



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 41

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Monday

[Preliminary Transcript]

27 November 1989

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of
Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to draw the attention of the House today to the fact that we are celebrating an important anniversary in Newfoundland, that is the Anniversary of the First Two Hundred Association. That Association was established forty years ago and it is, of course, even more important that that Association came into being because fifty years ago there was a first sailing from Newfoundland of those individuals who had answered the call to enter the Second World War.

So I would like it if the House would join with me in offering congratulations to that Group as they celebrate today.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My colleagues on this side of the House would like to join with the Government and the expressions by the hon. Minister in recognizing today the first group of 200. I believe, it was 198, actually, but they are referred to as the first 200, who left Newfoundland and Labrador. The first in the British Empire, as I understand it, to volunteer to serve in the Second World War. It is fitting and proper that this House

recognize this special occasion, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Before moving on to Ministerial Statements, on behalf of all hon. Members we would like to welcome to the galleries today three delegations representing three town councils, as follows, firstly: a delegation from the Harbour Breton Town Council in the persons of the Mayor, Calvin Bugner, Deputy Mayor, James Cox, Councilors Dan Chapman and Eric Dawe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
A delegation also from the Gaultois Town Council in the persons of Mayor - Roy Ingram, Councilors Ron Simms, Gordon Hunt, Glen Rogers, and Town Clerk - Sylvain Rose.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
And from the Gambo Town Council, the great historic District of Bonavista North, the Mayor - Peter Lush, Councilors Andy Kelly, Brian Janes, Gordon Paul, and Town Clerk, Miss Effie Barkhouse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
A delegation also from the Marystown Council represented by their Mayor, Derm Welsh, Deputy Mayor, Mary Hodder, and Councilors Sam Synyard, John Baker, Pius Ducey and Vince Brenton, Town Manager, Jim Mayo, Town Clerk,

Dennis Kelly, Recreation Director,
Ken Anthony.

I am sure all the Members extend
them a welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

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

DR. KITCHEN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, during the debate last week on Bill 42 having to do with The Local Authority Guarantee Act, a number of points were made in the debate and I agreed to make available to Members of the House a complete listing of all the debts owed by municipalities, in the form of either loan guarantees, or loans from the Newfoundland Municipal Financial Corporation, and I am pleased at this moment to table this listing as of October 16th., which is the date that was used in the Bill. These Bank Loans to Municipalities, which have been guaranteed by the Province, as well as a listing of loans to municipalities by the NMFC, also guaranteed. The Bank loans total in excess of seventy million, while the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation loans are approximately three hundred and fifty-nine million, for a total municipal debt to the Province of four hundred and twenty-nine million dollars, and the amounts owed by each municipality are set forth in this listing which I am tabling. You notice for example, I do not wish to pick them out, but just by way of illustration

the first one on the list, Admiral's Beach, has a guaranteed loan of \$436,500 and a guaranteed bank loan of \$33,000 which means that the work is in progress and not in the form of the NMFC loan; it is for a total of \$470,000 and similarly the Town of Bonavista for example, owes \$6.7 million dollars, Botwood \$4.5 million and so on, they are all listed, each municipality here as of October 16th, the date that the schedule was prepared for the Bill, I am sure Members will find it very interesting to peruse these.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker first of all let me thank the Minister of Finance for providing this House with this information, this information was asked for by the Opposition when we were debating the Local Guarantee Bill a week or so ago. What I find interesting about the information provided by the Minister is actually what is missing from it. We have the NMFC guarantees and we have the outstanding guarantees that have not yet been rolled into the Municipal Financing Corporation, but I think what would be very interesting for the House, Mr. Speaker, and for the Province, and why we raised the question a week or so ago, was to try to get some understanding of what per cent of this debt was actually paid by the Province on behalf of municipalities, because that really flows then into the position taken by the President of Treasury Board when he was over here, suggesting that because the Province was paying a large percentage of that debt anyway on

behalf of Municipalities, why was it not treated as grants rather than turning up as loans and as guaranteed debt under the Municipal Financing Corporation? That was the point we were trying to get at, and while the information is very interesting and will provide us with many sleepless nights as we try to decipher it, we still do not have the ability, because the paper does not address the question of how much of this is in fact being paid by the Province. So therefore, why is it not treated as grants to Municipalities rather than debt financing.

DR. KITCHEN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. KITCHEN:
Mr. Speaker, I have another item that bears a comment, namely in accordance with section 26 subsection 1 4 The Financial Administration Act 1973, the Department of Works, Service and Transportation is authorized to commence entering into agreements for the purchase of goods and services to be delivered in the fiscal year 1990-91.

What I am tabling here are pre-commitments. One for maintenance of equipment and supplies for \$5 million, one for vehicle and equipment \$4 million, and one for maintenance and repairs \$2 million. I apologize to the hon. Leader of the Opposition for not providing a copy of this earlier.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not know whether or not the information that the Minister is providing to the House right now is even supposed to be presented on this particular order of business, I have no idea.

He has apologized, I can only accept his apology for not providing the Opposition with a copy of any Ministerial Statement that he might be making, which is the normal and courteous thing to do. Other than that, Mr. Speaker, we do not have a thing in front of us. We will have to have a look at it when we get an opportunity, and see whether or not the Minister of Finance is trying to take the House on his back again, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy, but in his absence I would like to direct the question to the President of the Council, the Government House Leader. In view of the fact that the Province along with the Government of Canada have begun land claim negotiations with the Labrador Inuit Association, and in view of the fact that prior to the start of those negotiations the Province adopted and made public a provincial policy respecting provisional measures that the

Province would adhere to, and that would guide the Province through the course of those negotiations, and in view of the fact that one of those provisional measures the Province adopted required the Province to consult with the Labrador Inuit Association before taking any action that might impede or impact in any way on the LIA's land claims, could the Minister tell the House why it was that the Minister of Mines and Energy could execute a twenty-five year lease with the Iron Ore Company of Canada without any consultation whatsoever with the Labrador Inuit Association, thereby clearly flying in the face of the adopted Government policy and the provisional measures the Government have adopted in dealing with this particular land claims issue?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, the same issue has been raised a couple of times previously. What I will have to do is take the question under advisement. My understanding was that what was done was done properly in light of the agreements that exist and so on, and the understandings between LIA and Government. However, having said that, I will have to say to the Leader of the Opposition I will look into it and report back tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Nobody is denying the assertion that the procedure was done properly and done according to law. The problem here is that the Government in adopting their land claims policy and their provincial provisional measures policy have said they would do one thing and have ended up doing something else. Now, could the Minister tell the House this: On every occasion, as I understand it, when the Government negotiators have sat down with the LIA negotiators they have repeatedly said to those negotiators, 'We must bargain in good faith. We must trust each other.' Can the Minister explain to the House how this failure to consult with the LIA on this particular Strange Lake lease squares with the position the Government negotiators are taking every time they meet around the negotiating table of bargaining in good faith and trusting each other.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, the rhetoric of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is interesting, but because he states something to be so does not necessarily mean that it is so.

As I indicated to him, I will look into the situation. I am absolutely certain that what is being done is being done properly, and just because the Leader of the Opposition says that no negotiations are being done in good faith and so on, does not mean that that situation exists, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting how the Government House Leader can take words and twist them to mean something different. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a fact: The Labrador Inuit Association have now said publicly that they feel betrayed by the actions of this Government, and in particular the Minister of Mines and Energy, over this Strange Lake lease. That is their public commentary, Mr. Speaker, not my rhetoric.

Now, would the Minister tell the House this: What action does the Government intend to take now to correct this betrayal and to get those negotiations back on track with a view to settling the outstanding issues in a co-operative and consultative way? What is the Government going to do to get the negotiations moving again, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my information is that the negotiations are on track. There is no need to get them back on track because they are on track, and I refuse to take part in verbal repartee that will inflame unnecessarily what is going on now.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, the LIA is not the only group in this Province feeling betrayed by this Government. I can tell you the

people of Grand Falls certainly feel the same way, and for very good reason.

Last Friday, my questions to the Minister of Justice: The Minister of Justice, last Friday, November 24th, said in Hansard, Page R14, and I quote, 'Why, one may ask, was a court built in Grand Falls to start with?' First of all, I point out to him, a court was not built, the court has been there for years. It is a courthouse we are talking about. Mr. Speaker, there is lots of evidence of the need for that courthouse. Grand Falls, for example, had a resident Superior Court Judge before any other community in Central Newfoundland, including Gander. The Bar Association in Grand Falls petitioned for a new courthouse, the Chief Justice recommended it, indeed, I spoke to him personally about it. The Chamber of Commerce, the Town Council, judges in Grand Falls, visiting judiciary, recommended by Public Works, recommended by his own Department, and even the Premier, Mr. Speaker, wanted a courthouse in Central Newfoundland, albeit in Windsor.

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister now agree that the slight towards Grand Falls and Central Newfoundland was unwarranted, unworthy, unfair and totally unnecessary? And would the Minister now publicly apologize to the people of Grand Falls for making those highly offensive statements in the Legislature last Friday morning?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. DICKS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As the hon. Mr. Justice Noel used to say in response to rather protracted questions by lawyers, I suppose there is a question in all that.

Obviously, the Member has taken something from the record and quoted it somewhat out of context, with all due respect.

What I said was, in view of the urgent needs of the Province, Grand Falls was not at the top of the priority list. So what I indicated quite clearly on the record was that Gander was and has been, particularly at the time of this courthouse being constructed, the first, foremost location at which a courthouse should have been built. That was not the case.

Now, as to the lobbying and the petitioning, the fact that it was located in the hon. Member's district should speak for itself. And notwithstanding the lobbying of this group, I can assure him that there are many groups in the Province which lobby for many things, but it falls to the Government to do the responsible thing, to do the right thing, and to address on an appropriate bases which should be done first. And, quite frankly, Grand Falls has a courthouse, and I am pleased to see it, but there is no doubt in my mind, having reviewed all the circumstances and looking at priorities both now and at that time, that Gander took priority and precedence and it should have been built there. For that, I offer no apology. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House

Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

It has not taken this Minister long to reach the arrogance level of his Premier and other colleagues in Government.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister if he would for once stop playing games and perhaps read a little less Seneca, which I think is the book he carries around with him all the time.

This particular project was worked on since 1986. The courthouse was in Grand Falls for years and years and years; it needed replacement. So it did not happen yesterday. Would he show decency for a change and give an honest and straightforward answer to the people about this question? Why exactly is that new courthouse not open, even though it was completed and due to open four months ago, last August? Can he give us an exact answer without the rhetoric?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. DICKS:

Mr. Speaker, two things: One is no, I cannot. And let me explain to the hon. Member why I am not in that position. First of all, the courthouse in Grand Falls was built when there was a freeze on Government construction. For some reason an arrangement was made, and I suspect it was when the hon. Member was President of Treasury Board, to build a courthouse with a private developer and lease it back to the Government to facilitate construction in Grand Falls, for some unknown reason again. Now, as to why it is not built, I suggest he contact the private developer who is doing it and obtain an answer from that

quarter. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe my ears. I mean, is the developer the Minister of Justice now, or should I phone the hon. Doug House or who? You are the Minister of Justice. You should be able to provide the answer if you have any interest in court facilities for the Province.

I will ask the Minister this. Obviously he is continuing to be evasive, so I would ask him to try to be a bit more straightforward. He said he cannot give the answer, he cannot give the information. Would the Minister undertake to get an answer for the House - he has been asked twice now, Friday and today - and table the information in the House in the next couple of days? It should not be much trouble. He should be interested in it, anyway.

And will he admit that perhaps the real reason why that courthouse is not open is because it is a very easy way for this Minister to save money in his budget this year, simply because it is project being undertaken in the district held by a Progressive Conservative? And will he acknowledge that this really is just another example of this Government's blatant disregard towards the district of Grand Falls and the people of Central Newfoundland? Would he acknowledge that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. DICKS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If I may instruct the hon. Member Opposite, the people of the Province have already shown that an easy way to save money in Government is to change Administrations, which they did in April.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DICKS:

What the hon. Member has said is manifestly not true. The courthouse was originally scheduled to be opened in or about the month of November, and it is somewhat delayed. As I indicated to my learned friends opposite the other day, I viewed the facility, I think it was in the month of September, and it was substantially complete at that time. The fact that I was not able to attend an opening in November does not trouble me unduly. In response to the hon. Member's question, I will try to find out why, in fact, it may have been delayed for several weeks, and let him know in due course. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. The Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I have a short question for the President of Treasury Board, the Government House Leader.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, cancelled a \$1 million contribution towards a Regional Recreation Complex for the Exploits Valley area, it delayed the water treatment plant project in Grand Falls, they cancelled the Community College expansion project, \$3 million, they cancelled Recreation grants, they

cancelled paving the southeast arterial road, and now they have delayed the courthouse opening. Mr. Speaker, how much more evidence do we need that this Government is punishing Grand Falls? And is it not true that this Government's famous fairness and balance statements are nothing more than a major sham and a bluff perpetrated on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. The Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not know which of these comments to answer. Question Period is so short, I will not try to answer them all, I will simply say to the Member opposite that because we did not carry out every single election promise he made does not indicate that fairness and balance does not exist.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries. Over this past weekend I had the opportunity to attend the Combined Councils of Labrador Annual Meeting. The hon. the Member for Eagle River was also in attendance. He was speaking on behalf of all Government Departments, and he advised those in attendance that the Government's policy with respect to the Fisheries is, and I quote, 'Those closest to the resource would be and should be the first to benefit'. Would the

Minister advise the hon. House if this is a policy of his Government?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not necessarily accept the preamble. I am sure if the hon. Member was speaking he spoke well and made a good speech, but I understand there were Cabinet Ministers at that meeting.

