication of it. What the Government acknowledges is the responsibility of the Provincial Government in all of the pension funds to make sure that it pays the cost, provides the funds necessary to make these funds whole for the funds that ought to have been contributed by the Government in the past and were not, and went into general revenue, in some cases.

In the case of teachers' funds,

teachers actually made contributions and it was taken into the consolidated revenue fund and the Government cannot avoid total responsibility for that. The extent to which the Government and the teachers, or the Government and the unions involved have together improperly provided for the funds for this, all parties that are party to that improper funding have to accept responsibility. We will know exactly what the situation is after the Pension Commission has done its work. That, we hope, will probably be sometime early in the new year. Certainly by the time the House reconvenes after the Christmas break, I would expect we will be in a position to advise the House at that time. As to what will or will not be in the Budget, that can only be determined when the Budget is brought in.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, the Budget was brought down some time ago, and I was asking the Premier how much was included for that particular item in the Budget. I will confirm that the previous Administration did make the commitment that we would accept responsibility for all past unfunded liability, in view of the fact that the Province managed the Pension Fund on behalf of the NTA. The Minister of Employment and Labour, who was President of the NTA at that time, made that position very strongly. I would be interested to know if her position has changed on it, Mr. Speaker. I want to say that we did make that commitment. I was asking the Premier if he has made

that commitment, and has he made a commitment to put funds in the Budget to ensure that that unfunded liability does not grow in future?

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Federal Government is proposing legislation which will change the regulations under which pensions can be registered under The Income Tax Act, what negotiations have been ongoing between this Government and the Government of Canada to eliminate any negative impact of that on teachers and on other pension plans in the Province, such as The Uniformed Services Pension Plan, which will likewise be affected, and has the Government undertaken any negotiations to stop that? Or, secondly, what action will they take to initiate a program to alleviate those things, in other words, to replace any benefits that may have been lost as a result of this new legislation coming in in Ottawa?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, by my count I think there were about eight questions, and I will try and answer the gist of the questions.

AN HON. MEMBER:

There were three there. Three.

PREMIER WELLS:

I think the record will show that there were considerably more than three.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the last part of the question, what steps if any the Government is taking with respect to the changes proposed by the Federal Government

to the pensions legislation, those, Mr. Speaker, are essentially federal tax measures, federal fiscal measures for which this Government has no responsibility. If it impacts on all people entitled to pensions in the Province, it impacts on all people and all of us have to bear the brunt of it. We cannot take responsibility to make any one group or any one individual whole for the impact of federal income tax changes, that is up to the Federal Government or the individuals concerned. We have made representations to the Federal Government on behalf of groups affected, including the teachers, expressing our view as to their approach and requesting that they not implement such changes. Whether or not they will, I do not know. There has been some indication recently, I have seen in the media, that they may not. Whether they were persuaded by the strong representations that we made or not, I am not quite sure, but representations were in fact made.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would submit to the Premier that the Government is responsible, since the NTA agreement is unlike any other collective agreement. The collective agreement with the NTA has a consensus clause which says that pensions and pension benefits cannot be changed without the consent of the NTA. Therefore, the Government is very fully responsible in this particular case.

Will the Premier confirm that either he will ensure that the

Federal Government provides a grandfathering clause which will protect the benefits that teachers have been paying for for many years, and they have been contributing on the basis that they would be receiving those benefits? Or, otherwise, if benefits are to be lost, will the Premier or will the Government implement a program to replace those benefits? And, finally, will the Premier ensure that any changes that may or may not be made to the benefits payable to teachers will be made only at the bargaining table with the NTA and not unilaterally?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, we have inherited a god-awful pension mess that we have to correct. It will take us some time to do it. We have established a Commission to ascertain all of the facts, and when those facts are in, we will make decisions and make announcements as to what we are going to do.

Now with respect to the argument that the hon. Member made that the Government is somehow responsible for the consequences of legislative changes by the Federal Government, the inanity of that proposal just boggles the mind. The Provincial Government has no responsibility for the consequences of legislative changes made by the Parliament of Canada. That is clearly and solely within the purview of the Parliament of Canada. Even the former Government was not so careless as to guarantee that the Government of this Province would compensate for the financial consequences to any group because

of legislated pension changes by the Federal Parliament.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MATTHEWS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Fisheries. In light of the very important AGAC (Atlantic Groundfish Advisory Council) meetings that are ongoing in Halifax at this very moment, could the Minister inform the House what position the Province is taking to these very important AGAC meetings, to the table today, covering the inshore fishery allowance? What is the position of the Province?

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Minister of Fisheries is in Halifax right now, at this moment I expect, discussing that very issue. The position we are taking is quite clear, we are against any reduction in the inshore allocation. We take that position, of course, for a number of reasons, the main one being that while the total 115,000 ton allocation is seldom caught, we are now near catching that allocation, and certainly any fish surplus is needed to help restore the stock.

Secondly, of course, the transferring of the surplus to the offshore would result, then, in

that fish, or at least part of it, going to the other provinces. So, certainly, we are against any reduction in the inshore allocation.

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

MR. MATTHEWS:
Well, I am glad to hear the Minister say that, Mr. Speaker. It is sort of reassuring. We would encourage him and his officials to take a very strong stand on that particular issue, because, as we all know, the inshore allowance has been referred to very often as sacred and should be left as it is.

In light of the NIFA meetings over the past number of days, could the Minister tell us if the Province will be supporting NIFA in its attempt to prevent the total collapse of the inshore fishery, particularly the state of the northern cod stocks and so on, and whether he and the Government will be supporting NIFA in its request to have the environmental impact statement done on northern cod stocks? Will he be supporting NIFA in that request to the Federal Minister?

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I know where NIFA is coming from. They have certain strong reservations as to the wisdom of allowing a winter fishery in the areas where the groundfish are supposed to be spawning. We would have nothing against that approach, quite frankly, but when you talk about eliminating a winter fishery, then, of course, there are a great many implications and we would

want to have all of these implications carefully studied before we could support what NIFA is obviously trying to do.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister really has sort of jumped ahead one step, because what I was asking first was, would the Government, indeed, be supporting the request of NIFA for an environmental impact study and statement on the state of the stocks?

So I am just wondering if he supports that. He has tied that into the suggestion that there be an injunction, I guess, or a request for an injunction against fishing from January to May, I believe it is, in the northern cod stocks by deep-sea trawlers, so I would ask the Minister, what is the Government's position on a request to have that fishery stopped in that period of four to five months? Of course NIFA is saying, and we have heard suggestions over the last number of months that that is, in fact, the spawning period, and most of us agree that the question has to be addressed, and the answer, as to whether or not that is, in fact, the spawning period. But what is the Minister's and the Government's position? Will you be supporting NIFA in its bid to have the deep-sea trawler fishing stopped in that period of time?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I should point out to the House and to the hon. Member that our support has not been requested as yet, anyway, from Mr.

Cabot Martin's group. Certainly, before we could take a position on the position that he is taking, that maybe the winter fishery be brought to a halt because of it being the spawning season, we would have to look at that very carefully. Because, as I said a moment ago, there are very, very serious implications in taking that kind of action. So we would want to be, first of all, absolutely sure that the action is necessary and will produce the kind of results we want to produce.

Secondly, of course, we have to look at the broader picture to study what impact that will have on the companies that depend on that fishery for their survival.

MR. MATTHEWS:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Could the Minister outline for the House these couple of actions by NIFA, and what, in essence, will we see coming out of the Harris report that is related to these couple of projected measures that NIFA is recommending?

When you look at this whole question, of course, you wonder about studies and more studies, and so on. What can we expect from the Harris report along the lines of what NIFA is recommending? Is there any tie-in whatsoever there?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. Member must understand and realize that I am not privy to the

contents of the final Harris panel report. We have made a presentation to the panel, and we have repeated in our presentation some of the concerns we have heard expressed in the course of our twelve meetings around the Province. As a matter of fact, at every single meeting we had, that question was raised and some very strong fears were expressed that maybe there was overfishing to too great an extent during the spawning season. We have made our case pretty well known to the Harris panel. Again, in answer to his question, I have not seen the final document; in fact, I doubt if the document itself is finalized yet.

MR. PARSONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. PARSONS:
Mr. Speaker, my question, too, is for the Minister of Fisheries. I want to ask him a specific question: Is the plant on the Southside going to close? Is it on the chopping block? Have there been any discussions pertaining to this closure with NatSea?

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I regret that I am unable to answer the hon. Member. I have no knowledge at this point in time as to exactly what NatSea intend to do with their plant on the Southside or, in fact, in Burgeo or Arnold's Cove. I know they are looking at various options available to them, but certainly no decision has been made, as far as I know anyway, to

close the Southside plant.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. PARSONS:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries again, is it not a foregone conclusion that the plant is closing? Yesterday, during a speech given in this hon. House, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Efford) reaffirmed our worst fears by saying the plant is to close.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:
The Member for Port de Grave said, "What an industry to put over on the Southside when the fish plant closes up, a baked cucumber bottling plant!" I do not know if the Member for Port de Grave was trying to be facetious or not, Mr. Speaker, but I want to ask the Minister what contingency plans are in place for the Vaters, for the Critches, for the Meaduses, and many more who sold millions of pounds of fish to NatSea? And what is going to happen to the 400 people who work over there, who will be thrown out on the street if this happens?

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Social Services, the Member for Port de Grave, I am sure was being facetious, and he was probably, by the way, throwing back at hon. Members some of the things they might have been talking about or planning during their time in office.

Getting back to the Southside plant, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, we are going to have a crisis, I think, in the industry. The fish stocks are depleted. It is something we are going to have to cope with. And as to whether or not it will affect the plant on the Southside or the plant in Burgeo or anywhere else, is a matter that I am not competent to comment on right now. I am sure the owners will be making that decision very shortly, themselves.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, we all wonder, I think, sort of aloud if the Member for Port de Grave, the Minister of Social Services, was really overwhelmed in his speech which constituted a leak from Cabinet. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask the Minister, because of the emphasis being placed on the part-time fishermen, if his Department has statistics showing the actual amount of fish caught by part-time fishermen in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador in any given season?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any such statistic. It might well be that the Federal Department, which issues the licences, part-time licences and full time, and keeps statistics on landings, would be able to tell. It would be an interesting figure, and maybe I will make arrangements to get it and so inform the House at some future date.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the Minister of Fisheries, as well, and they relate to the fishing crisis in Newfoundland and Labrador. As the former Minister, the Member for St. John's East Extern, just asked about the closure of fish plants, one of the oldest inshore fish plants in Newfoundland is in Witless Bay, in existence for over thirty years. It has gone through a series of operators. In 1989 we had a temporary operator because it was just impossible to get a full-time operator to go in there. The plant obviously was kept alive by the former Government as a social plant, if you want, a plant that could not make money on its own but a plant we kept alive because there were over 300 plant workers involved and many thousands of fishermen who sold fish to that given plant.

I want to ask the Minister, is this fish plant in Witless Bay going to be allowed to be closed under this Government's policy of rationalizing, making the fishing industry more efficient, or is it going to be allowed to exist as it has done for over thirty years?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member is right. The Witless Bay plant is a very important part of the fishery on the Eastern Southern Avalon. In fact, it buys fish from anywhere from 300 to 500 fishermen, and it employs up to

500 plant workers. In the course of a summer it would process 5 million pounds of groundfish, not to mention the pelagics and the shellfish. That plant, Mr. Speaker, has been sold to Shawmout Fishery, I believe they call themselves, the owners of which are Mr. Joey George and Mr. Con Sullivan. It will be refurbished and, hopefully, back in operation by the time the season starts in the spring.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, if I got the Minister of Fisheries' answer correctly, it has been sold to Shawmout Fisheries. I must say, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the many persons who work in Witless Bay and who sell fish there, I am both delighted and somewhat surprised, realizing that there were several proposals in for that operation, some who had very profound and deep, long-standing Liberal connections. I am glad to see that the best operators were picked. And I give the Minister and the Administration credit for that. They have picked the best operators and they have not used -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:
And I do not mind saying that. Because if the Minister of Fisheries had told me they had sold it to the other principals or other persons who had made proposals, who were not, in the eyes of both the fishermen from the East End of St. John's, the union, the local council, the best

operators, I would be here screaming patronage of the highest order, because you had given it to the wrong operators. Now that it has been given to new operators, is the Government supplying any special assistance, other than normal Government programs in the form of loan guarantees or the like?

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, you know, the hon. Member should not show any surprise. We have been in office since May 5, and he must know the policy of fairness and balance in doing things.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
He must know that we are a Government that will make a decision not based on political affiliations or anything else, but we will do the right thing.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) the recreation grants.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, that plant was in receivership and, as you know, this year it was operated by the same company, by the way, and they did a very good job. In the spring of the year the receiver called for proposals for prospective operators for the plants. Three were received. The receiver recommended what they thought was the best operator, and we concurred with their decision.

No, Mr. Speaker, there will be no financial help sought by the company, nor will there be any financial assistance offered.

