



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 39

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush*

Thursday

[Preliminary Transcript]

23 November 1989

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):  
Order, please!

ooo

MR. SIMMS:  
A point of order.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Well I want to raise this as a point - it will be up to the Speaker to rule whether it is a point of order. But certainly it has occurred in the past where Members have risen on a point of order to clarify statements in newspapers which have appeared incorrectly. So I want to take advantage of that.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. Member is on a point of order.

MR. SIMMS:  
Yes, the guise of a point of order, or whatever Your Honour might rule eventually.

However, in today's edition of **The Evening Telegram** page 3, Thursday, there is a headline that talks about the singing, the shouting, the flag waving, which I have no difficulty with. But the secondary headline says 'MHAs endorse Wells position.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the people responsible for the headline to perhaps put a

correction in tomorrow's edition to point out clearly that that is misleading because, of course, MHAs did not endorse the Wells position, only the Liberal MHAs endorsed the Wells position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
As the hon. Member sort of suggested it was not a point of order, it was a point of explanation, clarification.

#### Statements by Ministers

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today that two new innovative firms, X.L. Helmet Ltd. and Grove Telecommunications Ltd., are currently establishing in the Gateway Enterprise Development Centre in Port aux Basques -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:  
- the provincially-owned small business incubator mall located in that town.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, the Province currently has two small business incubator malls located at Port aux Basques and Pasadena. These facilities were constructed under

the Federal/Provincial Industrial Development Subsidiary Agreement II, in order to assist small manufacturers and technical service firms to get established and survive the difficult initial years during which so many small businesses fail. The incubator malls provide below market rental rates and shared services to their tenants.

Business counselling to the small business tenants is provided by development officers at each of the malls.

My Department in conjunction with the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation provides the ongoing financial and Administrative support required to operate the incubator malls at Pasadena and Port aux Basques. The most recent tenants for the Gateway Enterprise Development Centre in Port aux Basques are ideal candidates for an incubator setting and offer very significant economic and employment benefits to that community. X. L. Helmet is a growing innovative manufacturer of plastic products such as safety helmets and product containers. The company had its origin in Ontario in 1985 and has been attracted to Port aux Basques by the availability of a skilled workforce in the area as well as the excellent facilities and services available at the Gateway Enterprise Development Centre. Local development groups in Port aux Basques have been very aggressive in their efforts to entice new and established businesses into the town, Mr. Speaker. The X.L. Helmet project is a prime example of how these efforts, when combined with Provincial and Federal support, can pay dividends. Grove Telecommunications is a

Newfoundland firm which for the past several years has been almost exclusively dedicated to the development of technology applicable to the Province's fishing industry. One of Grove's innovations is the FMS 1000, a fish monitoring system for use in fish processing plants. This system has a demonstrated ability to achieve marked improvements in productivity within these processing plants. It is this technology which will initially be brought to the full commercialization stage at the Gateway Enterprise Development Centre to initially service markets throughout all of North America. Further innovative systems developed by Grove such as the FMS 2000, a fish monitoring system designed for use onboard fishing vessels, are scheduled for future production at this facility in Port aux Basques. Combined, Mr. Speaker, The X.L. Helmet and Grove Telecommunications projects will provide a total of upwards to one hundred full time jobs to the Port aux Basques and area residents who have been so adversely affected by the closure of the Newfoundland Railway and by recent cutbacks on the part of Marine Atlantic. Projects such as these dispel the notion that sophisticated manufacturing can only be successful in major urban centres. Port aux Basques is not a large centre by mainland Canada standards but it has the key advantage of being strategically located to service markets throughout eastern North America. I am confident that further announcements will be forthcoming in the very near future on other innovative firms establishing in Port aux Basques to capitalize on the strategic advantages which the area possesses. Mr. Speaker, I commend the efforts of the Port

aux Basques people, and the MHA for the Port aux Basques area for his diligent and hard work, and, Mr. Speaker I commend the Channel/Port aux Basques Community Diversification Corporation in particular, towards the diversification of their local economy. The Department of Development looks forward to a continued cooperative relationship with development groups in that area toward meeting our mutual objective of strengthening and broadening our economic prospects and our economic base. Port aux Basques' efforts toward economic development reflect an underlying attitude which is completely in tune with Government's philosophy on the economic development of the Province overall.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:  
Government recognizes that responsibility for the economic development of Newfoundland and Labrador is not our exclusive domain. Local communities and development groups must also be strong driving forces if there is to be long term success for our people in a broader, stronger economic base.

As more and more communities duplicate Port aux Basques' aggressive and creative diversification, much progress will indeed be made in the future.

Mr. Speaker, this Government is very happy to welcome those two new companies and on behalf of all Members we wish them very well in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We welcome this announcement, of course. We are delighted to see these two companies establishing in Port aux Basques. I am familiar at least with one of them. Grove Telecommunications is a very innovative and energetic company which has established here in the Province. It is a native Newfoundland, in fact a friend of mine from childhood, who started that company. They are a good example of how Newfoundland firms can, indeed, develop technology. We often think that we cannot do it and that we have to import technology but his technology, that was developed in the first instance for the Newfoundland market, and now they are moving into the export business. We can, once again, show that we can export technology and they are to be congratulated.

X.L. Helmet Ltd. is an Ontario firm, as I understand it, and again this is a fine example of import substitution. No doubt there are many helmets imported in this Province and we are delighted to see that that type of safety helmet and other plastic products can now be manufactured here and substitute therefore for products that are being imported, and create employment here.

These two companies are to be congratulated. Also, to be congratulated are the Local Development Associations that were instrumental in attracting those two companies to Port aux Basques. The Minister and the Member for LaPoile (Mr. Ramsay)

should not be so quick to take credit for something that came about as a result of a Federal/Provincial agreement which we signed in 1980.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

I remember the skeptics at the time who said incubator malls will not work. You certainly cannot do it in Pasadena and you cannot do it in Port aux Basques. Do you know where they wanted to put it, Mr. Speaker? Hon. gentlemen opposite may not believe this: They wanted to put it in Mount Pearl.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh!

MR. WINDSOR:

They wanted to put it in Mount Pearl because they said, if it has a chance to work, we should make it work where it has all the best possibilities first, and I said no, for two reasons.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

First of all, it would be looked at as political pork barrelling, and I do not want that to interfere with this good opportunity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

Secondly, I said, let us put it to the test. If we can prove it will work in Pasadena and Port aux Basques, then it can work almost anywhere. And I think we need more. I think we need one in Windsor. My friend from Grand

Falls (Mr. Simms) will confirm that one in Windsor would be an ideal way to get that industrial park going. And there are other areas in the Province where this concept can work. It is an ideal concept. It is much better than putting false subsidies into companies that are not viable and cannot stand on their own two feet, and, by creating a false economy, we keep them here for awhile, allow them to get into debt, and then they go totally bankrupt.

Here is an example of where we help a company by creating an economic climate that makes it attractive for companies to establish and to do business in Newfoundland and Labrador, give them an opportunity to get on their own two feet and then they can stand and be good viable companies contributing to the economy and the employment situation in the Province, no thanks to the Minister and no thanks to Dr. House and his band of merry men.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

The Minister will be aware, no doubt, that yesterday in this House, the Premier, in response to questions, confirmed that maybe as many as 6,000 people or so could be displaced in the fishing industry over the next while in this Province, as a result of cutbacks and downsizing of the industry. The Minister also knows, Mr. Speaker, that for the first time in five years, at least, to this moment, the Provincial Government is not participating in any way in the Fishermen's Response Program. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister whether or not this year's lack of involvement by the Province, in any way, for the first time in five years, in this emergency response program is another indication of the Province's commitment to downsizing the fishing industry?

MR. SIMMS:

A good question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is obvious. No.

MR. SIMMS:

You do admit you are not participating.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister must know, and Members on the other side of the House must know, because we are certainly receiving the calls, hundreds of calls a day from all parts of this Province,

complaining about the criteria for this year's Fishermen's Response program. Members on all sides of the House, Members in Ottawa - if you watched Question Period last night - and it is all over. People everywhere are calling, wanting to know about the restrictive criteria that has been put in place this year for this emergency response program.

Now, I want to ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, how are those fishermen and plant workers going to survive this winter if they cannot get employment for the short-term on those response programs and, more importantly, how are fishermen going to be around next year to take part, and get ready to take part in the fishery, if they cannot get employment on those emergency response programs for this year?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, we have made representation to the Federal Minister concerning the criteria that has been established for fishermen to qualify for the assistance, and we have been told by the Department that the \$5 million that has been allocated to look after the program will, in their view be adequate, and that if it is not, then there is a good chance they will make more funds available.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to say that \$5 million will be adequate when probably one-third of the people in this Province who need to get on those programs, probably not even the one-third will qualify, because of the restricted criteria that has been placed on the programs. That is the problem, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister this. Is the Minister and this Government going to devise some components that this Province can participate in this program. For the first time in five years we are not participating. Is the Government going to have some compassion and participate in this program, or is the Provincial Government saying to the fishermen and the fish plant workers that you can face welfare for the rest of this year, and then not be ready to go into the fishery next year? Is that the message that the Minister wants sent?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat what I said a moment ago, that is a Federal Program. That fact that the Federal Government has made that program available indicates that they are now willing to accept the responsibility for what caused the problem. From where we stand, it appears that the program will be adequate to look after the needs of the fishermen who will need assistance. We have been told by Ottawa, by the way, that in cases where it is not adequate, the necessary changes will be

made, certain flexibility will be built into the system and that if more funds are necessary, more than likely, it will be available.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister must have earplugs in if he is not hearing from his own people - the Member for Eagle River (Mr. Dumaresque), the Federal Members of Parliament, Mr. Rompkey, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Baker, people who are tearing the world apart, but nothing from this Government and this Minister to have changes made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister this: How can the Minister square his lack of action today and the Government's lack of action today, with his calls from the past, demanding that the Provincial Government always participate, and we did for five years, but he demanded that the Provincial Government always participate in those emergency response programs. How can the Minister sit there and say nothing, when he was demanding for years that the Province participate in those programs?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member is saying what we have been saying, and I have communicated to the Federal Minister that there are certain restrictions in that

program that are unacceptable. But I should remind the hon. Member, Mr. Speaker, that it is his friends in Ottawa who impose those restrictions and maybe he should be making representation to the Federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and to his friends in Ottawa.

MR. RIDEOUT:

We have, but you are the Government.

MR. W. CARTER:

We have, too, Mr. Speaker, and we are waiting on final word back from the Minister.

But would the hon. Member, Mr. Speaker, suggest that the Province now jump in and start throwing millions of dollars at a program -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes, yes!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, if they do not want an answer I will be happy to sit down. Are they suggesting that the Province -

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, yes, we do suggest that. Because you demanded it when you were over here. Hypocritical to the highest degree.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DUMARESQUE:

The problem is with the criteria.

MR. MATTHEWS:

The gentleman for Eagle River (Mr.

Dumaresque) should take his frustrations out on his own Minister who is the Minister of Fisheries for Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

After three weeks, Mr. Speaker, in this House we have had to remind the Minister that he is the Minister of Fisheries for Newfoundland and Labrador. My question to the Minister and to the Government is this: In the Liberal election platform and promises, the promise was made to develop and implement a workable catch failure insurance or assistance program for fishermen in this Province - and with a picture of the Premier in the corner here. That hundreds and thousands of fishermen and fish plant workers in this Province read this during the election and consequently I would think that some of them were persuaded to vote. The crisis in the fishery this year is because of a catch failure, where fishermen have less income because of lesser amounts of fish caught, which consequently impacted on fish plant workers because there was less fish to process. Will the Minister stand in the House of Assembly today and honour the Liberal Party's commitment to, at least, in some small part - I am not asking him today to announce a catch failure insurance program - but to stand in his place and announce a Provincial Government Assistance Program to complement the Federal Emergency Reponse Fishermen's Program?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!



MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, I suppose every communication we have had with Ottawa in the past seven or eight months, we have talked about the need for a catch failure insurance. We have talked about the need for improvements in the UI fund, as it relates to fishermen. We have reminded Ottawa of some of the inequities in the present system. And to answer the hon. gentleman's questions, Mr. Speaker, yes, we have made strong representation to Ottawa to have some kind of a catch failure insurance implemented.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Why do you not go up to Parliament and get it, boy!