Mr. Speaker, the matter of adjacency is a principle the Province supports, and that is the basis on which we are now endeavouring to remove the Nova Scotian fishery, I suppose, from the 2J+3KL area. The principle of adjacency is a principle that is embodied in The Law of the Sea Conference as it relates to Labrador. Certainly I think the people of Labrador have the right to have first call on the resource. Luckily, Mr. Speaker, it appears that there is enough there both for the plants in Labrador and to be able to make a substantial contribution to the processing sector on the Island part of the Province. But the principle of adjacency is one to which this Province subscribes, certainly in terms of the national scene when it applies to outside provinces that are given certain quotas within the 2J+3KL area.

I repeat what I said a moment ago, that in the case of Labrador, I think the people down there have a right to expect that their plants be provided with an adequate supply of raw material to keep them operating.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask the Minister a straightforward question, once again. Is it the policy of this Government that those closest to the resource should be the first to benefit? Yes or no.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what more he wants. I can write him a letter after Question Period, if that will help. If that will help, I will write him a letter. I stated a moment ago what the policy of the Government is to the principle of adjacency, which means, of course, that the communities that are adjacent to the resource will get first crack at the resource. And I repeat what I said, that I see no reason why the communities and the fish plants in Labrador should not be given first crack at the resource. That is not to say, by the way, that any surplus will not go to the Island part of the Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Would the Minister kindly answer this question? In view of the fact that indeed it is the policy of this Government and presently there are something like close to 400 fish plant workers between Nain and L'Anse-au-Clair who do not qualify for UIC benefits this year, and in view of the fact that there are Labrador fish plants between Nain and L'Anse-au-Clair

that would be open today if the resource was available, why has the Minister one of the middle distance fleets fishing within sixty miles of Nain, Hopedale, and Makkovik, which has already delivered one load of fish to the St. Anthony plant and are now on the way to bringing back the second load?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, as Minister, of course, I am not following the movements of our middle distance boats on a daily basis. Now, I accept what he has said, and I promise I will take the question as notice and maybe later on, during this afternoon's session, I will provide an answer for him.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR:

I have a question for the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. The Emergency Response Program has been in place now for a couple of weeks, and this Administration has announced that it will adopt a wait and see attitude. It has now been two weeks, so can the Minister tell us how many people, fishermen and fish plant workers, registered at CEIC for the program and how many actually qualified?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I am just trying to recall, because the Minister of Fisheries and I were speaking about it just

before lunch. I do not want to quote the figure, because I might not be quite correct on it. It would probably be better to direct it to him.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Quote it.

MS COWAN:

I am not going to quote anything that I am not certain of in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR:

I thank the Minister for that substantial answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINSOR:

As the Minister has now been in her position for over six months, and in that period of time the unemployment rate in the Province has risen by, I think, 2 per cent, not counting the number of people who have moved out, can the Minister now tell this House what employment strategy her Department has to deal with this crisis in our Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There are a couple of responses to that, several in fact. First of all, we are preparing programs for the Budget, as I referenced last week when I was asked a similar question. We are at the moment

planning a meeting with Barbara McDougall, in Ottawa, hopefully to take place on Wednesday of this week, although I am not certain about that. I am going with the Minister of Fisheries to Ottawa on Wednesday to see the hon. Mr. Siddon, and we hope at that time to be able to see the hon. Barbara McDougall as well. We continue to administer all the programs that were approved in the Budget that was prepared and set before this House and voted on earlier in the spring.

MR. WINSOR:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo on a supplementary.

MR. WINSOR:

I cannot believe what I am hearing. Did I hear the Minister say she is going to deal with the crisis next year?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINSOR:

In my district, nearly 200 people have already left Fogo Island to seek work on the Mainland, and of the 200 who registered for the CEIC Emergency Response Program, only sixty got employment. Has the Minister some kind of a strategy in place for communities like Fogo, that have been devastated by the fishery? They will not qualify for the Emergency Response Program, so what are these people going to do this winter? Does the Minister have a program to deal specifically with rural Newfoundland which has communities that are suffering because of her inability to put programs in place from the Province, not Ottawa - from the

Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

I just told the hon. gentleman in my previous comments that I am going to Ottawa to discuss these matters with the hon. Mr. Siddon and the hon. Barbara McDougall.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the absence of the Minister of Mines and Energy, I direct this to the Government House Leader. Recently, in answer to a question from the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier indicated that the constitutional entrenchment of the Atlantic Accord was not a Government priority. However, sometime ago, in a Ministerial Statement, the Minister of Mines and Energy indicated that the Province was fighting for all it was worth for all the industrial benefits we were entitled to under the Atlantic Accord. If the Accord is so important, why is Government not pursuing its entrenchment more forcefully?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, as has been stated a number of times in the House, discussions are proceeding with regards to the implementation of previous agreements having to do with Hibernia. The statement has

been made in this House that the Atlantic Accord was, perhaps, not the be-all and end-all, that it was perhaps signed for other reasons, and was something that should have been signed in 1982.

Discussions are ongoing, and negotiations are ongoing regarding the industrial benefits from Hibernia, and when something definite comes out of these discussions, this House will be the first to know. These discussions will continue regardless of the entrenchment of the Atlantic Accord.

I would like to point out to the Member opposite that the Atlantic Accord only goes as far anyway as trying to guarantee a very small expenditure on Hibernia. The only thing in the Atlantic Accord with regards to expenditure of money is a guarantee that \$1 billion will be spent on the Hibernia project.

MR. SIMMS:

What he asked was, are you pursuing it?

MR. BAKER:

The fine points of that Atlantic Accord have not been ironed out yet, so it is not a final document; a final agreement has not been reached.

So I would say to the hon. Member that we are doing now, and the discussions we are in now, goes, perhaps, far beyond what the Atlantic Accord envisioned.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

At the recent First Ministers' Conference the Premier argued for

a more powerful Senate but really did not pursue in any great way a constitutional amendment giving us more say over the fisheries. Indeed, he says provinces and premiers have too much power and that we cannot handle more power over the fisheries. Is not the Premier's preoccupation with increasing the power of the federal institutions inconsistent with our exercising rights under the Atlantic Accord?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. BAKER:

I suspect most people in Canada realize, and maybe Members opposite should start to realize, that for the smaller provinces in this country it is very important that we have a strong central Government, very, very important, because in this Country we depend upon fairness and balance.

MR. TOBIN:

You sound just like Trudeau.

MR. BAKER:

Here is somebody interjecting about Trudeau. That was not a strong central Government under Trudeau. We need fairness and balance in the Country as a whole. In this country we need to realize that the economic activity in southern Ontario is being fueled by the rest of the Country, that the economic activity in central and southern Ontario depends upon the rest of this Country and, therefore, there should be mechanisms for making sure the whole Country benefits from that economic activity. The only way to do that is to make sure that we are in fact a Country with a strong central Government. If we are simply a collection of

individual little countries put together, then we cannot possibly hope to benefit from the prosperity of central Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEWLETT:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Green Bay, a final supplementary.

MR. HEWLETT:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that having one-tenth of the say in the Senate is going to move us up very much on Confederation's ladder. I would ask the hon. Minister this: The Premier is threatening to tear up the Meech Lake Accord, and he has been confrontational with the Federal Government, is the Premier not setting a precedent that if the Federal Government so wished, they could tear up the Atlantic Accord?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. BAKER:

That is a rather strange connection to draw there. I am amazed sometimes at the gaps in logic in the hon. Member's statement. The Triple-E Senate will guarantee more equity in this country, a Triple-E Senate where the Senate is elected and equal, ten representatives from each province, or five, or whatever it happens to be - an equal number of representatives from each province and having power in the country. Other than giving us a balance of power in the House of Commons, that is the surest way to guarantee that the interests of individual provinces are looked

out for in this country.

The House of Commons is representation by population. The House of Commons is distributed according to the population in this country, therefore, the control of the House of Commons is with Ontario and Quebec combined. That is the control. And that body should exist, because there should be representation by population; but in our country there should also be equal representation by province. And I say to the hon. gentleman, do not scoff at it so easily, do not write it off so easily. It is a very important concept, one that he should have a look at and seriously consider.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

Would the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, as I know he has done before, explain to this House the method of choosing the roads projects for the provincial roads capital works program for this year?

MR. EFFORD:

Fairness and balance, boys.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I have explained in the House before, when we took over the Government on April 20 this year,

and when we were sworn in - I guess it was May 5 - at the time we had to go through the process of getting Interim Supply passed through the House, and then the Budget. In the process, there had to be some tenders called for the local roads that come under the provincial Budget, not the ERDA agreements. Under that agreement, we had to have it within the constraints of the Budget, so I said to the officials in my Department, 'Provide me with a list on a priority or on a fairness and balance basis of what is needed in the transportation system in Newfoundland. Never mind the purely political, partisan lists that the previous Government have put in there, give me a list within the constraints of the amount we are going to be putting into the Budget, somewhere in the vicinity of \$30 million.' So, that was how the list was derived at. It was compiled by the people who knew the needs of the Province without any political interference, as was done under the previous Administration, and all of them are guilty of it. The thing I find extremely interesting, Mr. Speaker, is that they just cannot believe that things are done in a fair and balanced way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

I just want to ask him a couple of short questions. First of all, would he provide and table in this House the list that was prepared by the public servants? Would he

answer this question? That section of the Bareneed road which passes in front of the Minister or former Minister of Social Services' house - I am not sure which he is now - was that on the list, Mr. Speaker? If it was not on the list, was there a separate tender given out for that section of road, after the original tenders were issued, or was it an extension of one of the tenders that had already been issued?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I will take the Member's question under advisement. Because it requires detail I do not have, I will provide him with the list in Answers to Questions.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question Period has expired.

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am presenting the Report of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation for the year ended March 31, 1989. In doing so I would like to call attention of hon. Members to certain points in that Report.

We note from the Report, people will be interested in knowing, that the consumption of spirits in the Province compares about the same as the consumption of spirits in the nation, that the

consumption of wine is somewhat less than the nation, and the consumption of beer is somewhat higher.

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, this is merely a routine procedure Presenting Reports by Standing Committees and Special Committees. It is not an occasion where there are speeches or elaborations or anything else, simpling tabling. The Minister is wasting the time of the House, and it is important because Members on this side do not get a chance to respond under this Heading. So we should keep things in strict order.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Member has a point, the Minister is simply making a very brief comment on a Report that is significant. I am sure that he is only trying to help hon. Members by his comments.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. Opposition House Leader is correct to an extent. Generally, the particular routine is for the presentation of reports with as little commentary as possible, but in the past it has been customary for a Minister to make a few brief

passing remarks.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, I will cut them very short and thank you.

I just want to point out that in the Report it indicates that we have thirty-seven liquor stores and fifty-five agency stores and that this is the highest proportion of privately owned stores in Canada. That is the point that I wanted to make there.

Members will be very interested in knowing that again this year revenue from the commissions on beer exceeds the profits on the operation of the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Marystown Shipyard Limited Consolidated Financial Statements for the year ending March 26, 1988.

These statements should have been tabled, Mr. Speaker, by the previous Government but the House was never opened so I will table them now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Notices of Motion

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act To Amend The Co-operative Societies Act".

