



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 40

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Friday

[Preliminary Transcript]

24 November 1989

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT:
It gives me great pleasure today to announce Government's continuing support for the Special Sawmill Assistance Program.

As hon. Members may be aware, this program was established in 1976 to provide working capital loans at preferred interest rates to improve the viability of small and intermediate sized sawmill operations in the Province. And to stimulate production and employment in this industry during the winter months.

The rationale for the program rests in the seasonal nature of the sawmill industry. Sales for the industry usually peak in the summer, resulting in negative cash flow during the winter months. Average profits in the industry are simply not sufficient to support the inherent cash flow problems induced by winter season production. It is because of this and the low equity base of most sawmillers that commercial lending institutions are reluctant to lend working capital to these operations. Hence the need for a Government sponsored program.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, the Special Sawmill Assistance Program

has been renewed on an ad hoc basis through formal reference to Cabinet each year. This has created a general uncertainty within the industry from year to year, and to some extent has inhibited the implementation of needed capital improvements in the industry that have medium to long term payback periods.

In recognition of these difficulties and the overall economic and employment benefits available through the program, especially for rural Newfoundland, I am pleased to inform the House that this Administration, as opposed to the previous Administration, has decided to offer the program on a permanent basis, effective immediately.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:
This marks a significant change in policy with regard to Government's support for a long term commitment to the sawmill industry. It will also mean that specific levels of funding for the program will, in future, be announced with the tabling of the Budget in the House of Assembly each spring, well in advance of the time when sawmillers need the financial assistance available through the program. This should greatly assist sawmillers in planning their operations each year and in making sound business decisions on a longer-term basis than has been possible up to now.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to announce that based on extensive consultations with sawmillers over the past summer the ceiling on loans available to the program has been raised from \$40,000 to \$50,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Therein, Mr. Speaker, lies two of the improvements that I alluded to this program a couple of weeks ago. And that the interest rate charged clients has been set at 3 per cent below current prime lending rates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

As well loans will be provided on an advance payment basis.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

And repayment schedules will be set over the May 15 to October 31 period each year exactly as the sawmillers requested.

The various improvements I have outlined today, Mr. Speaker, are designed to make the program more responsive to the needs of sawmill operators, and it is Government's intent to continue with consultations from time to time to ensure that the program remains relevant to changing circumstances within the industry.

In terms of Government's specific financial commitment to the Special Sawmill Assistance Program this coming season, a sum of \$700 000 will be made available over the period November 1 to April 1. It is expected that up to 50 small to intermediate sized operators will take advantage of the program, directly contributing to the creation of approximately 5 700 person weeks of employment-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

- which is the equivalent of about 245 full time jobs during the five month period when loans will be made available.

Mr. Speaker, my announcement today regarding the Special Sawmill Assistance Program reflects this Government's commitment, and the resource policy commitment and particularly the commitment, Mr. Speaker, of the Chairman of resource policy, the hon. Member for St. Barbe. The Government's commitment to this important industry, and our resolve to see it make an even greater and long-lasting contribution to the rural economy of this Province. I encourage all eligible sawmillers to participate in this enhanced program and pledge Government's support to ensure that the industry remains a vibrant and important sector in the overall forest products industry in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, this statement and the actions taken in it indicate this Government's support to the forestry industry, and all that depends thereon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister in my line of questioning

there a week and a half ago, went back and took the correspondence that was on his desk and rooted through it and found the Sawmill Assistance Program on the bottom, and made sure that it got out within the two weeks that was ordinarily needed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WOODFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in the first statement there, the rationale for the program, yes, that is true, the seasonal nature of the sawmill industry and the fact that it is not mentioned here but it is down further, but the spin off from the sawmill industry itself when it comes to logs, in the winter time it is not only the sawmillers themselves that benefit from the actual sale and the inventory of logs, it is the people in the community who are usually off work at that time of the year and everything is slowed down so they usually go in and cut and sell to the local sawmillers in the area thereby creating some extra income and helping the sawmiller build up an inventory. The rest of it, Mr. Speaker, the wood lots, a lot of the sawmillers have wood lots and they can cut on it, some of them have not so they depend on this program heavily, and depend on the jobbers to cut and bring it to the mills in the off season for sawing. Nothing new, absolutely nothing new in the program except for the fact that it would not, it would not be on a yearly interval, it is permanent so to speak, it is in place and will be announced in a Budgetary process every year, good thing, it is good, because it cuts out the uncertainty there,

there is no doubt about that, they know what they are going to do the next fall, it is an excellent idea. But let me tell the Minister, in saying that for the last three years, that I know of, the program was on a three year basis, it was automatic every fall except for the fact that it had to go to Cabinet, but it was never hung up, it was never hung up, they knew it was coming, they knew the amounts that was going to be in it and they knew that by the 15th or 20th of October that it would be out, but apart from that it is a good idea to put the permanent thing in there. Overdue, yes, long overdue, they did create uncertainty over the last two or three weeks, there is no doubt about that, they created uncertainty in the industry, that has been put to rest now. It has nothing to do with what the Minister says creates uncertainty within the industry from year to year because of the implementation of capital improvements, it has nothing to do with capital improvements. The sawmill industry in this Province does not base its inventory it gets in winter time on capital improvements, they know what they are going to get because of the permits they get for their wood lots and the amount of logs coming in. It has to do with inventory, yes, it has to do with inventory. They build up their inventory for the winter months thereby creating a solid employment nature for the summer months. The forty to fifty thousand dollars, yes, I agree with the Minister there as well, that is good, the ceiling is raised from forty to fifty that is because of the fact that it must be obvious that a lot of the millers were coming in for more, the advance payment is nothing new, that was there, that was

always there, they paid it off in the fall of the year. The three per cent interest rate below prime, that was there, nothing new, and the stress, the Minister and his last couple of paragraphs really stresses the fact that fifty-seven hundred person weeks of employment, two hundred and forty-five full time jobs, nothing new, nothing, absolutely not a job new, but it certainly does galvanize the amount of sawmillers there and the jobs that are there and keeps it, I suppose at what the status quo was.

That is good and, I suppose, creates some certainty and stability for the sawmill industry. The \$700,000 from what I can understand is enough, but I am sure that if there is more needed the Minister in his wisdom will put more in. I am sure that the Newfoundland Sawmillers Association will certainly let him know about that.

Apart from the raising from the \$40,000 to \$50,000 and the assistance going on a permanent basis, there is absolutely nothing new in it. But then again, we on this side agree with the Minister that anything done positive for rural Newfoundland augurs well for all of us, so I commend him for that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier on a number of occasions over the last several months has indicated that the Hibernia project or the Hibernia Development is really only the equivalent of a couple of fish plants. In view of the fact that there are very serious economic problems facing the Province in the fishery and in other areas, could the Premier, this morning, tell the House whether or not negotiations are proceeding on course with the Hibernia project? Whether or not progress has been made? When, in the Premier's view, could we expect to have a final agreement reached on the Hibernia project?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful for the question. It gives me an opportunity to report to the Province as a whole the state of affairs at the moment. Since we put things back on track on September 11 by the actions the Government took in August and September, I committed to the people of the Province that I would keep people advised of progress, and if we went off course or fell behind I would let them know. Up until the day before yesterday we had a briefing of the planning and priorities committee of Cabinet by the benefits assessment team and by the head of our negotiating team. I am happy to report to the Province that the schedule that was established at the meeting on September 12 in Montreal has been adhered to. We have not fallen

behind in any respect. That is not to say that there is no difficult negotiations, or firm positions being taken that have not yet been resolved. There are some firm positions being taken by different parties on issues that have not yet been resolved. I am happy to report to the Province, Mr. Speaker, that the negotiations are on course, and assuming they continue the same way over the next few months, I would expect the anticipated date of mid year 1990 to be met for the signing of a formal agreement. I have seen nothing at this point that would lead me to believe that that is not likely to occur, although I emphasize again there is still some bargaining to be done, and still some issues that have not been finalized. In particular the Federal Government lender-risk-sharing assessment is a major thing that has to be dealt with.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Premier for his answer.

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

I wonder if the Premier could tell the House whether or not progress has been made between the Province, Mobil and its partners, in the negotiations on the industrial benefits package that would offset any losses to this Province as a result of the design change in the production platform?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

No. Progress has not been made in

the sense that we only got their package, the final details of their package in the last two weeks. We have put together a team of competent people who are doing the assessment of it and that is what the meeting was with planning and priorities commitment the day before yesterday, for that assessment team to report their judgement of what had gone on and what they had seen in their assessment of the proposal and ask for direction from Cabinet. We gave them that direction and they will now move to start discussions with Mobil and its partners over the next number of days.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier no doubt realizes that the Province's ability to have any meaningful say in the negotiations on the Hibernia project are really found in the provisions of the Atlantic Accord. Could the Premier tell the House whether or not his Government have reached any final conclusions with the Government of Canada, and the required number of Provinces, to have the Atlantic Accord entrenched into the Canadian Constitution?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, we have taken no specific steps in that regard. The ability to work a deal does not depend on the Atlantic Accord. A similar deal could have been worked in 1982 when the former Government turned it down. The Province would have been

infinitely better off had the former Government not been so obstinate at that stage a better deal could have been made and every economist who has looked at it will tell you that. And we could have had the thing underway in this Province at this time, and the chances for the project being financially successful would have been greater at that time. So I disagree with the underlying premise.

The answer to the question, Mr. Speaker, is we have not had any discussions recently with the Federal Government, but we will see.

MR. HEWLETT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HEWLETT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I came up on an elevator this morning, Mr. Speaker, totally packed with Liberals, so tightly packed that when the door closed I nearly lost my nose.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. HEWLETT:
The Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs (Mr. Gullage) on the elevator indicated he had some news for me on a particular community in my District that I have been dealing with him on. But nonetheless my duty to Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition is such that I must ask him a question on a different matter.

In a summation on a bill the other day the Minister indicated that the Premier's exemption of Steady

Brook from amalgamation with Corner Brook, in his words I do believe, may or may not have been a good idea. So I would ask the Minister is he saying he disagrees with the Premier's exemption, or that because of the inconsistency it is merely an embarrassment to him?

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker, Steady Brook was included initially on the list put forward for amalgamation. It was felt by our planners that it should be there. And the reasoning was such that it is within the control boundary of the City of Corner Brook. Now Marble Mountain, as we know, has a corporation which has a mandate to develop it. And that complicates the matter to some degree. But we did decide to remove it from the list, and the reasoning was that it is removed from Corner Brook by some distance. It is within the control area, and not within their actual boundaries as such — planning boundaries. And it also has, of course, complications in the fact that there are two towns and two jurisdictions near Marble Mountain. So we did remove it from the list.

Subsequent to that I have received letters from both Corner Brook and Steady Brook and my response was such that I asked them to make representation to the hearings when they are held in the area. I think that is fair. They have a right as anybody else does, whether they are included in the briefings as a participant and a

possible community to be amalgamated in a given area or not, is beside the point. Anybody is allowed and permitted by the legislation and by the act to make representation to the hearings. And that is exactly what I said to them, if they wish to make representation and make points concerning Marble Mountain they could do so.

MR. HEWLETT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the politics of the West Coast, but people who know that situation indicated to me that certain prominent Liberals, including our Minister of Justice (Mr. Dicks), probably interceded in this matter.

In the three island communities in Green Bay that are up for amalgamation, I won 77 per cent of the total vote so, Mr. Speaker, there are no prominent Liberals in that neck of the woods to intercede for those people. Would this be the reason why they were not taken off the list? The prominent Liberals in Green Bay are on the north shore of the District and the three islands concerned are on the south shore.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Provincial and Municipal Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

There is no politics involved, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GULLAGE:

I re-examined the criteria and I spoke to the planners before making a decision, a decision which I made after concern was expressed to me by the people in the area about the proximity of Steady Brook to Corner Brook and the situation regarding Marble Mountain. It was not a simple decision, it was not taken lightly and after consultation with my officials we decided the proper thing to do was to remove them from the list, and, as the Minister I did so.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A final supplementary.

I put this one to the hon. the Premier. The Minister indicates there was no partisan politics involved. I think the Premier, in a TV interview some time ago, indicated that the Humber River gorge was an issue separating two communities. Also, the Premier in debate indicated something to the effect of other good reasons. If there were no politics and the Humber River gorge was an issue would the Premier care to indicate what other good reasons led to this exemption?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

With the greatest of pleasure, Mr. Speaker.