They have indicated they are willing to put their own money up front; in fact it is going to cost something like \$1.5 million to refurbish that plant. No, I am sorry, in excess of \$1 million to refurbish the plant, and they have given us a surety that they intend to do what they propose to do in their proposal, and that no financial assistance will be required from Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member from Ferryland
- one minute.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary, and very quickly. On the point of fairness and balance as it relates to the fishery in the Ferryland District, yes, the Government has shown fairness and balance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

In one case in issuing a new licence you were blatantly, politically patronizing, and in the other case you were showing good management. So if that is fairness and balance, we will take it and we will live with it. Again, Mr. Speaker, from the point of view of the persons involved in the fish plant, the assurances that have been given to make sure this plant operates, and the fact that this plant will again be allowed to apply for normal Government financing, normal Government programs without any special loan guarantees, are there assurances that have been put in place to make sure that this money is going to be spent to refurbish

the plant, that it can continue to exist as an economic, viable plant into the future?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman keeps referring to our decision to grant a certain type licence to Cape Broyle Fisheries. I would like to tell him that what we did there was restore fairness and balance, for which I make no apology. With respect to the second part of his question, yes, we are requiring from the new operator an assurance, a surety, a bond that they will, in fact, perform as promised and, I repeat, no financial help has been sought from the Government.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question Period has expired.

Before moving on to the next item of business I would like to welcome to the galleries today, on behalf of all hon. members, members from the Northwest Brook Local Service District, Mr. Don Bursey, Chairman, and Mr. Art Baker, member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was asked by the Leader of the Opposition

about a freeze imposed by the Fisheries Loan Board on all vessels being built by Eastern Ship Builders. The exact question was: I wonder if the Premier could tell the House on what basis the Fisheries Loan Board would initiate a freeze on all loan activity involving this particular company?

I made an enquiry, Mr. Speaker, and I have to tell the House that there was no such freeze on that company. The Fisheries Loan Board advise that they became aware of an action taken in the court claiming that a particular boat, or a boat of a particular design, built by that company was unseaworthy and unusable, and there were claims respecting the loan and the Fisheries Loan Board, so the Loan Board consulted the Department of Justice and asked what their position was on the matter in respect of future and other boats of this kind. They received advice, and based on the advice they received, they advised an applicant for a boat of the exact same design that they would not be able to proceed with a loan in respect of vessels of that design until this matter had been resolved. There was no freeze with respect to the company itself, the freeze was with respect to vessels of that particular kind.

There was also a question, Mr. Speaker, Would the Premier now advise if the land claims negotiations with the Federal Government and the Labrador Inuit Association are progressing at a satisfactory pace? I indicated that I felt certain the preliminary comments made by the hon. member were not accurate, but that I would find out and advise the House today as to the full

situation.

Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the land claims discussions have been ongoing on a regular basis. They are proceeding satisfactorily from the Government's point of view. It is expected that in the not too distant future a frame work agreement will have been agreed upon, and then the detail of the land claims negotiations can be proceeded with.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further answers to questions for which notice has been given.

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for Torngat Mountains asked a question: Why did the Minister of Mines and Energy on October 4, 1989 enter into a 25 year lease with the Iron Ore Company of Canada for the development of the minerals in the Strange Lake area, in view of the negotiations regarding land claims?

I will give a little bit of history, Mr. Speaker. In 1979 a license to explore the Strange Lake area of Labrador was issued to Paul Penney, and was subsequently purchased by the Iron Ore Company of Canada or transferred to the Iron Ore Company of Canada. Over the last ten years the Iron Ore Company has spent in excess of \$1.8 million in exploration of the Strange Lake mineral claims. They have fulfilled all the provisions to keep the claims in good standing. In 1989, the Iron Ore Company requested the Government to issue a mining lease to them according to the terms of The Mineral Act. Upon review officials of my

Department determined that the Iron Ore Company of Canada has fulfilled all the requirements to obtain that mining lease and, therefore, they recommended to me that the lease be issued, and I so did that on October 3.

As per mineral regulations and An Act Respecting The Acquisition Of Rights To Minerals In The Province, that have been in place in this Province since 1976 and under which with the conditions met, there is really no leniency to say otherwise. I will read from the Act, Section 26. (1) "The holder of a licence may at any time during the currency of the license apply to the Minister for a mining lease of all the minerals in, on or under the land or part of the land covered by the licence and the licensee has a right" I would emphasize Mr. Speaker that the licensee has a right "to the issuance of a mining lease..." subject to the conditions being met. All conditions were met, the license was issued.

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

I have a petition here from 1,312 residents of my District in the communities of Burgeo, Ramea, Grey River, Francois, and the prayer of the petition is this: WHEREAS as the hospital at Burgeo has been closed due to a nursing shortage this year thereby depriving the residents of a facility that has been there for a long time and WHEREAS there is no other hospital

or medical care facility in this area that could meet the need temporarily, when the present hospital has reduced the services and WHEREAS there are two major industries in the area one at Ramea and one at Burgeo served by the hospital, and should a major accident occur medical attention would be needed immediately and WHEREAS the geographical location of this area in the District of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir prevents ready access to other mainstream medical assistance especially in winter BE IT RESOLVED we humbly pray your hon. House may be pleased to take whatever action is necessary to ensure that this life or death facility is kept in full operation on a year round basis to serve the needs of a very hard working, God fearing people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a very serious petition and in view of the fact that over 1,300 people from that District took the trouble to sign their names to it, I feel that it should be entered into this House and the salient point is to take whatever action is necessary. Since that petition has been in process, I feel that we have started to take whatever action is necessary to alleviate the problems and concerns of those people.

First of all, when I found out about this petition, I immediately discussed it with my colleague the Minister of Health, and pointed out that this was a serious problem and we would have to address it. I realize that from time to time in the House the concerns of the people of Burgeo, as you are no doubt aware, and that whole area, are brought about due to the fact that it is impossible to get nurses to go to this area. Over the last five or

six months there has been a down-grading of the service because of the fact that we have not been able to attract nurses to go to Burgeo. When I was able to discuss this with my colleague, the first thing we did is we visited Burgeo, and the Minister of Health and I then had meetings with the staff that are currently at the hospital, we ensured that there was a temporary service there, the Minister of Health guaranteed that there would be an ongoing search for nurses and as soon as the nurses could be attracted to this area, the hospital would go back into full operation. The point is, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague the Minister of Health was able to go there and get the information first hand from the hospital employees, from the Town Council. Now as a result of that, in the new year there is going to be a complete study of the health care in that area, hopefully provision will be made to ensure some new facilities which will possibly help to alleviate the long term problem. I present the petition because I feel that it is a serious problem, I feel that when over thirteen hundred people take the opportunity and take the time to sign up, there is serious concerns and I know that with the action that my colleague has initiated, I am optimistic that the problem should be solved in due course and I hope it is sooner rather than later. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker, as Opposition Health Critic I would like to respond briefly to this petition, which as

the Member has indicated deals with a very, very serious, problem in his District and I have no hesitation in supporting the prayer of this petition, because in an area like Burgeo where there is no other hospital and where there are major industries and no ready access to other areas which do have health facilities, the need can only be considered as urgent and critical, and I fully support the concerns of the residents in the area and the need for the Government and the Minister of Health to do something about this ongoing, unsolved problem. Now, I know that over a year ago the Government received a very important task force study from the Nursing profession, on the Nursing work force, and amongst many other issues that were addressed, this whole problem of the need, or the relationship actually, between nursing shortages and bed closures was addressed, and I am somewhat disturbed that after all the many months that have gone by the Government has not yet in any meaningful way addressed the recommendations of that task force. I believe their response has been to set up yet another advisory committee to advise on the advice of the advisory committee, and that seems to be the response that we are continually getting when issues of concern, not only in Health, but in other areas are being raised. It is taken under consideration, it is being studied and answers would be coming in due course. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is fair to say that it is time for some solutions to these problems to be put forward, not simply studying the problems, because in cases like this where people are denied hospital services, the risk to the people in that area is very, very

serious. I do not have all the answers myself, because I do not have access to all the information, but I would wonder if it would not be possible for Government to consider such moves as having an incentive pay for nurses who work in remote and rural areas, since it seems to be a chronic difficulty to get people to work in those areas, where the health care needs of the people are critical. Or, I would be very interested in hearing from the Minister of Health as to what initiative he is taking, if that is not practical, to address this issue? It simply cannot be allowed to go on, and on, as something that is continually being studied with no solutions in sight.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. I want to thank my enlightened friend for St. John's East who truly gives every indication that she is indeed concerned about the health care of this Province. I should explain to the hon. Member though that the thought of extra pay was the one which was addressed by me shortly after receiving this portfolio, but I soon discovered that there is a problem with the union and we are not permitted to pay extra pay to people who do live in remote parts of the Province. If we were, I can assure her, that being from a remote part of the Province myself, I certainly would have gone that route. That is one possible solution which the union feels we are not allowed to work.

Mr. Speaker, the problems that are encountered at Burgeo, the problems that are encountered at Harbour Breton, the problems that are encountered at Nain, and in many other places throughout this Province, were passed into our lap when we took over on April 20. One of the things which happened over the past number of years, I tell my friend for St. John's East, although she was not responsible for it because she was not a part of the people who did it, there was a three year freeze placed on hospital and nursing home construction in this Province. In some cases the freeze was on for five years and for a five year period, and in some places three, there was not a single nail driven, not a single hospital built, an absolute total freeze, Mr. Speaker. Can you imagine the build up -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. DECKER:

The buildings which were done were committed before the freeze came on, Mr. Speaker. Can you imagine the build up of need that was there facing us when we took over this Government on April 20? There is a backlog of need in the health care system that will take us ten years to overcome, because of the mismanagement of the previous Administration. We will need millions of dollars to overcome the negative affects of that freeze, which was arbitrarily placed on the health care services. It has done irreparable harm, Mr. Speaker, and how the Members can jest about that I do not know. It will take years to catch up. As my friend pointed out, after that petition arrived, we did indeed visit Burgeo. Since I have been Minister I have

visited hospitals and nursing homes throughout this Province, and I have seen how they have been allowed, in some cases, to fall into the ground. Our task, Mr. Speaker, is to try to bring back some semblance of order to this mismanaged system that we have inherited. To do that, Mr. Speaker, I talked with the people in Burgeo, met with the workers in the hospital, met with the representation from the board which controls that hospital, and met with the town council. I told the people of Burgeo that immediately after the new year, in January or February, a group of people will go out from the Department of Health and they will sit down with the town council in Burgeo, sit down with the hospital board which works out of Western Memorial, and they will try to come to some understanding as to what is needed in Burgeo. Now, Mr. Speaker, this will not be done arbitrarily this time. This is a wide open Government which listens to people and talks to people. That is the difference. This is the kind of Government we are running, Mr. Speaker. We will talk to the people in Burgeo and we will explain to them what is happening to medicine on the verge of the 21st century. We will make suggestions to them, they will make suggestions to us, and together we will find a solution to the problems in Burgeo. That is the commitment that we have. We have inherited a lot of problems.

Mr. Speaker, I know, the people of Burgeo know, and my friend for St. John's East knows, that when we isolate all the needs in the health care system, there are going to be a large pile of needs throughout this Province: Nurses, Doctors in rural Newfoundland,

more chronic care beds, more nursing home beds, the pile is going to be so high, and on this side, Mr. Speaker, as my friend knows, there is going to be a pile of money, the fiscal reality. Now we have to match that fiscal reality with this pile of needs, many of which were left behind by a Government which put a freeze on. We have to match these.

And do you know the good news that we have for the people of Burgeo, and the people all over this Province? Just as the Minister of fisheries showed an example today of fairness and balance, no political partisanship, no political pork barreling, we will match the few fiscal dollars that we have, Mr. Speaker, with this big pile of health care needs, and it will be done simply on the basis of need, and fairness and balance will be the determining factor. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there further petitions? Before going on with the Orders of the Day, on behalf of hon. Members I would like to welcome to the galleries today a delegation from the St. Lawrence Town Council, from the district of Grand Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

MR. BAKER:

Order 16, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Fisheries." (Bill No. 26).

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is introduced for a very sound and very basic reason, of course, and that is to revise and to replace the 1973 Department of Fisheries Act. Of course that is made necessary by virtue of the fact that we have in recent months done some reorganization within the Department of Fisheries, and consequently this bill is necessary to accomodate some of those changes.

The only substantive change, Mr. Speaker, to the Act has been to transfer, as part of our departmental reorganization, the powers of the former Fishing Industry Advisory Board to the Minister of Fisheries. The Bill neither increases nor decreases the authority or the power of the Minister in respect of the former Department of Fisheries Act. As I said a moment ago, it simply transfers to the Departmental Act, the authority which the previous -

MR. WARREN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member from Torngat Mountains on a point of order.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the Bills that was discussed in the Committees, but we have not yet gone through this bill fully in Committee. I am wondering why the Minister is bringing it in before the Committee fully discussed the Bill?

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is not really a point of order. Every attempt -

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is.