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following resolution: WHEREAS the Premier has rejected opportunities to advance Newfoundland and Labrador by enhancing provincial rights through the Meech Lake Accord, and WHEREAS the Provincial Government has no constitutional power over the management of the fishery, the Province's most important industry, yet the Premier is prepared to scuttle the Meech Lake provision for a negotiation of shared provincial fisheries management, and WHEREAS the Premier has stated flatly that there is no point for the Province to seek more power because the Province does not have the ability to exercise it, and WHEREAS the Premier is advocating that more power over the lives of the people of the Province be centralized with the Federal Government in Ottawa, and WHEREAS there has not been such a condemnation of the ability and potential of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador since the Amulree Commission Report of 1933, which lead to Commission of Government; BE IT RESOLVED, Mr. Speaker, that this hon. House of Assembly declare full confidence in the intelligence, talent, skill, energy, and resourcefulness of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. And, be it further resolved that this hon. House

declare complete faith in the ability of the people of the Province, collectively, to handle additional power, through the Provincial Government, and exercise it to the benefit of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would now like to reply to the question put to me by the hon. the Member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) concerning the landings carried out by one of our mid-distance vessels. I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that the vessel itself was fishing for turbot on an experimental basis and that the plants in Makkovik and the Labrador Shrimp Company were both offered the catch. However, the conditions under which it had to be offered were not acceptable, and I should elaborate on that. Under the Collective Agreement with the Fishermen's Union the fish caught by the mid-distance boats must be auctioned to ensure that the top price is received and, of course, the top wages earned by the fishermen. I am told that the price offered, or agreed to, or the economics of it would not be acceptable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, could I please have quiet?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

In the case of the Labrador Shrimp Company, Mr. Speaker, certain conditions were offered that were not acceptable to that company, hence the landing had to occur in St. Anthony.

Orders of the Day

MR. BAKER:

Order 7, Mr. Speaker.

Second reading of a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Fisheries." I believe the hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) was speaking to that.

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Opposition House Leader, on a point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

I am afraid I might forget it so before the afternoon runs out I just want to advise the House that the resolution we will be calling on Private Member's Day, Wednesday, will be the resolution introduced very ably by my colleague the Leader of the Opposition earlier today. Just so all Members are aware of it, it is the Provincial Rights Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

I believe I have about six or seven minutes left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. PARSONS:

A half hour is fine with me.

MR. SPEAKER:

Seventeen.

MR. PARSONS:

Oh, glory be to God, I will not be using it.

Mr. Speaker, I covered the areas on Friday that I have concerns with as it pertains to the fishery.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would just like to remind the hon. gentleman we were wrong. It is seven minutes he has left and not seventeen.

MR. PARSONS:

That is what I thought.

Mr. Speaker, from my point of view, and many others in Newfoundland and Labrador, we consider a number of things that are paramount as to the dilemma that we find our fishery in today. Number one, we all know that the overfishing on the Nose and the Tail of the Grand Banks is something that has to be addressed and how we go about addressing it, Mr. Speaker, I suppose, the only avenue left open for us is in the diplomatic field.

I do not think we are going to use any other kind of pressures to get Portugal and the Spaniards to come to the bargaining table or just to explain to them what is happening,

that what they are doing could cause the destruction of the whole Province. I am a firm believer that if we do not stop the fishing during the months of, I believe it is January to March, when the fish are spawning, I firmly believe, I am firmly convinced and many others like me, that we will destroy our fishery, our Northern cod - I read an article by a biologist who said that he did not know, but there were some doubts about it. Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. House if there is any doubt at all, do not let it happen.

Mr. Speaker, we have made a lot of mistakes which started off with the two hundred mile limit. When the two hundred mile limit became a reality, the Federal Government should have at that time taken in all our continental shelf, the nose and tail of the Grand Banks, and have control over it. Since that day, Mr. Speaker, we have had numerous committees, numerous reports, and I would like to mention a couple. We had the Kirby report, we had a report done by Dr. Alverson, and now Dr. Harris, and I think that his report is pending and should be presented to Government within the next short period.

Mr. Speaker, now we have a new man on the scene by the name of Stein, and I think that this gentleman has to come up with a solution. I do not think that it is possible, Mr. Speaker, but he has to come up with something that will satisfy the big companies, something that will satisfy the stock market, something that will have to satisfy the Federal Government, and the unions. I mean I would not consider wanting his job, or taking his job if it was passed to me on a silver platter.

Mr. Speaker, with all the other reports that came in as it pertained to our fisheries - I do not know if we are gullible or not, Mr. Speaker, but they were accepted as gospel. I hope that this time around, this Government and this Opposition, will all speak in unison, and send a message that I do not think was ever sent before. Mr. Speaker, we want a program or programs that keep our plants open. Mr. Speaker, we want the same programs so we will keep our Newfoundlanders and Labradorians employed for the interim period. This is a renewable resource we all know, and while the renewal period is in progress we want the Federal Government to do for us what they did for the Western provinces, and bring in a program to address an emergency situation, Mr. Speaker. An emergency situation because that is what we have here in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that any Government, I do not think that any group of people in Newfoundland and Labrador who presently have discussions ongoing with this task force, should ever sell the Newfoundlanders and Labradorians down the river, because that is what they are doing. If any group in Newfoundland suggest, even vaguely, that the Newfoundlanders and Labradorians had anything to do with the situation that is now in existence in our fishery, Mr. Speaker, their heads are in the sand.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would ask the Government again for all Members, not alone on the Government side, I would like to ask the Government to come around to say to Ottawa, look we are not

going to close any plants, we are not going to victimize the six thousand people that the Premier talked about. We cannot do it, it is morally wrong. They help other parts of Canada, and Newfoundland is no different. We want Newfoundland to be helped, Newfoundland to be placed with the same criteria that they use. Now we know we are not talking about potatoes, we know we are not talking about farm products, but we are talking about a renewable resource.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a mistake for anyone to place any fault on Newfoundlanders or Labradorians. The fault lies with the Federal Government and the Federal Government should take the responsibility for their own faults.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate that there is no fault whatsoever to be laid on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. They had nothing to do with this situation. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Eagle River.

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

I rise to address this Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Fisheries", and to expound a bit on some of the questions that have arisen recently about a couple of things. One thing, in particular, is the emergency response program for fishermen.

As has been pointed out in this

House, and throughout the Province via the media, in Labrador we have a particularly critical situation at the present time. We have some 250 individuals, men and women, all bona fide and full-time fishermen and plant workers, who have been told that they cannot qualify for the emergency response program for fishermen.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, myself and the hon. William Rompkey and the Member for Bonavista - Trinity Conception, Admiral Mifflin, met with the media and discussed a number of things about this particular program. I guess, the point we wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, is that in a press release on November 3rd, the Minister of Employment and Immigration, the hon. Barbara McDougall, made it quite clear that individuals who had lifelong attachment to the fishery would be given consideration in this program. I guess, where our frustrations are coming from is that at the local CEIC level, they are explicitly told to rigidly enforce the guidelines, that if you had ten full weeks in the fishery last year, you need three weeks this year to qualify; if you did not have ten full weeks last year in the fishery, you need six weeks to qualify this year.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how much it is going to take. I do not know how many statistics they want to see at the welfare lines this winter in Labrador. I do not know how many hardship cases they will want to see on television in the next few months, but I know, if they had to answer the calls I have in the last little while, they would see people are very, very desperate indeed. People have gone through this summer without any fish, through no fault

of their own. Plant workers have gone through the summer, and indeed, throughout the year, without any qualifying weeks in some cases and, in most cases, with two or three qualifying weeks.

So I wanted to again bring it up as much as possible, to bring it to Government's attention and ask the Minister of Employment and Immigration through this hon. House, if she will see that the regulation and the compassion and understanding that they articulated in their press releases and she has articulated in the House of Commons, that this flexibility is built into the program and exercised at the grass roots of this Province and be able to respond to situations like I have.

I know one particular case where I have a sixty-four year old gentleman, he was lowered into the boat when he was nine years old and for fifty-four years he has been a full-time active fisherman. Last year in the Labrador Straits we had a terrible fishery, he only had three qualifying weeks, therefore he qualified for emergency response, this year he only got two qualifying weeks and they will not acknowledge his existence, they will not acknowledge him as a fisherman at all even though he spent fifty-two years as a full time fisherman, and never in those fifty-two years had to ask for any kind of emergency assistance or have to go to welfare or anything like that. Now that is the older people, and on the other side is the younger people. I have people there that we encourage to go through the school system and try to get through grade twelve, but now they are coming out of grade twelve, Mr. Speaker, and they need

twelve qualifying weeks in order to get on the emergency response program. Everybody knows that on the coast of Labrador the fishery is the only thing, there is no logging industry, there is no mining industry, there is no great tourism industry that can take up the slack at this particular point in time, all we have is the fishery, young and old, ever since you were old enough to get into the fishing boat as I did, we all had to go into the fishery. It was the only game in town and I cannot fathom, Mr. Speaker, why, any conscious and responsible Government in our country would take these kinds of measures to actively try to displace the old and the young from our fishery in Labrador without telling us and without showing us, the alternatives that you are preparing for us. If you are going to put a mine in Labrador, well, tell us that too, but please, acknowledge, acknowledge the situation. The money is not the problem at this point in time. The CEIC office in Goose Bay is saying the money is not the problem, it is the criteria that we are being told to strictly, rigidly enforce. There is money there from this particular program that if it were freed up, if they were allowed to accommodate the hundred and thirty-five or hundred and fifty people in this particular situation, they could do so without any financial hardship to this particular program. So again I would appeal through this hon. House for the Federal Government to recognize that indeed we have hardship and terrible cases where families are not going to have a very, very good Christmas, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that in the near future that will be changed, and again we make a special plea on behalf of the

uniqueness of Labrador because at twenty-five or thirty below zero, which is what is there now on the coast of Labrador, there is no way, if the program is not brought in again now before January for the other people, there is no way we can do anything with the breakwaters or the slipways or the community stages, they are all frozen over. They had ninety-eight centimetres of snow in Nain about two weeks ago, there is no way that we are going to be able to react to those particular needs in Labrador, so it is imperative that the changes come immediately. We have been saying that now, Mr. Speaker, through the media and every other opportunity, to see if this can be changed and I hope indeed that it will. Now one of the opportunities to change some of this, one of the opportunities that was available to the Federal Government in the past number of years is for them, to institute into the Labrador fishery a proper developmental plan, one that would put accent on secondary processing and one that will indeed give them some opportunity to get at the fish next to their door. What I am saying to the Federal Government is, this principle of adjacency that they so proudly hold up and so proudly proclaim as being the answer to a lot of their problems, why is it, for instance, that that Progressive Conservative Government in Ottawa have routinely refused to give one fish of Northern Cod to our own native fish companies. If they are so proud of that principle, why did they refuse to give one fish tail of our own Northern Cod to the Labrador Shrimp Company, to the Torngat Fisheries, when at the same time they were giving portions of that Northern Cod to mainland shrimp companies in New

Brunswick, Quebec and Nova Scotia. Why are they doing that, why at this point in time, when we have the richest shrimp fisheries in the whole world, we have not got one inshore shrimp fish licence on the coast of Labrador. If they are so concerned about having that particular segment of the Province taken care of, why the fifty-three inshore licences on the island of Newfoundland, not one along the coast of Labrador. We have the richest shrimp grounds off the Hopedale Channel that you are ever going to see.

Again, when it comes to secondary processing, of all the cod that leaves the coast of Labrador, salt fish in particular, from Rigolet and on up through, at this point in time not one fish is dried on the coast of Labrador, not one; ten drying plants are in place on the Island. Mr. Speaker, we are fair people, but we cannot sell out our own economic livelihood to sacrifice the political whims of the Government in Ottawa. It is clear, it is factual, it is blatantly unfair.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to take this opportunity to again highlight a number of these things. I hope in the near future the Government of Canada, which has the authority to enforce the quotas, has the authority to ensure that licences are issued for harvesting capacity throughout the Labrador coast, will, at this point in time, have the immediate authority to put compassion and understanding into their Emergency Response Programs. And since people in our part of the Province have no mobility, there is no where to go in Cartwright or Black Tickle this time of year to look for a job, I hope they recognize that particular aspect of our

Province today.

And in our deliberations, I hope other Members will support this particular program being changed immediately, and that the particular programs of eligibility with fishery related projects be flexible enough to ensure that people living in communities where it is 25 degrees and 30 degrees below zero, that they will be able to go in and be able to provide meaningful things to their community.

In particular, I would hope that the Federal Government will allow gear replacement programs as an eligible program under this emergency response, because last year, Mr. Speaker, throughout the Labrador Straits, where we had a terrible fishery, this particular program was available. The fishermen there who had a terrible fishery were able to be helped out in two ways: the gear replacement program offered them an opportunity to buy a few nets, and it also offered them an opportunity to mend those nets and to prepare them for the next season. So, while they never had the money, they were able to garner the fishing gear, and they had work, which qualified them for unemployment insurance last year, and they were able to provide that meaningful gesture to their families and to the whole community.

This year, Mr. Speaker, the strict, harsh, and cruel guidelines that were put in place eliminated that Gear Replacement Program, and eliminated the long-time and new fishermen who are automatically associated with Labrador. I know our Minister of Fisheries responded on June 12. When I first alerted him on this

particular issue, he said, What are we going to do about it? I was there, and we made sure, in that first letter that went to that Minister of Fisheries, that there was the stipulation, 'If you bring in the Emergency Response Program this year, please allow for flexibility so that we can accommodate life-long fishermen, plant workers in the fishing industry, and please allow programs that will be of benefit to the community but will also reflect the uniqueness of Labrador.