The suggestion that politics is involved in it is unworthy of the hon. Member. It had nothing

whatsoever to do with it. The hon. Member for Humber East (Ms Verge) should know, but maybe she does not take into account, or she objects to it, look at the relative position of Steady Brook and Corner Brook, with only a narrow gorge that has to accommodate a river and a road in between. It is five or six miles apart and the reason given by the Minister explained good sound reasons but there is one very sensible reason. Both the communities of Corner Brook and Steady Brook are self-sustaining and they do not need help from the taxpayers of the Province to pay their debts. Steady Brook is entirely and totally competent on its own. It is not subsidized by tax dollars to pay its debt. It pays its own debt, has its own tax sources, and that is another good and sensible reason for doing so. Now, that is the other good reason to which I was referring at the time. They can do it without the additional subsidy from the rest of the taxpayers of the Province and that is a good sound reason for taking it into account as well. Apart from that, the reasons that the Minister gave make eminent good sense in the circumstances. If there is a reason why they want to be amalgamated there is no objection to that either. As he says, anybody who wants to can make whatever representations before the hearings they may, but it is not essential. There is no overwhelming reason for amalgamating those two, as is the case, in many other communities in the Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. The Minister will be aware that within her Department she has what is known as a Labour Standards Division, and flowing from that the Minister puts in place a Labour Standards Tribunal and the function of that tribunal is to adjudicate on matters that are usually initiated by aggrieved employees. The mandate of that tribunal ran out, I believe, approximately seven months ago, sometime back in May, and there are many, many cases before that tribunal which are backlogged right now. Approximately thirty or forty cases have been waiting that seven month period to have their cases heard and some of the matters are fairly important. Can the Minister indicate why it is taking so long to deal with that? Has a new tribunal been put in place? If so will it be given a mandate to deal with all of these backlogged cases that have been waiting now for about seven months?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I can assure the hon. the Member for Harbour Main that that matter has been taken care of and that I just recently signed the letters going out to the individuals who will sit on that particular tribunal, and we have put people on that who will deal with the backlogged cases as expeditiously as possible.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:

I thank the Minister for her answer. A supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. The Minister has a number of Labour Standards people on staff and a number of people in that division of her Department whose function it is to insure that safety in the workplace is kept at a reasonable level.

I would like to indicate to the Minister that, of late, I have had a number of people in the construction industry, in particular, complaining of a lack of safety measures being employed by contractors around the Province. They complain that the Department of Labour, the Labour Standards Division specifically, have very little presence on any of these construction sites, which is causing a lot of the contractors around the Province to be a little bit shoddy and sometimes unconcerned about safety in the workplace. Will the Minister indicate how many of her Labour Standards people are assigned specifically to safety on these construction projects around the Province, and how often the Labour Standards people visit these projects, every indication of late is that they do not seem to be visiting these projects as frequently as they should.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I am very pleased to answer this question. When I came into my function as Minister of this particular Department, I was appalled by the lack of attention that has been paid to Occupational

Health and Safety in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:

I indicated not too long ago in this House that I was shocked, because it struck me as if there was almost an exploitive Third World mentality that had been in operation, that it did not matter what condition the workers worked under, as long as they had a job and it was lending some income, and so on, to the Province, that it was fine.

I am taking several measures within the Department to see that that situation is corrected. In fact, the whole area has been one that has predominated in my workday since I became Minister for that Department. I might correct one mistake, too, before I go on. It is not the Labour Standards people who look into occupational health and safety. We have a special division that does that, that is very, very understaffed. We have about 10,000 workplaces in the Province and we have 10 Occupational Health and Safety inspectors, which means that they deal with many situations on a crisis basis only, and that is of great concern to me, as well.

The construction industry is an area of particular concern. That is because of the nature of the construction business. People come in, work for the summer, and then they disperse all over the Province, and it is very difficult to offer seminars and what-have-you to those individuals.

We are trying this year a system of seminars that have to do, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Answer the question.

MS COWAN:
I was asked several questions, which I am now answering. If you are interested in having the question answered, I will continue, if not, I will sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:
Those kinds of comments, Mr. Speaker, simply reinforce the opinion I expressed at the beginning, about the lack of interest of the past Government in Occupational Health and Safety.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:
If they want Occupational Health and Safety in this Province improved, perhaps they would be interested in knowing what we are doing.

The construction industry is an area of particular concern, as I was saying, and we are experimenting now with trying to hold a number of seminars. They are beginning right away all around the Province, on the mobile crane situation, the cranes and the other boom trucks, that type of thing, which come in contact with power lines and have caused a number of serious accidents.

It will be interesting to evaluate

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

This is the difficulty when a question is rather long. The Minister was first of all dealing

with a preamble and then she got into the answer. I would hope that the Minister could clue up in another fifteen or twenty seconds for the answer, please.

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I have concluded.

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

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, I do not mind the Minister's long answers. It is refreshing to see that she has finally come to life and she is alive and well.

In view of the seriousness of safety in the workplace, not only on construction projects but in all areas of employment, and in view of fact that everyone involved in that particular aspect is concerned with this very important matter, including the Federation of Labour who have mentioned it on a number of occasions in their annual brief to Government. Will the Minister undertake to call together parties from all sectors of the Labour movement, management as well, to fully discuss the issue? Will she table in the House all the information relevant to the number of accidents that have occurred in the workplace over the last one year period?

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

MS COWAN:
I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I might say again to the hon. Member from Harbour Main that my concern goes far beyond having an advisory committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:

I have talked to all the concerned groups. I have concerned groups calling me all the time wanting to come in and talk about occupational health and safety.

I am at the point of hiring management consultants to come in and do an evaluation of the entire Occupational Health and Safety Program to see how we can better meet the needs of this Province, because it was so dreadfully neglected by the past Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to direct this question to the hon. the Minister of Health. It is a simple and very serious question and I know that the hon. gentleman is going to give me an answer that is neither abusive or evasive this morning.

My question relates to funding for chronic care beds in the Province. I know I do not have to give the Minister a case by case of the desperate situation that some of our frail elderly are living in, in this community, and in fact, throughout the Province.

What I would like to ask the Minister this morning is, when will his Department be in a position to provide funding to open the forty-one existing chronic care beds at the Agnes Pratt Home which have been sitting empty since they were built by the previous Government?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

I thank the hon. Member for her question. It shows the concern that she has for health care, unlike her colleagues who neglected it for seventeen years, Mr. Speaker.

To answer her question, the matter of the forty-one beds is actively under consideration. Also, the beds in the Dr. Twomey Centre out in Botwood, which is not yet open, are as well under consideration. We are also actively pursuing opening an Alzheimer's unit at the Hoyles Home.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am dreadfully aware of the problem that she has brought forward. I am daily reviewing it. I would certainly hope that in a reasonable time, we will be able to make the announcement that these chronic care beds are open. As, Mr. Speaker, we intend to open more chronic care beds, because the real problem in the health care system and the hospital system, is with our chronically ill people, more so even than with the acute beds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

I do not doubt the good intentions of Government, but as somebody has said earlier 'hell is paved with good intentions' and good intentions do not do a whole lot about relieving the situation of some of the frail elderly. I can give the Minister cases in point who are actually in danger of doing themselves personal injury or burning in their homes, and good intentions in this case are simply not enough. We are talking about empty beds. We are talking about a line up of approved patients that want to get into them.

If it is a question of money, perhaps I should turn my attention to the President of Treasury Board and ask the President of Treasury Board: does in fact his Government recognize the frail elderly patient living at risk in the community, as a priority for this Government? Because if he does, I am sure he will agree that he has to provide money to open existing beds, which are only lacking in staff.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I did not realize she was finished. I would say to the Member that as the Minister of Health indicated we are very aware of the problems. For the four years that I have been sitting in the house and for years before, I have personally been aware of a

lot of very serious circumstances that need to be dealt with in terms of care for the elderly, and there is no doubt that the problem is a difficult problem. I would point out to the Member that maybe many other Members opposite are aware that there is a Budget process that is starting now and that whereas we cannot respond piecemeal, day by day, the plan for health care in this Province will be very, very obvious, when this Budget process is finished.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Health Policy which I have read and reread, dictates that as long as demand exists hospitals beds must be kept open, institutions must not be understaffed, and compassion, that wonderful word compassion, must always take precedence over business administration. If we cannot adequately care for the sick, the disabled and the aged among us, we have failed as a society, and we can take cold comfort in cutting costs and improving balance sheets. I would like to ask the Premier, if in fact, he will admit that he has failed society in being totally unable to fulfill his election promises in relation to the care of the frail elderly in our society.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

The hon. Member, with great respect to her, has included in her question the answer. We acknowledge that the former Administration failed miserably to take care of the sick and disabled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

They brought us to this sorry state after seventeen years of desperate Administration. Now give us just a little bit of time, Mr. Speaker, to correct it. We know that we are good, but we know also and we are prepared to admit that we cannot achieve a perfect situation in just a few months. As the President of the Treasury Board said, it is under consideration at the moment, we are preparing the next Budget now, the exact position and the expenditure that we will make on health and other similar programs and the manner in which it will be spent will be disclosed in the next Budget. Now that is within a year. The second Budget will be brought down within one year of our forming Government, I can assure the hon. Member. Sometime before the 5th of May, 1990 the Budget will be brought down and then the hon. Member will see that this Government has acted pursuant to its criticism, and addressed the terrible mess that the former Administration created, and that hopefully, within a year, we will have a great many, if not all of the problems resolved, but it may take us a year to do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Justice, the question is about the serious inadequacy of space for the busiest court centre in the Province, The Provincial Court in

St. John's. Number one, why did the Minister's Department take a four lawyers room at Atlantic Place for judges offices simply to replace judges offices one floor above. Number two, why did the Minister's Department leave no space but the public corridors, for lawyers having sensitive discussions with sexual assault victims, other victims of crime, other witnesses. Number three, why did the Minister's Department make no provision for confidential phone calls by lawyers other than the public pay phones in the public corridors.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. DICKS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With response to the Member's questions for Humber East (Ms Verge). First of all, there is no doubt that the Provincial Court facilities in St. John's are somewhat inadequate. In fact, I could add to the list. There are some problems with security there and access and so forth. I merely point out that it was not this Administration that put the Provincial Court in the present circumstances. The judges themselves are very concerned with the fact that they do not have windows. The requests were made to the previous Government, and nothing had been done about it.

I first of all want to assure the hon. Member for Humber East that, contrary to her own Administration, in the present Budget process I have, in fact, requested funds not only for the problem that she has outlined, but also for additional space there, that will accommodate the judges significantly, including a new

courtroom. So the questions that she has raised are legitimate, except they do not reflect on our Administration but rather her's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DICKS:
To answer the question directly because of these inadequacies the judges themselves have, I understand, taken over the lawyer's office that was there for use for counsel and are, in fact, using that. So it has made it a little more imperative that we now try to accommodate the lawyers who are there to appear before the court, with additional space.

So I want to assure the Member the problem is well in hand, but it is one of longstanding, that was not addressed in appropriate time, that has brought about the current problems.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MS VERGE:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have to correct the Minister. It was his Government that took away the lawyers' room and put lawyers and victims of crime out in the corridor. Mr. Speaker, the previous Government had a beautiful new courthouse built in Grand Falls, a courthouse for both the Provincial Court and the Trial Division of The Supreme Court.

AN HON. MEMBER:
The house that 'Len' built. But

the Liberals will not open it.

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, that building was completed in the summer. It was ready for occupancy in August yet it sat there empty for four months. What is the Minister waiting for? When is he going to open the new Grand Falls courthouse?

MR. RIDEOUT:
He is too busy telling jokes to the constabulary.

MR. SIMMS:
Ah, ha! He will not be telling any more.

MR. DICKS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DICKS:
Well, Mr. Speaker, let me respond to the questions pertaining to the Grand Falls court. First of all the pressing need in this Province for several years has been a courtroom in Gander. That has been conveyed to me by the Chief Justice of the Provincial Court, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal. Why, one may ask, was a courthouse build in Grand Falls to start with?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DICKS:
Mr. Speaker, not only that but the Government had a freeze on, and in order to provide that facility it was not built by the Government, but it was built by a private developer with a lease-back to the Government, which I questioned.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Recommended by the Chief Justice.

MR. DICKS:
Now the reason it is empty, Mr. Speaker, is that it is still in the process of being completed. And I understand it is scheduled to be opened in the next several months. So it is a facility that will be opened. It is certainly not a priority that should have been addressed in the fashion that it was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Question Period has expired.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The Chair just wants to make a couple of comments on Question Period this morning, comments that need not be made, and I am sure observations that hon. Members would be totally aware of, but the Chair has to make them. One, I want to advise hon. Members of the necessity to get to their question quick, and secondly, the fact that Ministers should also get to the answer quick. I say to hon. Members again, when the preamble is long it makes it difficult for the Minister to take the essence from the question, and it also gives the Minister a little leeway to wander around, when the Minister ought not to have that leeway, but it relates to the question that has been asked. I also want to dispel a myth that hon. Members seem to hold, that brief questions require brief answers. Of course that relates to the type of question. If somebody asked the Premier what is the rate of unemployment, that obviously requires a very brief

answer, but if they asked the Premier what were the causes for the rate of the unemployment to be the way it is, an equally brief question, but the answer will not be as brief.

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

MR. DICKS:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, An Act To Revise The Law Respecting The Provincial Court -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

We will have to revert to that if hon. Members will allow, because I believe I have already gone into Answers to Questions.

Will hon. Members agree that we go back to Notices of Motion?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:
Agreed.

o o o

Notices of Motion

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

MR. DICKS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Revise The Law Respecting The Provincial

Court."

Orders of the Day

MR. BAKER:

Order 2, Mr. Speaker.

MS VERGE:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MS VERGE:

The Member for Humber East, on a point of order.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like Your Honour's ruling on the question of whether it is parliamentary, or acceptable, for Members of the House to clip their fingernails in the House during a full formal sitting like this?