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have been in this Assembly, I think it is about eight years now, and I have never seen a Minister with a crisis as serious as this one is, and you can laugh all you like, but the people in Lord's Cove and all the Northern Peninsula and the Northeast Coast do not think it is a laughing matter because -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

- you are starving the greatest percentage of them in two ways; you are not providing them with food for this winter and you are starving them out of the fishing industry for next year, because they cannot afford to get back in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear; hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:  
My questions to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, are: Everyone in this Province it seems, except the Minister, has realized that there has been a serious fishery problem in this Province since June. Why did not the Minister have a program developed to come into effect, a contingency plan properly thought out in conjunction and in co-ordination with his Minister of Unemployment, to help the fishermen and fish plant workers in this Province? Why did he not have a program ready to go? These are the questions.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:  
The friends of my colleagues opposite in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier and I went to Ottawa on August 23, I believe, it was, and presented a case for Newfoundland in terms of a short term and a long term solution to some of the problems, asked that we refrain from making any public comment on it. So we held back at the request of the hon. Members' friends in Ottawa. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a plan of action in place. A plan of action has been financed by the Federal Government and rightly so, because

the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, in so doing are acknowledging that the crisis in the fishery in terms of the depletion of the resource is their responsibility. And they have implemented now a program, it might not answer all of the problems or solve all of the problems, but certainly we have been told that it is going to go a long ways toward it. And so we will have to wait and see what happens, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before asking my final supplementary I would just like to say to the Minister of Fisheries that they are friends of mine in Ottawa when they do something right for this Province, and when they do not they are not friends of mine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

It seems obvious, that for this Party and this Opposition to get answers in this House we have to bring in the real Leader of the Government the hon. Dr. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

My supplementary to the Minister; in light of his refusal over the last number of weeks to bring in a program to compliment the Federal Emergency Response Fisheries Program, the Premier has made

reference over the last few days to the fact that he wants people to do something meaningful in the Province. As a component of the Federal Program, the few fishermen and fish plant workers who qualify under the very harsh guidelines, the programs that they are going to participate in will not be meaningful, because the material component provided by the Federal Government only allows for \$125 per work week for materials, which means that a lot of the programs, in essence, are not going to accomplish very much in infrastructure for fisheries and other stuff around the Province. Will the Minister make a commitment that he will implement a material component to compliment the Federal Program, even though it is as restricted as it is, so that those few fishermen and fish plant workers who qualify under the harsh guidelines, and since he will not bring in a Provincial program, will he make a commitment to bring in a material component such as has been in existence for the last four years in this Province, to compliment the Federal Program? Will he at least do that little bit for the fishermen and fish plant workers of this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

I do not know what is getting into the hon. Members opposite to be suggesting that the Province of Newfoundland now undertake a program, given the fact that the Federal Government is quite willing, quite able, and certainly better able than we are, to fund the program. There is a

relatively small program in place now where we do top-off certain grants with a material component. That program is in place and people who request help under that program will be considered.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When this Government cancelled the Private Sector Program, throwing hundreds of people out of work, the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations promised to create even better programs to employ more and more people. I ask her today, where are those programs now, when they are needed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

I did not hear the first part of his question. I am sorry. It is very difficult to hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

Maybe the hon. Member would like to repeat the question?

MR. HEARN:

When the Private Sector Programs were cancelled, forcing hundreds of people out of work, we were promised by the Government and by this Minister that new programs would be developed to employ even more people. I ask, in light of the present unemployment situation, where are the programs?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of

Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As the hon. Member would know, having been a Member of Cabinet in the last Government, obviously my Department is in the process now of preparing programs that will be considered in the preparation for next year's Budget.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, the difference between the former Government and this Government, is that our Government introduced programs when they were needed, and if there had to be a special response program it was introduced immediately. I ask the Minister, for all the people who are being starved out of the fishery by this Government, intentionally starved out of the fishery, and realizing that the present Federal Programs are inadequate to address all the needs, what is the Minister going to do to make sure these people are employed so that they can stay at home rather than getting on buses, boats, and trains and heading for Toronto?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister.

MS COWAN:

One of the things that our Government had the foresight to do, which the past Government did not, was to create a Department of Employment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Way to go!

MS COWAN:

The second part of the question, as to what I am doing, I am supporting the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, may -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member will wait until I recognize him, please, I am sure.

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

MR. HEARN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

I was in a bit of haste to remind the Minister that back in our day, we also had a Department - we called it Labour and Manpower in those days, and it did the same job as the Minister's did. In fact, it did it much better.

I ask her, when constituents call, not only my constituents - I know of at least four Members who had calls during lunch hour, looking for information on the Fishermen's Response Program, telling us they cannot get on the program because they did not have X number of weeks in the fishery, simply because there was no fish, no other reason. So, I ask her, when constituents call who have not had a cent of income since early June, not a cent, who realize they cannot get on these programs, and who ask, 'What is the Provincial Government going to do for us?' what can we tell them?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister for Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

In the first place, I am only aware of one call that came to my office regarding this, and that particular call, since I was not present, was referred.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to go to another Minister, perhaps one who might be able to provide an answer, on an entirely different subject. I want to direct my question to the Minister of Education. It is a follow-up to a question I attempted to ask him on Friday of last week, with respect to the fees versus contributions issue, an issue that is of importance to all educators and

all parents, I guess, in the Province.

Just a brief background, as I said on Friday. In some school handbooks there is a course fee that is listed, and, in many cases, it does not clearly spell out that these fees are actually meant to be contributions, rather than mandatory payments. And I said then, I was not suggesting that parents stop their voluntary contributions, in fact, I encouraged them. But, my question to the Minister on Friday, which he took five minutes to answer, and I think, if I read Hansard correctly, he never did answer, is this: - I will say it slowly for the Minister - Are parents who cannot afford the course fee aware that they do not have to pay it? And, are they aware of the fact that it is voluntary? That is my question, short and simple.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go back and give a little bit of the background from last week. Local parents, students and teachers raise a great deal of money in this Province locally, at the school level, about \$5 million last year, to supplement provincial grants and to supplement local taxes. Some of that money is in fees. And there is some confusion in certain parts of the Province about whether these are, 'legally' applied or not.

There are areas where we have had some indication that parents have asked for clarification of whether the fees are in accordance with the law. I do not know how many have contacted my office, but a

few have, and I have informed them that Section 100 of The Schools Act, Subsections 5 and 6, address this. These sections suggest that compulsory assessments cannot be charged where there are school taxes; that boards can charge fees for use of facilities and for school-related activities out of school hours; that they can charge fees for public exams, for school lunches, within school hours; that there are some charges for books and consumable learning resources that can be applied, and that there are other fees that may be approved by the Minister.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the process of making sure that every parent in this Province realizes that no child should be denied access to an educational program because of inability to pay fees.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many parents are aware or unaware of that, but the Department of Education is taking action to ensure that every parent is aware of that fact.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. The Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, if that is accurate I would like my first supplementary question to ask the Minister to tell me what kind of action they are taking, because it is quite clear that had this issue not been raised by an industrious reporter with the Grand Falls Advertiser and other Grand Falls media, the likelihood is that this problem would have gone on far too long. The situation is, since it was

reported, one of the schools out there has in fact changed the wording in their hand books so that, that oversight has been corrected and another school intends to do it, so they are to be commended. My question really is, and I want the Minister to answer it in a little shorter form, I would like a briefer answer, I want him to tell us what kind of action he is taking to ensure that this problem does not exist all across the Province, because right now we are dealing with the matter in central Newfoundland as was raised. I would like him to tell me if there are any instances where kids or students have been denied access to a course, I want him to tell me that, have there been any instances where students have been denied access to a course if they cannot pay a fee, and therefore not get a proper education and secondly, whether or not any students have been denied academic results, as a result of this particular problem. Can the Minister answer those questions. Since he is going to take a long time to answer them I might as well ask a long question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

That was to be my first point, Mr. Speaker, I wish the Member would ask a short question, if he did he would get a short answer. Mr. Speaker, my officials are doing two things. We are examining School Board Regulations to see what is in place throughout the Province to guarantee that these fees are seen to be contributions and number two, we are developing our own set of guidelines to distribute to School Boards to ensure that in the future this

would be clearly understood. One guideline I have already mentioned. As to whether or not students have been disadvantaged as a result of this, I am not aware of any students who have been denied access to specific programs because of these fees. Teachers tell me they go out of their way to treat people equally, particularly students who are disadvantaged, and I am delighted to hear teachers say that, because that is consistent with the Liberal philosophy of equality of educational opportunities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:

And teachers and School Boards are guaranteeing our Department that they are not denying access to programs because of these fees. I do not know of any case either, Mr. Speaker, where a student has been denied access to or academic records as a result of this or results, and if the hon. Member has any evidence of that, I would like him to pass it to me and I would investigate it immediately. My final point, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the reporter in Central Newfoundland raised this issue and I congratulate the media in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. The Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister, of course, should give some credit to the Member for keeping the issue alive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, a short supplementary, a short, short supplementary. That is my preamble. The Minister has now said that he was not aware of any situations where students were denied access to a course. Now that is contrary to the information I have because I understood the Minister was aware of an incident, but you say you were not aware of an incident, not made aware. The question I want to ask finally, Mr. Speaker is that according to the Schools' Act, it says that students cannot be forced to pay school fees or course fees in areas where there is a School Tax Authority. I am wondering if the Minister might have some ulterior motive here, and whether or not there might be some consideration being given to abolishing the School Tax Authorities, in order to allow these fees to be forced upon parents.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

I do congratulate the hon. Member for his initiative in this regard. Mr. Speaker on the question of where school fees may be applied, I think it is a matter of how the term school fees is defined. A school fee in the law, it is my understanding, is defined as a compulsory payment. These fees that are charged at the school level are not compulsory payments.

On the question of the school tax, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. Member says they have been imposed, I would like to see the letter. Perhaps there has been a letter to my office on this, I will check it, and if I find anything to the contrary, I will correct my

earlier statement.

On the question of school taxes. Does he want a short answer on this one or a long answer?

MR. SIMMS:

A short answer.

DR. WARREN:

A short answer on such a complex issue as this. Mr. Speaker, school taxes are now under review. In the election we promised either to abolish the school tax or reform the school tax, the process is ongoing and as soon as we make a decision we will let the people of the Province know.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I want to inform every person in the Province that school taxes are legal payments and we would certainly encourage everybody to pay these taxes so that education can proceed over the next few months, while we are discussing this issue.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Premier advocated a provincial water and sewer corporation wherein large and small communities, rich and poor communities could share the financial burden, and on Monday of this past week the Minister of

Mines and Energy released a report on the cost of fuel and utilities for Newfoundland and Labrador, which shows a tremendous difference in the cost of fuel and utilities on the Island portion of the Province, as compared to the Coast of Labrador. Would the Premier take the necessary steps to create a provincial fuel and utilities corporation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, maybe the hon. Member has a point with respect to utilities. At the moment on the Island part of the Province there is uniform electricity rates, except in the diesel areas where the basic rate for a basic supply of electricity, which we just increased I believe during the last budgetary process, is an equal rate, even though it is generated by diesel and higher cost diesel generation, there is an equalized rate for the basics, then once you get beyond the basics there is a higher rate. Frankly, I would like to see us be able to implement a proposal whereby the utility rates, the hydroelectric utility rates throughout the Province, are the same, Labrador and the Island part of the Province, in general, costs are about the same.

As far as Labrador itself is considered, at the very least we have to try and work a situation where all of the utility rates in the Coastal areas of Labrador are about the same as they are throughout the Province. But in Western Labrador I am reluctant to suggest that they should pay the same rates as the rest of the Province. That is the one area where the people of Labrador have

a bit of an advantage. I do not think it is right to take it away from them.

This Government's position, Mr. Speaker, is that where the people of Labrador can get some advantage, we should not take it away from them and equalize it throughout.

MR. WARREN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

In my supplementary question, the Premier partly answered it, maybe we can consider Happy Valley - Goose Bay and consider Nain, where the electricity rate cost to the consumer is approximately 4 times more per kilowatt hour for a person in Nain who uses more than 750 kilowatts compared to a person in Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

Now, I ask the Premier my supplementary question, if he is interested in having uniformity throughout the Province, surely goodness he should consider the electricity that is consumed in St. John's, in the Western part of the Province, in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and on the Coast of Labrador, and remember at the same time that those who are earning the less are paying the most. So I ask the Premier to come clean, and if he wants to give the people a real change in this Province, have a uniform electricity rate also.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.



PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, if I recall correctly, I do not know if it has been announced or not, we probably hide all our good deeds and do not announce them, which is a mistake on our part. I think we should be announcing them more often.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

PREMIER WELLS:

We have not been announcing it.

I think, in the last few weeks we have authorized or provided for a situation where the caribou plant in Nain could have equal access or fair access to electricity rates, the same as other fish plants along the Coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

That is an action that we took that the former Government did not take. We saw to it that there were equalized rates.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It was not there.

PREMIER WELLS:

Yes, it was. Indeed, it was. The plant was there.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we did that to provide fair treatment for the people of Nain.

We are going to provide fair treatment and do everything possible to ensure that everybody on the Coast of Labrador are treated fairly. We do not intend to take away from the people of Labrador one of the few advantages they have, in the areas where they do have it. In the few areas where they do have it, the lower

cost electricity, I think they are deserving of it and they are entitled to the benefit of that lower cost electricity, because they have to pay higher cost for travel and transportation and everything else. So it is unfair to deprive them of that, and we do not intend to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

On behalf of hon. Members I would like to welcome to the gallery the MP for Bonavista - Trinity - Conception, the hon. Rear Admiral Mifflin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to welcome to the gallery the Deputy Mayor of Corner Brook, Priscilla Butcher.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table as was required by the appropriate legislation the following Financial Statements and Annual Reports. They are The Livestock Compensation Board Financial

Statement to March 31, 1988; The Newfoundland Crop Insurance Agency Financial Statement to March 31, 1988; and The Newfoundland Crop Insurance, Fifteenth Annual Report for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1988.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:  
It is the best speech that the Minister has made in the House.

MR. SPEAKER:  
At this point the Chair would like to announce, not the appointment of a committee, but certainly the assignment to a committee, a special assignment, and this is re broadcasting. Both sides of the House have agreed to the principle of broadcasting under the procedures that we now have in this House which is radio, and they have agreed to that principle, but they have agreed to place before the Committee of Privileges and Elections, the responsibility of looking into drafting up rules and regulations governing this procedure. The Members of that Committee are the Member for Eagle River, the hon. Mr. Dumaresque; the Member for Port au Port, the hon. Mr. Hodder; the Member for Ferryland, the hon. Mr. Power; the Member for Bonavista South, the hon. Mr. Gover; and the Member for Pleasantville, the hon. Mr. Noel.