And the Gear Replacement Program, in particular, after it was announced that it was not in, I know this hon. Minister of Fisheries FAXed off another letter to the appropriate Minister to have a review of that particular aspect of the Program. At this point we are obviously very disappointed that this particular aspect of the Program is not in place.

Let me also say, Mr. Speaker, that this particular Minister has a program in his own Department right now where if a fishermen's committee has a project they want to put in place, and if they made application for top-up funding for materials, that program is there. That program is being exercised. It is being used to get extra materials in communities. That, I think, Mr. Speaker, is a great indication of where this Government is coming from. They have been on top of this particular issue, they have offered the alternatives, and if, indeed, the Federal Government were to do as they say and implement the flexibility clause and gear replacement in this Emergency Response Program, we would indeed have a very, very good situation. Instead, Mr.

Speaker, we have hundreds of families along the coast of Labrador, hundreds of men, women, and children, who are going to have a very, very dark Christmas indeed.

So I hope, again, Mr. Speaker, that this will highlight and expose what the reality is out there and cause hon. Members to appreciate the uniqueness of Labrador and see why we always have to be consciously fitting that uniqueness into our decision-making and policy implementation process. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

If you ever heard someone talking from both sides of his mouth, I think the Member for Eagle River has just done so.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries answered a question I put to him a short time ago. I know I am not allowed to say the Minister told a lie, and I would have to withdraw it, but, Mr. Speaker, I just had a telephone conversation with a particular company in Labrador and I have been advised that that company was approached by a person by the name of David Hearn -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Curran?

MR. WARREN:

Curran or Hearn - who is in charge of the middle distance fleet, and this company was asked if they were interested in the fish that was caught in waters off Labrador.

MR. DUMARESQUE:

Which company is it?

MR. WARREN:

You just listen.

Mr. Speaker, this gentleman asked, What are the details? And, as of 3:10 p.m., when I left my office, that company had not received an answer from the Department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

Now, let me tell the hon. the Minister and his colleague from Eagle River, who was talking about the Federal Government not putting their money where their mouth is, I think it is time for the Minister and the hon. Member to wake up and not say, 'We are going to look after the people closest to the resource first,' when you are part of this Government who are letting the fish go from Labrador to the Island part of the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman went up to Labrador and was introduced as the spokesman for all Government Members, all Cabinet Members in Labrador, and sitting in the chair next to him was the Minister of Environment and Lands (Mr. Kelland).

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

But the gentleman from Eagle River was the spokesman for all

Government Departments in Labrador. I could understand the Member for Naskaupi being a little bit perturbed, to say the least, as a member of Cabinet -

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, he was not.

MR. WARREN:

- at having a backbencher designated spokesperson for Government throughout Labrador. I would say it must be very, very embarrassing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from Eagle River said, 'I was there when the Minister sent a telegram or a Fax to Ottawa.' He was also there when the Minister did not tell the truth in this House today, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What are you talking about?

MR. WARREN:

The hon. gentleman knows what I am talking about. The hon. the Minister came back with the answer. Ask the hon. gentleman what he said, then you will know.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you, it is pointless. Last year, under this Federal Government program, I say to the hon. the Member for Eagle River, the former Minister of Fisheries, and the Provincial Government of the day, supplied money for materials to get the fishplant workers and the fishermen along the Labrador coast employment. It was this Government that did it. Mr. Speaker, this time last year the program was in effect, and this time last year there was fifteen to twenty centimeters of snow, the temperature was minus twenty-five and minus thirty degrees, but the

program was carried on in heated buildings.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. gentleman, unless he is going to stand up and say to this Government and say to the people in the Province, Look, do not take the resources out of Labrador, then the best thing he can do today is get up, bow to the Speaker, submit his resignation from that party and sit with a party that has a commitment to Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Not here. No, not with us.

MR. WARREN:

Oh yes. I would have no problem with it, Mr. Speaker, because I would think, given three days on this side of the House, he will understand that we are concerned about Labrador. All my colleagues understand. But all the hon. gentleman wanted to do was lambaste Ottawa, or the Federal Tory Party in Ottawa. It is true!

Mr. Speaker, let me say one more thing to the hon. gentleman. It was his buddy, Mr. Bill Rompkey, when Mr. Rompkey was in Cabinet, who was asked by the Combined Councils of Labrador to make changes to the UIC regulations. His own buddy, Mr. Rompkey, was asked to make changes to the UIC regulations, and he was a Member of Cabinet at the time. And now Mr. Rompkey is saying it is all the Tory's fault. Your colleague, your friend, your bosom pal had the opportunity to do it.

MR. DUMARESQUE:

Do you know what is happening now?

MR. WARREN:

Oh, yes, I know what is happening now, what the Minister is already

doing with the turbot off Nain. That is what is happening. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. gentleman, before you open your mouth, make sure you have the facts. It is unfortunate that a lot of times you put your foot in your mouth because you do not have the facts. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries did not give the real facts in this House this afternoon, and I want to give notice -

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader, on a point of order.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I let it go before simply because I thought it was inadvertent on his part and so on, but it is a well accepted practice, and I can quote from Beauchesne, paragraph 494, '...that statements by Members respecting themselves and particularly within their own knowledge must be accepted.' The hon. Member continually indicates or is trying to indicate that the Minister of Fisheries is not telling the truth, and I think he should withdraw that.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

I just want to make a point on the point of order. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, if a Member comes into information that is contrary to information presented to this House by a Minister of the Crown, and a Member of the Cabinet, what

recourse does the Member have? What recourse does the President of the council suggest the Member take? The Member has indicated, and perhaps he did not word it in a proper parliamentary way, although he said at the outset that he did not want to say anything unparliamentary - he said that right at the outset -

MR. BAKER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
He said that the information he has received is contrary to the information the Minister of Fisheries gave today. Clearly, in his view that is misrepresentation of the facts, from the information he has since received. So, Mr. Speaker, there has to be some kind of consideration given to the context, and nobody raised the problem or the matter before. The Member was eloquently explaining his position, and I think that is fair ball.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Further on that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I agree with part of what the Opposition House Leader said. There is room for disputing the facts amongst hon. Members. The proper course for hon. Members to take would be to simply present his facts and indicate that they differ from the facts presented by the hon. Minister. It is not proper, and as I indicated to the Opposition House Leader, I let it go because, at first I thought it was just an inadvertent slip, but the Member seems to be persisting

in that approach so if he wants to state his facts, fine.

MR. SPEAKER:
I request the hon. Member, if he has facts to present that refute the things that were said by the Minister, I suggest that he present them, but I would also ask him to withdraw some of his comments.

MR. WARREN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what comments you want me to withdraw but if there are any unparliamentary comments that I made I kindly withdraw them. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I want to give notice that tomorrow, once I see the answer from Hansard that the Minister gave today, I just want to give notice that I will be on tomorrow, when I receive the answers, quite possibly getting up on a point of privilege of a Minister, in this House, misleading this House. Mr. Speaker, I will say this in closing, I have another commitment on behalf of the Labrador people and I will say this, Mr. Speaker, I only wish that the Member for Eagle River would continue to put his foot in his mouth, as he has been doing this afternoon in particular, what he is saying and what the Minister is saying does not coincide. With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, I was not going to join this debate but I was provoked viciously by the depths of the intellectual argument

coming across from the other side. If you listened attentively to the arguments put forward by the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains and you examine what he said, Mr. Speaker, all it was, was an examination of his credibility versus the credibility of the Member for Eagle River. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Member for Eagle River has anything to be ashamed of, he is a fine young Member, he has been exemplary in his duties and when we stack his credibility up against the Member for Torngat, Mr. Speaker, he is immeasurably, head and shoulders, beyond that particular Member. Mr. Speaker, in the short six months, let us examine the record, I have never yet in the six short months that I have seen the hon. Member for Eagle River operate as a Member, watch him walk his muddy dirty boots into the flag of Labrador, not that Member, Mr. Speaker, not that Member, I have never seen him walk that flag into the floor. Mr. Speaker, in the short time that he has been here I have not seen him spend thousands and thousands of dollars flicking around the country and the world on behalf of the Government wasting public taxpayers money. He has not done that. Mr. Speaker, in the short time that he has been here, I have not seen him construct a hundred thousand dollar personal toilet for himself, Mr. Speaker, no, I have not seen that. What have I seen, I have seen him represent the Coast of Labrador in a very dignified way and as a spokesman for the Government in Goose Bay the other night, he was exemplary and I have already had phone calls from people up there, not partisan people telling me that he was not up there. And what did he bring on behalf of the Government, did he bring a cucumber house to

Labrador, did he bring pipe dreams to Labrador or does he bring truth, honesty and dignity to Labrador.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about the ferry to Bonne Bay?

MR. FUREY:

The ferry to Bonne Bay: I am very proud about returning the ferry to Bonne Bay that that Government removed. It was a ridiculous move when you took it, I told you so, but you turned into partisan animals and removed it anyway at the expense of jobs on the south side of Bonne Bay. We will talk about that in a minute. But what did he bring, what did he bring to Labrador? I understand the hon. Member for Eagle River brought a thirty-five thousand dollar commitment from this Government to the combined councils of Labrador, when the previous Government only gave them \$15,000, so he is to be commended on that announcement as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

So, Mr. Speaker, what we saw for five short minutes from the hon. Member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was a simple regurgitation, a vicious blur of verbal vomit tossed across this side of the House. That is all it was. Strip it down and look at it. What was it? It was asking, is the hon. Member for Eagle River credible? Any reasonable, fair-minded person knows that in the six short months he has been here he has been an absolute, superb, dignified, honorable, wonderful, Member for Labrador that we, on this side, are very proud of, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:
The hon. Member is blushing.

MR. FUREY:
Well, if the hon. Member is blushing it is significant and signifies his deep humility.

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

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

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is happening here. I have been in the House for eight years and it is the first time that I have seen a Member having to stand up and defend another one. I suggest to the Minister of Development that if he has that type of a problem with the Member for Eagle River (Mr. Dumaresque) that he talk to him outside the House and not in here. You are the fellow that has the confidence problem to get on like that.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

Are you on another point of order or speaking to this one?

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker, I was going to respond to the point of order raised by the Member but since there is no point of order, as is frequently the case, I rest with your judgement.

Thank you.

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, is that not typical of the hon. Member, to get up and make that kind of a comment, then run out of the House and not stick around? If the hon. Member could give us living proof of its intellect we could determine that his intellectual dishonesty was pretty prevalent a few minutes ago.

Mr. Speaker, the whole debate and why I was provoked to rise from my seat was not in defence of the hon. Member for Eagle River, he is very capable of defending himself. When you get that kind of foolishness, petty drivel and diatribe coming from an hon. Member who is supposed to be here passing out the concerns honorably, honestly, and in a dignified fashion for his District. When you get that kind of drivel and diatribe it provokes you to stand in the House and call to the attention of all hon. Members that we all have a job here. The job here is not to cast aspersions on other Members, or to mudsling from one side of the House to the other, that is not the job at all. If the hon. Member wants to say something he should move to his own seat and have something to say. I do not mind sitting down and listening to the hon. Member if he has something intelligent to offer to the debate. If he has something intelligent to offer to the debate we are perfectly willing to listen to him.

Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is that this Government is doing all in its power, given the very

difficult circumstances that we find ourselves in, given that a Federal Conservative Government for the last five, six, or seven years, however long we have been crucified by that crowd in Ottawa, have misjudged and miscalculated viciously the cod quotas. We are a little Province and we find ourselves inheriting this position so we are doing everything in a constructive way to try to deal with this problem and deal with it in a logical, decent, and mature fashion. Full marks, Mr. Speaker, ought to go to the Minister of Fisheries and his Committee for the tremendous job they have done, not just laying out the problem, not just laying out possible solutions, but restraining themselves from being taken in by the foolish diatribe that comes daily from across the House, people who want to inflame the situation rather than deal with it in a mature and reasonable fashion, rather than dealing with it in the Newfoundland way, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to try to bring the debate back to what we are debating, which is the legislation respecting the Department of Fisheries, Bill No. 26.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill itself, of course, simply revises and replaces the Department of Fisheries Act, 1973 and also transfers to the new Departmental Act the powers, function and authority of the Fishing Industry

Advisory Board, which is presently contained in the Fishing Industry Advisory Board Act, its own Act, 1975. That is the topic we are discussing and throughout this whole debate over the last few days Your Honour has very kindly allowed Members to - I suppose it could be argued that it was straying somewhat, however for the most part most Members, on both sides of the House, took advantage of this piece of legislation to talk about the fishery, the Fishermen's Response Program, and so on. I think that is probably fair and reasonable on Your Honour's part to allow that kind of leverage, but, Mr. Speaker, I have to say while listening to the Minister of Development who just spoke in this debate and tried to portray the image of the Great Defender of a Member on that side of the House, the Member for Eagle River (Mr. Dumaresque), when we all know, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Eagle River is quite capable of defending himself, and I doubt very much if he needs the Minister of Development (Mr. Furey) to get up and try to defend him. I think the Member for Eagle River was embarrassed.