MR. SPEAKER:

It is not a point of order. It depends on, I suppose, to the extent on how it is done and how many Members choose to do it. If all fifty-two chose to do it, it would certainly cause quite a problem, so I just ask hon. Members to abide by the normal rules of what is proper to do.

MR. BAKER:

Order 2.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act, (No. 2)," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 15).

MR. BAKER:

Order 3, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Corporation Act, 1973," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 16).

MR. BAKER:

Order 4, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Quarry Minerals Act 1976," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 18).

MR. BAKER:

Order 5, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Economic Council Act," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 27).

MR. BAKER:

Order 6, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Development," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 24).

MR. BAKER:

Order 7, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Department of Forestry and Agriculture," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 19).

MR. BAKER:

Order 8, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Department of Mines and Energy," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 25).

MR. BAKER:

Order 9, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 9. Third reading of a Bill "An Act Respecting The Department of Finance". (Bill No. 21).

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I presume that the Government House Leader is going to go through 9, 10, 11, and 12. Well, maybe we can agree to forego all the formalities so that we can get on with other business. I understand from the Clerks that can be done as long as there is an agreement.

MR. SPEAKER:
Is it agreed that we take as read the third reading of Bills No. 21, 23, 20, and 28. Order 9, 10, 11, and 12 on the Order Paper?

All those in favor, 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:
Contrary, 'nay', carried.

On motion, the following Bills: "An Act Respecting The Department of Finance", (Bill No. 21); "An Act Respecting the Department of Environment and Lands", (Bill No. 23); "An Act Respecting the Department of Justice", (Bill No. 20); and "An Act Respecting The Department of Employment and Labour Relations", (Bill No. 28); read a third time, ordered passed and their titles be as on the Order Paper.

MR. BAKER:
Order 18, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WOODFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WOODFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I would not want the Members of the House to think that I am going to try to follow the footsteps of my colleague to the left (Mr. Tobin) who was here yesterday, but he will be back on Monday.

I would just like to have a few words on this Bill, Mr. Speaker, on the amendment to The Fisheries Act. We went through this Bill in Committee. We have had some concerns with it although it has been stated here already that there is no major changes to the Bill except the fact that it is going to do away with the Fishery Industry Advisory Board Act, 1975 will be repealed and will be put into The Department of Fisheries Act, 1973. So apart from that there is not a lot there.

We did have some concerns, just for the record I guess, about getting copies of the Acts before our meetings and prior Acts, summation of additions, deletions, and amendments and so on, that has been take care of by Committee. Seeing that this Bill is on, it gives me the opportunity to bring up some concerns that I have about the fishery in my District and more specifically pertaining to the fishery response program. I would like to touch on that one first.

It is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, for me to sit here as a Member of the House of Assembly and representing a part of my District that has a lot to do with the

fishery, namely the White Bay South part of it, which includes Jackson's Arm, Sop's Arm, Pollards Point, and even some in the Hampden area. To see Members opposite one after another stand or sit and support the Minister or the Premier or whoever says that we do not need any more money in that Fishermen's Response Program this year. I am sure that Members opposite as well as I, who represent fishing Districts, are after getting calls and letters expressing their concerns, concerns from their constituents that this program is not going to fulfill their needs.

Now to say, always, contact your buddies in Ottawa or contact the Feds, is one thing, but I am sure if the Minister of Fisheries were driving down the road some night out here and he looked in and saw a house on fire and knew there were people in it, I am sure he would not go and look for the owner, he would stop his car and go in and try to do something for the people that are in there, and this is no different. The element of blame can only be held for so long, it can be only sustained for so long. Blaming, I am hearing it every day, I am hearing it ever since the House opened last spring, on the Federal Government, if it is not the Federal Government it is the seventeen years of previous Tory power. When does it stop, when does the Government opposite realize that they are Government, nobody, nobody on this side I am sure, are going to accept blame for everything, I know, but nobody is perfect. In three or four years time the people of the Province will judge again, the jury is out and will judge again on whether the present Administration did right or wrong. I am sure there

will be a lot of things done right and I am sure there will be a lot of things that the public will judge wrong. Blaming present troubles on past misfortunes is a trap that we all fall into at given times. Often it becomes a convenient crutch for not getting the things done that we ought to, excuses have a time limit. The older they are they weaker they get, I think Members opposite should take those few points and keep them in mind over the next three or four years. Excuses, like I said, the older they get, the weaker they get. Face it, meet it head on like Members opposite had to do on very controversial issues whether it was the Fisheries Response Program or whether it was Sprung or anything else, meet it head on. Do not revert, blame it on the Feds, well I am speaking on behalf of my constituents, not my colleagues. I am concerned about the Fisheries Response Program, very concerned, I have a real disaster. If the California earthquake the other day or something down in el Salvador or something in Bangladesh or something anywhere, the Federal Government, the Provincial Governments and many other agencies in Canada would react immediately because those people are in trouble. We have a disaster in the fishery this year in this Province, we did not have to wait til October or November, we could all tell back in June, as early as June in my District that we were going to have a disaster in the fishery. We might have had to wait to see if that was going to be because there was no Caplin or no Herring or no ground fish, no cod, no crab, but we had certain sectors that we knew back in June that was going to be a disaster. In the White Bay South

part of the District, it is a disaster. The criteria stipulated by CEIC and the Federal Government does not and will not meet the needs of the fisherman or plant workers in the Province this year. The Feds have put three to five million dollars into the program. Federal MPs have already stated and have already gone after the Federal people that this is not enough and I think that one of the Members, namely Brian Tobin over our way has stated already that we need some three million dollars for his district alone, so it goes to show that it is an absolute necessity that more money should be put into it by the Federal Government and I might add the Province. I think that the Province should put something into it, if nothing else, put money into a program and show them up, expose the Feds, take a preemptive strike so to speak and say look, tell the people of the Province that yes, we are concerned, they did not do it, so we will do it. We are looking at people who have been, this year more specifically and we are coming up to Christmas, a time when each and everyone of us like to spend time with our families and at least have something except bread and butter to put on the table, we have people in the District of Humber Valley who are going to have a job to do that this year, Mr. Speaker, unless they revert to Social Services, and I am serious I am not talking about something that is hearsay, I am not talking about something that is far-fetched, I am talking about facts. They cannot get on the program. The criteria - correct me if I am wrong - I think you have to have six weeks this year in order to be able to get on a fisheries response program this year, and if you have three weeks, they have to

be in the fishing industry ten weeks the previous year.

Out of 152 in Jackson's Arm - Sop's Arm area, we have 28 people going to work Monday on a Fisheries Response Program that has them working on a senior citizens home there that has been done over the last few years through job strategy programs and so on, very successful. Nothing down in the White Bay part of the area, and much needed, but they have no money for materials, absolutely none. When you look at 28 people going out of Fisheries Response Program for eight or ten weeks, and \$125 a week per man week for materials, I do not have to tell any Member Opposite or on this side of the House what that is going to do for the program - very little. The same thing applies to some of the other programs that were supported and said were no good, the people were given money and nothing to do anything with only sit and lay around for the six or seven weeks they are employed.

So, if the Provincial Government came in with a program even to top up the so called programs here, it would help the people do something meaningful in the community and also look at the fact that we should be giving some of those other people that are much - need unemployment insurance or need the weeks work in order to qualify, and in order to have something this winter to put them through the winter because it is not only this winter, it is not only this one, we have to look at next year. If it was bad this year, it certainly is going to be much worse next.

We all know, and it has been stated in the House previous to

this, that there is going to be a cut in the allocation in the TAC, Total Allowable Catch. No doubt, no doubt in my mind, no doubt in anybody's mind. Where and who is going to be hurt by that remains to be seen, but we know that the fishing industry as a whole is going to be hurt. Identifying a particular community or identifying a particular company, we cannot very well do it now except for the fact that it has already been mentioned under the so called proposal of LIFO proposal, Last In First Out proposal that that would be detrimental to a lot of smaller communities in this Province that depends on that program. For their very livelihood, the community of Jackson's Arm in White Bay, for instance, and Sop's Arm have got absolutely nothing else to depend on. Some work there in regards to the forestry, and some work there with regards to Cat Arm and a few other places, but other than that, there is absolutely nothing.

So, I would emphasize to the Minister and to all of the Cabinet Ministers to take the bull by the horns if you have to. We are after the Feds, yes, I agree they should put more money into the program, I agree they should be more flexible, but I also say that we should look at the human part of it and do something ourselves for the people we represent. We do not have to put something that is going to be there for next year, put something in to help the immediate problem now. And then, as the Minister has already stated, we are looking at a long term plan which would look after next years problems. I agreed not to put anything in for an on going thing, but for God's sake, look at something for the rest of this

fall. We are getting up, like I said, close to Christmas, close to a time - and there is a lot of uncertainty there, there is a lot of uncertainty. While all Members are representing fishing Districts in the Province we know that they have absolutely nothing. And a lot of those people are hard workers, both plant workers and fishermen. They are not people who are sitting on the sidelines. Mother Nature, along with some other factors, I suppose, performed a very cruel joke on them this year more specifically. They went out but there was nothing to catch and nothing to process. That is not their fault. The last thing a fisherman or a plant worker wants to do is to go down to the social service office. The last thing any Newfoundlander or Labradorian wants to do is go down to the social service office. They will go and pick up their unemployment cheque because they know that they had to work X number of weeks, whether it was ten, twenty, or thirty in order to get it. They will do that in order to sustain themselves and their families. The last thing any member in this House wants to do is take away the last thing they have, and that is their integrity. We certainly should not take that away from those people, their pride and their integrity. They have been beaten, they are down, we should not rub it in, and we should make every effort, and I ask the Government in its wisdom, to make every effort to try and put a program in place to help those people over the next months, especially this winter.

It is not only the actual people themselves who are suffering directly in the fishery. Let us look at what happens when, for

instance, 152 fishermen and plant workers around the Jackson and Sops Arm areas have no money. How do the councils collect their taxes? How do the other businesses around collect on their bills? That is the way they operate. We are still in the old merchant days, a lot of those communities, where they go down and charge so much and then pay it the next month, the next two months, or whatever. Even when they are on unemployment let alone when they are working in the plants and fishing out of the boats. That is still there so it affects the whole community, everything starts to wither and everything starts to die. It stretches outside the communities into other municipalities in the area. I can only talk about my own now and that is Deer Lake where the major shopping centres are, and there is no difference from any other region in the Province. They come there to shop, they come there to gas up, they come there to eat, they come there to do a lot of things, and if they have no money to do it everything suffers. There is no tax base, they have no infrastructure as it is in those communities because it usually goes to the bigger centres like Deer Lake, and they just have problems collecting taxes in any case.

I have heard it now in debate on the Fisheries Bill, and some other Bills, I know you are supposed to be relevant and so on, but I have heard the Member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) - we had a great laugh the other evening in the House, Members opposite, and I suppose some Members here laughed, I even laughed myself, at the fact of Sprung. It is always Sprung. If it is not the seventeen years

of Tory rule, if it is not the Feds, it is Sprung. I do not know if anybody else in this House would but I certainly would not back down from a question on Sprung. I never did. If Members opposite keep up, just a word of caution, keep up talking about the Sprungs of the world and some other things that this Administration did, yes, I agree it was not handled right. It was not handled right. Hindsight is twenty/twenty. My, you have not got to worry about you people being in power seventeen years if you could only have hindsight. You are there forever more. But you are human, each and every one of you are human, the same as the people who were on this side, identical, the only thing different, different political stripes. You are human, you are going to be susceptible to making mistakes, and you are not going to have them all right, believe you me. To say that Sprung was wrong and it was handled wrong is one thing but to say that we should not have a new technology in this Province is another thing.

The linerboards of the world, the Come-by-Chances of the world, there was something wrong with those as well. They were passed as supposed to be failures. Look at them today, look at them around the Province today and see where the major success is. The West Coast, Stephenville, and more specifically depending on the old linerboard mill, now Abitibi-Price, a success. Why was it not a success in the first place? It had to do with management. Why was the Come-by-Chance Refinery not a success in the first place? A combination of factors, management and some others. And if Members back themselves into a corner and

say that we cannot touch this and we cannot do that and you cannot attempt to do this or that, I will tell you Dr. House and his team are going to have a very, very difficult job. They are going to have a very, very difficult job.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They are the only ones who would have the job.