Answers to Questions  
for which Notice has been Given

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Works,

Services and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday in my absence I understand there were a couple of questions asked the Premier which I will now answer. One was from the Member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) concerning the Bell Island ferry. The contract for the construction of the Bell Island ferry was signed on May 26, 1989. The second part, the needs of the Bell Island, Fogo and Change Island ferry services, are currently under review. I will soon be making a recommendation to Government on the best route to follow. And I hope to be able to announce a decision in the near future.

Then as to the time that the ferry will be completed? Officials of my Department were in Marystown last week. The construction of the ferry for Bell Island is proceeding on schedule. The vessel is scheduled for completion in August of 1990. I think it will be on the Bell Island service by the end of September.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:  
The second question that was asked was from the Member for Menihek (Mr. Snow), concerning the winter maintenance of the Trans-Labrador Highway. First of all I point out to the Member that, as I am sure he is aware, the distance from Labrador City to Churchill Falls is approximately 235 kilometers and there is only 145 kilometers of this road completed to date. I announced a contract in the House two weeks ago, and there will be a bridge constructed across the

Ossokmanuan River at which time the complete road will be open, and I imagine we will then be carrying out an assessment to see the possibility of providing winter maintenance on this road. At this time there is certainly no funding in my Department's budget to perform winter maintenance on this road. It is really only partially completed at this time. There is maintenance there in the summertime now which is provided on a contract basis, and there was never any provision made for winter maintenance, but the provision of winter maintenance will certainly be considered once the road is completed. At this point, no, there is no funding to provide a winter maintenance for this year.

#### Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

I intend to call Motions 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, which are all first readings. I wonder is it possible, rather than go through the complete procedure for each of them, to simply read them all at the same time? Is that normal practice in the House, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER:

You can, but you will need the permission of the Opposition.

MR. BAKER:

I am sure the Opposition is in an excellent mood today, much better than yesterday, I might note, and I ask the Opposition if they would agree to speeding up this procedure for us?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting some time now for the Government to act on a commitment to establish a committee to study House rules, and I have had some conversations with the Government House Leader with respect to that. If speeding up this process will enable the Government House Leader to speed up his own actions with respect to appointing that Committee, we would certainly have no difficulty in agreeing. We should have the Bills read, that is all, but we are quite prepared to let it all go through that stage without having to go through the whole rigmarole, but we should read them all. We will do that assuming the Minister will, before the day is out, hopefully, appoint that Committee on House Rules so we can start getting some work done on it. I know he wants to.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it that it has been moved and seconded, or there has been unanimous agreement that we take Motions 1 through 9, excluding Number 2, for the benefit of Hansard, to be read a first time.

All in favour, 'Aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER:

Against, 'Nay', carried.

On motion, Bills No. 37, 36; 35, 34, 41, 48, 45, 46, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Speaker, left the Chair.

#### Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Snow):  
Order, please!

Bill No. 43.

Resolution

That it is expedient to bring in a measure further to amend The Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957, the Act No. 70 of 1957, to provide for the advance of loans to and the guarantee of the repayment of bonds or debentures issued by or loans advanced to certain corporations.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Shall the resolution carry?

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:  
Mr. Chairman, this is a routine Bill to add to the schedule a list of loan guarantees that have been either extended or put in place during the past several months.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I did not hear the Minister's explanation. Would he mind briefly explaining again what this Bill entails. It will just take us a moment.

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

DR. KITCHEN:  
Yes, Mr. Chairman, this Bill is of a routine nature. What we are doing here is adding to the schedule a list of loan guarantees that have been made, new ones made or extensions given in the timing or in the amounts, over the last

several months since the change in Government.

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

MR. WINDSOR:  
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just a few words on this, and obviously we cannot disagree with the purpose for these, although we do not have a lot of detail on the particular loan guarantees. I think there are three new ones here - the Fogo Island Co-op. Maybe the Minister would like to give us some more information on the need for \$1.75 million for Fogo Island Co-op? When we supported the Co-op we had loan guarantees in place before and, if I am not mistaken, some of those are extended here in Clause 4. (inaudible) Mechanical Limited is a new company, I understand, maybe the Minister could tell us something about that and the rationale for that particular one. But other than that we can certainly support this.

The key point I want to make is that Government has recognized that loan guarantees are a valid and important part of Government's assistance for industry. It is interesting to see that the Premier now has changed the position that he had before he became Premier when he said that he would not honor certain loan guarantees. I trust now that the financial community has regained their confidence in this Government, that this Government will indeed honor loan guarantees that are duly given under the authority that is vested in the Government. I am pleased to see the Government is still utilizing this particular method of helping

industry.

So perhaps the Minister could give us some information on those particular ones that I requested?

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Chairman, before the Minister gives that answer I would just like to correct the gross misstatement. Only incredible lack of knowledge or an attempt to mislead the House, I do not know which, but only that could explain those kinds of comments.

I never at any time said there was anything improper about using loan guarantees where it is necessary or appropriate. But to keep piling millions upon millions, upon millions into Sprung is madness, utter madness.

MR. WINDSOR:

You found out that we were right.

PREMIER WELLS:

No. We were right.

MR. WINDSOR:

A good viable industry (inaudible).

PREMIER WELLS:

No. We were right. It should not have been done in the first place, Mr. Speaker. There is \$22 million of the taxpayers money gone into that crazy scheme that the Government promoted and spent \$22 million of taxpayers money on, and the hon. Member stands in the House and makes that kind of silly statement that he made today.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is aware that on occasion it is necessary and desirable to provide support to industrial enterprises, fishing enterprises or other industrial enterprises in the Province, to give them the kind of assistance that they need to

establish a viable industry, and the Government is happy and anxious to do it where there is a reasonable prospect of it being successful.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are not going to go on the madcap spending spree that the former Government was on when they did not know how to say no to any PC MHA who wanted a guarantee for some outfit in his District. We are going to treat the taxpayers of this Province with a good deal more respect and concern, and ensure that when we provide financial assistance by way of guarantee or direct cash payment it will be done on a considered basis that properly assesses the reasonable chances of viability of the project, and if there is a reasonable chance that it will be viable and that it can either promote the creation of new jobs or preserve existing jobs, then the Government will clearly support the giving of such guarantees. Because it is desirable to promote the economic development in the Province. But to make the kind of unfounded, inaccurate statement that the hon. Member just made, that kind of comment needs to be corrected.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, I would not have made a comment on this either, expect for the Premier's comments and intervention. But now that he has, I mean, I think his comments bear rebuttal. It is quite unfair of him, I believe, Mr. Chairman, to suggest that the previous Administration, of which many of

us were a part, provided loan guarantees to assist companies merely because it was in an area represented by a PC Member. I mean that is totally unfair and totally inaccurate. In fact, to use the Premier's oft used term 'It is absolutely false. It just is not true.' There were many loan guarantees, in fact, Mr. Chairman, there is one here referred to in this bill, the Fogo Island Cooperative. That was not a District held by a PC Member. It was a District held by the former Member, who we understand may be in line for a position fairly soon with this Government.

So I mean what the Premier said is just not true. And his comments cannot be allowed to stand on the record without at least somebody rebutting them and that is what I am attempting to do here today. I do not want anybody to think that every time the Premier speaks he speaks absolutely the gospel and the truth, because that is not so.

DR. KITCHEN:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. KITCHEN:  
I would like to say by way of preamble that, and I said it before, the difference between the way we operate and the way that they seem to have operated is that we are extremely careful with our loan guarantee program. We scrutinize the applications very carefully. We look at the possibilities of the loans being repaid. And that is when we will put up a guarantee. The success rate of the past Administration is pretty abysmal really. But I hope that our success rate may be better. We cannot be sure, of

course, until we have had some time seeing how these things develop.

I would like to say a few words about - I have been asked to make some comments about the particular loan guarantees that were made. Coady's Mechanical Limited came to us, and it is an interesting facility located in Stephenville which is attempting to expand, and it has been doing some good work. We looked at it carefully. We looked at their marketing plans and so on, and it looked like it was a very sound well-managed company which needed some working capital, and we went in there and guaranteed the bank.

Now on the Fogo Island Cooperative it looks like there are three, but actually there is only one. Because they needed \$1 million for a short period of time. So we put \$1 million there for a short time and then we said well, at the end of September we will cut you down to \$500,000, and at the end of October we will cut you down to \$250,000, and then it will expire on the end of November, and as of now that particular loan guarantee has expired. But they still have one that the previous Administration put in place, I think it is for \$1.5 million. And that seems to be a sound enterprise. And I certainly go along with what was done before. This seems to be a very worthwhile enterprise and is a co-operative venture that seems to have done reasonably well this summer.

Now, the Oceana Seafood Processors Limited: This is a loan guarantee for a group in the Twillingate area who needed a bit of working capital guarantee, and we were very pleased to put that in place. We feel quite good about

that one, as well. Then, the Torngat Fish Producers Co-operative Society was another. What we did there was replace the previous loan guarantee.

Now, there are a number of others mentioned there later on in Sections 2, 3 and 4, and the notes to the Bill explain them fairly well. I do not think I will read those.

On motion, resolution, without amendment, carried.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. SNOW:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to it referred, have directed me to report that it has adopted a certain resolution and recommends that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion, report received and adopted, resolution read a first and second time.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957", (No. 2) (Bill No. 15).

On motion, Bill No. 15, read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 15).

MR. BAKER:

Order 17, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Give Effect To The International Convention On The

Law Applicable To Trust And Their Recognition." (Bill No. 30).

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair has to be directed whether we are just beginning or whether we had the debate adjourned.

MR. BAKER:

No this is just the beginning.

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. DICKS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, may it please the Members of the House, the bill that lies before the House at the present time is something of an exception in comparison with most legislation that comes before us in the sense that it is enacting an international statute to make it applicable to Provincial Law, whereas the majority and not quite all of our legislation certainly deals with matters that have solely Provincial application.

You will notice first of all in the Schedule to the Act An International Convention - I thank the hon. Opposition House Leader for a kiss.

MR. SIMMS:

Just read the explanatory notes.

MR. DICKS:

Mr. Speaker, I must say I thank the hon. Opposition House Leader for his thoughts on the matter. I have been waiting for this opportunity to explain the burning question in everyone's mind as to the difference between a resulting and a constructive trust.

MR. SIMMS:

You are afraid -

MR. DICKS:

I can see the obvious enthusiasm on behalf of the Member for Humber East (Ms Verge). I must admit that it was a distinction which I had sufficiently forgotten to -

MR. SIMMS:

You can meet her outside the House afterwards and explain all of that.

MR. DICKS:

Well we have not done lunch in a while, but I am sure we can arrange something like that.

MS VERGE:

(Inaudible).

MR. DICKS:

Well that certainly sounds like something we could take under advisement.

As I say I think it is a particular application moreso in these days in the realm of family law in the division of assets, where it probably has more relevance. Judicial trusts are not ones that are done by expressed statute or by express agreement, but instead bring before them a judicial decision.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Carried. Carried!

MR. DICKS:

I will be very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, if it should turn out that my hon. friend on the other side is going to speak for twenty minutes and I have to listen to her. In any event, Mr. Speaker, I am enthused with the reception that this bill has gotten before the House and its recognition of its obvious value to us all. So on that basis I commend it to the House for approval. It is a reciprocal piece of legislation which essentially means that if someone were to leave Newfoundland

they would have some comfort that if they were to go to Netherlands or England or the United States or some other such jurisdiction that has recognized this convention that their trust recognized in Newfoundland would be accepted there and we would return them the same courtesy of course.

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible).

MR. DICKS:

So I would at this point say that it is certainly a constructive bill before the House that has resulted in greater trust between our two parties and I am sure that is the method on which we will endorse this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. REID:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Carbonear.

MR. REID:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity because it was under my chairmanship and the Vice-

MS VERGE:

(Inaudible).

MR. REID:

I find it hard to say.

MR. SIMMS:

Do not choke on it.

MR. REID:

Under the Legislative Review Committee this was one of the bills that we reviewed and I have to take the opportunity to say here, Mr. Speaker, that I have probably one of the best committees that ever worked in this particular House and I would



like to make note of that and say -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Oh, my! Oh, my!

MR. REID:  
- Mr. Speaker, that it was unanimous consent with our Committee that this Bill would pass as presented to us.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. REID:  
Thank you very much, the hon. the Member for Humber.