I want to follow up on what the Member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) said. The Member for Torngat Mountains, despite the fact that he attacked the Member for Eagle River - I mean, that is fair ball; he did not say anything nasty about the hon. Member, I do not believe, but he did attack him about his position, or representations he made, or whatever. The Member for Torngat Mountains did say he would welcome the Member for Eagle River over on this side of the House, should he decide to come. And that would be a matter that would have to come under some discussion, no doubt.

My experience with the Member for Eagle River is virtually the same. The Member for Eagle River, I find, is a very conscientious Member. There is no question about it. He works very hard on behalf of his constituents. And the Hon. the Member for Eagle River is quite capable, as I said, of defending any attacks that come upon him. And when I hear the Minister of Development, of all Members, by the way - of all Members in this House, for the benefit of the newer Members - of all the Members who would have the gall to get up in this House and attack another individual as he just did, attacking the Member for Torngat Mountains for ten minutes, and throughout the entire attack, kept saying we should bring this discussion back to a reasonable level, use honesty and intellect and all that kind of thing, in debate. The Minister of Development did not do it once. He spent ten minutes -

AN HON. MEMBER:

What did he say?

MR. SIMMS:

The same pious Minister, Mr. Speaker, talked about vicious vomit, talks about partisan animals full of nastiness, full of vindictiveness - himself, no question about it - talked about intellectual dishonesty, talked about diatribe, talked about mudslinging. My god, Mr. Speaker, since this House opened in June, I have not heard one Member use all of those nasty terms, many of them unparliamentary, by the way. Nobody raised a point of order, but Your Honour clearly could have called him to order when he called Members on this side partisan animals. That is clearly unparliamentary. It is not, in my own view, very nice language for a

Minister of the Crown to be using. So I say, Mr. Speaker, what gall for this particular Member, the Minister of Development! What gall! So pious! So holier-than-thou, Mr. Speaker! But you can see right through him, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and the people of the Province can see right through him. I am not surprised he does not participate in debate. But that is all I want to say. I want to say what he said. That is basically what I am doing. It is not my approach, usually, to attack other Members or talk viciously about them, but I did not like what the Minister of Development did here a moment ago, questioning the intellectual ability of another Member of the House and all the rest of it. I think that is very, very unbecoming of a Minister of the Crown, to say the least.

Let us talk briefly about some of the comments that have been made in the House in this particular debate. The Member for Eagle River spent most of his time in the debate, I guess, talking about the importance of the fishery to his area, the Labrador area, particularly, the coast of Labrador. And it was interesting to hear him attack the Federal Government with respect to its Fishermen's Response Program. He talked about the need for changes in that program, and we agree. Of course, we have been raising it in the House ourselves for the last couple of weeks, so we are comforted somewhat in hearing the Member for Eagle River finally agree with what we are saying, and hopefully, he can put some pressure on the Minister of Fisheries and others in that Government opposite, to get after the Federal Government to make

those changes which are very, very necessary, no question about it.

But, the other important point which he neglected to mention publicly in this Legislature, and a point which I believe he feels dearly about, is the point we have been raising on this side, Mr. Speaker. In the past four or five years a fisheries response program was always developed to help people get enough weeks work so they could have a reasonable income throughout the winter months or those months when the fishery was not successful. In those past four or five years, the Provincial Government of the day, which happened to be ours, always participated and had an add-on to the Fishery Response Program put forward by the Federal Government. What we have been trying to ascertain, or at least we have been trying to pressure the Provincial Government into doing is exactly that.

We know there is a problem. It is admitted to now. The Federal Members on the Liberal side, up in the House of Commons, are here today holding a press conference. Talking about the disastrous fishery season and the terrible tragedy that many people in this Province are facing because of that. That is precisely what the Member for Eagle River just finished saying, and something that we have been saying for the last two weeks. But the Provincial Government has a responsibility here as well. What is the Provincial Government going to do to help those people who, under the present guidelines, cannot participate in that program? That is the problem. We have been asking the Minister of Fisheries, we have been asking the Minister of Employment and Labour

Relations, what it is that they intend to do to try and help those people who are suffering? I am not sure, but I cannot believe for a moment that Members opposite do not realize, appreciate and understand the seriousness of the problem, because I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is serious. It is very serious. Those people who cannot qualify under that program have no income, they have nothing to put bread on the table.

So Mr. Speaker the Provincial Government, I think, should not be dilly dallying, they should not be waiting for this, waiting for that, to see what transpires. I think they should jump in, show the people of the Province their concern and their interest and put forth their own program to help those people who cannot help themselves, Mr. Speaker. That is the point of the debate thus far. Although it strayed a bit from the topic of the Bill itself. That has been the essence of the debate and the Member for Eagle River, I think, supported us in what we had to say. We support him in what he had to say with respect to the Fishery Response Program. We have no problem supporting him, that is what we have been trying to do for the last two weeks.

I would say to him that he should put some pressure on his own Government in caucus meetings or whatever to get his own Government to do something to help those people on the Labrador coast as well as people all over the rest of the Province. That was the whole essence of this debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker what the Member for Torngat Mountains was attempting to do in his brief comments today on this Bill was to bring this to

the attention of the House, and the Government House Leader raised a point of order with respect to it, today in Question Period, when he asked the Minister of Fisheries a question. The Minister of Fisheries responded, no doubt he responded with the information that was provided to him quickly by his officials. I have no doubt about that, but, of course, ultimately the Minister of Fisheries has to take responsibility for whether or not the answer is accurate. All the Member for Torngat Mountains was saying is that subsequent to his answer, he checked it out with a fish plant in Labrador, and he was told that in fact what happened was that an official from the Department of Fisheries, did call the fish plant in Labrador, did say they had some fish, do you want it? This fisheries official was then asked, what are the details? And the fisheries official apparently was supposed to get back to them with the details, but never did.

Subsequently, we understand and learn, the fish actually was landed over in St. Anthony. Now if that is true, then obviously the information that the Minister provided was incorrect. If it is incorrect, I am sure the Minister of Fisheries is man enough to get up in the House tomorrow or later on this afternoon, if he gets a chance, and say, 'I subsequently checked and the information was incorrect and I apologize if I did mislead the House in any way, shape or form, it was certainly not deliberate.' That is what you have to do, as hon. Members in this House. The same hon. Members that the Minister of Development talked about. People get up in the House they have to talk with honesty and give the information

to the Members of the Opposition who asked. But it has to be accurate information.

So I say to the Minister of Fisheries hopefully he has called his officials again and said, 'Here look, the Member for Torngat Mountains said this is what transpired with respect to one plant. What is going on? Can you get back and check it out again?' And then the Minister of Fisheries, when he closes the debate in the next few days on this particular piece of legislation, will be able, hopefully, to give an accurate picture of what transpired.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the main reasons I wanted to stand for a few minutes today is to deal with -

DR. KITCHEN:
Sit down.

MR. SIMMS:
I say to the Minister of Finance, I will not sit down. I will stay standing. The Minister of Finance is hardly the one in this House that would urge people to sit down, simply because he obviously wants everybody to follow his example and stay in his seat. So I intend to express my views and opinions, as everybody is entitled to do, who are elected to this House.

But I want to address what the Member for Exploits said in the debate, I guess it was on Thursday or Friday, when he talked about a resolution that was passed in this Legislature some time ago, the all-plants-open resolution. The Member for Exploits raised through the back door a point of order. He did not raise a point of order specifically, he just addressed throughout his comments this

issue, and he asked the Speaker to have a look at it. Well, the Speaker does not have a look at things when Members speak in debate, the Speaker would respond to points of order or points of privilege. And he talked about the resolution that was passed in this Legislature, I am sorry, defeated in this Legislature November 15, the all-plants-open policy as we called it, and it is an extraction from the resolution itself. And the Member for Exploits was trying to make a very weak argument, I thought, about preambles not being a part of a resolution. That is what he was arguing, preambles are not a part of a resolution.

Well, it is probably because of the fact that he is inexperienced, he is a new Member, and he is not familiar with legislatures and parliamentary procedures in legislatures, and so on, but, I say to him, if he had done a bit of research before he made those comments, then he would have avoided making a fool of himself with respect to this particular point. Because there are numerous examples, many, many examples in Hansards from days gone by where Members on that side of the House put forth amendments to amend preambles of resolutions on Private Member's Day. Why would they bother to do that if preambles were not part of the resolutions? That is point number one.

Point number two is, breach of order is really an interpretation by the Speaker to be put on a breach of order, rules of procedure. So, that is not the appropriate mechanism. It must be dealt with immediately, as my friend the Minister of Development discussed briefly the other day.

It has to be dealt with immediately. It was not. It was not even raised as a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, the most interesting thing I found in researching this particular issue is that Beauchesne makes several references, either under points of order or points of privilege. One. 'Statements made outside the House are not privileged questions.' The circulation of this resolution was made outside the House, so it is not an unparliamentary practice, not a breach of privilege or anything of that nature. But the most telling part, and here is what I want to quote for the Member for Exploits so that he will know the answer to this question when he talks about whether preambles are part of a resolution, Sir Erskine May, which is a well known parliamentary reference, on page 393, under the section Modification of Resolutions says in part, and this is the important part for the Member for Exploits, 'A motion modifying a resolution of the same session by omitting or altering subsidiary portions of it ...' the subsidiary portions of it are the preambles.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
Oh, yes, I verified this with the House of Commons Clerk. The House of Commons Clerk is much more of an authority than the Member for Exploits. It says 'omitting or altering subsidiary portions of it is in order, therefore' - and that is as the Clerk of the House of Commons says - 'that is the preamble.' Obviously, the preamble is part of the resolution. I mean, it is an

accepted practice; it is very weak to argue that it is not. I had to make that point, Mr. Speaker, because somehow the Member for Exploits was trying to suggest that preambles are not part of the resolution, and that is not the case. I would suggest to him that he is treading on dangerous ground if he intends to try to change all that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the only other thing I want to say about the resolution is this: When this copy of the resolution was circulated to some people around the Province to let them know the results, it essentially took quotations directly from Hansard, and that is most acceptable. That is most acceptable, because the resolution itself was quoted verbatim. Everything in the resolution, the preamble and the resolve part, was quoted verbatim and then Hansard's record -

MR. FUREY:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
And the Minister of Development just gave a great speech, attacking members over here for the way they are debating. He continuously interrupts, Mr. Speaker. I thought he was supposed to show Members on that side how you are supposed to perform.

The other thing in Hansard, Mr. Speaker, is the names of those members who voted against the resolution. Now, that is all that is here, the resolution itself and where does your member stand? All those against, and they are all listed, members of the Government side. Now, people can read. People are not stupid. They are not too green to burn, as members

opposite would suggest from time to time. It is there. Here is the resolution. It is vital that any Government response to this crisis recognizes the necessity to adopt an all-plants-open policy. In part that is what it says. Who voted against it? All the Government members who were here in the House that day. They were all there.

Mr. Speaker, I can understand why members opposite would want to try to wiggle out of it. I can clearly understand why they would try to wiggle out of it, but I think in all honesty, using intellectual honesty, that it would be very hard for them to wiggle out of it, because it is there in black and white, clear as a bell. Now, members will have to go out and explain to their constituents why, and that is fair ball. That is acceptable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:
It is clear that the Premier is away today, because there are all kinds of interruptions and interjections, and is it not great to see. I want to say this to the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island. The member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, as have other members I presume, but maybe they have not been, the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island has been tagged by the Premier as the private Member on the Government side to go around and beat the Meech Lake Accord to death, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, he is doing precisely that. We heard of his speech down in Cavendish, and then we heard reports of a speech he gave this weekend at the St. Andrew's Ball; he spoke for twenty minutes on the Meech Lake Accord

at the St. Andrew's Ball. And, Mr. Speaker, from all the reports we have been receiving from Cavendish, and from the group who went to the St. Andrew's Ball, all I can say, on this side of the House, is that we would encourage the Premier to continue using as his representative the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

We would urge him strongly to continue it, because the more often he speaks the better it is. We, of course, will have much more to say about that as time goes on and in future debates, including some of the misrepresentations the hon. member is making in these speeches outside the House. I want to make those few points.