MR. BAKER:

No. According to our Standing Orders, there is a procedure we go through in terms of bringing Bills into the House, and these procedures have been gone through. However, we are in the process of setting up the other committees. As hon. Members will realize, this is a very recent development, and it has been indicated to the House that in the process of setting up these committees and getting them to function properly, there are going to be certain growing pains, and the growing pains are going to be that occasionally things are going to have to be brought into the House that were not properly dealt with by the Committee. I am trying as much as possible not to have this happen, Mr. Speaker. However, if this is one of these cases, then it is one of the growing pains I referred to.

Mr. Speaker, in the ordinary course of events, and I am hoping that by next fall we will be on track, and perhaps for the spring, as well, pieces of legislation will be handed to Committees and dealt with before they are dealt with in second reading in this Chamber. We have not had time to do that at the present time, so this will occur occasionally. But

the Bills that will be left on the Order Paper at the end of this session now, some of them substantial bills, will be handled by the Committee between now and the opening in the spring, and what is perceived, and what I hope to be the normal running of this House, will be in full operation by next spring. But this is one of the growing pains, and there is really nothing in the Orders of the House that makes reference to these other Committees.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for any growing pains that the Government House Leader might be experiencing, but there are two or three points that need to be made, and I appreciate my colleague raising the point of order. First of all, this piece of legislation has been on the Order Paper since the first part of last week. Now, if the Committees are going to work, then there should have been ample opportunity for the Committees to review this piece of legislation from the first part of last week to almost the middle of this week, point number one.

Point number two, Mr. Speaker: It is my understanding that this particular bill was left in abeyance by the particular Legislative Committee because the Committee had sought certain information from the Deputy Minister of Fisheries and legal advice from the Department of Justice. The Committee has not had the courtesy of that

information yet, Mr. Speaker, so, therefore, the Committee has not had an opportunity to determine whether or not this piece of legislation is ready to pass through the scrutiny of the Committee and come before this whole House.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this: Having fully admitted that the Legislative Committee system is a good system in my view, I fully support it, having fully admitted that it is a new system, having fully admitted that there are growing pains, it is becoming very, very obvious to me, Mr. Speaker, and other Members on this side of the House, that when it suits the Government's advantage to circumvent the Legislative Committee system, then they are prepared so to do. We have seen numerous examples in this session of the House already; we saw the amendment to The St. John's Election Act coming into this House on the spur of the moment without being referred to the appropriate Legislative Committee, we see this piece of legislation not fully dealt with. It is my understanding that the Government House Leader is deliberately planning and plotting to bring legislation before this House over the next two or three days, or early next week, that will not even be referred to the Legislative Review Committees, and the Government House Leader knows what piece of legislation I am talking about - I suspect the Premier knows it too.

So there is legislation not being dealt with by the Committees, and not because the Committees are not in place and not operating. I fully acknowledge that there will be growing pains and we have to make provision for that, but it

seems to me, and it seems to us on this side of the House, to be clear beyond a doubt that there are certain instances that are readily identifiable where the Government is absolutely plotting to circumvent those Committees. I applaud the Government for setting them up. Now the Premier can shake his head, and do what he likes, I do not care, but the fact of the matter is, the municipalities legislation for St. John's did not go to the Committee, this Bill was before the Committee, the Committee was promised information, it does not have it, and here we are calling it in second reading in the House. We know that the Government has no intention of putting the Economy Recovery Commission legislation before the Committee. That has been told to us by the Government House Leader. So are we serious about those Committees or are we not? That is the point we are making. That is the only point to be made, and I think it is a point that should be made, Mr. Speaker, and made here today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, it is a long time since I have heard such a mouthful of hypocrisy. For seventeen years nobody ever heard of a committee, legislation was brought in on a moment's notice. We bring in some reforms. We want to establish committees. We are in the process of doing that. Our rules have not even been changed to allow it to

be done, yet we are going through the process to the maximum extent that it can be done in the circumstances. In fact, Mr. Speaker, even when the Committees are being provided for in the rules, there will frequently be times when legislation is introduced and second reading debated directly in the House before any committee ever meets on it.

This diatribe is coming from the hon. the Leader of the Opposition now as though the Government is doing something wrong, when the Government has established a process to reform this House and make sure that people have a fair opportunity to review legislation to the maximum extent reasonable in all of the circumstances, to make sure that the Opposition have an opportunity to bring on matters for debate that they want debated. We suggested this. This was our suggestion. When the other side were in Government they would never have anything to do with anything like that. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, there is no requirement on this point of order to have this debated in this way, and I cannot sit silent and allow the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that there is something wrong in what the Government is doing. The Government may well bring in eight or ten or fifteen pieces of legislation for second reading without going to Committee, and that will not be anything wrong. But I assure the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and other Members of the House that the Government's objective is to try to give hon. Members the maximum possible opportunity to review legislation before it is debated, and to provide Committees with an opportunity to review it. That is what we are in the process

of doing. This kind of tirade now is totally unfounded and totally unjustified.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, the Premier can get up and dance all he likes. He is not going to take this House on his back, whether he wants to or not. Now, this Premier and this Government, Mr. Speaker, do not have any monopoly on reform in this House of Assembly. It was another Government and another Administration that brought in reform that sent the Budget of this House to review committees. That was a significant step forward. And every time, Mr. Speaker, the government of the day would rightly or wrongly run into difficulty with the Estimates Review Committees, the Opposition, rightly, on this side of the House, was up dancing and jumping and demanding that their rights be protected, because the committee system had been set up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Government have set up a Legislative Review Committee system, which we support. It is not yet in the rules of the House, but we are supporting it and trying to co-operate and help in making it work, but if the Government is only going to make it work when it suits its fancy, then I can tell you it is not going to work. And the Premier should be a little bit more concerned with that, and less concerned with words like 'hypocrisy' and so on, if he is interested in true reform in this House. It ill behoves the

Premier to talk about decorum and co-operation and getting along well together, and then getting up and acting like a spoiled child.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader, and then the Chair is ready to make a ruling.

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to straighten up a misunderstanding. I am not going to rant and rave like the Leader of the Opposition. I want to clear up a misunderstanding that the Leader of the Opposition has, and it is simply this: At least in the initial stages, Bills that go to Committee can be dealt with by the Committee in two ways. I am talking now about the Legislative Committee. It can be dealt with by the Legislative Committee before it is even introduced in the House. This will happen when the House is not sitting. Then the Legislative Committee can suggest its changes, and this has already been done; there are Bills before this House now where the Legislative Committees have suggested changes and the changes have been made before the Bills are actually printed. That is one method of having input. The other method of having input is during the regular Committee stage in the House of Assembly, which we have not reached yet. Second reading, as the Leader of the Opposition knows, comes before the Committee stage in the House. Then there is a second stage where the Committee can have input. That is during Committee of the Whole on the Bill, when amendments can be made

to specific clauses in that Bill. So the allowance is still made for Committee input. Even if a Bill is introduced, debated during second reading in the House, and in the interim has gone to the Committee, there is still time for the Committee to have a look at the Bill and, during the Committee of the Whole stage, can then make the appropriate amendments and changes it wants to make, or state its opinion on it. So there is all kinds of opportunity for input.

I would also like to remind him again that there will be occasions, obviously, when legislation will go through the House before it has been completely dealt with by the Committees. This has to be possible, because we cannot have a couple of people holding up the legislative process in the House. And if the committee structure falls apart, for instance, if there is a lot of hold-up in the Committees that is unjustified, then, obviously, the House has a chance to decide; the House is the ultimate body in the Province that decides. There will be cases when emergency legislation comes in.

I just wanted to make that point, Mr. Speaker, because I am sure the Leader of the Opposition is misinformed or failed to understand the functioning and the purposes of these Committees.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair is now ready to make a ruling.

Number one, since there are no orders on it, obviously it is not a point of order. I will hear the submission by the Member for

Humber East, but I am ready to make a ruling and to get on with the debate.

MS VERGE:

Mr. speaker, I will be brief.

As the Deputy Opposition House Leader, acting in the absence of my friend from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), I had the opportunity of meeting the other day with the Government House Leader to make plans for the House yesterday and today, and it is very unfortunate that at that meeting we did not discuss a plan for today, because I think if we had we could have quite easily arrived at a plan that would have satisfied both sides of the House. I am quite puzzled about the Government moving to call the Department of Fisheries Bill for second reading today, not only because the Resource Legislation Committee had not completed its work, but because there is no apparent urgency to have the full House deal with this Department of Fisheries Bill. Today is November 21st. We are going to be sitting here for at least another three weeks, maybe four or five weeks. There is no suggestion on any one's part that the Resource Legislation Committee is not doing its work efficiently and responsibly.

What we have been told by a Member of the Committee and the Opposition Leader, without any contradiction from Members opposite, is that the Resource Legislation Committee had one meeting to look at the Fisheries Department Bill and asked for additional information from the Deputy Minister of Fisheries and legal advice from the Department of Justice, and is still waiting to get that additional

information. Now it seems to me that that is a perfectly sensible approach on the part of the Committee, and surely all of us, and the full House, would function better in debating the principle of this Bill, which is the point of debate on second reading, if we would allow that Legislation Committee the little bit of time required to get the additional information to complete its work and bring back a report. It is only November 21st, I say again, we have got plenty of time to deal with the Fisheries Bill in full House, so why not postpone this and move ahead to the Justice Bills, which, I understand, the Government House Leader is planning to call next?

They are two Bills which the Social Legislative Committee did consider and did unanimously endorse, and then we can move to debate other matters. If the Legislation Committee had had any warning that the Government wanted to do the Fisheries Department Bill in full House, perhaps the Members of that Committee could have speeded up the response of the Deputy Minister of Fisheries and the Department of Justice. Why not resolve this tiff today by agreeing to postpone second reading of the Fisheries Department Bill just for a couple more days, and give the Committee that bit of time to complete its work? I really do not understand the need for the Government to proceed with this today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order. As I indicated earlier, it could hardly be a point of order, since we do not have any orders related to this matter; it is an experimental procedure. One would hope that

both sides, in the meantime, would work together and co-operate on matters of this type to prevent this thing from arising, and to prevent its discussion in the House. But, as I indicated, it is not a point of order, it is not even a breach of a Memorandum of Understanding, I suppose, in the sense that both sides have agreed to carry out this method. I would hope that we carry it out in the spirit of goodwill, so that in the future we do not have this kind of debate in the House.

As the Government House Leader pointed out, it is a new procedure and whatever circumstances do cause us to debate matters, then it is possible that we could discuss these with both sides and make sure when we come to the House that at least we are in agreement in what we do. There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, before I was so unnecessarily interrupted - I guess is the better word - by the Member for Torngat Mountains, I was pointing out the reasons why this new Fisheries Act is necessary. Of course, one of the reasons is that we have now, as a result of the reorganization of our Department, in trying to make it a more efficient and maybe a leaner and meaner type of Department, certainly that which is necessary, we did transfer the powers of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board to the Department of Fisheries. Having studied that situation very carefully, we came to the conclusion that the way it was structured was costing a lot of money that could be saved, and we would pretty well get the same results from transferring the

powers of the Board to the Department of Fisheries itself.

We recognize, of course, the reason why the Advisory Board was first established, and we accept the fact that we do have certain responsibilities to the union and to the industry in terms of providing certain information to both sectors. We did not want to take steps that would run contrary to the agreement to which the Governments concurred some years ago, that there would be a Board established, so we sought the advice and concurrence of the union and of the industry itself before we took any such action.

Mr. Speaker, the reaction from both components, the industry and the union, was unanimous; both agreed that the Board, as it was currently structured at that time, was not necessary and, in fact, was not serving the purpose for which it was originally intended. I guess, Mr. Speaker, to make a long story short, the functions of that Board are now vested in the Department of Fisheries. We are providing essentially the same information that we were prior to the Board being abolished, and we intend to continue to do that. As I said a moment ago, this Act neither takes away from or increases the authority or the power of the Minister in respect of the former Department of Fisheries Act, it merely transfers to the departmental Act the authority which was previously exercised by the Minister in respect of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board.

Section 19 of the proposed Bill, Mr. Speaker, brings forward new penalty provisions in line with that in other legislation. It sets out maximum penalties

against any individual convicted of a breach of sections 16, 17 and 18, including an employee of the Department. Mr. Speaker, Sections 16, 17 and 18 of the Bill have to do with the availability of information from businesses engaged in the fishery. In those sections, of course, certain requirements are imposed upon people engaged in the fishing industry. Indeed, when certain information is sought, necessary information, then the people from which it is being sought have a certain legal obligation to provide that information. Failing to do so, of course, could result in a penalty. That, Mr. Speaker, we find necessary. In fact, if not abused and properly administered, we find that provides a very worthwhile service to the fishing industry.

In fact, it was on the condition that we would maintain that function within the Department that we were able to get unanimous agreement on the part of the industry and the union to abolish the Board and to integrate the Board into the Department of Fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is not world-shattering. It does not change anything within the Department, really. What it does is enable us to be better able to react to changing times, and react to the need to maybe restructure the Department of Fisheries and make it capable of being more responsive to the needs of the fishing industry, of course, and to the Union.