MS VERGE:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:  
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Because of the effectiveness of the Social Legislation Committee, chaired ably by my friend for Carbonear (Mr. Reid), I had a chance to exhaustively consider this Bill before, and hold forth on my passionate interest in the subject of trust in that form and therefore I will not have to take the full time available to me today to discuss the Bill. It is probably sufficient to say that the Opposition fully endorses this measure as well as the next one on the order paper which are both Provincial and Conventions already signed by Canada but which, because of the division of powers between the Federal Parliament and the Provincial Legislatures, require Provincial Legislative endorsement. The effect of this particular Bill, as the Minister of Justice has pointed out, is to avoid confusion that sometimes

exist now in International or even Interprovincial Trust situations, this is particularly so when one of the jurisdictions involved has a civil law system, since the Trust is not an instrument which is natural to the civil law system. It is a common law innovation so, Mr. Speaker, we do see practical benefits for people in our Province resulting from this Bill. Before I sit down, I would like to say that the Social Legislation Committee of the House and all Members on this side anxiously await more Justice Bills, this one and the one that is coming are both Legislative measures that were in the pipeline during my time as Justice Minister, but the last year though I was there, I was working on a much more ambitious and comprehensive legislative agenda for the 1989 Session of the House of Assembly. Among the measures that I was working on were Bills to recommend the Law Reform Commission reports on limitation of actions and that is a report that has been before the Government close to two years now, so it really should have been implemented through legislation in this House. The Law Reform Commission report on Enduring Powers of Attorney which is pointed, and which can be implemented very simply. A new Provincial Court Act which should have resulted from the work of a Committee that studied the need for improvement in Provincial Court Legislation for several months last year and early this year. New Securities Legislation which is desperately needed. Improvements to the Human Rights Code in terms of strengthening and broadening the substance of the Code. The Protection of Human Rights to individuals in the Province and Legislation to

modernize and reform the law dealing with Justices of the Peace. They were just among the planned list of Legislative measures of the previous Administration, which was a progressive Administration, and I am surprised that the Minister of Justice has not come before us with more than a few paltry housekeeping measures, including this uniformed legislation endorsing an International Convention that has been signed by Canada, while I endorse this Bill, I would encourage the Minister of Justice to give us more. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. The Minister of Justice.

If the hon. the Minister now speaks he will close the debate.

MR. DICKS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the admonitions of the former Minister of Justice, the Member for Humber East, but you know I think in her mild criticism, which I accept, is the response that is obviously indicated, the Legislation in fact sat in the Department of Justice for anywhere from a year to two years without any movement on it and I wish to assure her that I have met with the law foundation and the Bills that have been before us will certainly be moved forward with much more expedition than has been the case in the past.

I think that this Session will prove, and I am quite certain that by the time next Spring it becomes apparent, that this Minister of Justice and this Government will in fact be the most legislative and the most creative and the most responsive to the justice needs of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DICKS:

And in the same manner, with the same method that we have moved forward in administration, and in terms of our development of the Department, and the increase in morale, we will do so similarly in legislative fashion.

As to the delay, I would point out that with the number of papers on the Order Paper and, of course, it not only falls to Justice to bring forward its own legislation but also to respond to the needs of Government as a whole, that includes the various enactments, drafting, the various departmental division and the other enactments that have come before the House, almost forty pieces of legislation so far. I wish to assure the Member and her hon. colleagues on the other side of the House that it will be a monumental legislative year in the annals of this Province when it becomes evident, when the new statutes are published and consolidated for the people of the Province, that we are a very creative Government. We in fact take our legislative responsibility very seriously and not only that but move forward expeditiously.

So while I appreciate her admonitions, as I said earlier, I would certainly think that come this spring we will certainly have proven our worth.

Just to close debate on the Bill. As the hon. Member says, it is a piece of legislation that on the face of it appears archaic, but certainly does have application for people who will have problems that arise. We do live in a time when it is increasingly becoming

necessary to determine which law will apply because of the movement of people from different jurisdictions interprovincially and internationally. I think this is one piece of legislation that, although on the face is not relevant, but it is one that will be useful to the people of the Province, and will affect their lives to some extent over the coming years.

I thank the Opposition Members for their support of the legislation as well as the Committee for their work on it, and recommend it to the House for passage.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Give Effect To The International Convention On The Law Applicable To Trusts And Their Recognition," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. " (Bill No. 30).

MR. BAKER:

Order 18, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act Respecting The United Nations Convention On Contracts For The International Sale of Goods," (Bill No. 31).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. DICKS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to move second reading of this Bill. As most people know the sale of goods in each Province is governed by a piece of legislation within Provincial jurisdiction relating to the sale of goods. In fact termed, The Sale of Goods Act, and that

legislation, I should say, is virtually uniform across the country and through most of the American jurisdictions as well. There are problems, however, that arise internationally, particularly in this day and age when so much international commerce is taking place. As you know, the projections for the future will involve substantial developments in the resource area, which will entail the sale of goods certainly with the United States and Northern Europe for the most part. I think it is important, therefore, that we settle to some extent the law relating to the international sale of goods. You have before the House at the present time a piece of legislation which purports and which will in fact enact a United Nations Convention on contracts for the international sale of goods. It first of all defines the type of goods covered and which ones are not. And I point out for the connoisseurs in the House that under Article 2, Subsection (b) should you choose to go to Southeby's in England or Christie's and purchase goods by auction, that particular sale device having come of note to us all of recent, for various reasons, that your goods will not be subject to this particular convention.

So you should not necessarily assume that this will govern every commercial sale of goods that you may engage in, but on the other hand it will for all intents and purposes cover most of them. The convention that we are dealing with, the fine sale and the types of rights that arise when passage in goods takes place, remedies of a contract where one party or the other defaults, delivery of the goods, the obligations of the

seller, payment of the price and so forth, that is contained in the substantive part of the convention which is appended as a schedule to the Act.

It is worth note, I think, that in Section 7, that parties can exclude the application of the legislation, or the international convention, by expressly providing in the contract that the laws of the Province or another jurisdiction applies. That is an important factor since it leaves it to the parties to choose the law of the forum and in fact, choose for instance, the laws of Newfoundland should they conflict with any particular part of the convention. There is a second part of that Enactment 7, Subsection 2, which makes it perfectly clear that should this selection take place that the contract not be interpreted to make a schedule of the Act apply contrary to the terms of the contract. I think that is a mechanism that will safeguard the interests of people in the Province who choose to enter into contracts for the international sale of goods, so that they can make the laws of our Province apply, should they so choose.

I therefore commend it to the House, and move second reading, since I believe this type of legislation and international convention will become increasingly important with the onset of free trade, whatever one may think of that particular federal initiative, as well as one would hope growing intercourse with the other nations of the Asian Rim and Northern Europe which we hope to increase trade and development.

On that basis I commend this legislation to the House for

approval.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Most of the remarks I made with respect to the previous Bill endorsing the international convention on trust law apply equally to this Bill endorsing the UN International Convention on the sale of goods. It is another measure designed to avoid conflicts of law problems arising out of international legal situations, and in this particular case international sales contract situations. I would think this Bill would have more relevance to people in our Province since it is more common that people in businesses here get involved in contracts for the sale of goods with parties outside this jurisdiction, and outside of Canada, for that matter.

I would like to go back to the debate about the productivity of the Department of Justice under the new Minister. He and his House Leader point to the Order Paper saying that they have put forward forty bills. That is so because in all those forty bills there is little of substance. The vast majority of them reflect the reshuffling and new names for the public service. Several others involve one clause amendments. I do not think my colleagues on the Legislation Committee, I participate on, would differ with me when I say that we really have not had much to do yet. We have not been given any meat into which to sink our teeth. The

Department of Justice more than any other Department is responsible for areas of law which can be improved, leading to practical benefits for the people we represent through law reforms, and these are improvements that may be initiated without any cost to the Government. I mentioned several legislative measures that I, and the officials of the Department, worked on during 1988 and early 1989 before the Government changed. As far as I am aware these are measures that should have been launched in the House of Assembly last spring yet we have not seen them yet. Now, these two Bills we have been dealing with this afternoon, which endorse International Covenant Canada, the Federal Government has signed, really do not show any initiative or creativity on the part of our Department. They are word for word the same as Acts that are already passed, or that are in the process of being passed by the other Provinces, and as I say, the whole point of them is to endorse conventions that the Federal Government has already signed. I again call on the Minister of Justice to come forward with a Bill incorporating the Law Reform Commission recommendations on limitation of actions. He insinuated that I, as Minister had sat on that report, but the Law Reform Commissioners know the difference of that. It is a complex report that took them three or four years to produce. The Department of Justice under my leadership had it for about a year, and we were about to bring forward a Bill when the Government changed. A whole additional year is now passing without any sign of interest, let alone action on the part of the new Government and the new Minister. While the first Reform Commission report on

Enduring Powers of Attorney was given to me only last winter and that is something that I would have moved on last spring. The Government House Leader claims a record of forty Bills in this Session of The House of Assembly, why, I would remind him and the others opposite that in the last Session when I was Minister of Justice there were thirteen Justice Bills alone, most of which were quite substantive, including sweeping family law reform, including changes to the Human Rights Code and to the Provincial Court Act including a Victim of Crime Act. We need additional changes in strengthening of the Human Rights Code, we need some more Amendments to family legislation, we need a whole new Securities Act that is desperately needed and we need legislation making improvements in the legislative frame work for the Provincial Court. For that purpose I had a committee working during 1988 and early 1989 and I hear the Provincial Court Judges are becoming quite impatient because there has been no move on the part of this Minister to put forward their recommendations in the form of a Bill. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Opposition I indicate our support for this Bill endorsing the UN convention on international Sales of Goods contract, but I again call on the Minister of Justice to bring on more legislation, and in future, legislation that shows some initiative and some creativity on his part. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice. If the hon. the Minister speaks now, he closes the debate.

MR. DICKS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just in

response again to some matters raised by my learned friend, not directly relevant to the Bill which I am pleased to say, our colleagues on the other side of the House support, for all the good reasons that I have indicated to my learned friend. Just with respect to this ongoing matter I note that the Press gallery has been eagerly following this debate, so although I do not know if I should address as a matter of urgent concern, nevertheless, I certainly would not want to have the record of this House cluttered up with the remarks of my learned friend without at least making some disputatious comment on them. Let me say first of all, with the Provincial Judges Act which I missed in comment to the last Bill, is well in hand, in fact it is at its point of, I think, second or third drafting, as regards the response of Provincial Court Judges it has been uniformly positive and enthusiastic to my own concern about their plight in not having had an Act, notwithstanding the fact that the Draft had been before the Department for some time without any indication as to its measure of support within the Government, and I have made it quite clear, and in fact, I have been called because the judges are anxiously awaiting this Draft which I have so enthusiastically discussed with them and they know my thoughts are very clear on the issue and I put forward to them in a frank and firm manner exactly what the Government intends to do with a few things to be decided by this hon. House in due course, if not all of them.

MS VERGE:

Will you have this before Christmas?

MR. DICKS:

Yes, indeed I shall. I also wish to point out that we have four legislative drafts people who have been taxed, notwithstanding their own enthusiasm for what is happening, taxed beyond the measure of capability in drafting, preparing and bringing forward the Legislation, and I have been assured by all my Department that never have they experienced such a wealth of leadership and talent as now exist with this particular Government, in bringing forward on urgent basis matters which so affect our Government in this Province. As to the speed and amount of legislation, let me just say to my learned friend and her colleagues, that it will merely illustrate the precept that when this Session is finished, looking back at this point in our legislative timetable, that the best was certainly yet to come. Thank you.

PREMIER WELLS:

Pass on to them something about lawyers, I heard the comment about lawyers, and I thought they would really appreciate this. You should hear it, it is worth hearing. This is an excerpt from a letter written to me in support of the Meech Lake stand. Here is what it says, oh, I have to get my glasses, I might as well get it accurate. 'You seem to be a man of such courage, integrity and intelligence that it is difficult to believe that you are both a politician and a lawyer.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

I thought the House might appreciate the comment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

I guess the Premier will be prepared to table that letter, will he?

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Respecting The United Nations Convention On Contracts For The International Sale Of Goods," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 31)

MR. BAKER:

Order 16.

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

MR. SIMMS:

The debate was adjourned by the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I adjourned the debate a couple of days ago on this particular bill. I must say I found the Premier's quote from the letter quite amusing and I was going to say, and I might as well say it, it is hard to believe that the Premier would start writing letters to himself so early in the new term. Yes, that is quite a revelation. I think it surprises us all.

But just in relation to this particular, I guess, housekeeping bill or restructuring of the Department of Fisheries. I think what has come to light over the last three weeks or so, it can probably, when the Minister

himself in introducing the bill, the Hansard of November 21, L 23 when he said '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.' And, of course, those two words struck me very much over the last couple of days when he said the reason was to make it a leaner and a meaner Department of Fisheries.

And I guess my whole point is that we have seen certainly a sort of a mean streak for the first time in five years coming out of the Department of Fisheries, for the first time, in the Province not being involved in the Fisheries Emergency Response Program to assist thousands of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians from around the Province, who so desperately need assistance at this time because of the drastic catch failure that as drastically decreased the income of inshore fishermen around the Province, and consequently the income of fish plant workers because there was not enough resource to process in the plants to give them work. So there is no question. And in an ordinary Legislature, in an ordinary Government that was functioning properly, you would have a Minister of Employment who would very quickly be on top of the situation, and it would very quickly implement a program to address this very serious problem that we are facing in the Province.

And, of course, when you see the unemployment rate in the Province up 2 per cent over 1988, at October 1989 it is up 2 per cent, then that certainly must be very disturbing for the new Minister of Employment (Ms Cowan) especially in light.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:  
I am sorry?

MR. DECKER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:  
I am sorry. I thought the Minister of Health (Mr. Decker) was going to tell me the reason the unemployment rate was gone up by 2 per cent this October over last October was that many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who were on the mainland came home, could not find jobs, and consequently that swelled the unemployment rate. But I am sure the 2 per cent increase in unemployment this year is even more serious than it was in October of 1988, because there had been that many more Newfoundlanders and Labradorians left the Province than have left in the last fifteen or twenty years in this Province. And we will be introducing statistics over the next week or so that will show that more Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have left this Province in the last six months than in any other period in the last ten years. And that, of course, make the 2 per cent increase in unemployment even that much more serious. So I am glad that the Minister of Employment is listening to that and I am very surprised, with the impending crisis in the fishery, that we have known since mid-summer, that the Minister in coordination and in conjunction with the Minister of Fisheries has not done something to address this very serious problem because that is what her job is.