MR. FLIGHT:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

My friend for Windsor - Buchans just cannot get over the fact that I get coverage in The Advertiser and he cannot get any. God, is he miffed about that! Every day I see him its, 'God, you are in The Advertiser again. You are in The Advertiser again. The Minister of Education is in The Advertiser today, or Thursday or whatever. The Minister of Justice will be in next Thursday, and, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Exploits will be in, no doubt, announcing that he has been twinned: He has been asked to act on behalf of the Government for the people of Grand Falls, and I say to him I hope he can get the water treatment plant going, I hope he can get the \$1 million to serve the Exploits Valley region, including his district and his district, I hope

he can get the courthouse open quickly, and I hope he can get all the other problems solved.

MR. FLIGHT:

Who made them?

MR. SIMMS:

They were not made by this Member, Mr. Speaker. They were worked on by this Member, supported by this Member, delivered by this Member, but cancelled by the Government opposite and Members on that side, and the Member for Windsor - Buchans, as well as the Member for Exploits, should hang their heads in shame.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member of Environment and Lands.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will not take a whole lot of the time of the House, but I would like to make a few comments. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for not being here for the opening of the House this afternoon, but I was outside on another ministerial commitment, defending democracy, as this side does, and reassuring the people and reiterating to the people that we are indeed under a regime of fairness and balance, that we are an open form of Government in all questions, whether it is fisheries or some other question, any other question, and I was happy to get back in before this debate concluded so I could add a few comments.

It is indeed correct to say, as the Member for Torngat Mountains indicated, I understand from my colleagues, that he attended part of the recent Combined Councils of Labrador Conference in Happy

Valley, Goose Bay over the past week, and I say part because the hon. Member from Torngat Mountains was not able to spend the whole time at the Conference and had to leave early. Conversely, my colleague, the Member for Eagle River, spent the entire time at the Conference and, in his breaks and opportunities, arranged meetings with my colleague the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, with myself, and with the Federal Member, who also attended the entire Conference on behalf of his constituents and did a very fine job.

In the event the Member for Torngat Mountains may have inadvertently misled the House with information relating to the Member for Eagle River, let me put the record straight. In the first part, the hon. the Member for Eagle River was at the Combined Councils of Labrador Conference and annual general meeting in his own right as one of the four Labrador MHAs and, secondly, he was asked by the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation to represent him at the Conference and to respond to questions that may have been put to the Minister if he had been there himself, and I must say my colleague for Eagle River did a very fine job on the question of transportation, an excellent job, and at no time, at no time, Mr. Speaker, did he ever utter the words that he was there to represent all of Government and all the Ministers. I was there for the entire Conference, which is more than the Member for Torngat Mountains can say, because he was not, and at no time did he ever indicate or give any sort of an utterance like that.

What he did say, in effect, and

what any Member of our backbenches can say, is that we have such quality in our backbenches, on occasion we can call on any of our Members, because of their dedication, their quality and their merit, to represent any Cabinet Minister at any occasion when the Minister himself or herself cannot attend. And they have exclusively and without exception done an outstanding job, and we as Cabinet Ministers are very proud of the efforts they have made on our behalf. I can say that I can think of three Members I have called upon occasionally to represent me, including the Member for Eagle River, the Member for Lewisporte, I believe, Exploits as well, and probably one or two others. The Member for Placentia, who is not here right at the moment, he also represented me and did a fantastic job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. KELLAND:
He represented me in Labrador West, and represented the Government, and did an outstanding job, I would say, based on my six or seven months experience as a Cabinet Minister, that we have more depth in our backbenches than I ever witnessed in the front benches of the former Administration, without doubt, without question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:
I would go along with that. You have more depth in your backbenches than you have in your Cabinet.

MR. KELLAND:

Sounds like sour grapes.

The interesting thing about the Combined Councils Conference, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure it would be of interest to all hon. Members, the fisheries, obviously, along the coast of Labrador is a big issue, as it is in Newfoundland, and I do not particularly recall in any way that would be significant to me, or that I would notice, that the Member for Torngat Mountains ever raised the issue during the Combined Councils Conference. I do not think he ever said the word fish. Nor did he ever flap a fin, for that matter. I do not recall him saying anything of any significance to do with the fishery - I am so pleased he is back in the House so he can hear this - but what he did do, his contribution that I can recall, was just before he left the Conference a bit early because of another commitment, he tabled for the Conference people a copy of some questions he had raised with the hon. The Premier last week in the House of Assembly to do with standardization of utility rates and so on, and he tabled a copy, obviously, of the Premier's answers. Now, that was his contribution to the Conference, as I recall it.

MR. WARREN:

And it was a good one.

MR. KELLAND:

And it was a good one. As the Member is uttering from his seat now, it was a good one. It was a good point to bring up, because what he did say, Mr. Speaker, was that, 'I am providing copies of my questions to the hon. the Premier and a copy of the Premier's answers' - nothing really to do with Fisheries, by the way. He

said, 'I thank the Premier because he gave me good answers, and I support the Premier's answers.' I am sure the hon. Member for Eagle River will recall the Member saying that.

Now, having said that, let me quote from Hansard of Thursday, November 23, page 16, one of the Premier's answers. I mean, the Member for Torngat Mountains just about fell over himself in praising the answers he received from the hon. the Premier. One of the answers is as follows, "That is an action that we took that the former Government did not take. We saw to it that there were equalized rates."

Now in supporting the Premier's answers and lauding the Premier's answers and praising them in every possible way, the hon. Member for Torngat Mountains is in a position to be against what the former Administration was doing or was perpetrating on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. I am very pleased -

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

We are having difficulty hearing the hon. Minister with the conferences taking place there in the corridor. If they are going to continue to talk, I suggest they go outside the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of

Environment and Lands.

MR. KELLAND:

Obviously, from the actions of the Member for Burin - Placentia West, he reaffirms the fact that insecurity is a fact of life. Though he cannot hear me, we do not even need the microphones really, being very close to each other.

Thank you for the ruling, Mr. Speaker, that is fine. I do not believe it was a point of order either.

I want to say something about a comment made by the hon. the Opposition House Leader. He was talking about attacks back and forth. He said, in essence, the attack by the Member for Torngat Mountains on the Member for Eagle River was totally acceptable no matter how vilifying it was, no matter how degrading it may have been, but a much milder, more responsible response from the hon. the Minister of Development was not acceptable.

Now, I suggest hon. Members opposite have a terrible double standard, where you do not do what I do, you have to do what I say'. By the way, that is the way they ran the former Administration and that is why they are no longer the Administration, I would like to suggest.

On the question of fisheries, as it was raised at the Combined Councils of Labrador Conference, it was an issue that was expressed by a lot of people who were representing fishing communities. They addressed the question to our Federal Member representing Labrador, to the hon. Member for Eagle River who has a fishing constituency, and even to me. My

constituency is not generally considered to be a fishing constituency, but there are quite a few people who live in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, and in my riding in the winter, who fish on the coast of Labrador in the summertime. But nowhere that I can recall at the session I was in was the question ever put to the Member for Torngat Mountains, nor did he ever offer any information or expression of his feelings on fishery. The single biggest issue in his riding today, and he did not raise the point, he did not answer a question, he did not ask a question, nor did he make a comment in my hearing.

So for him to come into the House following that Conference, which he partly attended, and raise the issue of how well the hon. the Member for Eagle River represented his riding, I think there is absolutely no comparison. I have already clearly stated that the Eagle River representative was there for the entire Conference; the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains spent a very short time there, barely opened his mouth except in praise of the hon. the Premier, and then left.

I would not be personal. I would not sink to the depths of -

MR. WARREN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, again I know I cannot say it, but the hon. gentleman is misleading the House. The reason I say that is that at the Combined

Councils Conference I was asked to speak, and I did speak, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

MR. WARREN:

He is misleading the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, to clarify the point, I did not say the Member did not speak. I said, I do not recall hearing him say he raised any issues or any points about the fishery, which is the biggest single issue in his district.

MR. WARREN:

You were not there half the time, you were out drinking coffee.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, I would like you to call for order. If the hon. Member wishes to speak afterwards, it is fine by me. I will listen to him in apt and rapt attention.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member is obviously quite sensitive about this issue, simply because he did not, in my hearing, raise the issue of the fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. KELLAND:

He may have done it when I was not there, but I was there on Friday, Saturday, Saturday evening and a good part of Sunday, up to noon. My colleague, the hon. the Member for Eagle River, was there the

entire Conference, to my knowledge, except when he arranged short meetings with his constituents, with Ministers and other officials, as they requested.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order!

I have asked hon. Members on both sides if they will give the Member speaking an opportunity to be heard. It is difficult to hear up here, so I am sure Members down at the back are having problems. I ask you extend that courtesy to the Member who is speaking.

The hon. the Minister of Lands and Environment.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some day, Mr. Speaker, someone will get that name right, or close to right, but thank you for recognizing me, and for your ruling.

You know, I do not want to be personal; far be it from me to ever be personal about any Member. Every Member is in here by right of choice of the people, and we should not malign each other. It is improper, it is unparliamentary. I would never, never, ever deign to vilify another Member. If facts clearly stated sometimes hurt, as they say in some places, 'Thems the breaks.' That is the way it is. But to try to get a little more humorous and not appear to be on the attack, because I am not on an attack, I am simply making a point or two: There was an old joke circulating around the House of Assembly in the last session, Mr.

Speaker, that is maybe worth repeating. When the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains had his Tory awakening, as he called it in the newspaper, and left the Liberal side to go to the Government side for reasons known to himself, the joke around Confederation Building at the time was that when the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains left the Liberals to join the Tories, he raised the average IQ of both sides. Ten seconds to think about that one. That is not an original of mine. Actually it is something we heard around the building quite a bit and had the odd laugh about, but it is not intended to be personal, against the hon. Member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Shame! Shame!

MR. KELLAND:
I am pleased to see hon. Members opposite have their sixty-second delay working. The boys on this side knew what I was talking about.

Anyway, the question of the Fishery, Mr. Speaker, is a very serious one, and it was brought home, at least by some people, at the Combined Councils Conference. The thought that I expressed to those people I met with from fishing communities when they raised the issue of the seriousness of the fishery, and the state the fishery has been allowed to deteriorate to by the Tory Government in Ottawa, is that I felt, and I still do feel, that active and good representation of their concerns is being made by my colleague the hon. Member for Eagle River (Mr. Dumerasque) and certainly by other Members on this side of the House, such as the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Efford), the Member for Port de Grave, and many others who have

spoken on the subject over a period of time and not just this session. I have absolute confidence in the Minister of Fisheries to handle the situation as it should be handled, and when decisions are made with respect to the fishery, and when we can have input and influence, the Minister is possibly, more than possibly, without a doubt, if you compare predecessors, the most competent person to represent our views at whichever level he has to, I have no doubt and no hesitation in saying that whatsoever.

MR. TOBIN:
(Inaudible).

MR. KELLAND:
The sad part about the exchanges that go on - some are in fun and some can be cutting, of course. I often recall the hon. Opposition House Leader who used to talk about, do not complain to us, Mr. Speaker, it is just the ordinary cut and thrust of debate. I think what we have seen, now that they have been disposed and are no longer in power, is that cut and thrust has become cuss and threat, which more accurately describes what they do. I would suggest one thing to the Opposition House Leader, that if he hangs his employability on his belief that he is a parliamentary strategist, then I can sincerely extend the hope that he seeks other employment.

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

I would like to have a few words

to say on this Bill. I think this is a very important piece of legislation to come before the House of Assembly, namely to debate a Bill as it relates to the fisheries of this Province. I think we should -

MR. WALSH:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. WALSH:

I stand on a point of order, but possibly a point of information is what I want. Is this the second time that this hon. gentleman is speaking to this particular Bill?