In recent months we have, Mr. Speaker, endeavored to restructure the Department of Fisheries. We have endeavored to make certain changes to the Fisheries Loan

Board. I might add that we are not finished yet with the Fisheries Loan Board in terms of restructuring, but we are finding that the changes that we have implemented to date are worthwhile and are having the effect of making the Department, as I said a moment ago, better able to respond to the changing conditions. Changes that, of necessity, must be made in the fishing industry to make it a more productive and more functional and a better administered Department.

In the changes, Mr. Speaker, that we have implemented with respect to the Fisheries Loan Board, we have seen the role of the Chairman changed somewhat. Where at one time the Chairman was responsible for the day-to-day operation and administration of the Loan Board, that has since changed. We are now in the process of appointing a Managing Director, I guess, would be the correct title for the new Administrator of the Fisheries Loan Board. And the Chairman of that Board will, while continuing to be responsible for the overall administration of the Board, he will also act as the Assistant Deputy Minister of Fisheries, and will not be involved on a day-to-day basis with the operation of the Fisheries Loan Board. We find that too has some advantages.

I might inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that to-date it has worked very well, and I have every reason to believe that with a few more refinements within the Board, in terms of the higher echelon of the Board, that it will continue to improve in terms of its being able to respond to the needs of the fishing industry.

The Board, of course, continues to

operate as it did before, with a number of Board members most of which are appointed by outside agencies including, of course, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans who have the right to appoint, to nominate a person to serve on the Board. Then, of course, the Fishermen's Union, I believe the Marine Institute nominates some person to serve on that Board, and others. Of course, as Minister of Fisheries, I have the right to appoint three people to serve on the Board, two people actively engaged in the fishing industry and one person at large. Mr. Speaker, all of these appointments have been made and we now have a very functional Fisheries Loan Board.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is about all I have to say at this point in time about the new Act. I repeat what I said a moment ago. It is not world shattering. It is not revolutionary. It is merely changes in a Bill to accommodate certain necessary changes that have been made within the Department. Changes that we believe will, in fact we know from experience of the past few months, that they are having a very positive impact on the operation of the Department of Fisheries.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of fishery related statutes that we have listed in the Bill. I think some of these will be repealed. Approval was sought and we see from the Executive Council to repeal certain redundant, I suppose is the word for it, statutes within sections of the Act. And we will be introducing legislation, I expect, if not during this Session then certainly in the Spring Session, to repeal certain redundant or absolute statutes that appear under the

Departmental Act.

Mr. Speaker, I am rather amused to listen to some of the objections coming from the other side as to the method that is being employed now when introducing this Bill for second reading. It seems to me that the reforms that we are now seeing take place in this House maybe are moving a bit too fast for the Members of the Opposition. For example, for the first time in five years, Members now have the privilege of having a fall session where we can debate such things as the fishery. I think it is five years, four years, well I am sure it is five or six years since we have had a fall session.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

When? A number of years, five or six years since we have had a fall session and Members were given the opportunity to come before the House in the peoples House and debate the peoples business. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, of course, and the Member for Torngat took exception to the fact that we introduced this bill without it going to the committee system. Mr. Speaker, that too is a very worthwhile reform, but the hon. Members opposite obviously are not prepared to give it a chance to take shape and to function properly. I should remind the Members opposite that - like the Premier said - this is the first time that this privilege has been accorded to Members of the House, that Bills would be referred to a standing committee for study. And I would like to point out too, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition shows some amazement that we would dare introduce a

Bill without it's first having gone through the committee system. Well in the House of Commons from which this system, I presume is being patterned, a great many Bills go before the House of Commons without reference to the appropriate standing committee. In fact, only major pieces of legislation in the House of Commons, and I repeat, and that I presume is the system that the hon. House Leader is adopting in this House. Only major Bills and pieces of legislation are referred to the various respective standing committees. In fact, like I said a moment ago, there are numerous Bills introduced and passed in the House of Commons without even reference to the appropriate standing committee. So, what we have done here today is certainly not without precedence, Mr. Speaker, and it is not as devastating as the hon. Leader of the Opposition would have us believe it is. And I know that in time, of course, and as the hon. House Leader is given a chance to properly study the system and get it in place and get it working properly, that I suspect that all Bills in this House - even unlike the House of Commons and certainly unlike the previous Administration - will be referred to the committee for appropriate study.

So, Mr. Speaker, again it gives me some pleasure to introduce this bill in the second reading, and I look forward to hearing what the other Members on the other side have to say about it. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you Mr. Speaker. The hon. Minister of Fisheries goes through some lengths, Mr. Speaker, in his closing remarks on introducing the second reading of this Bill, to try to justify the lack of planning and the negligence on the part of the Government in planning the Government agenda. That is what we are talking about here, Mr. Speaker, the planning of the Government agenda, it is not the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. I say it with just as straight a face as the Minister of Fisheries was able to say what he just said, Mr. Speaker. It is the responsibility of the Government to plan its legislative agenda in all its forms, Mr. Speaker, in all its respects, and through the whole legislative journey, until the end of the process when the Bill is finally ready for proclamation. That, as the hon. gentleman - a veteran of a couple of Parliaments - would know well, is the responsibility of the Government. The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, tries to make a great deal about the committee system in the House of Commons in Ottawa. I would expect that perhaps this Government intends, at some point, to pattern its legislative review committee - perhaps it does, perhaps it does not, I do not know, but I suspect it does - perhaps intends to pattern its legislative review committees after the Commons Committees. And if, in fact, it intends to do that, what the Government will find is that second reading, in most cases, proceeds in the House of Commons, and it is only after the Bill passes the second reading that it is referred to the Commons

committee. Then it stays in the Commons Committee until the Committee deals with it, when it is referred back to the House with amendments or no amendments or whatever, for third and final reading. So, we have gone about this so far, in another way. We have gone about it in a way of referring Bills before they get to the House, to the legislative review committees, so that the committees can pass their judgement, recommend changes or whatever, to come to the full House. I do not expect, Mr. Speaker, if this process is going to work properly, that we can have it both ways. I do not expect it is going to work smoothly and that we can be referring bills to Legislative Review Committees before they get to the House. If that is going to be the process, I have no difficulty with that. But if the process is going to be: some are going to be referred to Committee before they come to the House for second reading, before debate on the principle of the bill, or if others are going to come to the House and then be referred back to Committee, something like the Commons system, then I say to the Government House Leader, that is going to be a very convoluted system of dealing with the public business, in dealing with the legislative business. The Government should decide, in consultation with the Opposition, which system they are going to use. Either system is fine. Like I said I do not care. But let us decide once and for all, Mr. Speaker, what type of system we are going to use in this House. It cannot be either or, it should be one or the other. And if it is one or the other and if the Government then, by and large, sticks to that, then I think the process can work.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, we welcome the Legislative Review Committee system. We did not have to if we did not want to. Government does not have a two-thirds majority of seats in the House. They cannot change the rules of the House by themselves. They can only change the rules of the House with the consent of this side, because our Standing Orders dictate that the rules can only be changed with the consent of two-thirds of the Members of this Assembly. So the Government cannot take the House on their back and change the rules any way they want. They have to do it in co-operation and in consultation with the Opposition. But do it whichever way you want, but I would suggest to the Government House Leader do it one way or do it another way, so that the system can have an opportunity to work.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to have a few remarks on this Bill, An Act Respecting The Department of Fisheries. Now I have noticed, Mr. Speaker, in looking at numerous pieces of legislation over the last several weeks, that this effort by the Government to bring in legislation setting up new mandates for allegedly new Departments of Government, is nothing short of puffery. It is only a show, Mr. Speaker. It is almost criminal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:
Now, Mr. Speaker, I assume there is something in Beauséjour to keep the hon. gentleman comforted while I am speaking.

Mr. Speaker, it is nothing short of criminal, the perception that the Government have tried to

portray of a total reorganization of Government Departments. There is no bill that we have seen before this House in recent weeks that proves that assertion, Mr. Speaker, more clearly than this Bill No. 26, An Act Respecting The Department of Fisheries. Because if any Member of this Chamber would take Bill No. 26, An Act Respecting The Department Of Fisheries, and lay it side by side, Mr. Speaker, with Bill No. 29, introduced on March 23, 1973, entitled an Act Respecting The Department Of Fisheries - here are both of them, Mr. Speaker, the new and the old.

MS VERGE:
(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:
In 1973, I do not think so. No, he was Minister in 1975.

But if Members would take the two Bills, the new one that the Minister is introducing today, and the old one that has been in place since 1973, Mr. Speaker, and go through them, take a night, as I did just recently, and go through those two Bills clause by clause, word for word, Mr. Speaker, and you will see that, with the exception of bringing the activities of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board into the Department of Fisheries, and with the exception of dramatically increasing fines from \$50 and \$100, as is the provision in the old Bill, to \$5,000, as is the provision in the new bill not an iota, not a tittle, not a jot, not a T, not anything is changed.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:
Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a fact.

I challenge the hon. gentleman for Eagle River (Mr. Dumaresque) to take the two Bills and read them clause by clause, word for word, paragraph by paragraph, and he will see unmistakably and clearly that not one iota is changed, and the Minister then has the gall and the gumption to stand up in this House, as have other Ministers over the last several days, telling us about the new reorganization of Government, the new mandates that they are bringing into their Departments. Mr. Speaker, it is not true. They are trying to hoodwink the public into thinking there is reform, innovation, new ideas, and new mandates. Not a thing has changed in this particular Act. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Fisheries wanted to incorporate the activity of the FIAB into his Department all he had to do was bring in an amendment to the 1973 Act. If he wanted to increase the fines from \$50 and \$100 to \$5000, as this new Bill does, he could have brought in two simple amendments, and that would have done it, because not one other thing is changed. Not, a thing, Mr. Speaker. It is amazing. You go through every single clause in this Bill and the powers and responsibility of the Minister are word for word in the new Bill, out of the old Bill. The powers and responsibilities of the Deputy Minister are word for word in the new Bill, out of the old Bill. Setting up Assistant Deputy Ministers, word for word from the old Bill, to the new Bill. Setting up Directors, selling off property, marketing, everything, Mr. Speaker, every single thing that you can mention that is in the new Bill is word for word in the old Bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is this

exercise all about? This exercise is about trying to, somehow or another, create the impression that there is a newness, a spirit, that there is a renaissance that has descended on the elected assembly of this Province, and it is all pie in the sky, it is all make believe, it is all smoke and mirrors. If you take the two Bills and look at them, they are absolutely identical, identical word for word. I could not believe it. I read the new Bill on the first day it was tabled in the House and I said, my heavens, I will have to get the old Bill, because I could not remember the old Bill. It has been awhile since I looked at it so I will have to get the old Bill. Certainly, all of those powers that the Minister is outlining here for himself, I wonder if all that was in the old Bill, and I get out the Section, Mr. Speaker, and there is not a word changed, not even a comma, not even a colon, not a tittle changed from the old Bill to the new Bill. He had the same power when he was Minister in 1975 as he wants to give himself today. It is totally unbelievable.

I looked at the Section on the Deputy Minister and I thought that the new Bill was sloppily worded. I thought that the new Bill was very badly worded, and lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, when I looked up the Section on the Deputy Minister in the old Bill it was just as badly worded because it was the same wording, there was not one thing changed. The Minister then wants to bring this piece of legislation into this House under the guise that he is bringing in something new. Mr. Speaker, something old, something new. Nothing has changed whatsoever. This Bill does a

couple of things.

MS VERGE:

Everything borrowed.

MR. RIDEOUT:

This was a great Tory Bill in 1973, Mr. Speaker, when it was brought in by a Tory administration and nothing has changed in 1989. It is still the same Tory Bill. But, then again, Mr. Speaker, it was a Tory Minister.

Yes, we are going to vote for it, Mr. Speaker. We are going to tell the hon. gentleman we are going to vote for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

There is no reason for anybody in this House - well, there are a couple of reasons. I have to hold there for a second, because there are a couple of reasons, but by and large there is no reason why any Progressive Conservative would not vote for our own Bill the second time. There is no reason whatsoever. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Opposition in 1973 probably voted against it, so there is no reason for the Conservative Opposition in 1989 to vote against it, because it is, in essence, our Bill.

MS VERGE:

But we would have to improve upon it, if we were still in power, because we are progressive.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I understand the Committee have some legal questions they would like to have answered. Mr. Speaker, the matter of bringing the activities of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board under this

piece of legislation - a very simple amendment - all the Minister had to do was repeal the old FIAB Act, that he brought in. Mr. Speaker, it was this Minister -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, no!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, Sir! Yes, Sir!

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, Sir!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, Sir! Yes, Sir! Yes, Sir!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Because, when I was Minister of Fisheries, the Minister asked me to look at repealing the legislation. I had it checked, and the Minister, who is now the Minister, brought that Act in in 1975. Now, Mr. Speaker, that Minister, who is now the Minister again, wants to repeal his own Act. It was necessary in 1975 - but then, again, that comes with the change, I suppose. The Minister was a Tory Minister in 1975 and he is a Liberal Minister in 1989.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is doing what you (inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER:

You were a backbencher then.