Now maybe in her job description

the Premier did not tell her what her job is. But I am sure most people in the Province know what it is or should be, and are expecting something to be done with this very, very serious problem.

Now, of course, in discussion on the Bill the last day it was brought up in the House, discussed and debated, as the Leader of the Opposition so rightfully pointed out for Members of the House, there are basically two changes in this Bill making it different from the 1973 Bill. One is that it includes the Fishing Industry Advisory Board under the jurisdiction of the Department of Fisheries. This Bill will give the Department that authority. And, as well, it deals with the increases in fines for infractions, and so on, in the Province. So these are the two major changes.

But when we look at what is happening in the fishery and the performance in this House of Assembly since 30 October, which is a little better than three weeks, I think the most major reorganization that one could expect in the next short while in the Department of Fisheries is a real change at the top. After watching the performance of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter) in the last three weeks in the House and the reaction around the Province to the fisheries crisis - and I see colleagues opposite nodding yes - I am sure we can expect the Premier to make a major major change in the Department of Fisheries before Christmas and that we will see a new Minister of Fisheries who has a social conscience and who will go about addressing the very serious issues in the fishery.



MR. TOBIN:  
The Member for Conception Bay South, the word is.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
The Member for where?

MR. TOBIN:  
Conception Bay South.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
The Member for Conception Bay South for--Minister of Fisheries? No, I do not believe that. I doubt that very, very much.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Tom Murphy?

MR. MATTHEWS:  
No, Tom Murphy will not be Minister of Fisheries either, because he will not have a fish plant in his District after Christmas. In order to be a Minister of Fisheries, you almost have to have a fish plant in your District. It is too bad, because I sort of thought the Member for St. John's South (Mr. Murphy) would probably be on the horizon for becoming the new Minister of Fisheries; but things will be in such limbo in his District, particularly with his fish plant, by that time, that he will not be considered. Now, I am not saying that because I want to say it. I am in the same situation in my own District, with two fish plants, but the point is that I, certainly, for the next number of years, do not have to worry about being Minister of Fisheries. That is one less worry I have than does the Member for St. John's South.

MS COWAN:  
Right on! Right on!

MR. MATTHEWS:  
The Minister for Employment (Ms Cowan) is saying, 'Right on!'

Right on! But, now, she had better be careful, because, based upon her performance as Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, I do not think she has too much to worry about. She does not have to stay awake too many nights either, worrying about being appointed Minister of Fisheries.

MR. PARSONS:  
The only job she created is her own.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Oh, no, she created more than her own, now. She has created a few jobs since she has been over in the Department, I have heard that. She has eliminated a lot.

MR. PARSONS:  
Yes?

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Yes. But she is close to being plus now. She wiped out just about all the Employment Services Division over there, a Minister who was supposed to create employment. And you would think, in this crisis now, where we are going to displace 6,000 to 10,000 people in the fishing industry, that the Minister would be boosting her staff in the Employment Services Division. You would think that if we are going to displace 6,000 to 10,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians from our most important industry, it would be a time when the Employment Services Division of the Department of Employment would be putting greater emphasis on looking at employment programs for the Province. I say that very seriously. I am not saying that to knock the Minister, I am just saying it because it is true. I mean, if what is going to happen in this Province, as predicted and

enunciated by the Premier and our provincial Minister of Fisheries, and what is coming out of Ottawa, all the signals coming from the industry, then, if ever there was a time for a very strong Department of Employment, and particularly, an Employment Services Division, it is now. And I am somewhat surprised that that particular Division has not got a lot of work done already to address this very serious issue. Because it is going to be too late when you have hundreds and maybe thousands of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, who are going to be displaced from the fishing industry with closures of fish plants, on the main steps of Confederation Building, asking the Government, 'What are you going to do?' It is going to be too late to address the problem then.

There has to be more planning put into this. We have been all expecting what has been talked about for the last twelve months, the decrease in the total allowable catch for fish quotas in the Province, and we all know what that means to us. It means less catch for our inshore fishermen and our trawlermen, less work in our fish plants processing less fish. And, I mean, we all know that. It is not going to be good enough when the crunch comes, when the crisis is on the doorstep and you have people waiting on the steps of Confederation Building for answers, to go out and tell them that it is going to take a bit more time to address this very serious problem. And, of course, you do have a Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, you do have a Minister of Fisheries. And, of course, to compliment anything they might do, they need the support of the Minister of Finance and the

President of Treasury Board and so on, to come up with money for the programs the Minister may introduce.

But what really frightens me, and I am sure Members opposite as well, it frightens them as well, because they are going to be just as affected as I am as a Member by the impact in their Districts, is that there are no signals coming from the Minister of Employment and from that particular Department, or from the Department of Fisheries, that they are doing anything.

MR. W. CARTER:

That is not true and you know it is not.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Oh, you woke him up.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Well, how about that. You are doing something? What I am saying is I have not seen any signals.

MR. W. CARTER:

Your eyes are closed.

MR. MATTHEWS:

My eyes are not closed. Sometimes they close, when I go to sleep, but they are not closed continuously. I know what is happening in the fishery of this Province. You do not need your eyes open to know that, you just listen to a radio station, and you listen to your telephone calls, and you listen to the Members of your own caucus like I listen to mine, and some Members of yours. I get calls from all Districts of the Province and not only from this side, from the Minister's own district, from people who have difficulty.

MR. W. CARTER:

From your District, too, by the way.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Of course you do. You sure did. They have a very serious problem and you did not help it when you froze a crab license for a resource short plant.

MR. W. CARTER:

Your Leader did not help any when he gave one out two days after the election.

MR. MATTHEWS:

It does not matter what my leader did after the election. You cancelled one five days after becoming Minister of Fisheries, for the record of this House. Five days after you were sworn in on May 5 you cancelled a crab license in a plant that everyone in this Province knows has had a resource problem from the time the plant was built by the Federal and Provincial Governments of this Province. I would not be surprised that you were then the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. TOBIN:

He was, as a matter of fact.

MR. MATTHEWS:

In the Frank Moores cabinet, when the Alcan Mine closed in St. Lawrence, on the actions of the Premier of the Province, and I would say supported by you, did the right thing by putting a fish plant in St. Lawrence because what else were the people going to do. They did not build a complete plant. They build one without freezing capacity and that is now there but what the plant now lacks is resource. There was an opportunity for a few weeks more work for a few more people in St. Lawrence, an economically depressed area, by attaching a

crab license to the plant so that whoever operated the plant the crab license would be there. Not to approach a buyer or a processor to move around the Province but to stay with the plant in St. Lawrence. And, what did this Minister of Fisheries do? Five days after becoming Minister of Fisheries you took it away from them, and every time you met with them since you say it is still under review. That is what you tell them. They told me yesterday in the gallery when I went up and spoke to them. I said, how did you make out with your crab license? They said, "we did not Bill, it is still under review since May 10." That is not good enough and I say to the Minister it is not. Attaching a crab license to the St. Lawrence plant was not doing something wrong, or something that was not needed. It was something that is needed badly because this year again, if the fish was not trucked into St. Lawrence by the operator, they would not have got ten weeks work. It was something that was needed, and for this Minister to take office and do what he did, you cannot justify that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You can justify giving it to them.

MR. MATTHEWS:

He could not justify giving it to them. Yes, he could, and you can justify giving a lot more licenses because if that plant is going to be viable, anywhere close to viable, it needs more resource, and in this Province you know as well as everyone in this Assembly and everyone in the fishing industry that with the cutback in quotas - and the old mumbler over there behind the paper should listen as well, because things are not going to be as pleasant for

him in Burgeo or Ramea either.

MR. TOBIN:

Did you say mummer or mumbler?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mumbler. Not mummer, mumbler.

In order to provide additional work and employment in St. Lawrence you have, as in other plants around this Province, you have to utilize other species, under-utilized species. It is going to take a lot of money to do that, it is going to take more than just a license attached to a plant. But there was an opportunity for the people in St. Lawrence to get a few more weeks work, and to give the operator a chance of making the operation viable. This particular Minister took similar action to what he is taking with the Emergency Response Program, he has done nothing. Yes, he did in this case, he cancelled the license.

MR. TOBIN:

Boy, that is terrible.

MR. MATTHEWS:

And he has done nothing with the Fisheries Reponse Program. And the gentlemen on that side know it. Members know it, he has done nothing.

MR. TOBIN:

Their constituents know it though.

MR. MATTHEWS:

But you will know, the same as you will know by not supporting an all-plants-open-policy, is that when you have thousands of people on the doorsteps to Confederation Building you will not be able to tell them oh, wait and go away. We will make a difference one of these days, we will decide to do something for you. It will not be

that easy.

And what we saw during the NAPE strike is only going to be a Sunday School picnic to what is about to happen in this Province. And I do not say that because I want it to happen. Because I tell you something, it is not very pleasant for anyone and moreso pleasant for anyone in Government.

MR. TOBIN:

Starvation is facing some of (inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

I tell you when you have to face that day after day you do not enjoy getting out of bed.

MR. TOBIN:

Starvation is not good stuff.

MR. MATTHEWS:

It is not. And as I said today and I sincerely believe that it is a definite plan and plot by the Provincial Government of this Province to eliminate thousands of people from our most traditional and basic industry. That is the way you are doing it. And Walter, you can smile all you like. But that is the message that is going around this Province and people are beginning to believe it. Because every time you open your mouth on the fishery you say it, and every time the Premier opens his mouth he says it. Two days ago when I used the figure of 6,000 to 10,000 people being eliminated from the fishery on November 21, the Premier looked at me and said, 'You are mistaking the facts. Where are you getting your information, he said? In Hansard 'What are you talking about?' He rose in his place yesterday, and he used the self same figure, he said, 6,000 people - those of us who were here heard

the man - are going to be displaced from the fishery. One day he said, I was mistaking the facts. And he asked me where I got the information? Yes, he confirmed. Of course, everyone in the Province had heard him time and time again. So it is hard to know what to believe.

MR. TOBIN:

What did you say last year?

MR. MATTHEWS:

I am sorry?

MR. TOBIN:

What did you say last year?

MR. MATTHEWS:

In the last session?

MR. TOBIN:

Yes.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I am beginning to believe what I said in the last session was true. And everybody remembers what I said and I am not going to get myself in trouble by listening to the hon. Member again today, and get stalled for another thirty seconds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MATTHEWS:

A minimum of 6,000.

MR. TOBIN:

Resettlement. He wanted resettlement last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

PREMIER WELLS:

(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is correct. It will be more

than 6,000. Now 6,000 to 10,000 is between 6,000 and 10,000. So if it is 6,001 is more than 6,000, and it is between 6,000 and 10,000.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Probably it is closer to 15,000.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Pardon?

That is still between 6,000 and \$10,000, is it not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Go back to the (inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

New mathematics, 6,500 is not between 6,000 and 10,000.

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible) give it up.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Give it up. You got some good news for Port aux Basques today, leave it alone, enjoy it. Do not put your foot in your mouth or two feet down in your throat so far.

MR. TOBIN:

He is going up to the Grey Cup Game.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, he is going off to the Grey Cup Game. Yes, I am glad he is. I am an avid sports fan. I am glad to hear the Premier is a sports fan.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Too bad he does not learn more about the fisheries.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is right. Too bad he does not learn about the fish.

MR. MURPHY:

When the other Premier used to go,  
(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, and I envied very one he went  
to and I do not begrude anybody.

But let us get back to the  
fishery, the most important game  
in Newfoundland and Labrador  
today. The most important game  
the fishery. And let us not  
forget, any of us, let any of us  
not forget -

MR. TOBIN:

The same as Joey got.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Let us not forget what we are  
talking about here. We are not  
talking about minerals. We are  
not talking about minerals in the  
ground. We are not talking about  
oil offshore, we are talking about  
fish, a renewable resource that is  
going to rebuild.

MR. GILBERT:

(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

Now the Member for Burgeo over  
there he should stop mumbling and  
listen a bit and if he wants to  
say something sensible get to his  
feet and say it. But, of course,  
that is why he does not get to his  
feet because when he gets there he  
is not able to say anything  
sensible.

But we are talking about fish, a  
renewable resource.

MR. GILBERT:

You would not know much about it  
anyway.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, I know a lot about it.

MR. GILBERT:

(Inaudible) over here.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Oh, yes, I did.

I did not agree with closing Ramea  
or Harbour Breton or Gaultois, or  
Grand Bank or Burin. I knew  
enough about it then that I knew  
that they should not close and I  
know enough about it today that it  
should not close either. Because  
if our fish is managed properly  
the stocks will rebuild. And you  
do not learn much about it the way  
you go, where you go and where you  
live. Go and live with the people  
directly involved in the fishery,  
then you would know.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Live with them (inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, that is what you have! Not  
down in St. Pete's.

We are talking about a renewable  
resource, and the fish stocks will  
rebuild off our coast, if we take  
the action that is proposed to be  
taken for the new TAC. And when  
the fish stocks rebuild, we will  
be able to afford to take more  
fish, which will increase the  
landings of our inshore fishermen,  
our trawlermen, and increase the  
hours of work per week, per month,  
per year, for fishermen, workers  
in the fish plants, and  
consequently, we will rebuild the  
fishing industry to what it was  
before.