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair will take some advice on this. I do not recall if the hon. Member spoke on this Bill. Is it that hon. Members can speak only once?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Correct.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

If he speaks now he closes the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

There is one thing I enjoy about being Minister of Fisheries and that is that I get so much help from so many people, and so much advice from so many people. I suppose most Newfoundlanders, whether they are sitting in the House of Assembly, or anywhere else, are pretty well all experts when it comes to dealing with matters pertaining to the fishery,

and of course the House of Assembly is no exception. I have listened with some interest to some of the comments coming from the other side, some of which have made sense and some have made probably less than good sense. We have heard some comments, Mr. Speaker, about the Federal Response Program, some criticism from the other side as to just how effective, or otherwise, the program is in being able to respond to the needs of the people that are affected this year by a poor fishery. I have had a survey conducted, Mr. Speaker, by the Director of Field Services, acting with the Department of Fisheries, and I can now give the House some of the findings of that survey. It appears that on the basis of the survey conducted by this gentleman that there are approximately 1100 plant workers and fishermen unable to qualify for the program within the effected areas around the Province. Labrador - 110 people, Northern Peninsula and the Straits area - 300, North East Coast - 250, Bonavista, Trinity - 40 people, the Avalon Peninsula - 200, the South Coast - 125, the South West Coast - 100, for a total of 1,100 people, according to our information, who are unable to qualify under the existing criteria in various parts of the Province. My report here says these are preliminary figures only and could increase as more projects get under way. It is estimated by our staff that more than 80 per cent of this total is made up of part-time plant workers and part-time fishermen. I repeat 80 per cent of the 1,100 people who are unable to qualify are made up of part-time plant workers and part-time fishermen. The report goes on to say that the remaining numbers include full time

fishermen, 5 to 10 percent, new entrants into the fishery and new entrants into the processing sector. So of the total amount, the total number of people who now do not qualify according to this report, 5 to 10 per cent are indeed full-time fishermen. It says a further consideration is a large number of individuals who worked on a project last season, worked for a few weeks this summer in the fishing industry and now want to qualify for a project again. A more thorough assessment to firm up these figures will follow next week.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is the report undertaken by our chief field person, and I have every confidence in the accuracy of this report, and I now am quite willing, if need be, to table it in this House. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that anybody in the House would down-play the seriousness of the unemployment problem that we have in Newfoundland today. I think most Newfoundlanders will agree that given the fact that the present Government has only been in office now for seven months, we can hardly be expected to have all the answers to all the problems that have been in the making now for the past ten or twelve years. And I should remind the hon. Members Opposite, and I do not want to sound too political, but I think it has to be said, that the unemployment problem we are now facing, the problem that is causing a lot of concern in this Province on the part of Government, and I am sure the Opposition Members, and I am sure on the part of the people in Ottawa, again I repeat, it is brought about, by and large, by virtue of the inability of the previous Administration to be able

to properly cope with the problem. And I would submit to you, Your Honour, that maybe if the money that was spent on the cucumber operation in Mount Pearl, \$20 million -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

It needs to be said - \$20 million that would have done a lot towards finding alternate sources of employment for our people, certainly in the fishing industry it would have. And I am sure the hon. Members Opposite, especially the hon. Member for Kilbride, regrets that that decision was made. When it appears that we are being blamed for the unemployment crisis that we have in this Province, then I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have to remind the gentlemen Opposite that a lot of the problem, indeed most of the problem is of their making, not of our making but of their making.

Mr. Speaker, I remind the hon. House Leader that we are the Government, or course we are, and I sometimes wish that he would remember that, and accept that fact, because I get the impression that the hon. gentleman sometimes is not willing to accept that he is on the opposite side now in Opposition, and that we have been given a mandate by the people of this Province to administer the affairs of this Province at least for the next four years.

Mr. Speaker, like I said a moment ago, I am not down-playing the importance of maybe some changes to this so called response program, and I am not down-playing the importance of the need for another program that would accommodate people outside the

fishery who are trying to get in under this program, by the way, but are equally in need of assistance. To that end I have been invited to Ottawa on Wednesday by my Federal counterpart, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, who wants to talk to me about matters concerning the fishery. I am not going to Ottawa with cap in hand looking for extra money or more money, because I am told, by the way, that the amount of money that has been voted for this Program will probably be more than will be needed to accommodate the people for whom it is intended.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Under the current guidelines (inaudible)?

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, under the current guidelines.

I mentioned earlier that there are, according to my report, 5 per cent to 10 per cent bona fide fishermen unable to qualify for this Program. I intend, when I go to Ottawa, to address that problem, if that is the case. Or it might be higher. If it is higher, I want to know from the Minister what can be done right away to modify the guidelines whereby these people can become part of the program.

There is one thing we have to be careful of, Mr. Speaker, and I ran up against it in the course of our regional meetings this past fall, when we had twelve meetings around the Province, listening to fishermen. One of the questions that we put to the gathering at every meeting was, 'How do you feel about make-work programs?' I can tell you now that in every case it was unanimous on the part of those in attendance that the

fishermen in our Province do not like, indeed they do not want, the typical type of make-work programs they have been getting. The reason, of course, for that is quite obvious: they tell me that maybe less than 10 per cent of the total amount of money that has been allocated actually goes into the pockets of the fishermen themselves.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) fish plant workers.

MR. W. CARTER:

I am sure the fish plant workers benefit from it, but I was not speaking to fish plant workers, I was speaking to fishermen.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

No, let me repeat, Mr. Speaker. I said a moment ago that we had twelve meetings around the Province, well attended by fishermen. Not fish plant workers, fishermen. At each meeting we put the question, 'How do you feel about make-work programs?' At each meeting the feeling was unanimous, they were against it, the reason being, according to them, that while they are accused of getting the money and all that goes with it, only about 10 per cent of the actual expenditure ends up in the fishermen's pockets. Now I am not talking about fish plant workers, that is another thing altogether. But a large part of it, no doubt, will go to fish plant workers, some part-time some full-time, a large part of it will no doubt go to part-time fishermen, a large part of it will go to people who work for a couple of weeks in a caplin plant, for example, and a large part of it will go to people who work processing caplin during

the summer for two or three weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I keep repeating, and I hope hon. Members opposite will listen, that I am not downgrading or downplaying the importance of the Program for certain people, but I do not want the fishermen of our Province whom I represent - it is my responsibility, and I am not unaware of the problems in other sectors of the economy, but my first and foremost responsibility is to represent the fishermen in our Province and to protect their interest.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The fishing industry.

MR. W. CARTER:

The fishing industry. I do not want a continuation of some of the slanderous, nasty comments that you get from the so-called smart alects up along, the commentators, the 10/42 syndrome, the types who come up with that. I do not want to see our fishermen or the people in our fishing industry being once again put down by these people and accused of spending \$4 million or \$5 million moving rocks from one pile to another, when in fact it is not true.

Now, I said a moment ago, with that in mind, on Wednesday I have been invited to go to Ottawa to sit down with the Minister of Fisheries and that, of course, is one of the things I am going to discuss with him. And I am not going looking for more money. If, in fact, there are only 5 per cent or 10 per cent of our bona fide fishermen unable to qualify, I am going to be reminding him that the regulations, just maybe, are too rigid, and I am going to be suggesting to him that if that is the case, then they relax the regulations to ensure that

everybody who is qualified will in fact be looked after.

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) made that suggestion already?

MR. W. CARTER:

If I can continue, Mr. Speaker, yes, I shall answer the question. I have talked to my colleague, the Minister of Employment and Labour, who is well aware of this problem and is quite concerned and quite willing to do what she can to try and resolve it. It appears that the statement that was made by the hon. Barbara McDougall, who is the Minister responsible, and the intent contained in that statement in terms of the guidelines and their flexibility, has never really permeated down through the system, because the word I am getting is that people in the regional offices here are adopting an entirely different attitude toward the program than that which was intended in the Minister's statement. And that is one of the things I am sure my colleague will be reminding her counterpart in Ottawa of on Wednesday, if and when she gets the opportunity to speak with her.

Mr. Speaker, unemployment is a very serious problem, we all know that, and in the fishing industry it is equally serious. This year, for example, we know that the landings were down, we know that the landings next year will be down still further, we know, given the recommendation of the Harris panel, the preliminary report, whereby it was concurred that 190,000 metric tons would more than likely be the upper limit of the 1990 TAC, given that fact we know that in 1990 we will be having to do with probably 100,000 tons of fish less than what we had

in 1988. So when you hear demands from the other side and from others about the need for an all-plants-open policy, of course we all support the need for all of the plants to be kept open, what Newfoundlander would not? What Newfoundlander in his right mind would want to see a fish plant closed unless it was absolutely necessary or absolutely impossible to keep that plant open? We do support an all-plants-open policy if, in fact, it can be done. But, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to harvest this year probably 100,000 metric tons of fish less than we did a couple years ago, and probably 75,000 or 76,000 tons less than we did in 1989, then tell me how realistic is it to insist that all plants be kept open, as desirable as it might be?

Now, then, let us look at it, let us carry that through to its final conclusion. First of all, National Sea is a private company. They were not restructured, they are a private company which, under the laws of this Province, must give the Newfoundland Government three months notice before closing a plant. That is required, I believe, under the Labour Laws of the Province. That the plant must give a three month notice prior to its closing. Once NatSea makes the decision to close a plant, if, in fact, they are going to make that decision, then we have no say in the matter, it is a private company. Somebody reminded me on the weekend, well, the Provincial Government looks after the licencing of plants. So I said, are you suggesting now, then, that if NatSea, for example, is threatening to close the plant in St. John's that we as a lever say to them, Look, if you dare close the plant in St. John's, we are

going to lift the licence of the plant that you are now operating in Burgeo? Is that the kind of approach we would have to take? Of course not! Of course not!

The other alternative, of course, would be for the Government to insist that all plants be kept open. Then, of course, there are other problems, because we would then be required to provide the necessary subsidies to keep those plants in a viable position. So let us assume we can do that. Let us assume that the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland would be prepared to come up with the necessary wherewithal to keep all the plants going by way of subsidies. That, then, triggers another problem, one I have not heard too much about from the other side, which, of course, is the problem of countervailing tariffs under the Free Trade Agreement. That would, of course, entail a countervailing tariff being imposed on, I presume, all Newfoundland fish exports to the U.S. for an amount of money equal to what the plant was receiving in terms of subsidies, so that that would be devastating.

So, these are the problems we have. And when you talk about demanding all plants be open, I think you would be well-advised to give some thought to some of the implications of what you are saying. And I do not blame the Opposition. I guess if I were sitting over there, I would be doing the very same thing.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) keep the plants open (inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

These plants are geared up for an offshore fishery. For example, the plant across the harbour is capable of processing 60 million pounds of fish a year. That is about ten times as much as the average inshore seasonal plant would need in order to remain viable. So the plant across the harbour, unless and until it is able to attract that kind of raw material, or even close to it, then it must follow that it will become uneconomic, and, all things being equal, you will end up more than likely, in a few years or maybe less, with a beautiful, big operation, but bankrupt.

Now, let us look at FPI, Fishery Products International. They are under a somewhat different arrangement, Mr. Speaker, in that under the terms of their restructuring they are required to give both Governments three months, 90-days, notice of their intentions to close a plant. I might add, by the way, that in neither case have we received any such notice, so we are safe in assuming, I suppose that -

MR. R. AYLWARD:
(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

They are still required, if they are going to close that plant, to give a 90-day notice.

Now, let us look at FPI. The same laws of economics would prevail. If you are going to force FPI, for example, to keep their Trepassey plant operating at 30 per cent capacity, their Grand Bank plant at 30, their Fortune plant at 30, and Catalina plants at 30, I do

not think you would need to be a genius or have a degree in business administration or economics to realize that these plants would not be economically viable. Again, if the Government were to move in and subsidize the operations, as they are required to do, by the way, under the terms of the FPI Privatization Agreement signed on February 17, 1987 - let me read it to you. Clause 5 of the Privatization Agreement reads as follows, Mr. Speaker: 'If the Board of Directors of FPI at any time approves the permanent closure of a plant, the approved action shall not be proceeded with for ninety days after notice of the approved action is given to Canada and Newfoundland. In the event that either or both Canada and Newfoundland oppose the approved actions, then FPI shall continue operations at the existing levels and the party or parties so opposing that action shall assume the additional cost associated with the continuation of the existing levels of operations which are incurred after the ninety day period.

'The cost so assumed, including the loss of income to FPI, shall be determined by reference to a firm of chartered accountants agreed to by Canada, Newfoundland and FPI or, in the absence of such agreement, as determined by reference to arbitration as set out below. If both Canada and Newfoundland oppose the action contemplated, the cost associated therewith shall be borne equally. If any disagreement arises between Canada, Newfoundland and FPI with reference to, or any matter arising thereunder upon which the parties cannot agree, then any such disagreement shall be referred to arbitration by a single arbiter in accordance with

The Arbitration Act, which decision shall be binding and conclusive on the parties to this agreement.'

So what it says in layman's terms is that once the 90-day notice has been given of their intentions to close, and if either or both parties, the Government of Canada or the Government of Newfoundland, decide that the plant is to remain open, if both parties take that action, then both parties will be responsible for any losses incurred by that plant by virtue of having to keep it operating at less than full capacity after the 90 day period has expired.

Let us assume that Newfoundland were to oppose the closing of the plants and let us say that the Federal Government did not join in that opposition, then the Province of Newfoundland would be fully responsible for the total cost of keeping the plant.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Right on.

MR. W. CARTER:
The member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews), obviously, is well acquainted with the terms of this.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) as well, but they are not operating at 100 per cent now.

MR. W. CARTER:
No, they are not operating, Mr. Speaker, but they are operating at a lot closer to 100 per cent than what they will be, having had to cope with the reduction in quotas that in total would be about 100,000 metric tons.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Sixty now.

MR. W. CARTER:
Probably sixty, but I suggest to you that given the reduction in the quotas, and if these reductions are treated on a pro rata basis, then their operating capacity will probably be far less than 30 per cent, which would certainly not make them viable.

MR. HEARN:
(Inaudible) the new FPI International Act that that is eliminated.