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is right, I was. But I must say to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, I only went through the metamorphosis of political change once, and I shall never do it again, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:

The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, has gone through a change almost every six years. In fact, the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, went through a change twice in two weeks, I believe. He ran for the Tory nomination in Bonavista - Trinity Conception and lost it, and then ran as a Liberal candidate in St. John's West. It was an emergency situation, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman had to have a place to run, and he found they could not find a Liberal candidate in St. John's West, so he hopped on the bandwagon and then he went to Twillingate, and here he is. God bless him! More power to him!

Mr. Speaker, I said there are two changes that this Bill incorporates. One is bringing the activities of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board into the Department. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe that is a bad thing to do. I do not think it is a bad thing to bring the activities of the FIAB into the Department of Fisheries. In fact, as the Minister knows from Departmental organization reviews that were carried on just a few months before he became Minister, O and M of Treasury Board did a major review of the Department, the Loan Board and the FIAB, and that group recommended bringing the activities of the FIAB into the Department.

Now, I do not know yet how the Minister proposes to incorporate those activities into the Department. That is going to be the key question. I support the concept of taking the resources and the mandate and the activity of the Fishing Industry Advisory

Board into the Department of Fisheries. But, what is the Minister going to do with those additional resources when he gets his hands on them? That, I think, is something the Minister ought to tell this House when he is finalizing debate on this piece of information.

What I believe should take place is that the resources, financial and otherwise, that were assigned to the FIAB, should be used to make a vibrant, vital Marketing Division in the Provincial Department of Fisheries. And it should have an international side to it. The Marketing Division in the Department of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, is woefully inadequate, was woefully inadequate when I was there and, unless the Minister is going to make some significant changes, it will still be woefully inadequate.

So, the Minister has an opportunity here, Mr. Speaker, to take those resources of the FIAB, take the personnel, bring them in and meld them together with the personnel that are there in the Marketing Division now, and put together one good, single Marketing desk in the Department of Fisheries. And, any marketing activity as it relates to fisheries, other than generic, that is in the Department of Development, should come out of the Department of Development and go into the Department of Fisheries. And, if there are personnel in the Department of Development that have been specifically and exclusively assigned to Fisheries, they should come out and go into the Department of Fisheries.

I believe that it is in the Department of Fisheries, in that

line Department, that marketing activity ought to be centered, that marketing expertise ought to be centered, and it is vitally important that it have to it, an international flavour.

We are not going to expand activity in the fishery, Mr. Speaker, by marketing to ourselves. We are going to expand economic potential in the fishery by marketing in the international community, and that is an area, when the Department of Development was growing over the years, that seemed to be all-consuming and to be taking away from certain line Departments, in this case the Department of Fisheries, activity that I think could have been better dealt with and more professionally dealt with in that particular Department. So I say to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, as he goes about bringing the activity of the FIAB into the Department, there is an opportunity here for him to greatly expand the marketing base of his Department, and I think he would serve the industry well if he were to do that.

The only other thing, Mr. Speaker, this Bill does for some unexplained reason - the Minister did not mention it at all in his opening remarks - is to dramatically increase fines - it dramatically increases fines - for offences under this Act. Under the old Act, as I said, the fines were from \$50 to \$100; in the new Act, they go from \$500 to \$1,000, and that is a dramatic increase for fines under this particular Act. This is not the Act, by the way, Mr. Speaker, that gives the Minister the authority to licence fish plants, that is the Fishing Industry Inspection Act; this is not the Act that gives the

Minister authority to make regulations saying that processors have to freeze the core of their caplin to a certain temperature, that is another Act.

The offences that can occur under this Act are not very significant, in my view; somebody could trespass on a piece of property the Minister holds in right of the Crown, or somebody could obstruct, perhaps, entrance to a piece of property the Minister holds in right of the Crown, something of that nature, but it is not significant in the sense that dramatic public harm would be done to justify increasing the fines from \$50 and \$100 to \$500 and \$1,000. So I do not know why, Mr. Speaker, the Government and the Minister are being so heavy-handed in terms of the penalties they are trying to get the authority to impose on people who might fall or run afoul of this particular piece of legislation.

The other thing I noticed in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and when I made the point earlier that nothing had changed in this Bill from the old one, here is a prime example: Under the old Bill, the Minister had the authority to dispose of assets, and assets can mean anything from bait holding units or baited trawl units to community stages to fish plants. The Minister had the authority to dispose of them. Now, it was a policy of Government when we were there, that before the Minister of Fisheries disposed of any assets, like a fish plant or a community stage, the Minister had to seek Cabinet approval. It was not in the Act; the Act did not specify approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Neither does the new Act specify that, because, again, it is

straight out of the old one. But I believe it was a good policy. I believe it was a good policy, that before the Minister of Fisheries disposed of fish plant assets that were owned by the Province, or disposed of communities stages that could be used for fish processing activity, I believe it was a good policy that the Minister have the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, in other words, the Cabinet, before he did that. And our policy was that not only did you have to have the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, you also had to consult with the community involved; if there was a Town Council or a community council, you did that. If there was a Development Association, you had to consult with those, if there was a Fisherman's Committee, you had to consult with it. And, then, once you did all that, the Minister could go and seek the approval of Cabinet before he disposed of a fish plant facility or a community stage facility, and I believe that was good. But the Act does not say that the Minister has to do it. And I believe that was good, because it was not leaving the total decision of disposing of some of those assets, that are very, very valuable, up to one Department or one Minister. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister would take a serious and sincere recommendation and give assurance to this House that that procedure will be followed.

The other thing I think important for communities where you are disposing of fish plant assets -

MR. FLIGHT:
We know that.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forestry might know everything. You would never say it from the way he responds in the House and so on like that, but it just might be possible that he might know everything.

One other thing I believe was important to protect the future of the community involved, was that if those plants that were disposed of by the Minister were ever sold, were ever closed, then the Crown would have the right to buy them back for the amount that was paid to the Crown, plus any improvement that was made to them. Now that was a mechanism that was put in place to protect communities so that you would not have people non-discriminately buying up assets, and then when there comes a downturn or a perceived downturn in the fishery, using their entrepreneurial right to close down those assets. There was always a clause in every one of the sales, in every one of the leases, that the Government would have the right to buy those assets back for the amount that the Government was paid for them, plus any capital improvement that might be made.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is going to be nothing earth-shattering happen in the fishery as a result of this particular Bill, because the Bill with two minor exceptions, as I have already pointed out, is practically taken word for word from the old Act of 1973.

What I think is more important, Mr. Speaker, is that the Bill gives this House an opportunity once again to address some of the very serious problems facing the fishery in this Province today. There was some opportunity to do so last week, in a private

Member's resolution, there has been an opportunity to do so from time to time in Question Period, and we certainly have taken advantage of that. But because this Bill, "An Act Respecting The Department of Fisheries" is before the Legislature, Members on both sides of the Legislature can take the next day, two days, three days, four days, or a week or whatever, to debate the serious problems that are facing the fishing industry in Newfoundland and Labrador, because that is the principle contained in this Bill.

The setting up of the Department: If you are going to set up the Department, Mr. Speaker, it is set up to deal with the fishing industry in its totality, and the fishing industry in its totality today is not a very healthy industry; and the fishing industry in its totality tomorrow will only be a healthy industry, depending on the approach taken by the Government of this Province to make it so. Because, Mr. Speaker, and I said it before in this House and I will say it again, I cannot say it often enough, the final protector of the fishing industry in Newfoundland and Labrador will always be the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. It does not have the jurisdiction, it does not even have the constitutional right to be consulted in the management of the industry. That we know. We gave away that right when we joined Confederation in 1949, and it has not changed since. We do not have a right to be consulted. But - but, Speaker, it has always been the case historically, over the last 40-odd years, that if the Government of Newfoundland were to dig in its heels, were to dig in its feet, were to be intransigent on a matter of principle relating

to the fishery, then the Government of Canada, no matter what the political stripe of that Government, have, with few minor exceptions, listened.

MR. FLIGHT:

Talk about the FFTs, the factory freezer trawlers, as they are called?

MR. RIDEOUT:

I will talk about FFTs or TTFs or whatever the hon. gentleman wants to talk about, whenever I am ready to get to it, or talk about the four-eyed bark beetle or whatever it is the hon. gentleman is supposed to be out combating those days, or the Linerboard Mill which he visits frequently, and which has not been open in the last number of years.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the principle I just articulated was seen any more clearly than in the original restructuring program that this Province and the Government of Canada and the industry went through in the early 1980s. That was an opportunity, a golden opportunity, Mr. Speaker, an opportunity that the Government of Canada and the bureaucrats of the day finally thought had been dumped in their lap to rationalize once and for all the fishing industry in Newfoundland and Labrador. Because there is a belief, Mr. Speaker, that is running rampant in the Ottawa Valley, and it has run rampant in the Ottawa Valley despite the political stripe of the Government in Ottawa, that the fishing industry in Newfoundland and Labrador is ineffective, it is inefficient, it is outmoded and it must be rationalized. And they tried to do that, Mr. Speaker, with restructuring in the 1980s.

What would that rationalization have done to the fishing industry in this Province at that time? Well, Mr. Speaker, it would have seen Burin closed, it would have seen Gaultois closed, it would have seen Grand Bank closed, it would have seen Harbour Breton closed, it would have seen Ramea closed, it would have seen a major, major surgery done on the fishery as we knew it in the early 1980s in Newfoundland and Labrador. And the Provincial Government at that time said, no, we are not going to participate in that kind of restructuring of the fishery. And everybody at that time told us we were crazy, we were silly. You just could not do anything to make Gaultois viable. You could not do anything in Burin. We said, Well, let us try secondary processing in Burin. And today Burin is a pretty prosperous place, Mr. Speaker.

We were the ones at the time who dug in our heels and said we cannot accept this concept of closing down plants, closing down communities, taking people permanently out of the industry, because, Mr. Speaker, we are in an industry that is renewable. That is the principle. That is why we cannot accept it. The industry is a renewable industry.

Now, when the prairie provinces run into a drought in the agricultural industry, they do not close up farms, Mr. Speaker, they do not take young men and women off the farms and drive them into the cities, they do not have a resettlement program that will take them from the farms in Saskatchewan into Regina.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister does not know what he is talking about. Because if they did, where would the \$2 billion, \$1 billion in two successive years, have come from to support the drought stricken agricultural industry on the prairies? Where did it come from? It came from the Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker, and the prairie provinces involved, to keep the farms open, to keep the farms in production, to keep the people on the farms.

MR. FLIGHT:

Did they keep them there?

MR. RIDEOUT:

They kept them there unless they wanted to go voluntarily.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes. Yes.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, they kept them there unless -

MR. FLIGHT:

(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman go over to his own seat? Then I might entertain a question from him.

Mr. Speaker, the principle involved here is that there was a serious problem in the agricultural industry for one, two, three years, or whatever it was, in recent memory on the prairies, and that serious drought problem was addressed by the Government of Canada and the Government of the Provinces involved, putting in a special bridging program - a special bridging program - to keep people involved in the agricultural industry in Western Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our industry in Newfoundland, the equivalent of the agricultural industry in Western Canada, is sick. Our industry, Mr. Speaker, the equivalent of the agricultural industry in Western Canada, is in trouble, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, the people involved in that industry in this Province have a right to expect the same kind of treatment from their Governments as people in the agricultural industry received; they have a right to expect a program that will bridge them from the sickness and the cyclic sickness of this industry today, to a new and brighter prosperity tomorrow.

Now, that prosperity might be five or six years down the road. It might be five or six years down the road because you have to rebuild the stocks, you have to rebuild the industry. The stocks have to be helped to rebuild themselves, but everybody knows that that is possible, that can happen. What we need in the interim is a bridging program, a program that will allow people to stay in Gaultois. That is what we need.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Just as there was a program to allow people to stay on the farms in North Battleford in Saskatchewan. That is the kind of program we need. We need a program that will allow fishermen to be able to stay in their fishing boats and earn whatever they can earn by the sweat of their own brows but support them, just as they supported the farmer in Saskatchewan. That is what we need in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

We need a program that will allow fish plant workers to stay in the fish plants as long as there is an ounce of fish to process, and then be able to support them, and support their companies, their employer, with a bridging program that will allow them to be there in Gaultois, and Ramea, and Grand Bank, and Harbour Deep and other places, when the stock comes back in five or six years time.