Now, what really frightens me  
about the action that is being  
agreed to in principle by this  
Provincial Government, is that you  
are going to close down  
communities today in looking for a  
solution, and you are going to  
eliminate hundreds of communities

in this Province. You are going to impose economic devastation, not only upon those communities, but upon this Province. So, the key is to keep those communities vibrant, even if at a reduced capacity, keep those communities alive, keep those fishermen fishing so they maintain their fishing skills, keep the infrastructure in place that is so necessary. These are the things, until the stocks rebuild. They get their proportionate amount of the increase when the stocks grow, inshore fishermen will make more money, trawlermen will make more money, plant workers will make more money, the Treasury of the Province will get more money, and we will become a more affluent Province. But, if we shut those communities down tomorrow in the search for a solution to the fishery, we will not reopen them again. Fish plants that will be closed will never open again. They must be kept open, even if at a reduced capacity. Twenty weeks work is not what we want, but it is twenty weeks more work than no work, and do not forget that. And this Provincial Government must be willing to be determined in a resolve with the Federal Government to do that, if it takes a few million bucks to do it. In the early 1980s we put \$40 million bucks into the program. We got our money back. And if it takes a few million dollars - I say this to the Minister of Fisheries - if it takes a few million dollars to accomplish that, do it. Because, if you shut the fishery down, it is going to cost the Treasury of this Province a lot more money than the few million dollars you will have to put into the fishery. I want you to think about that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PARSONS:

That is too bad! By leave?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, of course, he will not agree to that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would like, since it is shortly after 4:00 p.m., to announce the questions for the Late Show, for this afternoon. The first one is, 'I am dissatisfied with the answers given to me by the Minister of Fisheries with regard to the plant closures, National Sea, the amount of fish caught and the part-time fishermen.' That is from the hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

The second question: 'I am not satisfied with the answers given to me by the Minister of Justice re auction services by the Sheriff's Office to auction assets of Lantern Wholesalers Limited.' That is from the Leader of the Opposition.

The third question: 'I am not satisfied with the answer to my question to the Minister of Fisheries regarding the Fishermen's Response program.' That is signed by the Member for the district of Grand Bank.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to make a few brief comments on this Bill.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) sit down.

MR. TOBIN:

No, Mr. Speaker, I am not finished yet, but I do not intend to take too long. I only have a half hour, I think.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You only have thirty minutes.

MR. TOBIN:

I only have thirty minutes, Mr. Speaker, unless they want to give me leave for sixty minutes. It is up to them. We will see when the time comes.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill before the House today, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, adds very, very little to the Department of Fisheries. As a matter of fact, it does nothing to change anything that has been put in place.

I listened with interest today and the other day, to my colleague from Grand Bank, the adjoining District to mine, Mr. Speaker. If we can just address, for a minute, the place in this Province where the deep-sea fishery got its beginning. As a matter of fact, Burin was the first fresh fish, frozen, deep-sea plant in Newfoundland. I do not know if people realize that or not, but Burin was the first. At that time, Mr. Speaker, the people of the Burin Peninsula used to leave and go on to catch fish, harvest the great waters off the coast and to bring back the fish, the product, and process it and that created many, many jobs for

Newfoundlanders. They were proud people then, Mr. Speaker, and they are proud people now. They harvested the fisheries then and they harvest it now.

As a matter of fact, we heard the other day various people in the House speaking about the fisheries and they talked about the middle distance, and they talked about the inshore, and they talked about the offshore, Mr. Speaker, but the people who left the trap skiffs and went to harvest the waters out there in the fresh fish trawler operation came first from the Burin Peninsula. Since that it has diversified throughout the Province, Mr. Speaker, there is a fish plant in St. John's and, as I understand it, about to close. There is a fish plant down in Catalina, Mr. Speaker. A very successful fish plant, extremely successful and very competent fishermen down there, and I think most of them are from my District but that goes without saying.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

That is right. I would think that when you look at the captains down there, people like Jim Beazley, and Pat Antle and all that crowd down from my own District, I can name them all. I can name the boats. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have a first cousin who the Minister of Fisheries will be familiar with. I had an uncle that I am sure the Minister of Fisheries would be very familiar with, as a matter of fact he was the trawler captain out of Trepassey, and many years before that he fished all his life and he used to be up North to (Inaudible), I had an opportunity to visit there where he did it.



AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
Oh, yes, they always supported the Minister of Fisheries when he ran in St. John's West, even when the Member for Pleasantville ran up there as a socialist. He ran up there one time against the Minister of Fisheries and I can tell you that the Tobins were out in full force supporting the Minister of Fisheries.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
What a mistake?

MR. TOBIN:  
No, no. I do not think any of them regret it Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
Yes, they were smart people, and that is what I am the product of.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
No that is a fact. I am sure that to this day my father and my parents and my uncles and everybody else would say with pride that they did support the Minister of Fisheries when he ran in St. John's West, and they found him to be an excellent representative of the District.

What happened to him since? He got confused, Mr. Speaker. He was doing well. He got confused and he lost a nomination and he got dragged into bad company. If a child goes out, Mr. Speaker, and gets in bad company you never know where he is going to end up. The Minister of Fisheries after he lost the nomination got a bit

upset and all that and he ended up in bad company, the Liberals went after him and that is where he ended up, Mr. Speaker. But before that he was a pretty good representative in the District.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
That is right. We did support him down in Burin - St. George's. I supported him.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was a Government employee at the time. At that time, Mr. Speaker, you were not allowed to get involved in politics. It was the Peckford Administration that brought in the regulations last year that permitted civil servants the opportunity to become involved. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you something else, it was time. It was bloody well time that civil servants be provided the opportunities.

I will give you an example, in 1982 when I ran for politics the Member for Grand Bank who was a teacher, paid out of the public purse, had the right to take a leave of absence for up to five years, but not only the right to take a leave of absence but to seek the nomination and run. Mr. Speaker, I worked with the civil service as did you, as did you, and up until we changed the policies you would have to quit your job.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
What did you do?

MR. TOBIN:

What did I do? I will not say what I was going to say,

Mr. Speaker, when I worked with the Provincial Government in 1982 as a Government employee I had to quit my job to seek the nomination and to me that was wrong. Any Government worth their salt had to change it. I committed myself that when I got elected and got in here I was going to see that that regulation changed and it has. Well Mr. Speaker we took everybody that was in the collective bargaining process, where I came from when I was a Member of NAPE, I was in that great union of NAPE, very active at one time, in NAPE. Yes, I was around, and when I got in Government I saw to it, I was involved in it, my colleagues in Cabinet, and I was in Cabinet when it was changed, we brought in regulations that provided the opportunity for all civil servants who were members of the collective bargaining process to become actively involved in politics and I think I was right. Well, I was committed to it.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
What is that, No, I did not. No, Mr. Speaker, I did not, I did not get arrested with Mr. Penney, nor did I get arrested with the Minister of Environment and Lands. Mr. Speaker, we knocked around together too. But I want to get back to the Fisheries again. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, he is asking for an answer, I can tell you Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. Member what I did not do. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to be kind, I have never been a nasty person in this House (inaudible). I have had a lot of fun, and I challenge anyone here in the eight

years that I have been in this House, to go through Hansard and the Member for Gander, Mr. Speaker, the House Leader can say the same thing. He was there for a term. I challenge anyone here to look through Hansard over the past eight years and find once where I have been personal with a Member. That is true, I have had a lot of fun, I yap back and forth, but never, never, never as long as I have been in this Assembly. I do not know about anybody else, but I can tell you one thing you cannot single out a person, never Mr. Speaker, that is right. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have, and I do not intend, no, I have had a lot of fun in this House I said it the last time I was speaking, is that there are fifty two in this legislature and you have to do what you have to do as Government to stay in power, and we have to do what we have to do to make sure that you get out of power.

MR. SPEAKER:  
You are doing it for us then.

MR. TOBIN:  
No, Mr. Speaker, that is true, we do not have to be over-anxious at this stage in the game, because there are three years left, but there are some people on that side of the House that are extremely anxious to see us back there. The point I was going to make I tell you something too, I have been in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, when I saw people who stood pretty low in debate, they are not here now, but I think that these personal insults, these personal character assassinations, there is absolutely no need for it and I am not being personal when I say this, but I think that the person who should be showing leadership in this Assembly in terms, and I

hope the Member for Gander is listening to this because I want the message brought back, that in terms of showing leadership in this House of ridding ourselves of all of that old stuff that took place over the years should be the Premier. Now, Mr. Speaker, over the last little while, the Premier at times, becomes very personal in this Assembly, and I would encourage the Premier and I would encourage the Government House Leader to have a chat with the Premier someday and encourage him not to become so personal, because one of these days, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier gets personal, and I have said it, I have never been personal, I would not come at him with both barrels, I would be like a machine gun, because there is only so much of that kind of stuff that a human being can be expected to take. Now I said that. He has been personal with other Members, I do not know if he ever said anything to me, he has never used my name, he has never used my name or made reference to me. Last year, Mr. Speaker, yes, okay, I walked into that one. I can take that, Mr. Speaker, if I had been speaking, I think I would have said the same thing to him, so I do not mind that kind of stuff. That is the thrust of the debate, when you are going to give it, Mr. Speaker, you have to be able to take it.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Did he tell the truth?

MR. TOBIN:  
No, he did not tell the truth. The Minister of Fisheries just told the truth. We are very smart people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the thrust of the debate. The Premier has been getting personal. Last

year in this House he looked across and he said, there is nothing over there only animals. Remember that day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:  
No there was somebody over there who mooed like a cow. And my colleague for Kilbride (Mr. R. Aylward) got blamed for it.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Yes, that is right.

MR. TOBIN:  
And he did not do it, by the way.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Who did it?

MR. TOBIN:  
He is not here now the fellow who did it.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
I know who it was.

MR. TOBIN:  
But the people in his District wish he was.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us get on to the issue of the fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Do not be sidetracking him, now.

MR. TOBIN:  
I hate being sidetracked.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
You are a hard man to sidetrack.

MR. TOBIN:  
The other day in this Assembly, last Wednesday we put forth a resolution that called for an

all-plants-open policy. It clearly stated, all-plants-open policy. Mr. Speaker, that meant the plant in St. John's where the Member from -

AN HON. MEMBER:

The hon. Minister is leaving.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, he is leaving. There he goes, Mr. Speaker. He is gone, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He had to leave.

MR. TOBIN:

And do you know, something, Mr. Speaker, if I voted against an all-plants-open policy, and the one in Marystown was going to be closed, I would crawl through the door as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

He did not drive. He walked out under his own power. He is coming back.

MR. TOBIN:

He is coming back.

Okay, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like for the Member for St. John's South (Mr. Murphy) to hear what I have to say about this all-plants-open policy.

MR. MURPHY:

All ears.

MR. TOBIN:

We have that resolution put in the Chamber and what happened when the

votes came? Now, Mr. Speaker, what plants are we talking about? We are talking about every plant in Newfoundland and Labrador. That is what we are talking about. We are talking about the plants in Grand Bank and Fortune.

MR. EFFORD:

What about the one in Mount Pearl?

MR. TOBIN:

We are talking about the plants - Mr. Speaker, I would not be surprised if the Member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) or the Minister or the Acting Minister or the former Minister or the present Minister of Social Services, I would not be surprised that he does not know that Mount Pearl does not have salt water. And I hope now that I have taught him something.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is we were talking about the plants in Grand Bank and Fortune. We were talking about the plants in Marystown. We were talking about the plants in Burgeo and Ramea and Gaultois and Hermitage and Harbour Breton, the plants in St. John's, Mr. Speaker,

And I want to talk about the plant in St. John's while I have the opportunity. The Member for St. John's South I think is a very sincere individual.

MR. POWER:

Come on now!

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, I do. I do.

MR. PARSONS:

Do not be stretching the truth now.

MR. TOBIN:

And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for St. John's South

was forced into voting against that resolution. By whom? By the Cabinet Minister, from St. John's, namely, the Member for St. John's Centre (Dr. Kitchen), the Minister of Finance.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
He is not here.

MR. TOBIN:  
And the Minister of Mines and Energy (Dr. Gibbons) and St. John's Centre, the Minister of Finance. It was the Members in the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, that showed the leadership in doing what they could to see the plant in St. John's closed. They had an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. John's Centre knows full well that he had an opportunity to vote on the resolution to keep the plant in St. John's open, Mr. Speaker. And what did the Minister of Finance do, Mr. Speaker? He turned his back on his constituents. That is what he did.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
If the vote on the Legislature on Meech Lake was so important yesterday, why is not so important on the fisheries?

MR. TOBIN:  
That is right, Mr. Speaker. It is a very valid point. But the Member for St. John's South, Mr. Speaker, and I must honestly say that I felt bad for the Member for St. John's South because he was down there, Mr. Speaker, when they had the protest and he got up - what is this? Somebody, Mr. Speaker, dropped this on my desk - it appeared in a brown envelope. And it is a resolution - all-plants-open-policy.

WHEREAS the fisheries in the Province is the most important

industry; - and it goes on, and

WHEREAS it is vital that any government response to this crisis recognizes the necessity to adopt an all-plants-open-policy;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government do initiate it.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) read the rest.