MR. WOODFORD:

Sprung is out there now, it is working, there is not a word about it, there is not a word. The money is spent, someone else has it, there is not a word - it is new technology - for any Member on the other side to say what was new about it is complete ignorance, and I mean ignorance in the sense of the agricultural part of it or the technological part of it complete.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WOODFORD:

Yes, right. The things that were done - to give you an example of that and what could be done, I mean those people were shipping two thousand tons of cucumbers to North America every winter from Spain, Mexico, Holland.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WOODFORD:

They were not subsidising the poor people in North America, they were paying \$1 a kilogram freight to get that over here, and then someone asked me the question why we could not send it from St. John's to Toronto or down the seaboard. Did someone ask me that? A prime example was yesterday, the Minister came in with a Ministerial Statement

yesterday on the great helmet factory that is going to be situated out in the hon. Member from LaPoile's District. A great thing, they are going to export, but we have always been told more specifically in this Province by bureaucrats and politicians that we cannot do it. We cannot do it, you have to import it. Bring it in, you just cannot do it here. We can do it, we can do things in this Province to export. A prime example is the one in Port aux Basque just announced yesterday, a prime example. We are doing it in Pasadena in the Incubator Mall. There are chinese people there doing the plastic bags and everything, looking after Macdonald's and everything, pretty well all across Canada, and we say we cannot do it. We got it in Sprung. Forget Sprung, the so called Sprungs, Dons and the Phills of the world, but look at reality and look at the business part of it itself. It is still there, it is working, they have their own money put into it and now they are putting some equity into it. One of the very first things I did after only two or three weeks in that Department was talk to this gentleman, Chris Snellen who was growing the romain lettuce down in the bunkers. They told him that that could not be done. That was a success. I suggested to the Dutch people that when they started to come down here to go in, have a talk to the local greenhouse operators and see how he could help him out. You have the expertise in the horticultural part of it, you have the expertise in the growing of peppers, cucumbers and herbs. Go in and take the local fellows and have a talk to them. Maybe you could help them, maybe the local people could grow the plants for you to transplant into your

operation whereby you can knock the so called factory syndrome out of the sprung complex, and make it a growing and production zone rather than having reproduction and processing in the same building. They talked to them. We have one of the local operators in there now, this young fellow Snellen, very pleased picking up all kinds of tips on the growing capacity of that plant and the way they do it in Holland - very successful, and I would say that he will be one of the catalysts in making sure whether that plant goes or does not go because of the local content and because of the communication. That is one thing they did have in Holland that we did not have here.

You cannot go in, like I said before, and put a gate up around something, I can put a place in the parking lot, put a fence around it and put all kinds of dogs there. I would have the press there forever and a day wondering what is in there. It has to be open so you can see it and the people in the Province can benefit from it. That could have been a lab and a so-called agricultural college so to speak for every other segment of the agricultural industry in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WOODFORD:

It was not. I said that first when I spoke, handled wrong, mismanaged. Never mind about the waste. When you look at waste you have to look at different things. Is the ice tank over at the University or over at the Marine Centre a waste? Is the wave tank over there a waste? This Province will never recoup money from those

type of operations, but our children and our people are taking advantage of it and people from all around the world are coming in here. If we take that attitude that it is a waste, this is a waste and that is a waste we will do absolutely nothing in this Province. Absolutely nothing. We will not be able to move. We are an Island out in the North Atlantic -

MR. MATTHEWS:

You can waste land if you keep that up.

MR. WOODFORD:

Look at the country of Iceland, just look at it. A major success in every field, even in the agricultural field, one of the biggest. It can be done there, it can be done here. What I am getting at is we can take that technology and Dr. House and his team I am sure can be looking at this over the next while - they are going to have to. Nobody has to tell any Member in this House how much more logs you can assign Jackson's Arm or Cormack. I can tell you now. Nobody can tell you how many more beauty salons or convenient stores you can put up there. I can tell you know. They have to look at something different. They have to look at new technology and bringing in new companies that are sustainable and can stand on their own feet and be successful here and not only serve the people of this Province, but also export on a year round basis.

And that is going to go out into the smaller municipalities, Port aux Basques, again a primary example, Pasadena. Usually when you hear something about manufacturing you hear about St. John's or you hear about Corner Brook or Grand Falls or probably

Gander. But we have the Pasadenas of the world, or the Port aux Basques of the world and other municipalities as well because I know of other local products, for instance, out around the Lewisporte area that are involved and even around my area.

So in Holland, to give you a prime example, they have it all around the countryside, pretty well anybody who is interested in that industry it is all around the countryside and they grow pretty well everything, but they are successful because they kept costs down. They are efficient. And that can be done around this Province. I would love to stand up here in four or five years time and see another building like that, a prime example would be down in Burgeo; if the fish plant goes, what better thing to have their than something like that with fifty or sixty people working. We can. So do not throw out the baby with the bathwater. That is the message.

The training for fishermen and so on is going to come. We know there are going to be cuts. We know there are plants going to go. We know people are going to come out of the industry. So they have to be trained for other jobs and to get into other parts of the industry in this Province. What is there for them to go to, if we do not bring in the new or do not take chances? If the Government opposite came up with a new idea on something I would be the last one to condemn it. First I would wait and see. I can understand why they tore the guts out of it before. The election was on. The election is over, gentlemen. You won. Forget about it. It is done. The money is spent and people are working. Leave it

alone.

Getting back to the Response Program itself, I say what I said earlier and ask the Minister to take a case to Cabinet where something meaningful can be done now, not in a month or two months time, but now. We have to do something. We have to show that we have a social conscience as a Government and as Members of the House of Assembly. For instance the Sawmill Assistance program announced by the Minister this morning. It was better. Sure, some aspects of it were better, but why do they have to wait? Is it just because it was a P.C. programme? That is the question I ask. It had to be looked into again. Why was it not just approved, let go and then put something in place for another year? Anyway, it is passed, it is out, and it will be good for the sawmill operators. But the question remains, why wait?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible). It is signed, boy. Give it up.

MR. WOODFORD:

Yes. Well, I guess that is something we all get into after we speak for twenty minutes or a half hour. They say there is only one thing better than a speech by a politician, that is no speech at all. So, I mean, I agree with everybody here.

I know we get up and take our partisan shots and we shoot from the hip sometimes, and we blame it on someone else, or this or that, but we should, for once in this House, take a look at it. I am talking about facts, not fiction. I am talking about people's lives. And I do not want to be an alarmist. I am not being that. I

have proof of it, as I am sure, do other Members of this House. I am sure I am not the only one who has proof of it, that people are out there wanting. And they want to get their eight or ten weeks. They do not want to be given a Social Services cheque. They do not want it. It was not their fault, I reiterate that. So, for God's sake, I say the Minister should confront his Cabinet colleagues and put in place a program so that those fishermen and plant workers can have something to sustain them through the winter months.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Exploits.

MR. GRIMES:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is a pleasure, again, to have an opportunity to rise in the House to speak to Bill No. 26, in this case, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Fisheries".

I would just like to make a few brief comments, firstly in terms of comments by the previous speaker, the hon. the Member for Humber Valley. I am sure all Members in the House concur with the very sincere and deeply felt concern he expresses relative to people involved in the fishery in his District. It is for that reason I was looking for an opportunity to speak in relation to this particular Bill, as well. Because there are a number of communities in Exploits District that are just about totally dependent upon the fishery and, of course, those people have been

contacting me, as their Member, and I share many of the concerns expressed by the hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

To sidetrack a little at the beginning before I get to a couple of points that I would like briefly to make. I also share some concerns with the previous speaker, the hon. Member, mentioned Sprung, and so on.

There were some problems with the way it was handled, as he readily admitted, and those were the major share of the problems. I think all of us, on both sides of the House, are extremely hopeful that that will continue to function and prosper.

I believe, the agreement this Administration put in place upon assuming office, indicates, in fact, in turning it over to the group running it now, if it does work, we do stand a chance to get some return on the money invested. And I think the biggest concern for all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians at the time, relative to Sprung, was the shroud of secrecy that surrounded the thing in the first place. I concur fully with the hon. Member's statements that had it been done openly and up front, it probably could have worked from the beginning the way it is probably going to work and that we hope it works now.

It is unfortunate that that thing has become the epitome of a bit of a political football, because I think, maybe, the reputation of what will be a viable enterprise might be damaged by some of the slurs that we, through back and forth in this House relative to using the Sprung name, whereas the name should be removed altogether,

if at all possible; I know it will not happen, because I will be guilty in this House, too, of yelling out 'Sprung' some day. The problem is with the fact that we will find out, I suppose, in the near future, that something that maybe is really worth \$6 million or \$7 million probably will show somewhere in excess of \$20 million that is somehow tied into it. Somebody will figure out how at some point in time, but maybe all of it could have been done openly, without that shroud of secrecy before.

So, I, certainly share, and I believe all hon. Members share in the sentiment expressed by the hon. Member that we hope that enterprise works and prospers and that, in fact, it shows the kinds of new things that can be done and that can work in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Back to the Bill, just for a few short minutes, Mr. Speaker. I think the initiative taken by this Bill in putting the Fishing Industry Advisory Board back into the Department of Fisheries, and so on, instead of a separate entity with a separate Act, is largely agreed upon by Members on both sides of the House as a right and proper thing to be doing. And, in fact, there has been very little concern expressed over the Bill, itself. I am sure it will pass in due course in this Legislature.

However, it has provided a useful forum for Members on both sides to speak to their concerns about the fishery. The Federal Government's Response Program was announced just recently. I think it would be dishonest for Members on either side of the House to stand and say that they have not received calls

from their constituents, because I certainly have. And in areas like Leading Tickles, Glovers Harbour, Fortune Harbour, Cottle's Cove, Moore's Cove where they depend very heavily on the fishery, those people have expressed concern that some of them cannot qualify under the present criteria.

However, we have had statements made that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter) and the Premier do not seem to care and that they are not making representations and that they do not want more money, or that we do not need more money and so on. That is partially true, but again it is a typical example of how people use their expertise in debate to slightly twist the words that are used for their own purposes and for their own motivation.

I think what we have seen clearly on this side of the House through the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries is an approach saying that we will try to whatever degree possible to maximize the Federal response. And if at the end of the day, which is nowhere close yet, there may still be some kind of need for provincial involvement then that would still be considered and is being considered. But at the present time every effort is being made through consultation and representation to make sure that the Federal response is maximized. There are some difficulties with the criteria.

However, I firmly believe that the Minister of Fisheries in closing the debate, at a future time, will certainly demonstrate that those full time people who are totally dependent upon the the fishery on an ongoing basis, most of them,

contrary to what is being said in this House, have found it possible to meet the criteria as stated by the Federal officials. There are some people who are having difficulty. No doubt about it. And those difficulties are being addressed and hopefully will be overcome in some fashion.

So there is an ongoing concern in trying to check to see if this program, as announced, responds properly to the needs of the people who are full time involved in the fishery. If, however, there are other problems, if there are people living in what are basically fishing communities who are having difficulty qualifying for unemployment insurance for other reasons, then I do not believe that the Minister of Fisheries or the Premier or anybody in the Province is trying to see that they get included in a Response Program that is earmarked for people who are involved full time in the fishery. So there may be a difference of opinion or some people may be categorizing other workers in the community as people involved in the fishery because they live in communities that largely depend on the fishery. And maybe some of those other people are not qualifying this year for unemployment insurance programs, but that does not mean that they should be rolled into a Fishery Response Program. That may have happened in the past.

And I guess some people on the different side of the House might even argue that that has merits, that regardless of what they are involved in, if there is a program out there with money in it that you try to get everybody into it whether they are in the fishery or not. But you have to differentiate at times and say if

it is for the fishery use it for people who are legitimately involved in the fishery, maximize the use of it for people who are legitimately involved in the fishery, and if there are other needs in those fishing communities where people need assistance to make sure that they qualify for their unemployment insurance benefits then other criteria in other programs are the way to address that not to try to move people into a program not designed to handle their needs.

I rise at this time, Mr. Speaker, as well on this bill relating to the fishery to ask if the Speaker would, in fact, for my education as a Member in the House, look into the propriety of using excerpts from Hansard, points raised in the debate, in a fashion that does not accurately reflect votes that were taken in this House. And I refer to a document in this case, and I would ask the Speaker to check into it at some point in time and report back to the House, that was circulated with a title saying 'Resolution on all-plants-open policy'. And I would like for a couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker, to explain the basis of my question that I would like to have answered in this House at some future point.

Maybe the rules of order concerning resolutions in this House are different from any other organization that I have ever been involved in, whether it be a professional organization, a union, a service club, or whatever. I have always understood that in the normal rules of order applying to resolutions, that a resolution to be voted on by carrying it, defeating it, or amending it and then carrying it, the only things

that can be voted on are the actual words of the resolution itself, and that any preamble does not get voted on, that any preamble that is referenced as a Whereas is only giving rationale as to why the actual resolution itself is presented for consideration, and when the vote is taken on the resolution, Mr. Speaker, the only thing that the House then has stated is how it feels on the words that come after, therefore be it resolved. Because if such a resolution is passed it means if there is an action in that it is to be done if carried in the House. If it is rejected it means there was a proposed course of action which is not to be followed through on. If it is amended and then carried it means that some different course of action other than the one originally proposed should be considered by the House and then if carried actioned as amended. So, if I might go through the resolution as stated on this paper, which was debated in this House and rejected, and the count was recorded in Hansard, it talks about Whereas the fishery is the Province's most important industry. My recollection of the debate on that day is that every speaker agreed with that pretext, with that part of the preamble, and it was based on that reason, I think, that the emergency debate on the fishery was agreed to, because it is acknowledged widely that it is, and remains, the Province's most important industry. There was no vote taken on that and it is improper as far as I understand, unless this House has different rules than any other organization, to consider a vote on something that says Whereas. That is a statement of introduction. Then it goes on to say, Whereas the fishery is now

facing a major long-term resource crisis, a statement which was agreed to by every Member that rose in the House to speak to that debate. It then talked about, Whereas it is vital that any Government response to this crisis recognizes the necessity to adopt an all-plants-open policy. My recollection as well is that every speaker that spoke said that certainly if there was not a resource crisis and if all the plants could stay open, if that was not going to be a problem, that would be the preferred way to go. But, that was only introduction and there was no disagreement in this House, that I can remember being registered by anyone, about those statements. The hon. Member presenting the resolution then got on to what he wanted the House to try to do, which the House would either agree with, or disagree with by vote. It said, Therefore be it resolved, the first part, Mr. Speaker, that the Government immediately inform this House of the basic principles of its action plan to address the fishery crisis that it has proposed to the Government of Canada. No, disagreement whatsoever. As a matter of fact the Premier stood and tabled, for public consumption, the total details of the basic principles of its action plan, available for every Member of the House and the public. No disagreement whatsoever, but at least since it is actually the beginning of the resolution, this side of the House stated if that is where the resolution had ended we would have supported it. As a matter of fact it did not even need our support because we actioned it, therefore that part of the resolution became unnecessary and redundant. Then there was a vote taken because no amendments were offered, Mr.