Mr. Speaker, we need a drought program. There is a drought in the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador. There is a sickness in the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador and we need a program to deal with that drought. But what kind of program are we getting, Mr. Speaker? We are getting a Government mentality that has never been different in Ottawa, a mentality which is 'that it is inefficient, ineffective, it is too large, there is a major crisis. It slipped through our hands in 1981 and 1982, but there is a major crisis now and here is an opportunity to do what that foolish Newfoundland Government in 1982 would not let us do, and that is downsize the fishery.' Mr. Speaker, that will happen as sure as I am standing here if this Government does not stand firm to its principles, and that is what I am concerned about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, it was not easy, it is not easy, it never is easy to stand up to those experts from outside who think they know the answer to the rural way of life

and to the fishing economy and rural economy of Newfoundland and Labrador. It never is easy. But, Mr. Speaker, there were rural people in Saskatchewan, and Alberta and Manitoba who stuck up to them and said, We want to stay on our farms. Well, we want to stay in our fishing boats in Newfoundland, we want to stay in our rural communities, and we want to stay in our fish plants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

I cannot believe, Mr. Speaker, for one moment that any Government of this Province, no matter what the political strip of the party in power, but any Government of this Province would do anything other than to demand that the bridging program that is necessary to take us from the sickness of today is put in place for the next five or six years. Mr. Speaker, if we do not, here is what is going to happen: Everybody in this Province knows that the fishing industry, like the forestry, if properly managed, is a renewable industry. Everybody knows that. Everybody knows that there is now a new desire and a new determination and a new commitment to proper management. We have been hoodwinked too long. All of us have been hoodwinked too long by the expertise of the scientists and the biologists, and so on. So, now there is a new determination in this Province, I believe, that goes right down through the core of our people to every last man, woman and child in this Province, that we are not prepared anymore to stand by and have the experts manage our way of life and manage our most important industry for us. I do not think you will see that happen anymore.

But if we do not stand firm now, Mr. Speaker, you will see the fishing industry rebuild, as it will, if it is properly managed, you will see the stocks rebuild, you will see the total allowable catch start to go up again, in three, four, five, six years, but the sad part about it, Mr. Speaker, is you will see the face of rural Newfoundland changed forever because the plants that will close down now will never be allowed to reopen again, the fishermen who will be taken out of the boat now will never be allowed back in the boat again, and the plant worker that is coming out of the plant now will never get back in that plant again. That is the reality of what will happen. Because, you see, Mr. Speaker, the industry now operates, at best of times, at 70-something per cent capacity.

So what you will see when you take out the inefficient, you take out the ineffective, you rationalize, to use the great big buzzword from the Ottawa Valley, then Gaultois will never reopen, Ramea, if it is closed, will never reopen, and Grand Bank, if it is closed, will never reopen. Because what they will do, Mr. Speaker, is they will allow the offshore companies to get the largest share of the increase as the stock rebuilds, and they will make more efficient and more effective and more productive and more viable two or three large plants in Newfoundland and Labrador. That is what will happen. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, it will be criminal if this Provincial Government does not stand and fight to the last man and woman against that approach.

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible) going to close plants

the other day.

MR. RIDEOUT:

It will be criminal.

MR. RIDEOUT:

We had to do it, Mr. Speaker. It was not popular. There were a lot of our own people who thought we were foolish at the time, but it worked. The problem we have in the fishing industry today, in 1989, Mr. Speaker, is not because we were wrong on restructuring in 1982, not at all. It had nothing to do with the resource in 1982, it had to do with the financial state of the companies; twenty-odd per cent interest rates, the marketplace, the Canadian dollar. It had to do with a whole bunch of things, Mr. Speaker, in 1982 when we did the restructuring, but it had nothing to do with resource. So, therefore, the restructuring of 1982 did not bring upon us the crisis that we have in 1989. It is a totally different issue altogether.

Mr. Speaker, there is an opportunity here, there is a challenge here, and I find it very, very difficult when I hear the Minister of Fisheries for Newfoundland and Labrador so ready to sing the corporate tune; it really worries me. We asked questions in this House just recently about whether the Government was dedicated to an all-plants-open-policy, and the Minister's response was along the lines, Well, some of the companies said that even with Government support, that is not an option because it does not positively impact on their bottom line.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not imagine it positively impacted on the bottom line of the farmer in

Saskatchewan or in Alberta or in Manitoba. But what it did do, Mr. Speaker, is that it kept the farmer on the farm, and it kept the rural economy of the Prairie Provinces alive for when there was a brighter day, for when the drought was behind them, for when their crop would grow again, for when the wheat would flower and bloom again. And the same kind of program, Mr. Speaker, applied to the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador will keep people in the rural communities of this Province ready and able to partake in a growing and expanding fishery as the stock improves and grows, as it will. To do otherwise, Mr. Speaker, will mean that you take them out of the industry forever. It will mean that you take them out forever and that you forever close down permanently rural communities in Newfoundland and Labrador. Now that is fundamentally different than the approach I think ought to be taken.

It is right in tune with what Ottawa would like to take. There is no doubt about that. It is not new for the Ottawa Valley mentality, but it is totally out of whack with the approach that I believe the Provincial Government of this Province should be taking. We should get up and walk out of the room, Mr. Speaker, if that is what they want to talk about. Get up and walk out! They cannot participate without us. They cannot do it without us. They have to talk to the duly elected Government of this Province. And until they are prepared to remove certain things from the plan, or from the program, or from the concept or the principle that are foreign and abhorrent to a way of life in this Province, then we should tell them to go climb a tree and think about

it, and come back and talk to us in a day or two, or a week or two, or a month or two or whatever. That is the fear, Mr. Speaker, that I have. That is very much the fear that I have.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed when reviewing Hansard over the last few days, that the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier likes to take a shot at the Middle Distance Program.

MR. GILBERT:

I suppose they do.

MR. RIDEOUT:

"I suppose they do," says old stovepipe, Mr. Speaker. He would not know middle distance now if it struck him between the two eyes. If it was a Ford he might know what it was, but he would not know the Belle Isle Banker, Mr. Speaker. If it was a Crown Victoria he might know what we were talking about, but the Belle Isle Banker, no.

Mr. Speaker, let me for just a moment or so mention the Middle Distance Program. Why was the Middle Distance Program thought about in the beginning?

MR. EFFORD:

(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:

I will tell the hon. gentleman.

Why was the Middle Distance Program thought about in the beginning, Mr. Speaker? Well, there were a couple of reasons. First of all, the scientific projections were up and up and up for the stock. We did not devise that. That information came from the experts, the biologists, the scientists. Of course, Mr. Speaker, any Minister, not the

Minister of Social Services, but the Minister of Fisheries can tell the Minister of Social Services, or whatever kind of Minister he is those days, any Minister who ever sat around a ministerial table and dealt with fisheries matters will know that he had to fight like the proverbial dog to try to hold on to what we always considered to be the rightful share of Newfoundland and Labrador to northern cod. I am sure the present Minister will tell you that. I can certainly tell you that, and Mr. Morgan before me, and others right back to when Mr. Carter was a Minister previously. When you sat around the table to talk about the allocations from the different species, there was always that mind-set in Atlantic Canada, supported, by the way, by the Government of Canada, that Newfoundland always took the dog in the manager attitude: Newfoundland did not want anybody else to have it, but they could not take it themselves; we did not have the capacity to harvest all of the fish that had been allocated to us over the various years and the various programs, therefore, somebody else would want to take it. And year and after year Nova Scotia demanded more, New Brunswick demanded more, and Quebec started to demand with the programs in the North Shore there a year or so ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, the position that Newfoundland and Labrador found itself in was simply this -

MR. EFFORD:

(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:

You worry about your holes, John. You are the Government now.

Mr. Speaker, the position the

Government of Newfoundland and Labrador found itself in was this, we could either become pro-active about harvesting more fish and landing it in Newfoundland and Labrador, or somebody else was going to do it for us. That was the position that Newfoundland was in. That is exactly the position we were in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
And, Mr. Speaker, we became pro-active. Do you know that Newfoundland was the only country - in this case a Province - the only fishing entity in the whole of the northwest Atlantic that did not have a middle distance fleet? Do you realize that, Mr. Speaker? The only major fishing entity in all of the northwest Atlantic that did not have a fleet of vessels that were in the middle, between the inshore, up to 60 feet - 65 feet, and the offshore trawler fleet. The only fishing entity in the world, Mr. Speaker. Here we were being in that unique position and, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we were in the unique position of having everybody else in Atlantic Canada saying, Newfoundland, if you cannot catch it, we can and we will.

So, Mr. Speaker, we tried to devise options for catching that fish. Now, we could have said increase the total allowable catch and give it all to the offshore trawler fleet. That was an option. But, then, Nova Scotia would have gotten their share of that, New Brunswick would have gotten its share, and National Sea would have gotten its share, and most of that goes to Nova Scotia. That is an option we could have taken.

MR. EFFORD:
What about the sixty-five footers?

MR. RIDEOUT:
They were not even in existence at the time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:
Nonsense!

MR. RIDEOUT:
It is not nonsense at all. They came into existence after the Middle Distance program came in, and then we started to support them, as the hon. gentleman knows. If he were not blinded by partisan politics, he would admit that, Mr. Speaker. He would admit it. We supported these sixty-five footers going into 2J+3KL with mobile gear. We supported them, but the Middle Distance program was ahead of them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:
(Inaudible) but I will wait until you finish.

MR. RIDEOUT:
You can say what you like. I know what you will say. You will get on with the diatribe you got on with yesterday, which made no sense, and you will make a fool of yourself again.

Mr. Speaker, that was the option facing this Province; be passive, sit back and have that fish harvested by somebody else. Well, we made a conscious decision, Mr. Speaker, to bring that fish to Newfoundland.

MR. EFFORD:
A ridiculous decision.

MR. RIDEOUT:
It was not as ridiculous as the mess the hon. gentleman finds himself in now. I wonder when the hon. gentleman is going to move

his chair down there in the corner? I expect it might be next week, Mr. Speaker, from what I am hearing out of Mr. Justice Mahoney's office these days.

MR. EFFORD:

I guarantee you one thing, I will never move it over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

And, Mr. Speaker, I guarantee the hon. gentleman one thing, he will never sit in this caucus! Never! While I am leader of this caucus, he will never sit here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

They can have another leader tomorrow if they want to take the hon. gentleman, I can tell you that. I would never sit in the same caucus, Mr. Speaker, with that hon. gentleman. Never!

The Middle Distance Program, Mr. Speaker, delivered fish. Where did the Middle Distance Program deliver fish? Did it deliver it to plants owned by FPI? Did it deliver it to plants owned by National Sea? No, Mr. Speaker, it delivered fish to Quinlan's out in Bay de Verde, it delivered fish to Woodman's in New Harbour, to the Harbour Grace Fishing Company in Harbour Grace, to Bay Bulls Seafoods in Bay Bulls, to Witless Bay, to LaScie, to thirty-odd communities around Newfoundland and Labrador. Mr. Speaker, it delivered fish to those plants.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, as a matter of fact, the last year we put fish into Cartwright, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman knows that. We put fish into Cartwright the last year we were involved in the program.

MR. EFFORD:

Tell us about the cost.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The cost! The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, who owns more shares in Rolls Royce than anybody else in this House, says, tell us about the cost. Tell us about the cost.' Well, I will tell the hon. gentleman about the cost. There is not one harvesting component in the fishery today that makes money on its own. That is the cost!

MR. EFFORD:

The sixty-five footers make money on their own. The sixty-five footers are making a profit.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, sure they are making a profit, but I am talking about FPI, and NatSea, and Harbour Grace Fishing Company and all those who operate integrated operations. Not one of those harvesting operations make a profit on harvesting alone.

And what was the other factor in the cost, Mr. Speaker? Those vessels were eminently viable, could pay off their debt if we went out of the country and bought them for \$2.5 million in Norway, but what did we decide to do? To support our own shipyard down in Marystown, which was over \$5 million a vessel. That is the cost!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is the cost, Mr. Speaker. This Minister, when he was over there, negotiated a \$21 million agreement with the Federal Government to build FPI vessels in Marystown. And what did this Government do? Let part of that money slip and let the shrimp trawler go to Norway, Mr. Speaker. That was not the kind of Government we were. We built the boats in Marystown. We knew that it doubled the cost, but we also knew that it kept a skilled work force in Marystown for another day. We knew that too, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

At what cost!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Oh? At what cost, again, to what? Very good! The shareholders of Rolls Royce, Mr. Speaker, would be proud of him!

Now, Mr. Speaker that was why we took the initiative to go into that program, but today, Mr. Speaker, today that program like other programs, is operating in a situation where there is less and less resource. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the Middle Distance Program should not be, should not be allowed, Mr. Speaker, to impact on those who were in the industry before it. I have no problem with that. Let me throw out this idea, Mr. Speaker, to this Government which is searching around for new ideas. The four vessels which were built at Marystown are ice class vessels, ice class vessels. When I was Minister of Fisheries the then Fisheries critic used to

be daily badgering me about: what are you going to bring in, what kind of incentive are you going to bring in to get the fishing companies to go in to 2GH where there is surplus cod, what an awful thing to have in 1989, Mr. Speaker, surplus cod, but the then critic used to be always after me. The companies say that it is not feasible to fish up there, it is not economic, but why can you not do something about it, you are the Government, why can you not have a program to entice them to go up there to try it out, maybe over a period of time they will develop the technology and they will be able to make a go of it. Well I say, Mr. Speaker, what better time to take those middle distance vessels and send them to 2GH where there is cod available, right, send them up there and leave them up there, not in 2J+3KL, we know there is a problem in 2J+3KL with resource right now, and there will be a problem for the next five or six years. There was one vessel up there, that is what was up there, one. There are six vessels in the fleet. Instead of taking those vessels, Mr. Speaker, instead of taking those vessels and tying them up over on the Southside, or tying them up somewhere else in Newfoundland and Labrador, instead of taking those vessels, Mr. Speaker and selling them off to the private sector, for which I doubt licences will be issued for them to continue fishing, why would not the Government of this Province, even if it were at some cost to the tax payer. After all they would be bringing back fish that could go into Bay de Verde, or could go into Harbour Grace, or could go into Bay Bulls, or go in somewhere else keeping fish plant workers working. Would not that be useful, Mr. Speaker, would not

that be a better situation than closing down fish plants, Mr. Speaker, would not that be a better situation than forcing people out of their communities and forcing them to leave Newfoundland and Labrador and go somewhere else. Is there something mad, Mr. Speaker, about that idea of sending those vessels into 2GH?