MR. TOBIN:  
Yes, I will read the rest. Do you want me to? THEREFORE be it resolved that the Government immediately inform the House of the basic principles of this action plan to address the fisheries crisis that it has proposed to the Government of Canada; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the House establish a Standing Committee on Fisheries, so that the Government can, on a continuous basis, have the benefit of the views of the Members of this House in developing a fisheries policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, an all-plants-open policy. And where does your MHA stand? Where does the Member for the district of Kilbride stand? He was for all-plants-open. What about the Member for St. John's South? He was against all-plants-open, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Mount Pearl was for it, and the Member for the district of St. John's Centre was against it. That is where it is, Mr. Speaker. Some Member from St. John's, a Member from the metropolitan area, I would suspect, or collectively with other Members, took the initiative, and rightly so, to inform the constituents of St. John's where the Member stood on a

vital, important issue.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
They should know.

MR. TOBIN:  
Should they not know? Should not the people of Burgeo know -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
And Ramea.

MR. TOBIN:  
- and Ramea, where their Members stood? Should they not know?

That is a good point. Should not the people of Harbour Grace know that their Member stood and voted against keeping their plant open?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
The Member for Harbour Grace stood in this House and voted against keeping the plant open, and do not forget it, you did it..

MR. CRANE:  
They know it already.

MR. TOBIN:  
You have talked to them, have you? They know it already?

And, you know, voting against it, you should have done the honourable thing and resigned. That is what you should have done. Any man who betrays his constituents as the Member for Harbour Grace did last week should resign.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker, this is important. We had an all-plants-open policy put here the other day and the

Members of this Legislature voted -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
The Minister of Fisheries voted against.

MR. TOBIN:  
The Minister of Fisheries voted against.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There has been a meeting going on here for about ten minutes now and I have difficulty trying to hear the hon. Member, so I would like for people to be quiet.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MS COWAN:  
(Inaudible) taking it easy.

MR. TOBIN:  
Do not you worry about taking it easy.

Mr. Speaker, I must say, I get a little bit huffy when I see how, collectively, a group of individuals over there are committed to the destruction of Newfoundland's most important industry. They are, Mr. Speaker, committed to the destruction of Newfoundland's most important industry.

MR. MURPHY:  
We have to share Marystown fish in order to keep all plants open. (Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
Oh! Now, Mr. Speaker! Now we have got it! Now we have got it! The Member for St. John's South wants a couple of plants left

open. He does not want the all-plants-open. He just confirmed that, Mr. Speaker. I was wrong in what I said first, that he had sympathy for the St. John's plant. I was wrong and I apologize. He just said now, some plants will have to share fish. What a twerp, Mr. Speaker! Is that not unbelievable, Mr. Speaker? Is that not unbelievable, that the Member for St. John's South would say that? I can tell the Member for St. John's South, Mr. Speaker, that my District comes first with me. My district is first!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:  
The people in my District are first and I worry about St. John's and other Districts after I worry about my own District. I think that is the way most of the Members are, except the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, who worries about nothing.

MR. WALSH:  
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:  
Sit down, boy, and do not be wasting my time!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. WALSH:  
Mr. Speaker, I have to stand to that. I mean, for a Member to stand in this House and say that I care for nothing or no one, knowing full-well that I have, on occasion, even purchased lunch for the hon. Member! I mean, to say I care for nothing includes himself and that is just not correct. I care for my District and I care

for the things I can do for my District, such as actually signing a contract for a ferry that was left on someone's desk gathering dust. I care strongly for my District and to say that I do not is just not correct.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order.

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say to old snitch.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw that. I am sorry I said it. I should not have said it. Let me say, to my hon. colleague for Mount Scio - Bell Island that there certainly was a contract left on my desk when I was Minister of Transportation when Government changed. As a matter of fact there were two left on my desk to be signed, and the Government that he is part of signed one and forgot about the other one, he threw people out of work in Marystown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:  
And, what else did they do, Mr. Speaker? He denied the people of Bell Island a good ferry. We saw the Member for Placentia (Mr. Hogan) when his constituents came in the House - my colleague picked it up and pointed it out to me, let me say, Mr. Speaker, with all

sincerity, the calls that are coming from the fishermen of Placentia Bay -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Both sides?

MR. TOBIN:  
Yes, both sides. - about this restructuring plan, the calls that are coming from both sides. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Member for Placentia is big enough to impress upon the Minister of Fisheries the importance of the Newfoundland Government becoming involved in the restructuring program.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
He will.

MR. TOBIN:  
I think he will, too. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries, through the Government and through one of the most powerful men in the Government, the hon. Doug House, are not concerned about what has happened. We have had these economic advisors before. We had doctors here who were economic advisors before.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
We had Valdmanis.

MR. TOBIN:  
What was his name? That was his name was it?

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is what we are seeing. We are seeing the destruction of Newfoundland's way of life, and the Member for Placentia involved right to his eyes in the destruction of rural Newfoundland. Every day there are people leaving his district to go to Toronto, every single day.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Long Harbour.

MR. TOBIN:  
Yes, Long Harbour. The people who are here today, Mr. Speaker. How many?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Six families.

MR. TOBIN:  
That is six too many, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Member should not be happy about six families who left his District. There should be six families moving to his district, sixty families. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Placentia takes pride in only six families left, only six families left since they formed the Government. Is that not terrible?

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) is going to say it all now. I say to this Government that they are on a mission and they are on a course full speed ahead to the destruction of rural Newfoundland. Where is the plan to help the fishery? Where is it? The Minister of Fisheries will do nothing, the Premier will do nothing and there are hundreds of people out there crying out for somebody to keep them from the welfare rolls. That is what is going on in this Province. It is going on every day. As a matter of fact my colleague has over a hundred in two communities who are crying out for assistance, and the Minister of Fisheries still stands in this House every single day and in essence says, I am doing nothing for them. It is a Federal responsibility. The Premier should immediately, Mr. Speaker, get in his car and instead of going to the Grey Cup Game, drive down to Government House and pass in the resignation of Government



and let us take over and do something for the fishermen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It is now 4:30. Does the hon. Member wish to adjourn the debate?

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

Debate on the Adjournment  
[Late Show]

MR. SPEAKER:

I recognize the hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thanks for the applause on the other side, it was unexpected. They know what I am saying is the truth.

On Wednesday of this week I asked the Minister of Fisheries if the plant on the Southside was going to close? I, at that time, had information that there was ongoing negotiations between Government and NatSea.

On the cucumber bit, I will get to that too because the Member for Port de Grave, and I personally think that it was a Cabinet leak, the Member for Port de Grave, I do not know if they call him the Minister of Social Services or not. In fact I should apologize to him because I should not be getting off-track, but I have to say this to him. This is what the Premier said, the position is no different, the Minister of Social Services has been relieved of his duties as Minister of Social

Services. He has been relieved of his responsibilities as a Minister. He remains the Minister and will remain until I hear the decision from Judge Mahoney. Now that is why I did not know what to call you. In fact, I called you by your name and for that I am sorry.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

Just a second now, take it easy now. Now my argument to the Minister is very simple, I had calls from people who sell fish over there, from plant workers, and they say the only reason why it has not been disclosed is because they are being held up for ransom. They do not know what the company is saying to Government. If all quota is reduced, then that plant will go. And if that is the case, where does that leave the fishermen? Where does that leave the plant workers on the Southside?

Now the ironic thing about it is those people were right, because yesterday when the Atlantic Groundfish Advisory Committee's deliberations ended they said, before they ended their deliberations, that the FAC would not be set before February. Now if that is the last part of February or the first of March what time does that give the people who sell their fish and the plant workers, and the plant on the Southside, where does that leave them? What kind of a dilemma are they in? I have seen seasons when the codfishery, the trap fishery started or began in early May. Now if we go into March, we have two months where those people have to find other areas to sell their fish. What about the hundreds of plant

workers over there? What are they going to do? I am speaking also to the Member for St. John's South, he has the same concerns as I have. If you could tell the people now, I mean the Minister of Social Services did get up and made a joke of it. He was being facetious. It was not facetious as far as I was concerned. It was a very, very serious matter. We have hundreds of people who are not going to be able to sell their fish, and we have hundreds of people who are going to be thrown out of their jobs. The hon. Member classed it as a joke. He said he was only just joking about it. Something to joke about; a person loses his job, or a fisherman comes in with a load of fish and he has no place to sell his fish, a big joke.

I say to the Minister, the Minister is a responsible Minister, and I said to him that day and I say to him again today - look if the plant is going to close, if there are negotiations coming on, tell the people and give them a chance to make other arrangements to sell their fish. And people who are dependent upon that plant to work in, they could perhaps look elsewhere. But right now they are held up in abeyance. They are held up for ransom by NatSea. NatSea is saying to Government, Government is holding them up because Government should be the responsible body to come clean with the people and say look, the plant is not closing, or the plant will close. What National Sea is saying is that the TAC is cut, your plant is going to close and the people are in the middle. I say to the Government it is their responsibility to tell the people that NatSea is getting away from the plant on the Southside, is NatSea closing the

plant on the Southside, or are they not, are they going to keep it open no matter what? I am sure the Minister can relate to that and I am positive that the Member for St. John's South agrees with me. I mean that plant on the Southside, there are a lot of people depending on it, and I think the onus is on the Minister to tell this hon. House what is happening on the Southside. On Wednesday when I asked the question, I certainly did not get a clear picture and I want to ask the Minister now, if he would give me and the people of St. John's who sell their fish over there, who work over there, more in emphasis my colleague here from Kilbride, the people from Kilbride who work there and other areas of the Province, will they have a job and will their boats be able to sell their catches to that plant on the Southside. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of respect for the hon. Member for St. John's East Extern and I will give him the benefit of the doubt, I do not think he is trying to talk just for the sake of talking, and certainly I do not think he is trying to unduly concern the people that are being served by the National Sea Plant on the Southside of the Harbour, but I have to tell him, Mr. Speaker what I told him on Wednesday that I have absolutely no knowledge of what is going to happen to that plant and I suspect that at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, not even the company itself is aware of what is in store for that plant on the Southside. I agree with him that if we had that knowledge,

of course we would have a responsibility to make it public and let the people that will be affected know where they stand, and when he talks about the need for processing capability, I should remind him that, I believe it was on Tuesday when I answered to a question from the hon. Member for Ferryland that I announced that the Government had just concluded negotiations with a company headed by Mr. Joe George and Partner Ken Sullivan to refurbish and reconstruct and prepare the plant in Witless Bay hopefully for operation by the time the 1990 fishing season rolls around, so, Mr. Speaker, I have been quite honest, I cannot tell the hon. gentleman what is going to happen to the plant on the Southside nor can I tell him what is going to happen to the plant in Grand Bank or Fortune or Gaultois or Ramea, Harbour Breton or Burgeo or Trepassey or any other deep sea plant. I cannot speak for the owners, it might well be that the owners by this time have decided exactly what is going to happen, and I would imagine being shrewd business people that they will put together maybe various group of scenarios, I think everything is predicated on the assumption, Mr. Speaker, that when the Total Allowable Catch is announced in a few weeks time or in the New Year, that there will be a hundred and ninety thousand metric tons, but again that is only an assumption, it might even be less, so I would think that probably the people who are involved in these major corporations are doing their homework and are trying or putting together a number of options that will be available to them, but certainly the Province has not been notified either officially or otherwise what is going to happen, and Mr. Speaker, there is a lot

that is being said these days from Members on the opposite side, not as much from my friend and colleague from St. John's East Extern, I think he has been a very responsible Member in his approach but there has been a lot of irresponsible statements coming off the opposition benches, almost as if they would be delighting in the prospect of plants being closed. That is the impression they are giving, they cannot contain themselves, they are almost gloating in the prospect. We have been in power now, this Government, going on seven months a little over six months. They expect us, Mr. Speaker in six months to resolve the problems that have been in the making now for a large number of years, probably seventeen years. Yes, and I think the hon. Member reminds me that I was Minister, I should remind him that during that period we had a good fishery, but obviously something happened after I left. Something obviously happened, Mr. Speaker after I left that caused the fishing industry to go off the track and now we are paying a price for it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they talk about an all-plants-open-policy. Of course the -

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Your time is up.

MR. W. CARTER:  
The Speaker will decide that, not the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
No, the rules says five minutes each.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, they talk about an all-plants-open-policy. How irresponsible can a bunch of

people be? How totally  
irresponsible.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Irresponsible?

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, without knowing all of the facts, they say keep all the plants operating without regard for the condition of the stock or the fact that the allowable catch will be reduced. They have been totally irresponsible in their attitude, Mr. Speaker.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we will do the right thing in the fishery. We will now go about laying a solid foundation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Despite what the hon. gentleman is saying -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister's time has elapsed.

MR. W. CARTER:

- we will now build a solid foundation on which we can build a good fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave! By leave!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, two days ago I believe it was, I asked the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dicks), and Attorney General, a number of questions related to a contract for auctioneer services that was entered into by the sheriff's office responsible to his Department and responsible to him as Minister.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister came back yesterday with four or five pages of legal gobbledeygook that you would want a constitutional lawyer from some university around the country to give you an interpretation on. Well, Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that there are three or four very important questions that the Minister did not answer or did not attempt to answer in the statement that he gave the House yesterday.

First of all, the Minister seemed to want the House to believe that the exorbitant rate, when the industrial rate and the Government rate is anywhere from 2.7 per cent to 2.9 per cent of the appraised value of the goods. The Minister wanted the House to believe that somehow or other that because of additional services like security and so on, 15 per cent was justified in this particular case.

Mr. Speaker, experts in the industry tell us that perhaps 4 or 5 per cent might have been justified in this particular case where security had to be provided. And, in fact, similar work is being done in other areas of the Province where the auction firm had to travel and incur travel expenses and so on for that kind of rate, not five times as much, Mr. Speaker, like happened,

15 percent, but may 4 or 5 per cent.