Speaker, from Members on either side, there was a vote taken on the last part, the second part of a two pronged resolution that went on to state, Therefore be it further resolved that this House immediately establish a Standing Committee on Fisheries so that the Government can, on a continuing basis, have the benefit of the views of the Members of this House in developing appropriate fisheries policy. It was on that basis that speakers on this side of the House stood at the end of the day and voted against that resolution. It was the only issue in the debate that day of which there was any dissatisfaction and opposition expressed on this side of the House by Members that participated in the debate, and by Members that stood at the end of the day to be counted so that they could show where they stood on the resolution. Then to find, Mr. Speaker, that a few short days later, a week later, there was a document using the record of this House, and select excerpts from it, suggesting for public consumption that there was a Resolution before this Assembly dealing with all-plants-open policy. No such Resolution, Mr. Speaker, was ever presented to this House. The reason I raise the question is to have the Speaker report back so that I will know for future time how the actual debate of this House is to be treated when it is presented to the public. The hon. Opposition House Leader rose at the beginning of the Assembly Session yesterday and talked about the media and asking them if they would consider adjusting a headline that they wrote, because he did not think that it accurately reflected the vote that was taken in the House on another Private Member's Resolution and of course, I am

sure that in past practice the media people will decide based on the request of the hon. Member, whether or not they will adjust their headline and put a correction in the paper. However we have Members opposite, for some deliberate unknown reason trying to go out and state that a Resolution was placed before this House that never existed, and are implying here on that basis that certain Members were for this thing and certain Members against it. Now if there ever was a Resolution about all-plants-open then everybody in this House would have known where the hon. Member for St. John's South would have stood, because he would have stood in this House the same as he did down in front of the plant in St. John's South the Sunday before that, when he was part of the demonstration organized and led by himself the Member for St. John's East, Members of the union, and plant workers. Because if there is any way to keep all plants open, and that plant in particular, that Member has gone on the public record everywhere as saying he is for it and to have an insinuation now through something, Mr. Speaker that unless the Speaker reports back to this House and suggest to me that I am totally in error and that this House operates differently from any other organization in the Province, to suggest that that same Member and others on this side stood and voted against the Resolution on an all-plants-open policy, I do not know the proper phrase, but it is in some way certainly a misrepresentation of a very serious nature of what occurred in this Assembly, and if that kind of thing is allowed to continue then I really believe that there is very little value in any thing that will happen in this

Assembly if it can be distorted in that fashion, so I understand the hon. Opposition House Leader rising yesterday and suggesting that maybe the media might have used a slant in a headline, but I would like to know how the rules of the House apply to preambles and Resolution, and is there any prohibition or restriction on hon. Members within the House making selective use of Hansard documents and the record of the vote in this Assembly in an inappropriate fashion. Being selective as well, Mr. Speaker, in recording where does your MHA stand. At the top it certainly talked about Resolution and all-plants-open policy, I would like the Speaker to give a ruling to the full House on that, because that was not the Resolution, there was no Resolution on that. Mr. Speaker, if I might continue, selective use, Mr. Speaker, as well at the end of that same document, distributed by Members opposite, suggesting in particular, Mr. Speaker, that certain Members voted in a certain fashion, but in no way giving the full list of who voted in which way, inappropriately addressed as it is, but then it puzzles me as to why there would be particular note of the Member for the District of Mount Pearl voting for a policy on keeping fish plants open whereas the neighbouring District, the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, and the Member for Waterford - Kenmount, no record as to how he voted at all. Now, if it is important for the hon. Member for Mount Pearl then why is it not important to state what the neighbouring District Member and representative also voted.

So, with that Mr. Speaker, I would conclude my comments on this Bill

by saying that I would like, Mr. Speaker, for a ruling to be rendered in this House for all Members to be party to and be able to avail of, as to the propriety of the misrepresentation of a resolution defeated in the House of Assembly on the basis of the actual words 'what constitutes a preamble, what was actually voted on, and what is right and proper for Members to use arising from and resulting from debates in this Legislature.

I thank the House, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to rise and speak and I look forward in a day or so, at the discretion of the Chair, having some commentary and decision rendered as to the appropriateness and propriety of that kind of action relative to votes taken in this Legislature?

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I listened with some interest to the Member for Exploits trying to squirm his way out of a tight situation. There is no doubt about the fact that the Members are in a bit of a tight bind and you could easily see why he was trying to back away from it in Parliamentary fashion. I would suggest if it is not the concern of the breakdown of the Resolution that affected the Member I would suggest it was the number of telephone calls and letters that the Members opposite have gotten since their stand was known on the

Resolution concerned.

The Member, who was rookie Member in the House, is not aware of the fact that on several occasions in the past his colleagues who were on this side for a number of years, on many occasions amended preambles because they realized that the preamble was part of the total package. And, on several occasions resolutions were amended because the preamble did not suit them. Of course, when we voted we voted upon the total context. Quite often sections were left out entirely or considerably changed, because the preamble is part of the total package that you vote on in the House.

The Member also has to be very much aware of the fact that in discussions on the future of the fishery, that the Government policy as stated by the Premier and others is quite clear, that they realize that in order to rationalize the fishery, plants must close. So the Government has already stated quite clearly and categorically that plants have to close in order to rationalize the fishery in the Province. Consequently, they are not in favour of an all-plant-open policy. The Member for Pleasantville suggested that we should put in a resolution on that alone, that all plants be kept open. It might be an extremely interesting one because we would then get on record the statement of the Premier and his direct feelings on all-plants-open and we would see what part it plays in his amalgamation, centralization and rationalization philosophy.

However, perhaps the salvation of the fishery as it exists today in Newfoundland, if it is to be left in the hands of the people

opposite we might have to rely very heavily on the Minister of Finance. Now, he is not in his seat unfortunately so, but I am sure he is listening.

Anybody who has followed, and I say this in all sincerity, anybody who has followed the career of the Minister of Finance, who has taken any of his courses, who has read any of his writings, will realize that the Minister has a deep feeling for the small rural Newfoundland community.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

Over the years, the Minister of Finance has stressed time and time again that we were not putting enough attention to keeping the small areas alive. He, in his - whatever input he had into his courses at University into his say into curriculum, would always stress the fact that there should be more to do in the schools that related to living in an outport.

And I hope that the Minister today realizes that the small outports around this Province are being seriously threatened by what is happening in the Fishery. I am not sure today whether very many Members in this House really realize what is happening. We have discussed many, many serious issues here. We have talked about Sprung and we have talked about the forestry, we have talked about Come-by-Chance and we have talked about employment. All serious issues, all affecting jobs, all affecting technology, all affecting our future.

But we have to remember that this Province was first settled because of the fishery. Hundreds of small

settlements all around the Coast grew up simply because of the fishery. People still live there and prosper because of the fishery. If the fishery is allowed to die in all or any of these little towns, then the towns and the areas around them die also. Looking at the benches opposite and when we look at the Cabinet except for the Minister of Fisheries who has had a lot of experience in the Fishery, and hopefully the Minister of Finance. The knowledge of the effect of a devastated fishery on the lives of people in the rural areas, I am sure, cannot be planted upon the minds of others simply because they have never experienced what it is like to live and fish and depend upon the fishery in smaller rural areas.

So, I hope that the Ministers, who sit around the Cabinet Table in particular, and the people who sit in the back benches and who realize that part of what has been our history is just about to go down the drain, that they will use their persuasive methods to convince their colleagues to make sure that the fishery does not die in Newfoundland.

The all-plants resolution that the Member from Exploits talked about, in itself is extremely important because if any of the plants are allowed to die, and we can come up with all kinds of reasons why perhaps companies cannot afford to keep them open. But we can come up with a lot better reasons why they should not be allowed to close. And I say again, that if a company, whether it be F.P.I. whether it be National Sea or whether it be anybody else -- and I mentioned the two of those specifically because they have larger plants and larger quotas

than anybody else -- if they for financial reasons want to back out of Burgeo, which would completely wipe out the area, if they want to back out of St. John's South, which would affect a tremendous amount of workers and fishermen, would not completely devastate St. John's or anything, but it certainly would have an effect economically and a tremendous effect upon the lives of the people who depend upon the facility for work and for a market. If they want to back out of Trepassey which would eliminate the whole south east corner of the Avalon, if they want to do that, then there is not much that can be done to stop them, they are private companies. But what can be done that the Federal Government with the backing and the support of the Provincial Government can make sure that the quotas that are assigned to these plants stay with the plants. That is one possibility. If companies know that they are leaving behind a lump of the quota which hopefully as the stocks rebuild if the management plants work, if stocks rebuild then these plants will become viable again four or five or six or seven years down the road. But once companies move out whether it be the National Sea Plant or the Trepassey Plant or the Harbour Bretton Plant, once they move out and move that quota, move the cod and other species that they process in these plants to some of their larger operations which are not operating full time now, and we know the problems they are going through. National Sea moreso than FPI. And they build up two or three or four super plants, operating twenty-four hours a day, making money for the company, providing lots of work for the people in the selected areas. We realize that the areas

which were left will always be left. It will not return to the areas they have moved out of. Everyone realizes that. So to say oh, we are only closing temporarily that, of course, is a fallacy. Because once they move out of the smaller areas there is no way they will move back. Number one, there will be no work force there in three, four or five years time. The younger people will have to pack up and move to Toronto or to Cold Lake or to Vancouver or wherever else Newfoundlanders move.

The middle age people will have to resort to welfare, because there is nothing else in any of these areas. That is what is going to happen if we allow plants to die. If the quotas are left, number one, the owners, the companies will think twice about moving out, even if they do then somebody else might be encouraged to come in, somebody who believes that the fishery can grow and prosper again might come in. You are not getting anybody to come into National Sea plant down here or to Burgeo or to Trepassey or to La Scie unless, and that is an inshore plant, maybe we should look at the larger ones too, Marystown or Grand Bank, you have a quota assigned to the plant. Because these plants cannot operate viably on what fish that is available inshore. So maybe if the Government has the intestinal fortitude to take a stand like that then the plants can be saved.

Companies say we do not want welfare. The choice is either give the companies a bit of welfare now and worry about free trade when we get to that situation. Either give the companies a bit of welfare or give hundreds or thousands of people

around the Province welfare. That is the choice that we have.

I mentioned the Newfoundlanders moving to Toronto. I happened to be there myself on the weekend to a meeting with some of the President of Treasury Board's former friends and the Public Accounts across the country.

MR. SIMMS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

And they were asking about him.

MR. SIMMS:

And they said what a fine job you were doing. What a big improvement.

MR. HEARN:

Actually they thought he did quite a good job, and he did in Public Accounts.

MR. SIMMS:

Come on, they did not say that.

MR. HEARN:

Too bad it did not carry over to Treasury Board.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

However, I got in a taxi one night and there were two or three of us and the driver said, 'Boy, he said, you fellows sound like Newfoundlanders.' He was from Badger's Quay. He had been up in Toronto around twenty-five years working. He said, 'Basically you have to work hard. You work long hours, and', he said, 'you just barely make a do of it.'

So when we talk about outport people because their way of life has been destroyed having to pack

up and move to Toronto, and it is much like in the other larger areas, but Toronto where there is lots of work - I heard somebody on radio this morning saying, 'Well, there are lots of jobs in Toronto and they cannot find work.'

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. HEARN:

Yes. And they can find an apartment for \$1,000 a month, an apartment that you would not put your horse in at home. Somebody told me they paid \$750 a couple of years ago for an apartment without seeing before they went in, there was no door and the mice scampered all over the place. A townhouse rents for over \$1,000 a month. And to buy any kind of a house, just a small two or three room bungalow, you know, that we call a modest one around the Province will cost you \$200,000 or \$300,000 anywhere near Toronto. The cost of food is a way worse than it is around here. And the cost of clothing is more expensive generally than it is in Newfoundland. So to think about moving to Toronto, unless you know the context -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. HEARN:

Oh, no, no, it is cheaper here. Oh, yes. You can travel any of the malls or any of the large stores up there you will find that the cost of food and clothing is much higher than it is here in St. John's.

AN HON. MEMBER:
That is where you go.