MR. W. CARTER:
This is privatization. It is now called Fishery Products International. This is their agreement, signed on February 17, 1987.

Mr. Speaker, I guess the point I am making is that we are facing, I think, some trying times in the fishing industry in the Province, but I believe if there was ever a time when we had to be truthful about things, true to ourselves, and do the right thing, I believe the time has now come. Because if we continue to go the way we are going, and insist on, as desirable as it is, all-plants-open and there be no reduction in the number of fishermen in the industry, if all part-time fishermen and moonlighters, so-called, be allowed to continue fishing, if we insist on that, as desirable and as politically desirable as it might appear, then I would submit to you, Sir, that within a very short period of time we will not have a fishery left in this Province.

MR. TOBIN:
How do you determine what you call a part-time fisherman?

MR. W. CARTER:
The licencing for fishermen is

administered by the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans. They have certain criteria established to determine exactly what a part-time fisherman is. There is nobody on this side of the House against a Newfoundlander, a retired school teacher, a welfare officer, or a politician being able to go out in his fishing boat and jig a few fish for winter, or catch a few fish for his own table. That is so far from what is in our minds that it is hardly worth mentioning. What we do object to, and the thing we are going to object to, and I have had it and I have run up against it, is where gentlemen who are engaged in a certain industry, or certain industries or professions, highly paid - I know of one case where the person in question is earning an annual income of close to \$50,000 a year, employed for nine months of the year, and that person, Mr. Speaker, owns a longliner, or his wife owns a longliner, and when his job ceases in early summer, they get aboard their longliner and they take off for Labrador and they fish in competition with the clients or the constituents of the hon. Member for Torngat Mountains, Eagle River and others, and they come back to their hometown just before school is open and they will have made a very substantial summer's earnings. Now, I do not think that is right. If we had lots of fish, if the stocks were in good shape, of course! Why not?

They will defend their God given right, they will wrap themselves in the flag and demand their right as Newfoundlanders, as men who fought and all this sort of thing, and whose father or brother might have paid the supreme sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe those people have a real case under the present circumstances. I think that if we are going to give the fishermen in our Province a chance to survive and a chance to be able to earn a decent living for themselves and their families, to live in dignity, and to live on a par with the people in other industries in this Province, then we are going to have to professionalize the fishery and we are going to have to make it a job of which they can be proud, and not a job of last resort, or a job that will attract people on a part time basis - politicians, teachers, you name it, social workers and that, Mr. Speaker, is the only way I think we can go. Now I do not know what the Members opposite want. I suspect that they are all good Newfoundlanders and they want - I guess they are as anxious to see the fishery survive and prosper as much as anybody on this side of the House.

I have no reason to think otherwise, but I would remind them, by the way, I would remind them before they are tempted to stand up in the House, or the public media, and start talking about the status quo, you know, leave all the fishermen there, all the part-timers there, leave all the plants open, I would strongly urge them to think twice and to really be honest with themselves. Really be honest with themselves because, Mr. Speaker, I am telling you know sir, that if that is the line we are going to follow, if that is the road we are going to follow, that the fishing industry in this Province will never be able to give the people engaged in it the kind of a livelihood that I believe they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, I

do not mind a bit of talking back and forth but one at a time, please.

Alright, secondary processing. Now as all the Members might know, there has been a lot of action going on in the past three or four months on the part of Ottawa and Newfoundland. Back in July month, the Prime Minister, in his wisdom, appointed a Cabinet committee chaired by the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark, on which we have our own Federal Minister serving. Barbara McDougal and Don Mazankowski I believe, and six or seven top Ministers, senior Ministers.

Following the appointment of that committee, the hon. the Premier appointed a parallel committee in the Province, of which he is chairman, myself and the Minister of Development, Employment, Labour and Education. We are Members of that Cabinet committee. Subsequent to the appointment of the Federal Cabinet committee, they appointed an officials committee headed by Mr. Ken Stein, and that committee has a very substantial budget I am told -

AN HON. MEMBER:
And Ray Andrews.

MR. W. CARTER:
- and Ray Andrews - came to Newfoundland, set up an office here, to assess the problem on the job, on the site as it were. And then of course to work with that public officials committee, the Province then appointed a similar committee to work with them.

The Provincial officials committee is chaired by David Vardy, who is the Deputy Minister of Fisheries. And Mr. Vardy was seconded on a full time basis about a month and a half ago. So, now he is giving

it I would say about seven days a week, I would be as bold to say about eighteen to twenty hours a day. The man is spending all of his time working on that problem. I -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Who is that?

MR. W. CARTER:
David Vardy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have to clue up in a few minutes, but I want the House to know that both committees are working well together. I suppose for the first time yet, for the first time ever, we have a Federal Committee that is now prepared to listen to a provincial committee. And our Committee under the Chairmanship of David Vardy is having a lot of input into some of the solutions that are being sought out to deal with the fishery crisis. I am hoping, if and when it becomes necessary for FPI or NatSea to make a decision to close a plant, I hope it never comes to that but I expect it will, then I expect by the time that announcement is made, that there can be a further announcement made by both the Province and the Federal Government outlining exactly what type of assistance will be available to enable the people affected by that closure to overcome the problem and to keep body and soul together.

I believe that we are now in a position of being able to do something big for the fishing industry of this Province. And while the short-term pain might be at times almost unbearable, I think the long-term gain will be very welcome.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have listened

with interest to some of the-

AN HON. MEMBER:

The stocks will rebuild.

MR. W. CARTER:

And the stocks will rebuild, and I can tell you now that if and when the stocks rebuild, those that are now displaced from the fishery, if in fact there are people displaced, they will be given the opportunity to go back into the fishery. But what we will do in the meantime, those who are displaced we will endeavor to provide an alternate source of employment for them or help, and that is what it is all about.

Because I can tell you now that not everybody in the fishing industry, especially not every part-time fishermen, wants to be a part-time fishermen, he is there because he has no choice in the matter in many cases. So if we can provide that person with an alternate source of employment, then I suspect you are not going to have too much trouble getting part-time fishermen out of the industry.

I can further say that I expect, even if and when the stocks rebuild, that you might have one heck of a hard time to get them back into it, if he is in the meantime able to provide an alternate source of employment for himself.

I have made a few notes as we go along on comments by some of the Members opposite, but there is really not much here that I can comment on. I think the Leader of the Opposition talked about our abolition of the Fishery Industry Advisory Board, he says that he would like to see a lot of the effort now put into marketing.

I can tell him now, that is what we are doing. We are going to concentrate heavily on marketing, both national and international, and, as he said, it is a very important aspect of our Department.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time has elapsed.

MR. W. CARTER:

I move second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Fisheries" read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, on tomorrow" (Bill No. 26.).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Order No. 20.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Education (Teacher Training) Act," (Bill No. 48).

MR. DECKER:

The only chance I get to speak to you, you will not ask me any questions over there.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on Bill 48. This Bill is entitled "An Act To Amend

The Education (Teacher Training) Act. Some would say that this is correcting an anomaly in the Act, but I would like to give a bit of an explanation as to what this is proposing. As many Members would know, Mr. Speaker, the Education Teacher Training Act provides that the teacher certification committee may, with the recommendation of the appropriate Board of Examiners, suspend or cancel a teaching certificate. Mr. Speaker, there are three Boards of Examiners, one for each of the denominational councils. Section 6 (d) of the Act restricts the powers of a Board to recommend the suspension or cancellation of a certificate of any teacher, and I read from 6(d), 'who is guilty of drunkenness, gross misconduct, or incompetence, and who is a teacher in any of the schools of the recognized denomination or group of recognized denominations it represents.' The key word there is, who is a 'teacher'. In the opinion of officials of the Department of Justice, that section prevents a Board of Examiners from recommending the suspension or the cancellation of a teaching certificate held by a teacher, who is not currently employed by a School Board. Such a person, Mr. Speaker, may be employed in some other field, in some other occupation. A teacher may be teaching in a private school or that person may be unemployed. So this amendment is an attempt to rectify what maybe considered an anomaly.

This issue, Mr. Speaker, has come to light recently with respect to persons who hold teaching certificates who may be convicted of certain criminal offenses. Unless these individuals are employed by a school board in this Province, the Teachers

Certification Committee cannot receive a recommendation to suspend or to cancel the license of such a person.

I might add one or two other points - I want to be very brief on this, Mr. Speaker. The Teachers Certification Committee has considered this issue, and that Committee represents the Department, the University, the Trustees, the Newfoundland Teachers Association - the Committee has considered this matter and has recommended this change be approved.

I might add only one additional point to this. Mr. Speaker, it is a rather interesting wording in the present Act. It says a teacher who is guilty of drunkenness, gross misconduct, or incompetence. That kind of wording has been changed in the Collective Agreement, I am pleased to say, because of the difficulty of defining some of these terms. So what the amendment is proposing, or what this Bill is proposing, is that the wording in the Act be the same wording that is included in the Collective Agreement, and that wording has been agreed to by all bodies. So the wording in the Bill right now recommends that the Board might recommend to the Committee the suspension or cancellation of a certificate or license of a teacher, who is guilty of gross misconduct, incompetence, or for other just cause. So the term 'guilty of drunkenness' has been deleted from the Bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, with these very brief comments, I move second reading of this Bill.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have no problems with this. In fact, it is one of the things we had been dealing with at an earlier stage. I would just like to emphasize the concerns raised by the Minister, that up until now, really, a certificate could only be revoked if a board made the recommendation. We may have some teachers who were, or will be in the future, operating outside boards. Or if the board did not make a recommendation, which could happen and which might have happened, we could have teachers who would retain their certificates. Perhaps today, as we stand here, the importance of certificates and control of certificates hits us as being a lot more important than it would in prior days, and it is extremely important, I believe, for the committee to have the initiator role in making sure that certificates can be revoked.

One of the other issues that has developed out of this generally is, in consultation with the other Ministers across Canada, that only now will we revoke a certificate for just cause here in the Province, but that information is also now exchanged with all other provinces across Canada. I understand that is still in effect, and I certainly hope it is; and they also let us know if they have teachers having their certificates revoked. Because we have had instances in the past where a teacher had a certificate

revoked for a just cause in one province, only to move to another province and begin teaching, and it has certainly caused extreme problems in the past.

I think, once again, as the Minister says, it is a bit of an anomaly and hopefully it clarifies what could have been a very touchy situation. We have no problems with this at all, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

If the Minister speaks now he closes the debate.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I am gratified with the support of the hon. member and the persons opposite. I think it is important to emphasize a point he made. We have had a number of situations in the country where teachers have moved from province to province, and this matter has become a concern of many. I do not know how, in a country like this, we can exchange information, but I know that Departments of Education are looking for ways of informing others of persons who have had certificates revoked in one province informing other provinces of this fact.

I might add one or two additional points, Mr. Speaker. The Department is pleased with the support of all the bodies in the implementation of this legislation. The university and the NTA and the trustees and the Department work very closely on a large number of issues, and I am pleased to say that in this area, and improving teachers' certification, improving teacher education, all of these agencies work very closely in the interests of education in this Province.

The DECs are supportive of this and, as a Minister, I want to ensure that we will continue in the future, the openness that my hon. friend displayed when he was Minister of Education. The willingness to consult: I am trying even to enhance the consultation that he did when he was a Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:

Consultation does a number of things, Mr. Speaker. In addition to involving people and giving people the opportunity to be involved, we also get ideas. As a Minister I intend to consult, not only with these agencies, but with parents and students throughout the Province. Certainly, in the last few months, I have had great experience in consulting throughout the Province with students and parents.

Mr. Speaker, the trustees of this Province represent the public. In the past few months, I have enjoyed tremendously my opportunity to consult with parents. I have met with the Newfoundland Federation of Home and School Associations on many occasions, and I intend to ensure that their input in the policy-making in Education is heard much more in the future than it has been in the past.

With these few comments, I want to thank the hon. Members opposite for supporting this Bill.

On motion, A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Education (Teacher Training) Act," read a second time, referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 48).

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I remind hon. Members that on Wednesday, Private Member's Day, we will be discussing the resolution presented by the Leader of the Opposition.

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

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Acting Acting Government House Leader - it is traditional for the Government House Leader; he has usually been quite courteous to us and to other members - to indicate what the business of the House is tomorrow. Could he advise us what that might be, or does he know?

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question under advisement and get back to him after I confer with the Acting House Leader or the House Leader. I do not have that information available right now.

MR. SIMMS:

Perhaps I could help the Acting Acting House Leader, Mr. Speaker. I understand it is the intention tomorrow of the Government House Leader to move into Committee of the Whole to deal with the four or five Bills there at Committee stage. I was just testing to see if he knew.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before putting the motion, I would like to remind hon. Members serving on the Internal Economy Commission that it will meet tomorrow morning at 8:00 a.m.

On motion, the house at its rising
adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday,
at 2:00 p.m.