There are a couple of other things, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister skirted around yesterday. The fact of the matter is that the Minister's officials knew in writing two full weeks before this auction was to take place that there was a second company interested in putting in a proposal. Even if the sheriff's office, Mr. Speaker, had to have the intestinal fortitude to pick up the telephone and call they may very well have been able to knock the price down from a 15 per cent commission which meant \$60,000 or so fee to maybe 5 or 6 or even 7 or 8 or 10 per cent.

MR. SIMMS:  
And save the taxpayers.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Because in this case it is going to be the taxpayers who are going to lose because the firm owes the Province almost \$1 million in retail sales tax. If they recover \$400,000 or \$500,000 the Province is still losing. But the Province is going to lose an additional \$48,000 now because of the bungling and the negligence of the Minister's officials and the Minister's Department.

Now, Mr. Speaker, even more important than that, even having said all of that which I just said, the most important discrepancy, Mr. Speaker, is that when officials of this second company had the audacity to write the Minister's Department and to call the Minister's Department they were met with a bureaucrat that said do not you dare open your mouth about this because you may never get Government business again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
That was put in writing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:  
What a (inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:  
That was put in -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Let me tell the House, Mr. Speaker, if the House will listen for one second, that that was put in writing to the Minister's Deputy Minister. It was put in writing to the Minister's Deputy Minister that a bureaucrat in the Minister's Department threatened that company.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Name them.

MR. SIMMS:  
Ask the Minister.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
The Minister can name them, because his Deputy Minister has the letter.

So, Mr. Speaker, is that the kind of fairness and balance, is that the kind of fair play that business people in this Province can expect when they are trying to deal with the Government?

Mr. Speaker, this particular company that complained, this is the second time they lost a contract by the same method to Newfoundland Hydro just recently. Now, they have been dealt another blow by the Sheriff's Office. The Minister is responsible, and he

must tell this House the ins and outs, not the legal gobbledygook that he got on with here yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

I have no idea.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. DICKS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would certainly like to take the opportunity to reply to the things raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. He raised, I think, essentially three or four different matters, depending on how one categorizes them. He first of all says I gave the impression that because of additional services, that it was somehow justified more than the 2.7 per cent or 2.9 per cent which Fitzpatrick had quoted to the Government and which, as I explained in my statement to the House, was not subject to this contract because that was for disposition of Government assets.

I think that is misstating what I said, with all due respect, because I did make it clear in my statement and, as well, in an interview to the press afterwards that, in fact, I expected that the percentage would not have been that low, that it would have been higher with something less than 15 per cent. And let me quote from The Evening Telegram of today's date, because, although the hon. the Leader of the Opposition did not get it right, The Evening Telegram does. Let me read exactly what it says: "But Mr. Dicks said that was for a simple sale of the assets whereas this

contract also involved such services as 24-hour security, extensive advertising and the necessary staff to prepare and conduct the sale, and related costs. He said the standard in most countries for that level of service is 15 per cent." And if you do not believe me, you can check with Sothebys and Sothebys, which, in fact, charge 15 per cent to the seller, 10 per cent to the purchaser.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Where?

MR. DICKS:

Sothebys in London, New York, Chicago.

Now, "Nevertheless, Mr. Dicks acknowledged that if quotes had been sought from the second company in the industry, Terra Nova Auctioneers, a lower commission fee than 15 per cent could undoubtedly have been established." So, I think, quite fairly and quite frankly, that was said in my statement to this House. The hon. Member refers to it as gobbledygook, and it has been my experience that when people call something gobbledygook, they either cannot read it or understand it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DICKS:

I assume in the case of the hon. Member it must certainly be the latter and not the former, since I at least attribute to him the ability to read.

My officials did in fact know, two weeks prior to it that the contract had been given, but in fact that was the problem. There was a contract for 15 per cent,

and had we looked for services at another price we still would have had to pay the 15 per cent. So the Government would have to pay it one way or the other.

MR. SIMMS:

What are they on?

MR. DICKS:

Wine, antiques and so on, things like you may not be acquainted.

The important discrepancy was that he met with my bureaucrats and said do not dare open your mouths or you will not get the business again. I would just like to point out to the hon. Members, should they care to listen that I was made aware that in a letter delivered today by a most important Member of the legal profession, who in fact has august acquaintance in this House, in fact his brother, and he phrases that when the officials of the court informed their clients, the internal auctioneers, the only thing which would be coming out of complaint would be negative impact on our client in the future.

So the allegation has indeed been made and I will check into it. If that is the case then appropriate measures will be taken against the person who was named in this letter. But I think in fairness to the individual it would be unfair to put the name before the House. I think that is quite proper.

The only other thing I would say in closing, Mr. Speaker, is that it is an honest mistake. Everyone is entitled to make them. The hon. Members opposite and the Party made one last March, and they have certainly forgiven their leader for taking them into a disastrous election and causing

such a benefit to the Province nevertheless. But I think that as much as his Party chose to forgive him -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DICKS:

- I will be equally kind with people who work for me and forgive an honest mistake. I would also point out that Mr. Thoms is a man of some distinction, chosen despite his political record, by the former Government to be Sheriff. I think in this case we have to give him the benefit of the doubt.

So again, Mr. Speaker, just in fairness to the question, I think I have answered it fully. If the hon. Member has any further concerns I will certainly take them up. And concerning the particular allegation made against one official in my Department, let me assure the Members of the House that will not be the case, if this individual said that, then he was certainly out of turn and will be duly disciplined for it. But in all, I have an allegation. I do not have an answer from the individual against whom it was made, and to, at this point rule in the matter and do something about it, I feel I cannot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is amazing how quickly they learn new words on the other side. I would just like to say to the Minister of Justice, that 'I

am the guy who shot the sheriff in 1982'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Of course, the sheriff may think it was a good shot because look where he is now. I wonder if he took the 15 per cent to buy a new horse? I do not guess he did that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is true. Talk about fairness and balance. They did not even object.

Mr. Speaker, my point of contention, of course, is once again with the Minister of Fisheries. And it seems there is one issue that has dominated this Legislature this past three weeks and it has been the crisis in the fishery, particularly the Fisheries Emergency Response Program. Of course just listening to the Minister again, there is little wonder why the fishery has dominated this Legislature the way it has, because he does not know what fish plants are going to be closed in Newfoundland and Labrador, and he does not know what decision the companies are going to make in Newfoundland and Labrador pertaining to plants being open. Well, let me just remind the Minister again that he is the Minister of Fisheries for Newfoundland and Labrador, and that -

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are just repeating.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, it has to be repeated, - and

that it is time for the fisheries policy for Newfoundland and Labrador to be established by the Minister in the Provincial Department of Fisheries, instead of in the board rooms of Fishery Products International and National Sea.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

The Minister of Fisheries and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador can determine, and decide, that plants in this Province are kept open, as the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in the early 80s decided, that the plants in Newfoundland and Labrador were to be kept open.

Now, getting back to the Fisheries Response Program. I would just like to say to the Minister that the problem is so serious there are thousands of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that were involved in the fishery this year, inshore fishermen and plant workers, who do not qualify for the special Response Program because of the harsh guidelines that are in place. For instance, on Fogo Island -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Speaking of emergency, Mr. Speaker, I think we need another one. Two hundred people have registered on Fogo Island for the Emergency Response Program and sixty have received approval. One hundred and forty out of 200 do not qualify and consequently do not have any means of support to get them through this winter. On top of that there are another number of fishermen and plant



workers who did not even go to register for obvious reasons. That is happening all over the Province as well.

Now, the question to the Minister for the last three weeks is, in light of the majority of inshore fishermen, and fish plant workers, who do not know how they are going to survive to get through his winter to put bread and butter on their tables, will the Minister make a commitment to introduce a provincial component to compliment, or to replace, the Federal program that people do not qualify for so that they have a means to get through this winter, and that will enable them to afford to be able to re-enter the fishery next year? Now, that is what I am asking the Minister of Fisheries. For three weeks he stood in his place and he said, first of all, he did not know about the guideline. He did not know what the impact would be in the Province. He did not know how far the \$5 million would stretch. Well let me tell him today that the \$5 million will not be spent.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Just hold on a second. The Province has the authority to introduce a new program setting its own guidelines, putting up its own money. That is what you can do.

MR. TOBIN:  
We always did it.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
From deferring loans, material component, paying wages if you want. You have the authority, you are a government, and this Minister of Fisheries has that

authority. And why does not this Minister of Fisheries immediately bring in a program to take care of those people that are left outside of the Federal program? Why does he not do that? And alleviate the hardship that is being suffered right now in this Province in hundreds of our communities and it is going to get worse as we get into the winter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Now that is the question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! The hon. gentleman's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave! By leave!

MR. MATTHEWS:  
No one is suggesting letting the Feds off the hook, but what I am saying is as a Provincial Government take some of the responsibility and do something about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, to show just how unreasonable the hon. Member is he talked about my not knowing about the criteria, what the regulations were.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
You did not (inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

Let me tell you what happened, Mr. Speaker, and I will remind him that -

MR. MATTHEWS:

I will read Hansard for you.

MR. W. CARTER:

The announcement, Mr. Speaker, was made by the Minister, Barbara McDougall, I believe, from Halifax on November 6. We received a copy of that press release in the afternoon. The question was asked during Question Period that day, of course. They were not even aware of the guidelines at that particular time. Mr. Speaker, I had my executive assistant call the local office of that Department and they were not even aware of the guidelines. But yet the hon. Member complains and accuses me of not knowing what the program was all about, when he asked to release the guidelines almost before the program was announced by the Federal Government.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Ridiculous!

MR. W. CARTER:

It is shameful, Mr. Speaker, that people elected to serve in this House would try to make such politics, cheap political shots on the backs of the people who are undoubtedly having a rough time of it this year. Mr. Speaker, it is shameful, that people elected in this House, representing, in some cases, in his case a fishing District would get up in this House, Mr. Speaker, and play politics, would get up in this House, Mr. Speaker, and play politics to such an important and to such a serious issue.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right on.

MR. W. CARTER:

That in my view is shameful and it is not worthy, Mr. Speaker, of a Member of this House, least of all a Member from Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) that old fishing District -

MR. MATTHEWS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I think 'not worthy' is certainly unparliamentary. And let me just say to the Minister that he in this House after the program was implemented by CEIC offices in his Province, stood to his feet in this Assembly and said, they did not have the guidelines and the criteria, when the program was already operating in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the Chair is not aware that 'not worthy' is unparliamentary, but the Chair will take a look at it and if it is we will (inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would not dignify what the hon. Member just said by attempting to reply to it, because what I said was correct. That program was not even announced, in fact it was just announced the same day I was asked to reveal the contents. Mr. Speaker they keep talking about the need for a Provincial program or a Provincial component to be attached to the Federal program. Well let me tell you what the people in the Federal Government Department concerned will tell you. They will tell you, Mr. Speaker that last year, I think the preceding year when

there was Federal money offered or introduced to be spent on the program, it caused a lot more trouble and more problems than what it solved, that is what they will tell you. When there was a Provincial component to the program, it caused more problems than what it solved. Mr. Speaker the fact of the matter is the Federal Government has announced a five million dollar program. They have set certain guidelines. Now, maybe we do not all agree with the guidelines. I personally, have taken exception to some of them and I have expressed that view to the Federal Minister and to the officials in Ottawa. I have written the Minister, and I have seen him personally and objected to some of the guidelines. Mr. Speaker they ask us to put money into the program, I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker if the five million dollars will be spent, and the fact of the matter is if we were to throw millions of dollars into that program, the guidelines would be the same, the criteria would be the same, people would not qualify to any greater extent. What they should be doing, Mr. Speaker, rather than getting up in this House and trying to score cheap political points, that is all you are doing, cheap political points, they should be targeting, Mr. Speaker their counterparts and their friends in Ottawa, their political soul mates who have come up with that program. It is not the Provincial Minister of Fisheries that he should be talking about and castigating and trying to make him appear to be responsible, it is his soul mate in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. The Federal Ministers, Ms McDougal and Mr. Siddon and others, Mr. Crosbie, who have agreed to this program. I was not consulted, Mr. Speaker, in terms

of setting the criteria for these programs, I was not consulted, consequently, Mr. Speaker I did not say it was adequate at all. I said it appears to be adequate and if it is not, no, they like to twist words, that is what they are good at, they like to twist words, Mr. Speaker, that is what they are good at. I said that if the money that they have allocated is not adequate, I have reasons to believe there will be more funds forthcoming.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. SIMMS:

Could I ask the Government House Leader what his intentions are for tomorrow with respect to the debate or legislation, what his plans are, what about the committee on House rules, is he ever going to appoint that committee so we can get our work underway, all kinds of things.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. The Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

The answer to that query, Mr. Speaker is yes, we are proceeding with our Legislative program. We have a lot of items on the order paper now and probably the first thing tomorrow will be to try to clear some of the third readings, so we could get it off the order paper, there are so many pieces of legislation there now, Mr. Speaker that it is literally clogging up the order paper. We do not want to have to print extra sheets, so first thing I guess would be to get rid of some of the items on the order paper, do third readings and then we will proceed with the second readings that are on the Order Paper.

MR. SIMMS:

What about the House rules.

MR. BAKER:

I suggest I would handle that tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

This House now stands adjourned until tomorrow, Friday at 9:00 a.m.