MR. HEARN:

No, the cost of living up there

for the average person is extremely high and you work. Both people have to work, if the husband and the wife are not working they will tell you that they just cannot make a go of it. So that is not a very great prospect for a fellow 45 years of age with six kids, getting out of a boat to try to move up to a place like Toronto.

So consequently we cannot let it happen. You say, well what is the alternative. With the poor fishery they are not doing very well. Many people in the Province will tell you, and unless you know the area, unfortunately, a lot of people who have not lived in the small areas and have not grown up there do not really realize that outport people who are used to living in rural areas, people who have depended upon the fishery can get along on very little. They might not be able to provide some of the finer things that we would want, but they own their own houses, they build them themselves quite often on their own land, which does not cost \$40,000 or \$50,000 or \$100,000 a building lot. They can provide a fair amount of their own food and even clothing, vegetables, fish, meat et cetera. Consequently, they can supplement that income. They cannot do it on Yonge Street. So when we look at what is happening, we have to look at these things because we are not just putting a few people out of work in some outports. We could be destroying a way of life that we have known for so many years in Newfoundland and we could be taking a race of people, moving them out of the rural areas either into welfare in our own larger centers or to a life of hardship in the larger areas in Canada. That is the choice we have when we deal with

the fishery.

The immediate problem that some of them are experienced fishermen who have done quite well over the past but for the last couple of years have been hit rather drastically and many of them find themselves this year without stamps enough to even qualify for UIC.

Once again the Member for Exploits said that maybe we are getting it all confused. He said, maybe there are a lot of people out in the communities who are trying to take advantage of the Fishery Response Program to get their stamps. That there may not be too many fishermen because people will tell you that most legitimate fishermen got their stamps. I will say to him, yes, he is right, the majority, over 50 per cent of the fishermen in the Province did qualify for UIC this year and some of them had to work, scrape, and move to get ten weeks of employment in the fishery. Others did fairly well because of good caplin fisheries, good crab fisheries in certain areas and stamps they got on salmon or whatever. But many fishermen, a large percentage, when you are talking about thousands and thousands the numbers amount quickly. There are hundreds who did not, solid legitimate full-time fishermen, get their stamps simply because of the fishery in their area. A complete disaster that occurred in many parts of the Province. I have whole crews in my own area, I have whole communities where the fishermen did not get enough stamps to qualify for UIC. That in turn meant that many of the small inshore plants did not work for any more than a meager number of weeks. People who every summer depend upon second shifts in

particular, regular plant workers, because with a good fishery most inshore plants worked double shifts at least for ten, twelve, or fifteen weeks. This year, because of the poor fishery we have very little or no work in relation to second shift workers, so many regular plant workers did not qualify for UIC either, so we are looking at large numbers of legitimate people, granted what the Member said to a point was true, there are many others in communities who would like to get on there, desperation, in many cases, there are a few dollars coming in the community, there is a program, why can I not get on it, and when you have hungry mouths to feed, and no money coming in since May or June you can understand the desperation. So hopefully the Province will step in to take up the slack that has been left by the programs, the Feds have been told over and over that the regulations would not work, they were told that yes, maybe there will have to be basic guidelines to eliminate abuse, because it is abuse of programs in the past that makes everybody a little more conscious of what they are doing now and harder to get money than it was earlier because of abuse, but they were told put in your guidelines but make them flexible enough to address the needs of legitimate people out there. They could easily do it by having the Fishermen's Committees, by having the Union, by having the Fisheries Officers who cover all the areas of the Province, Provincially and Federally, by having them verify who is legitimate and who is not. It could be done quite easily, hopefully it will be done, but it has to be done pretty soon. We talked about Christmas, Christmas is coming up and if you have not

made since early June and then you only made enough to pay for the bills you had run up during the spring, what prospects have you got for putting food on the table or toys around the tree for Christmas. The prospects are not very bright and that is exactly what is happening in many parts of rural Newfoundland today. The Member for Exploits said, at the end of today, the Provincial Government might step in, it is a Federal responsibility, but the Provincial Government might step in at the end of the day and I say to the gentleman that the end of the day for a lot of Newfoundlanders is pretty close at hand, so if you are going to show that you are going to do something, do not wait until it is too late, do not wait until a larger percentage of our population has gone to Toronto, do not wait until Christmas eve comes around and families find that they have nothing for the children on Christmas day and I am not trying to over emphasize the fact that it is a serious situation. I just say to you, and some of you do serve Districts where they have been hit hard this year and when you go home on the weekend, go visit some of the people and talk to them and anybody who does not know any body around their own area call some friends or colleagues you have or relatives who live in small communities where they have the fishery failure and ask them how bad is it this year and they will tell you it is pretty bad and the only hope that they have rests right here in this House and in Ottawa and unless we come up with programs to help them when they are stuck, well then the long term plans that we talk about, we will not have to worry about them because they will not be around, they will be hiring the Ryder

truck next week and heading up along also, not knowing what they are going into because they just know we can get a job, but a job in Toronto or a job in Vancouver is not like living at home, because home is where the heart is and there are a lot of people up along who would come home tomorrow, if they had a chance, and maybe with the proper management of the fishery, by keeping the plants alive, by keeping the hope alive, a lot of these people who are up along in a few years down the road, when we get back in power will get home.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for LaPoile.

MR. RAMSAY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder you know about the rhetoric of hon. Member's opposite with regard to this Government's supposed lack of caring and all this sort of stuff, my District last year, when the former Government was in power, experienced the exact same problems with the Fishermen's Response Programs, where were they then, Mr. Speaker, where were they then.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. RAMSAY:

Emergency Response Program in my District. Aha, aha, my District was left out, yes, it was, it was so. I offer that; Mr. Speaker because of the comments of the former Minister of Education, the hon. Member for St. Mary's the Capes, there is an element of blame you say, an element of blame to people in the Federal Government, fine, you speak of that, you speak of this so called element, whom do we blame. Will we blame a situation where you have a Federal system of

Government whereby the Federal Government concentrates power and concentrates voting power in the two larger Provinces, whereby decisions are being made which affect us here in our Province? And these decisions that are made will continue if the Meech Lake Accord was adopted as it stands. We would be forever seen as the Province looking for handouts from above, from the wealthy Provinces, and they would continue to see us as the poor Province which always needs help from Central Canada.

This is what hon. Members opposite would like for us to remain, as we are, with more power for the Provinces, without the financial ability to look after our own people, either through the gaining of new employment initiatives that are possible with the offset of proper programs. They see it differently, and that is fine, but to put that element of blame partially on us here in the Province and say that because of this element of blame, we have to put money into the program - now, the way you people did it over the last number of years when you, the Party opposite were in Government, automatically, almost a knee-jerk reaction. We have to be seen as doing something for our Province. So we will take some of the money, of which half of it comes from the Federal Government anyway, and put it into the program, thereby letting the Federal Government off from their responsibility. And you let those people off their responsibility and they now lie in wait with this criteria, waiting for us to react.

The Member for Humber Valley mentioned the scenario of a fire, if you saw a house on fire. Well, this house is on fire, it has burned down. The fish are no

longer there. The house burned down. Now, he said, you go and look for the owner. Well, you do not go and look for the owner, but who pays for it? The owner pays for it. The owner, if his house has burned down, will pay, either through his insurance premiums or through having to build a new house. Well, therefore, you look for the owner. The owner is, in this case, the Federal Government. The Federal Government should pay, rather than come up with a knee-jerk reaction and you react immediately. It is a matter of positioning.

Now, if we automatically take some of this money and put it in there, we are never ever going to get out of this where the Federal Government will get away from their responsibilities. Why are we where we are now economically? Well, you say there is no fish in Meech Lake. I say there is a lot of fish in Meech Lake, an awful lot of fish. And that is what there definitely is, if we are given a proper voice in a Triple "E" Senate, thereby being able to effect the policies of the Federal Government through an equal House of the Federal Government, where we would have an equal say. And, not speaking of the other equality, of language, which the hon. the Member for Humber East mentioned -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) a Newfoundland joke.

MR. RAMSAY:

What do you mean, a Newfoundland joke? It is far from a Newfoundland joke. You are the only people in the whole of the country who are voting totally against the Newfoundland idea of Canada with Meech Lake being an improper document.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RAMSAY:

A Triple "E" Senate. Time will definitely tell. And, if it is allowed to happen as it has happened now, we will be no further ahead. My children and your children will be here debating the exact same thing. Because, if unanimity were in there, do you possibly think you are ever going to get all ten provinces and the Federal Government to agree on something?

AN HON. MEMBER:

They already did with Meech Lake.

MR. RAMSAY:

They did not! They agreed amongst themselves, but the Provinces and the country itself has not agreed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RAMSAY:

You are talking about Christmas coming. Mr. Speaker, Christmas coming up, fine. The Federal Government is capable. We have not heard a word about this from Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Speaker. He conveniently, on an issue like this, dodges to one side, is being seen as helping the fishery by going to NAFO and whatever. Maybe it will take a full initiative of the federal cabinet to do this. Maybe it will take the personal responsibility of the Prime Minister to do it. But, Mr. Speaker, Christmas is coming and they are using this to their advantage in not reacting to any of the representations made by our people, and the Opposition. They are not reacting at all. They are just saying, we will fix it up. We will change the criteria, or whatever. Sixty-eight per cent of

the people in my district do not qualify under the current Emergency Response Program. That is fine. I say it is fine, that is the way it is right now, but that has to be changed, and they have been giving us assurances that the criteria will allow people, who have a traditional tie to the fishery, will be looked after.

AN HON. MEMBER:

But they are not.

MR. RAMSAY:

What do you mean, not looking after them?

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are not looking after them now.

MR. RAMSAY:

Okay, now, but say next week, or whatever.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Christmas will soon be here.

MR. RAMSAY:

Christmas will soon be here. Christmas is one month away exactly. I do not argue that. It is getting close and the Federal Government have the ball in their court. They can bat the ball around right now.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. RAMSAY:

Exactly.

You spoke of the material's component, the \$150 per work week per person on one of these programs. If we go and take some of the money from the provincial treasury which the Federal Government, as Mr. Mulroney has stated, is so kind to allow us to have, a little bit more, well

\$150. If we go and add another \$150 to that, add some Provincial Government money to it, will we be doing what is right for the taxpayers of this Province? I suggest not, Mr. Speaker, because that \$150 extra that we may put into it is \$75 federal anyway. It should, because of the fault if we want to say it, we are going to blame the Federal Government, the Federal Government should put the money into it. Why should we take the money that is required for health services, education and other important things in this Province, and the fishery, I do not mean to say it is any less important, but when the reason and the blame for the problem lies solely with the Federal Government should we take money that we need for other things and put into that? We should not.

You talked about an all-plants-open policy. Well, you have heard here in the chamber that we support keeping the plants ready for later on when the resource is brought back up to stream keeping the plants going. I personally support that kind of thing, an all-plants-open, but I do not support the resolution that you had on the Standing Committee. It is plain and simple. I voted against the Standing Committee which is part of the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. RAMSAY:
But you warped that.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we have to deal with the faceless bureaucrats in Ottawa with no measure of being able to change the Legislation of the Government of Canada in the House of Commons because of the

Senate. We have no way of changing that Legislation. If it is held up now it is seen as heresy or something, it is a terrible thing, this appointed senate. It is seen as something terrible, because of course, we have a PC Government in Ottawa and we have a Liberal majority in the Senate. Now, granted that it is an appointed senate, but that is seen as something terrible, and they will talk about it.

These bureaucrats who do not know how to set a proper criteria is someone sitting behind a desk in Ottawa, and I have spoken to some of them and asked how they ever came up with this kind of criteria when the problems are so marked, because they do not know. They think these are people going around and they are going to take their little bit of work here and there and they are, oh, a Fishermen's Response Program, we are going to get on that and we are going to use it. This is the attitude of Central Canada towards this Province, and at the epitome of this attitude and are we going to allow that to continue? And I say, no, we not allow Meech Lake to pass in its current form. And that is where the fish is in Meech Lake, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) Meech Lake.

MR. RAMSAY:
Now you keep on talking about money is the solution. Maybe we need more money as a materials component to the Emergency Response Program. Fine. Maybe we need more money, and that should be evaluated when the Fishery Response Program properly

addresses the needs of the people of the Province as required by the Federal Government.

Then we will assess it. And I am sure my hon. colleague, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter) will, if more money is needed, and this Liberal Government will see to it that the proper amount of money for materials will keep people from doing something like having to sit around because there is no materials component to the program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RAMSAY:

You heard yesterday about two new industries in Port aux Basques, something of which I am very proud to have been a part of, and I am sure that the hon. Government opposite would take some credit for it being where it is, and, of course, the former Liberal Government in Ottawa who made the initiative in the first place to put the incubator malls in place.

MS COWAN:

Who said that?

MR. RAMSAY:

The former Liberal Government in Ottawa, yes.

MS COWAN:

Oh, no.

MR. RAMSAY:

Oh, yes. Oh, yes.

Maybe not Pasadena, but Port aux Basques anyway.