MR. EFFORD:
(Inaudible.)

MR. SPEAKER:
Order.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I do not have to take any back seat to that hon. gentleman, who has done more to destroy an industry in this Province than any Government has done in the last forty years, Mr. Speaker. One of the few Ministers, Mr. Speaker, that we have seen in this House of Assembly in fifteen years, who has had to have his activity and his case looked over and ruled upon by a judge in this Province. Mr. Speaker it is that hon. gentleman over there. I spent six or seven years in the Ministry, Mr. Speaker I never had a judge come and look at my files yet. It is not guts, Mr. Speaker, it is doing what is right. And what is wrong with the idea of trying to develop that resource in 2GH. There was no pressure to do it before, as the hon. gentleman used to say when he was Minister of Fisheries, you cannot get people to go up there. Now you could entice people to go up there, you have a fleet of your own vessels that you can dedicate up there. There might be something wrong with it, Mr. Speaker. The idea, the fleet, and the means of doing it, was an initiative that was a Tory initiative, that is what might be

wrong with it, Mr. Speaker, but that is the only thing I can see wrong with it. Mr. Speaker, I hope that this House will take the opportunity, over the next three or four days, to thoroughly debate this Bill. There is nothing in the Bill that basically was not in the old Bill as I said earlier, but the fishery in this Province is crying out for all Members of this House to look at it in debate. We are not always going to agree, but I hope that in the rhetoric of the debate, someone, somewhere, will listen. We need a program to bridge this industry from the crisis of today over the next five or six years, so that it will rebuild and grow again. We do not need a program that is going to shut down plants, take people out of the industry, and shut down whole communities. We do not need that. The counterpart industry in Western Canada was not offered that option, Mr. Speaker. The counter to the fishing industry in Newfoundland and Labrador, in Western Canada, was offered a different approach. It was an approach that bridged people over the drought, that bridged people over the crisis, so that they could stay on the farm, stay in the rural communities, and be there when the drought was over. Well, the only plea I make to this Government, and to the Government of Canada, is to put in a program that will allow the fishermen to be there when the drought is over. I do not want to see them in Hamilton unless they want to go to Hamilton, or in St. John's unless they want to come to St. John's. I want to see them in the rural communities of this Province, ready to partake in the industry as it builds back, and for God's sake never let it go out of our minds that it will build back. We have to get that

cemented in our minds forever.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They do not believe that.

MR. RIDEOUT:

It will build back. Does not the hon. gentleman believe that?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do you believe it? You caused it.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Listen to him, Mr. Speaker. I caused it. You would not know but I was the Federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

AN HON. MEMBER:

People are moving out of the Province. There are more going out now than ever went, Tom. Wake up.

MR. RIDEOUT:

What was going out of the Province?

AN HON. MEMBER:

People.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, we will be bringing statistics up in this House in Question Period tomorrow or the next day that will show conclusively, Mr. Speaker, that despite the ranting and the raving of the Premier when he was over here, about fifteen people every hour leaving Newfoundland and Labrador, and the lady who was going to kiss his shoes somewhere during the election campaign, we will be bringing statistics before this House - we could have them up any day if there were not more pressing issues - showing that the rate has increased. Does the hon. Minister know that the employment rate today is 2 per cent higher than it was this time last year? Does he know that, Mr. Speaker? Are we in office now, Mr.

Speaker? Does he not know that there are more people leaving Newfoundland and Labrador today than there were this time last year?

MR. EFFORD:

(Inaudible.)

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I must beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I looked at Hansard for some reason today to see what he had to say yesterday evening because it was not very much, but he did mention twenty-nine days, but the record will show it was forty-three. I tell you that will be longer than the hon. gentleman will ever occupy the Premier's office. There is no doubt about that.

MS VERGE:

It may be longer than -

MR. RIDEOUT:

Well, I suppose he was a Minister for five months, or whatever it was, but he may never be a Minister again. We are hearing some interesting things from the judge those days. The judge is not a bit pleased that for the first time in the history of Canada - and I said that in this House the day after the enquiry was set up, the first time in the history of Canada - and the hon. gentleman had better check with his Department because I might have a brother working down there, if he wants to know where I got the information, for the first time in the history of Canada a judge was asked, under the Federal Judge's Act, to investigate political impropriety by a Minister of the Crown. I understand the judge even acknowledges that. The judge acknowledges that for the first time in the history of Canada, and

he has researched this, a judge in his position has ever been asked to do that. So, the Minister will have a little footnote in history like I had. I do not know what the judge will do. We cannot prejudge that, but he does -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:
Well, we have good sources. We have excellent sources, Mr. Speaker. We have real good sources, and we are keeping in pretty good touch with our sources, because the minute the judge goes to the Premier and says, I cannot handle this, I must have a public enquiry, we will be on our feet in this House, Mr. Speaker, you need not worry about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up a long time in the House, but I have to point out some of the wrong, I do not know the right terminology to use, but the wrong information that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Rideout) just gave out, pertaining to the middle distance fishery of this Province. Let me say to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition at the very outset, the best thing that ever happened to the future of Newfoundland and Labrador and the fishing industry, is that he is no longer Minister of Fisheries, that they are in the Opposition, and this Government is elected to look after the future of the Province. That is the best

thing that ever happened to the future of this Province and make no mistake about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
Let me give you, Mr. Speaker, a few examples why. Let me start off at when the Leader of the Opposition was the Minister of Fisheries. What about the caplin industry? What about the \$70 million marketing potential that we have in in this Province, if it was ever managed properly. They spent all one year. he and his deputy minister, going back and forth to Japan to ensure that we would at least have three weeks of caplin industry in this Province.

MR. TOBIN:
The whole year going to Japan.

MR. EFFORD:
What happened? They came back in the spring of the year with a report, Mr. Speaker, that was to give the encouragement and to give the insight, that this is going to be the best year ever. And I was in Opposition at that particular time and I said to the Minister of Fisheries, you do not have to go to Japan to ensure a good productive market in the caplin fishery. Japan wants a good product. All you have to do is put in a simple process of controlling when the caplin fishery opens, and when the season closes, to ensure that the fishermen of Newfoundland would catch a product to be marketed at the best possible time. It is very simple because caplin coming in at the beginning of the year carry a red feed in the body, and if that is caught when the red feed is contained in the body, the price of the caplin goes down.

And what happens is the quota is caught and half of it is dumped over the side, and the fishermen end up with no money. That happened when that Minister was there. It was very simple. All they had to do was control the opening and the closing of the caplin industry for last year and we would have had a very productive year for three to four weeks, and the fishermen in the inshore fishery, with no cod to catch, would at least have had some money to survive during the year. What happened was he spent the whole winter in Japan, he came back, and he allowed the season to open too early. The caplin were caught and the quota was filled, but the caplin were dumped over the sides, because of the red feed content, and it destroyed the market for another year. That is the type of Minister of Fisheries who stood on his feet and blamed this Minister of Fisheries, who was only there for six months, for not correcting the mistakes of ten years of poor administration - no knowledge, no administrative ability, no correcting of mistakes.

Now let me talk about the Middle Distance. They brought in a Middle Distance fleet.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, he did not explain and he would not stay in his seat to listen to the middle distance inquiry. The situation with the middle distance fleet is very simple. With ingeniousness and aggressiveness the fishermen of this Province decided they wanted to go farther afield. The inshore fishery was failing, and they wanted a boat which could go further out in the Atlantic

Ocean. And they took it upon themselves, and went half a million, \$600,000 or \$700,000 in debt, and they built sixty-four foot eleven and a half inch boats, and they told the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier of this Province that those boats were quite capable of going out to the Grand Banks and catching fish. The Premier of the day, the hon. Brian Peckford, said very clearly, no, those boats will never be able to fish and carry enough fish back from the Grand Banks to make a profit. They will never be able to go out in the weather conditions that we have on the Grand Banks. He said unequivocally no, it would not work. It cannot make money. It cannot pay off its bills. It cannot catch fish. He said it very clearly at the time and said it publicly, and it was said at meetings and it was said in this House of Assembly. At the same time they were bringing in the middle distance fleet - what happened? The fishermen defied the Premier of this Province, they defied the Minister of Fisheries of the day, and they went to the Grand Banks. They went as far as 200 to 220 miles, all around the Grand Bank, 120 miles out to the Virgin Rocks with hook and line, that is what they were told they could use at the time when the middle distance was coming in, because that is what the middle distance was brought in for, hook and line. It was not brought in for what it is doing today, destroying the stocks with the gillnets, it was brought in for hook and line. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter) said that it was a new technology, a new fishery, it never worked in any other country in the world but it was going to work in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Now that is what he said.

That is what he said, that is true. They bought the boats from Scandinavia, another country in the world which tried this technology, and failed, and had to tie the boats up in the harbour, and that is the reason why they got them so cheap. That is why the boats were bought so cheap, because the fishery could not work in any other country in the world, but it was going to work in Newfoundland.

Now, what happened. The 65 footer went out to the 3+0 Division with a hook and line and they proved that they could make a success of it. The middle distance fleet went out there and they could not catch enough fish to pay expenses, with the hook and line. So what did they do to the 65 footer, they gave him a quota of halibut, and they would not allow him to catch any cod, they allowed him a 10 per cent by-catch of cod. They allowed him a 10 per cent by-catch.

Now the thing that frustrated the fishermen from Port de Grave and from around the Coast of Newfoundland was that when they went to the 3+0 Division and they threw their trawls over board, their hooks to catch the halibut, they could not stop the cod from taking hold to the hooks. So they hauled up their halibut hooks and when they hauled them up there were fish, cod, on the hooks. What could they do? So the fishermen never had the heart or the desire to throw them overboard, those big dead cod floating all over the place, so they bought them in. They could

not control what was taking the hook. When they brought them in, what happened? They got arrested because they brought in good cod from the 3+0 Division. They did not want to throw them away, it was valuable food. It was valuable money. When they brought the cod in, when they landed in port in Bay Bulls and here in St. John's, they were arrested and they got fined, and they took the cod from them and sold it off, and they never got one penny for it.

They kept at that for a full year or year and a half, Mr. Speaker, until they destroyed the total desire of the people who went out there with a hook and line to catch fish.

The Minister of Fisheries and I talked back and forth about the same area many times and he said there is no quota out there for those types of boats. We can provide a 10 per cent. Yet the very next year the fishermen from Port de Grave were not allowed to go out and catch fish in the 65 foot boats, because the Premier of the Province said, at the time, they were not capable, they did not have the carrying capacity, they did not have the knowledge of the fishery. They went out and proved they could do it. Then they took the quota away from them.

The next year they sent the middle distance fleet out there and what did they do. They let them catch all of the halibut that they wanted, let them bring in all the cod that they wanted, and go to the market and sell whatever they wanted.

Now, here was the problem. They allowed them to catch the quota where there was no quota, and

where there was nobody (inaudible), now where was the problem? The 65 footer had only a crew of four men, and the skipper, five men. So they could make money, they could make a profit. But the middle distance boat had to have a crew of at least twelve to thirteen men and had no more of a carrying capacity than the 64 foot 11.5 inch boat. Therefore, with the expense of operating, due to the excessive size of the boat, the fuel, the lodging and the cost of twelve or thirteen men, they could not make a profit. So consequently, from the very first day that the middle distance boats started fishing on the Grand Bank, they started losing money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I did not tell the wrong size of the boat it was 64 feet 11.5 inches.

MR. RIDEOUT:
It makes a big difference. Why? Why? Why?

MR. EFFORD:
It makes a big difference Mr. Speaker, because some years they put an extra coat of paint on and that may make 65 feet.

But the very fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the middle distance boats, the size of the boats compared to 65 feet, the fact that they have no more carrying capacity, and they cannot catch the fish properly is the very factor why other countries in the world did away with that particular size of boat. Every Member on the opposite side knows that and the

former Minister of Fisheries knows full well, what I am saying is right.