One thing I wanted to speak about was one of these particular companies, X.L. Helmet which - if you want to know where Newfoundland stands right now, the

Canadian International Development Agency, I think, is the proper, CIDA, as it goes. CIDA has a program where they allow plastics equipment to be leased to third world countries. Well we have managed through X.L. Helmet to lease some of this plastics equipment for Port aux Basques to manufacture containers for the fishing industry. How many containers, you might ask are produced here in this Province now. Not very many, a very, very small percentage of the total. How many of these fish trays, anywhere from a three pound to a ten pound tray are manufactured in the Province? Very few. Most of them come from Montreal and Nova Scotia.

AN HON. MEMBER:

And Grand Falls.

MR. RAMSAY:

And this past year, a bad year in the fishery, there were 59 million containers used in this Province alone at about \$1.10 to \$1.15 per container. That is \$50 million business if we capture the whole market, even if you capture 10 per cent of the market. You are talking about a \$6 million business for this Province that has never, never ever been thought of, actually I suppose it has been thought of, but it has never been carried out before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RAMSAY:

So that is economic diversification, and that is the kind of a thing. I will just give you some of the things that Port aux is looking at in a general sense. There are a few that are very, very different, I suppose, because some of them will be

exported and will not be for a North America market at all. This Helmet Company has a contract with a company called the Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtle Company. We are going to be making teenage mutant ninja turtle helmets in Port Aux Basques, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RAMSAY:
Exporting them all over the world.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) in St. John's?

AN HON. MEMBER:
What is it?

MR. RAMSAY:
Oh, a teenage mutant ninja turtle is some new cartoon character or something which is all the craze, and they are going to be manufacturing child safety helmets with this moniker or whatever. And everybody -

AN HON. MEMBER:
The hon. Member across the floor will be the first one.

MR. RAMSAY:
- will outfit everybody in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, with one of those helmets when they are produced.

AN HON. MEMBER:
You need a hockey helmet (inaudible).

MR. RAMSAY:
And, of course, hockey helmets, yes. We have a design for a new hockey helmet. We may call it the Mariner Hockey Helmet, Mr. Speaker. We may very well call it that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RAMSAY:
We have, Mr. Speaker, also signed a deal with a company in the United States through X.L. Helmet, when I say we, the people of the area who are shareholders of this through participation, through the Community Diversification Corporation -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. RAMSAY:
No. But being a taxpayer in the Province - with an American bicycle company named Schwinn, the largest bicycle manufacturer in the United States and we are going to do the manufacturing and the assembly of all of their helmets. The bike helmets now are soon to be regulated into being required. Now they are a novelty item and you see them on some people who wear the skin tight leotards and whatnot going back and forth. But soon it will be exactly the same as motor cycles and there is going to be a huge market for bicycle helmets and helmets for skate boards and other sports and this sort of thing. There are something like eighty-three different sports that require through their regulations, helmets. Another thing they are looking at, they are doing a design with the National Research Council now on a new better quality fire helmet for fire fighters, something which is very badly needed and none of them now currently meet the standards that have been set for meeting the future regulations.

We want to get into the manufacturing of an unusual thing, this is for a Saudi Arabian market, it is a fire extinguisher

unit which goes in the wall, but the Saudis and people over in the far East apparently have regulations that require that we have a fire unit in the wall and they put a picture frame over it. This is required for their houses. We have another company which will be setting up, which will be manufacturing air-heat exchangers. I do not mention the names of these companies because, of course, the deals and negotiations and what not are still ongoing, but these are the kinds of things that can be set up everywhere in the Province given the access to markets, the access to roads, at one time the railway might be needed I suppose for some heavy equipment that might be exported, but we will have to put that on the roads now.

Defense contracting is another thing that you want to look at that Port aux Basques can have a key element in. We have 13,000 vessels going by my District every year, large vessels bringing in freight from Europe into North America going down the Eastern Seaboard of the United States. These vessels, of course, are bringing goods and services, goods mainly into the continent. What a market, Mr. Speaker, for the repair and refurbishing of vessels going transoceanic. It is an ideal market for the west coast of Newfoundland. It has never been tapped. Halifax has it now, but I would tell Halifax to beware of the future because Port aux Basques is very aggressive in this matter. Mr. Speaker, that is just some of the things.

If we are lucky enough to get the offshore going, Mr. Speaker, we also can play a large role in that, in light of pipe manufacturing, in light of heavy

steel fabrication, in light of a lot of different things that Port aux Basques can have a role to play. Now with the closure of the railway, we also do not just have the incubator mall, Mr. Speaker, we have the advantage of the railway transfer shed. A transfer shed which we were recently able to get the Federal Government to allow us to have. They were kind enough to transfer title to the Town, and that is the equivalent-- of about three incubator malls in itself, which I am sure the hon. the Member for Stephenville also has a lot of buildings out there that they can use for this kind of thing as well. I am sure some of this overflow will go all over the Province and our Economic Recovery Commission who is involved in pretty well every stage of these things, will also take some of the credit and justly so, Mr. Speaker.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am getting a bit away from the fishery but you can see the diversification that is necessary. Now while the fishery is in a lull, while the stocks rebuilds these are the kinds of things, and I suggest that you speak of the all-plants-open that is fine, but if there are industries which are employing people in these areas, and employing the majority of people in these areas, maybe some of the plants at the time that are in mothballs or whatever they have done with them at that particular time, because those plants are just operating two or three months a year, maybe those plants will not need to reopen, Mr. Speaker, maybe the economic viability of it would not be so.

I know hon. Members opposite would in five or six years time if every single plant was not open they

would say that we failed. But I would say that we have not failed because we have managed to diversify the economy, we have managed to keep most of the plants open, I would be sure at that time, and we also would then get into more secondary processing, more processing of higher value added products so that the value comes to this Province and not having half of it exported.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Labour intensive.

MR. RAMSAY:
Labour intensive, canning, product packaging.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Shelf-ready.

MR. RAMSAY:
Shelf-ready and microwave-type products. And we not only will be doing that, we will be supplying the plastic packaging, and all this is there for us. It is there for Ontario. Why can we not do it here? We can do it here, Mr. Speaker. We can!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RAMSAY:
If anyone continues to suggest even the fact that back through the years we have said we cannot, well, we know we can and we will continue to try to impress upon the people in Ottawa that we need a better say in the Senate and in Government, in general, for the country. If I were on the other side, Mr. Speaker, I would be hard pressed to suggest that an elected Senate will not do good for Newfoundland. I would be very hard pressed to suggest that.

Now, the means by which we go

about getting it, maybe they disagree with that, to offer them a way out, but I do not think it is in the best interests of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, to go against having an elected Senate which would be equal - not just elected and effective, but equal, every Province equal. That is the key.

That, Mr. Speaker, is all I have to say. I did not speak about the Act. There is very little in the Act changed. The Fishing Industry Advisory Board; pretty much housekeeping, Mr. Speaker. Having said that, I will let an hon. Member opposite have an opportunity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:
(Inaudible) and I thank the -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! Order!

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

MR. PARSONS:
I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I was so enthused, I was so excited with all the applause. I expected them to give me a standing ovation but they did not do it, and for that, I am disappointed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:
Now, you see how comfortable I am?

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of comments I have to make before I get into the actual Bill, some suggestions, perhaps, that I have pertaining to the fishery in

general. But I have to say to the hon. the Member from Port aux Basques -

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is gone.

MR. PARSONS:

He has left. But, anyway, it is nice to see someone being able to get up and say that the town of Port aux Basques is getting some new industry and is on the rebound. That is great for the Province. Those are the things we want to see come about. And I was more than interested in saying that the company there were going to make some new hockey helmets and fire-fighting helmets. Because I was a fire-fighter for a number of years, that sort of excites me, as well.

In the latter part of his speech, he mentions the canneries and this, that and the other thing that will perhaps offset the loss of jobs in the fishery. I think that is a bit of a myth, I really do. I am not saying that some people cannot be employed in this sort of venture, but it will never replace the fishery. It will never replace the loss of jobs, if we are to assume what the Premier said in his speech a couple of days ago, that a minimum of 6,000 jobs would be lost.

The other thing I want to address, and he made a lot of comment on it. That was the hon. Member and my friend from Exploits.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Your friend from Exploits?

MR. PARSONS:

I know he was not listening, so I have to repeat myself.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The old squirmer.

MR. PARSONS:

No, I am not going to call him the squirmer, I am going to say, my hon. friend from Exploits. He spoke on, and I think he asked for a ruling, really, from the Speaker, on what he called, I think, misrepresentation of facts.

I want to remind the hon. gentleman that he or the Member for St. John's South, or any other Member in the House on that day, could have made an amendment to that resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

MR. PARSONS:

You could have made an amendment, if you or the hon. the Member for St. John's South, or the hon. the Member for Port aux Basques, felt there should be an amendment in there pertaining to all plants staying open, then you should have made it.

If they wanted to just bring in a specific amendment they could have done it, but what you voted against, you voted against last and I will read it. 'Whereas it is vital that any Government's response to this crisis recognizes the necessity to adopt an all-plants-open policy.' Now that is what you voted against. You voted against it, and no matter how much my friend from Exploits wants to squirm around it, he cannot squirm out of it. You voted against an all-open-plant policy. You voted against it.

Mr. Speaker, you know certainly today in Newfoundland -

AN HON. MEMBER:

We will box him in Wednesday.

MR. PARSONS:

We will box you in, oh yes, I am telling you.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about it in many areas in Newfoundland, the emergency response program is necessary for survival, it is necessary to survive this present day. But in the few words that I am going to say, I want to address a situation that was caused, and why it is happening today. I want to go back to the past and reminisce a little on what happened in the past so we will not make the same mistake in the future. It is by our past mistakes that we should come up with better solutions, better resolutions, better commitments as it pertains to our prime resource, the fishery.

On the emergency response program, I must say, in our District with the exception of a few, not like some of the other areas in Newfoundland. Last year we were blessed with a very good fishery. I perhaps had three or four calls where some of the fisherman in my area did not get enough stamps to qualify for U.I.C. But Mr. Speaker, it is not paramount, there is not a large number. Again last year in the districts of St. John's east extern there was a fine lot of cod and most of the fishermen, at least fishermen, did get enough stamps. But again, I want to say to the hon. Members that when we talk about that program, I, many years ago had an involvement with many Federal programs, and the biggest handicap the people who raised the programs and who managed the programs was that we did not have enough money. We had the people and we had them sitting there, and they had no materials to work with. I know that there are several

programs on this emergency response program already in being and working, and I know one is, I think, on some sort of a building out on the west coast. And again, what we are talking about in the Federal Government program is \$125 a week, and my colleague from Humber Valley mentioned his name as I am mentioning now, but I want to go a little further in saying that in that \$125 a week, included in that are the contributions towards workmans compensation and U.I.C., all other contributions are included in the \$125. I do not know the exact percentage, but I do know that it is included in that \$125. It is at least ten or twelve per cent. So, what I would like to see the Provincial Government do is perhaps add to or make a special program of, and giving them the necessary materials to do the work that they, you know - to make it a viable program.

Are you going to put in the-

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

Yes, I know but it is not being specific. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars for the whole year, so the Minister of Fisheries, I know he is a man with common sense. He realizes that -

AN HON. MEMBER:

He went over a million and a half last year. (Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

No, that is not true, when you supply Newfoundland - when you give Newfoundlanders jobs, you do not waste money, you do not waste the money.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

We cannot blame it all on the Feds, we cannot blame it all on the Feds. In our program last year when we were the Government, there were three components.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

No, no, no, that was not, that was on going, there was \$3 million put in that last year.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

No, no, no. I have never heard anyone mention the political side of it, but the need was so great that the Provincial Government added a three million dollar component and the components were a topping up of materials, deferred payments on loans and interest free loans, all amounted to a substantial amount going into the pockets of people that needed it right across Newfoundland and Labrador. Mr. Speaker, what happened to our fishery and when I hear this past couple of weeks, some of the comments that were being made as solutions as to the things that are hurting our fishery, I have to laugh. I know that the Minister, I did not hear him, at one time, I think on one of the TV programs, last week mentioned the part time fishermen, Mr. Speaker. I do not know, there are a lot of young people here in this House and perhaps they have never heard of the old adage, 'the pogy', did any one ever hear people say 'I am on the pogy'? Okay, pogy is UIC. Now let me tell you something that years and years ago our grandfathers and my

father went pogy fishing in Boston, in Gloucester and they were doing the same thing then that they are doing now, they were pogy fishing, that is where the name came from because they were supplementing their salaries, they were trying to make a better living for their families. Now I heard the Premier say the other day, he was on his feet and he said 'there has to be six thousand less people in the overall fishing aspect of our environment, because it all has to do with our environment, six thousand less jobs and I imagine included in that were some of the part time fishermen and he did mention the school bus driver. He mentioned the school bus driver, he said here in one instance and he singled out the school bus driver, the people who work from September to the last of May driving a bus, now I do not know everyone here, especially the people that are involved with the Educational aspect of it knows that a school bus driver perhaps goes to work at seven o'clock, and he would park the bus at nine o'clock or nine-thirty, then he goes home, and comes back and drives the bus at three o'clock and he is finished again at five o'clock. Now the maximum amount that that man would receive, because most of them are not much more than the minimum wage, is about \$7,000 to \$8,000 a year. Would any one of the hon. Members opposite like to live on \$7,000 or \$8,000 a year? Tell me. Is there anyone over there? I cannot understand the Premier's rationale. Now if that man is energetic enough to go out and catch a few fish or go out and help in some one else's fishery, to try to make a better living, to try to raise his family with some dignity then my goodness, are we

going to take that away from him. I stated previously that that was going on in my grandfather's time. It is a traditional aspect of our way of life. I mean you cannot take it away from them.