Now, let me tell you what happened next. They destroyed the hook and line in the 64 foot and 11.5 inch boat, so the fishermen from Port de Grave and around the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland - it is not easy to take the willpower and the desire away from them - turned to another fishery. They went out to the Virgin Rocks, where the Portuguese fished for hundreds of years, and they turned to the gillnet fishery, and they made a success of the gillnet fishery. What does the Minister of Fisheries do but take the hook and line of the draggers, and put the gillnets on the middle distance boats and send them out to the Virgin Rocks, and drive the small boats around the Virgin Rocks out, because there is not enough space out there for all the boats, that is a fact. That is not a nightmare, that is a fact. If you want me to I will bring a few fishermen in the galleries and let you hear talk about the nightmares. But that is a fact, Mr. Speaker, and it is happening out there today. The middle distance Fleet is overwhelming and overpowering the 64 foot 11.5 inch boats because they had the support of the former Minister of Fisheries on their side because it was his baby. He brought it into the Province and he knew if he did away with them, he would have to admit defeat. And rather than admit defeat, he would rather destroy those fishermen around the coast of Newfoundland, and that is what happened. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, we had thirty-five 64 foot, 11.5 inch boats in and around Port de Grave, tied up for ten months out of the year with no quotas to catch. This Government

is not going to allow that to happen.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:
Because they were inshore fishery boats. When the inshore fishery failed, they went out to sea to catch fish. That is the very point I am making. They had the initiative and the desire.

AN HON. MEMBER:
The middle distance was there first.

MR. EFFORD:
The middle distance was not there first.

AN HON. MEMBER:
They were so!

MR. EFFORD:
Newfoundlanders were here long before the middle distance came across.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
They went over to Scandinavia and bought those boats. We have been here for hundreds of years and we are going to stay here for a lot longer, make no mistake about it.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:
You are all mixed up in your history.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing that saved the Province, the one thing that saved the future of the fishery, is the fact that we had a change in Administration. The people of the Province, Mr.

Speaker, woke up and realized that there is no future for that Government of the past and they got rid of them. They know they have a future with this Government. The confidence, Mr. Speaker, is starting to come back.

Now, let me touch for a couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker, on the closing of plants. Yesterday, I spoke in jest about the cucumbers. Goodness knows, I read it last night and it is more humorous than ever. I made a statement yesterday, probably with the negativity they are putting around the plants, that we could put a cucumber factory on the Southside. But let me talk about the logic and the reality of the future of the Newfoundland fishery if we had followed what these people are talking about.

You cannot keep plants open in Newfoundland if there is no fish to process in the plants. And if, on the Grand Banks, the stocks are not protected and do not get a chance to grow, how are the plants going to stay open?

In the District of Port de Grave, Mr. Speaker, we have eight fish plants. When they talk about closed is it what you closed? We have a fish plant right in the community where I live that has not processed one fish in the last two years, where it used to employ two hundred to three hundred people every single year. Tell me about that plant! We have another plant in Coley's Point, opened last year for three weeks only. We have one in Bay Roberts, the Bay Roberts Seafoods, operated about two months last year. Tell me about the plants that you people kept open.

MR. TOBIN:

Now you know what the (inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:

You people totally destroyed and lost every (inaudible) about the fishing industry around this Province.

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no question about it, the truth really hurts. But the future of this Province depends on the fishing industry and there is only one way to keep the fishing plants open, you cannot keep them open without fish stocks. The fish stocks have to be protected. The quotas have to be protected. You do not look at a band-aid approach for the day or for next month to get somebody re-elected for your own political views, you have to look at the long term.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

And the long-term in this Province is more important to this Government and to the people of the day, than it is in trying to get me or you or somebody else re-elected and that is what this Government realizes and that is what this Government is all about. The people of this Province are more important, the future of the Province is more important.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, take the otter trawlers. We talk about fishing quotas, we talk about what this Government did to those sixty-four

foot, eleven and a half inch boats. We have right now fifty-five otter trawlers licenced around the Province. Out of the total last year and this year, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out in conclusion about the otter trawlers around the Province. Fifty-five otter trawlers were licenced by that former Administration, with permission to go into the otter trawl fishery last year. They fished for six weeks out of the total twelve months of the year, six weeks with a \$1 million boat and equipment. Last year they got down on their hands and knees and they begged the Minister of Fisheries to give them a small extra quota to at least get enough income to allow them to make their payments for the year.

What happened when the quotas opened this year? They had four weeks of total fishery for 1989. The Federal authority gives the quota, but they had no support from the Provincial Minister of the day in otter trawlers. The quotas were given to the middle distance group, and that is what the middle distance cost this Province, fifty-five otter trawlers. As a consequence those people now are about ready to lose their boats.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Why did not (inaudible)?

MR. TOBIN:

The middle distance lost money, with sixty-four and eleven and a half inch boats tied up at the wharf because of the former

Administration. And if that is not looked at, Mr. Speaker, you will be taking the very livelihood away from the people of this Province - something has to be done. This Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, has the concerns of the people of this Province at heart and something will be done in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is no question that this new Administration is going to do something for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and the fishery, they are going to put them out of the fishery. That is the first thing they are about to do, put them out of the fishery. I say to the hon. Member, yes, there is not as much fish off our shores as we would like there to be, and there is going to have to be some very serious action taken by Canada, and as well by the European community, to address that. It is not a simple solution. And what happens outside the two hundred mile limit affects what happens inside, and the problem we have with that is that there is a misunderstanding and mistrust by the Europeans as to what the purpose of Canada is in trying to get them to take less fish outside the two hundred mile limit. That is the first problem you have, because they think Canadians, and us being Canadians, want them out of there so we can

catch the fish and take over their markets. That is the first problem you have, and I did not realize that before last week either. But that is the first problem you have, that they do not trust us, they do not trust the motives of Canada.

But when you look around at whatever the quota is going to be set at, whether the TAC is going to be 190,000 or lower, that fish will be brought in and processed in this Province, and it will create employment for hundreds and thousand of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. But as has been said by the Leader of the Opposition, if you do not open the plants at all and give them some work, they will never again work in the fishing industry in this Province. That is the message we want to give the new Administration, and give the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier, and you as a Minister of the Crown. If you close Gaultois, or Grand Bank, or Trepassey, or Triton or whatever, you will not see those plants open again. Consequently, the communities will be gone from this Province forever, and that is the problem.

The Premier, himself, talks about 6,000 jobs going out of the fishery. What are you going to do with the 6,000 people you displace from the fishery? That is the first question you have to answer. You do not have a clue as to what you are going to do with them.

The hon. Dr. House cannot tell us what he is going to do with them either, the chief honcho of the Provincial Cabinet who goes around the Province and talks over and above Ministers who make statements at meetings around this

Province. We saw it just last week with the Rural Development Associations where the Minister, and I have a lot of respect for the Minister, went to make statements to the Rural Development Associations of the Province and what did the hon. Dr. House come in behind him and do? Knocked the legs right clean out from under him and said something totally different from what the Minister said. So that is the first thing you are going to have to come to grips with.

The hon. Dr. House, by the way, is not going to solve the problems for Gaultois, Grand Bank, for Fortune, for Trepassey, for Triton or the people on the Southside of St. John's. He is not going to do it. I mean, it is unbelievable what is happening. And the thing that is frightening about it all, is that this Government supports in principle what the people in Ottawa want to do with our fishery, they support it in principle. And the people over there, particularly those in the Cabinet, know it all too well. Those in the backbenches might not know it, but they are going to find out the long, hard way. The hard way you are going to find out, when the announcement is made, the same as the people of St. Lawrence and Grand Bank found out about their hospitals, when it was announced without consultation.

I say very sincerely that that is what is going to happen to a lot of the people in the backbenches of that particular Government. One of them, just the Sunday before last, was on the Southside in a demonstration and a rally, and he does not even know what his own Government is supporting in principle on the issue of this crisis in the fishery. If he did,

he would not have been down there. That is what you are facing. What are you going to do? That is the question. If you can give someone twenty weeks work, is twenty weeks not better than no work? That is the dilemma you find yourself in in this Province today. Twenty weeks work is twenty weeks better than none. And if you take away the twenty weeks, you have zero. What else can you do for them? What else is there to do in the coastal communities of Newfoundland and Labrador that were settled because of the fishery? The very reason they live where they live is because of the fishery, and you are telling people they cannot get in their boats now and go out and catch a few hundred or a thousand pounds of fish, you are telling trawlermen they cannot go out and catch fish?

MR. EFFORD:

Where are you getting your information?

MR. R. AYLWARD:

You are telling them that.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I am getting it from listening to the Premier and listening to the Minister of Fisheries 6,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians going out of the fishery, John, what does that mean to you? It is not 6,000 coming into the fishery, it is 6,000 being displaced from the fishery. What are you going to do for them? What are they going to do to live? That is the question. You cannot grow enough cabbage in Gaultois to keep people employed there, there is too much rock. You cannot fish, you cannot grow vegetables. What are you going to do, paint the beach rocks and sell them?

We have to come to grips with it. Even though you will not be able to provide them with twelve months employment, which you are not doing now, you have to provide them with employment. The Federal Government and the Provincial Government must devise and develop a compensation package that will keep those people where they are, living in those communities until, as the Leader of the Opposition said, the stocks off the shores rebuild. Then they will get their percentage of the increase and they will work longer and longer periods of time, and if we manage our stocks correctly, they will be back to twelve month operations, by my guess, in eight to ten years. I think to talk any less than that would be foolishness, as I said before. In eight to ten years, they can be back to ten or twelve month operations in the areas around this Province where they are now. But it is going to take very concerted effort by everyone. For the first time in my forty-two years in this Province and on this earth, trawlermen, inshore fishermen, plant workers and industry realize that there is a very serious problem and action must be taken now if we are going to save what is left of the fishery and let it grow and rebuild back to what we want it to be.

The other problem we have is that we have to convince those who are fishing outside the 200-mile limit that the problem is as serious as it is. They do not believe it is as serious as it is. That is the other problem we have, that they do not believe our stocks are in as rough shape as they are. You throw statistics at them and they throw some back. The other thing you must realize is that they have industries and communities and

people, as well. And, as I said, they do not trust us. They do not trust our motives. The first thing they say to you is, 'Well, what is wrong with the quotas and the stocks inside the 200 miles? We are not allowed in there, so who is causing the problems in there? It must be you. It must be you Canadians. Of course, they try to refute the straddling stock theory, that if you overfish outside then that hurts what happens inside. Those are the kinds of battles we have on our hands in this fishery, but the answer certainly is not closing down six, eight, or twenty communities in this Province and throwing six to ten -

AN HON. MEMBER:

What are you talking about?

MR. MATTHEWS:

I am talking about what you said. You said 6000 people are going out of the industry and it could be higher. You consistently say it. I read it and I hear you.

PREMIER WELLS:

You are misstating.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I am not mistating. I am saying what you have said on any number of occasions in this Province. I have heard you myself. I know what you said. All the Province has heard you, and they are terrified of what is going to happen, to be quite honest with you.

MR. TOBIN:

You did not vote for an all-plants-open policy the other day.

MR. MATTHEWS:

What else can you do? Fishery Products International itself says

that if the TAC stays as it is today they are going to close two plants. Everyone in your Cabinet knows that if the TAC decreases we are going to see between two and six or seven plants close in this Province. We all know that.

MR. TOBIN:

We have letters to that effect.

MR. MATTHEWS:

And if you do not oppose it, which was the message of the Leader of the Opposition, you have to come up with a formula by the Federal Government that is going to ensure that they all stay open, at least for some period of time for the year, so that when the stocks rebuild they get their percentage of the increase and they work for longer periods of time until you get them back up. I do not care who you have in charge of the Economic Recovery Team in Newfoundland, or how many, or how much you pay them, they are not going to come up with a solution. The Minister of Forestry can smile, and smirk and shake his head, but I will tell you something: You are not all stunned over there, and Doug House is not the brightest person in the world. All of you together must have intelligence equivalent to what Dr. House has, and cannot some of you - I make no wonder the Minister of Health would laugh. Because there are times we have wondered about that. What can he do in those communities? That is the question. What can he do? We have seen development funds in place before in this Province, and I was involved in one. What can they do in the rural communities - that is what the question is - anymore than you are going to do in Long Harbour, by the way, which you are supposed to be taking care of? But that is a different

issue for another day.

What are you going to do if you do not keep them in the fishery? What is very frightening to me and to the people in the hundreds of communities, not only in Newfoundland, but in the 1,300 communities in Atlantic Canada which are dependent upon the fishery, is if you take away their fishery, you leave them nothing. What this Government has to do in co-ordination, and conjunction and co-operation with the Government of Canada is devise a compensation package. And, as well, the companies have to be directed as to where to land the fish, because if you do not, they will land it where they like and then your people will not work. The member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir had better get that in his head, as well. Because if National Sea do not land fish in Burgeo, there is nobody there going to work. And the Government of Canada has the right to direct where it lands.

We will get back to the cucumber caper tomorrow. I see the hon. the Minister of Social Services, I suppose, the in/out Minister, waving around, so I will adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn today, I would like the Government House Leader to indicate to us his plan for the House on Thursday. In that way, we can prepare and perhaps avoid the kind of disagreement we had here earlier this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader, I suggest we call it 5 o'clock.

MR. BAKER:

All right.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

I just want to say we will continue on with the same Bill we are debating today and the Justice Bills.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at two of the clock.