Now, let me say the other thing. I asked a question the other day of the Minister and I know that he is going to respond because I know that the Minister has the fishery at heart. And I know that the Minister responsible, he is a responsible Minister. He will do the right thing. I asked the Minister the other day to come up with a statistic explaining to the people how much fish is caught by the part-time fishermen? I am sure the Minister is aware and I am sure that the Minister no matter what he might say in a political vein, that this part-time fishermen bit is a red herring. It is a red herring if there ever was one. I would suggest very strongly, and I do not have any statistic in front of me that the moonlighters or the part-time fishermen in the Province of Newfoundland would not catch anywhere near 500 tons of fish themselves. I do not know how many people again are aware of it but a part-time fishermen is allowed one method of catching fish, hand line with a jigger. That is all he is allowed under law.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) gill-netters.

MR. PARSONS:

Perhaps a few people do have gill nets but again I do not think it is lawful. Now the Minister of Fisheries might address that when he gets up, but from what I am lead to believe.

The other thing about those

part-time fishermen, they are out there to make a few dollars to make it better for their families. I am going to tell you one thing right straight now, and I may be hauled over the coals for it, but they are not 10/42ers either. They are energetic Newfoundlanders. I mean they are not in bed in the morning. They are up and trying to do something to try and make it better again for their families.

MR. EFFORD:

(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

Yes, the hon. Member for Port de Grave, and you know something I part-time fish, and the Member for Grand Falls, to a minor extent. But yes, I fish, I trap fish myself and several other people and I must tell the hon. gentleman one time when we first starting selling fish fresh we had twelve employees, twelve young people out of school working with us during the summer and we created that much employment. But there was nothing wrong with it, all we did again, I was dissatisfied with the money that I was earning at that particular time and I was not about to sit on my end and put up with it. And I saw there were areas that I could make the a few dollars and we did not hurt anyone, all we did we put more money in the economy. But again going back to the part-time people I would suggest to the Minister out of the numbers that are on paper, there is perhaps 70 per cent of the part-time fishermen never wets a hook. They have this, they keep renewing their licence just in case they want to go out and catch a fish, to jig a fish or whatever. Mr. Speaker, it is at least 70 per cent or 75 per cent that do not even wet a hook.

So that is a red herring. It has no bearing, glory be to goodness, we are talking about hundreds of thousands of pounds of cod. We are talking about trying to shirk their responsibility. I heard a union man on the other day, a prominent union man saying that one of the biggest problems in the fishery were the part-time fishermen. Glory be to goodness, Mr. Speaker. I am going to go back to what the Minister said on television. I was only told what he said. He said that somewhere down in his District a full-time fisherman tried to sell some fillet and a part-time fellow had been there before him. Well in my District, Mr. Speaker, it is quite different. In my District every bona fide fisherman or full time fishermen wants to sell his fish to the plants naturally to get the stamps. That makes him eligible for UIC. So you do not get a chance to buy a fish from him. And sometimes a particular fishermen do have a bit of fillet, well you can buy it readily at the door and I think this is evident right around St. John's. And I do not see anything wrong with that.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to say to the Minister of Fisheries to keep this in his mind that areas like St. John's East Extern, areas like the Southern Shore, the part-time fisherman plays a major role. In Flatrock, I pick out Flatrock because I live there and I am aware of it. In Flatrock there are about fifteen full time fishermen with a full time licence. A lot of those men are trap fishermen who have in excess five, six, seven traps plus the gillnets, up to one hundred gillnets. And the only reason why they are making a profit at it or be able to sustain what they are doing is because of the help they

get from the part-time fishermen. They could not survive. I mean, you would end up with only two crews there where right now there is fifteen, so when we look at the part time fisherman, I know that the Minister of Fisheries is going to take it into consideration and I hope that he does, but a part time fisherman plays little or no role in the problems that we have existing in the fisheries this present day, and I am sure again, that the Minister realizes that. Mr. Speaker, during the early eighties, up to 1985, we were all made aware of, through Royal Commissions, mostly orientated by the Liberal Government of the day and I could name a couple, one in particular and that is the Senator of the day, Dr. Kirby. The other day there was some reference made to the middle distance fleet, the resource short plant program, but at that particular time when the message came out from Kirby saying that by 1988 the TAC should be able to sustain four hundred thousand ton catch, we had to do something to pick up the slack, we were doing things because we felt that those people had the expertise to tell us what was going on, that is right, I agree, but in 1985 a great number of people became upset, a great number of fishermen, plant owners, business men, you name it, fish plant workers, fisherwomen and they formed an association called NIFA. Now NIFA deals primarily and solely with the inshore fishery, that is the whole kit and caboodle is about the inshore fishery, but I want to say to the Minister now, that at that particular time that association hired three biologists, three local scientists and those three local scientists, if they had been listened to in 1986, I am not saying that we would not have a

dilemma, but what I am saying we would not have the dilemma to the degree that we have it today. I do not know if hon. Members are aware of Dr. Peets or Dr. Green or Dr. Steele, I think Dr. Peets is over in South Africa now, I think that he is doing something over there for one of the Governments in Africa, but I think that we went the wrong way, I think that if we had done things differently we would not be in this precarious situation. Dr. Steele said, and I can table this for you after, Dr. Steele said or Dr. Keith said in his report it is of grave importance that the TAC is constant with good resource management, and he suggested some of the rules to follow. He said that the methodology used in ascertaining the information that was presented was not suitable. They did not know how many biomasses were out there, they did not know the extent of the cod, and I presented this paper to the then Premier in 1986. Now, I did not do the whole paper myself. I would be less than truthful if I said I did, but I played a role in it and one of my sons helped out. We had scientific people involved in it, we had some people that were involved in the Law of the Sea, and whatever, but if that had been followed again in 1986 the problem that we have today, the need out there for the people, is today's problem. As far as the fishery is concerned, from my point of view, we have to make sure that the mistakes that we made cannot reoccur if we are going to have a viable industry. My friend for Carbonear (Mr. Reid) realizes that, and my friend for Harbour Grace (Mr. Crane), we all realize that, but the point remains when I voted for to keep all-plants-open this is what I was thinking about. I think the

Federal Government has a responsibility to bring in a program where all people can sustain the livelihoods that they have without moving, without doing anything only staying where they are.

Mr. Speaker, with that I will adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn I would like to point out that for a couple of years, or a year and a half, we have had a Committee in the House working on rules, and having a look at our Standing Orders. They have done a fair amount of work on possible changes to Standing Orders of the House. Two of the key members involved, I think particularly the former Member for Fogo and the former Member for Lewisporte, I believe, were rather key on the Committee. A report, I believe, is available from that Committee and what I would like to do now is announce a new Committee of rules to, over the next short while, to have a look at the report of the previous Committee and bring in recommendations concerning changes to our Standing Orders. I would like to appoint the MHAs for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), Humber West (Mr. Dicks), Bonavista South (Mr. Gover), and Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Walsh), to do that job for us, and I believe there are copies available of the report or the work done by the previous Committee that they can get a start on. I would like to suggest

that perhaps they get together for a couple of minutes immediately after the adjournment of the Session and appoint their Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we would be happy to second that motion. Obviously, we agree with House rules reform because it was under the previous Administration that the other Committee was set up, as a matter of fact. The only thing I would say is that I do not believe that this Committee's report was ever tabled. No it was not ever tabled, so it is not a public document, it is a draft document but certainly the Members of the new Committee could have a look at it without any difficulty.

The only other thing that I would suggest to the Government House Leader that we might include in the motion is, that the Committee be charged with the responsibility of bringing back its recommendations no later than fourteen days after the opening of the new session of the House in the spring of the year. So that we have a time limit, and we know exactly when we have to do it. No later than fourteen days. If that was agreeable to him and I would sort of include that in the motion rather than amending it or anything like that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Perhaps, if we word it slightly differently, if we put a calendar limit on it and report back to the

House no later than the end of March.

MR. SIMMS:

I think it should be when the House opens, because the House might not open until April knowing you.

MR. BAKER:

The House also might open the 3rd of January. So I think it is better if we put the time limit on it to allow enough time. Therefore, I would suggest the 31st of March be added to the motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be willing to bet that it will be closer to the 1st of April than it will be to the 3rd of January. I am willing to bet now, but I will bet privately.

I am not going to hang this up, it is not a big deal or anything. I suggested the 14th of March, obviously the Liberals want to do something differently. They just cannot agree with us. So he says the 31st of March.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

That is what I say. What do you mean not enough time?

Mr. Speaker, the Members who have been appointed to this Committee, I can speak for most of them I am sure, have tremendous abilities and qualifications and qualities, and would easily be able to bring a report in if the House opened the 3rd of January. But again,

the House will not open the 3rd of January. It might open the 3rd of February. It might. But it certainly will not open the 3rd of January. It does not matter, he said no later than the 31st of March. Did he not? I said not later than fourteen days after the House opens.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. Opposition House Leader would just indicate what his proposal is and we could then take a vote.

MR. SIMMS:

Perhaps we could take a Division on it, Mr. Speaker. Then we will see clearly where we stand. So no later than March 31st. This might be a rash decision, we might want to hold on to this until Monday and finalize it. That is fine, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Members have heard the motion, to make sure that we know what we are voting on, we are voting that the Committee bring in its report not later than the last of March.

All those in favor of the motion, 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against, 'nay', carried.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday at two p.m.

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
 First Session - Forty-First General Assembly
 Hon. Thomas Lush, Speaker
 Mr. Lloyd Snow, Deputy Speaker
 Mr. Percy Barrett, Deputy Chairman of Committees

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Mr. K. Aylward, (Lib)	Stephenville
Mr. R. Aylward, (PC)	Kilbride
Mr. Baker, (Lib)	Gander
Mr. Barrett, (Lib)	Bellevue
Mr. Hynes, (PC)	Trinity North
Mr. Carter, (Lib)	Twillingate
Ms Cowan, (Lib)	Conception Bay South
Mr. Crane, (Lib)	Harbour Grace
Mr. Decker, (Lib)	Strait of Belle Isle
Mr. Dicks, (Lib)	Humber West
Mr. Doyle, (PC)	Harbour Main
Ms Duff, (PC)	St. John's East
Mr. Dumaresque, (Lib)	Eagle River
Mr. Efford, (Lib)	Port de Grave
Mr. Flight, (Lib)	Windsor-Buchans
Mr. Furey, (Lib)	St. Barbe
Dr. Gibbons, (Lib)	St. John's West
Mr. Gilbert, (Lib)	Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir
Mr. Gover, (Lib)	Bonavista South
Mr. Greening, (PC)	Terra Nova
Mr. Grimes, (Lib)	Exploits
Mr. Gullage, (Lib)	Waterford - Kenmount
Mr. Hearn, (PC)	St. Mary's-The Capes
Mr. Hewlett, (PC)	Green Bay
Mr. Hodder, (PC)	Port au Port
Mr. Hogan, (Lib)	Placentia
Mr. Kelland, (Lib)	Naskaupi
Dr. Kitchen, (Lib)	St. John's Centre
Mr. Langdon, (PC)	Fortune-Hermitage
Mr. Lush, (Lib)	Bonavista North
Mr. Matthews, (PC)	Grand Bank
Mr. Murphy, (Lib)	St. John's South
Mr. Noel, (Lib)	Pleasantville
Mr. Parsons, (PC)	St. John's East Extern
Mr. Penney, (Lib)	Lewisporte
Mr. Power, (PC)	Ferryland
Mr. Ramsay, (Lib)	LaPoile
Mr. Reid, (Lib)	Carbonear
Mr. Rideout, (PC)	Baie Verte - White Bay
Mr. Short, (Lib)	St. George's
Mr. Simms, (PC)	Grand Falls
Mr. A. Snow, (PC)	Menihek
Mr. L. Snow, (Lib)	Trinity - Bay de Verde
Mr. Tobin, (PC)	Burin - Placentia West

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
First Session - Forty-first General Assembly

-2-

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Ms Verge, Lynn (PC)	Humber East
Mr. Walsh, (Lib)	Mount Scio - Bell Island
Dr. Warren, (Lib)	St. John's North
Mr. Warren, (PC)	Torngat Mountains
Premier Wells, (Lib)	Bay of Islands
Mr. Windsor, (PC)	Mount Pearl
Mr. Winsor, (PC)	Fogo
Mr. Woodford, (PC)	Humber Valley

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
First Session - Forty-first General Assembly

Hon. Clyde K. Wells	Premier
Mr. Baker	Executive Council
Mr. Carter	Fisheries
Ms Cowan	Employment and Labour Relations
Mr. Decker	Health
Mr. Dicks	Justice
Mr. Efford	Social Services
Mr. Flight	Forestry and Agriculture
Mr. Furey	Development
Dr. Gibbons	Mines and Energy
Mr. Gilbert	Works, Services and Transportation
Mr. Gullage	Municipal and Provincial Affairs
Mr. Kelland	Environment and Lands
Dr. Kitchen	Finance
Dr. Warren	Education