



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 63

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Wednesday

[Preliminary Transcript]

24 October 1990

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

Oral Questions

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, the bad news of deep and painful cuts in the health care system are continuing to come in from all across the Province. Today, for example, we heard from the Valley Vista Senior Citizens Home, in Springdale, where there are going to be twenty-four beds closed next year and twenty employees laid off. Last year, of course, the House will recall, fifteen beds were closed in the Springdale Cottage Hospital.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is this: In view of the Premier's confidence, as expressed in this House only a few days ago, that administrators could manage the health care system, will he now agree with the analysis put forth by those administrators, with whom he disagreed in this House just a few days ago, that the effect of this freeze will be a cutback of 12 per cent and \$6 million less spent in the health care system of the Province?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: I do not know about the 12 per cent and \$6 million on the health care system. I can say to the House, Mr. Speaker, that I do not agree with that individual's analysis. Let me restate again, Mr. Speaker, so that hon. members will understand, those numbers and

those figures are coming from the Opposition, the unions, and individual administrators or so on, in different hospitals or public services that -

Mr. Hewlett: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, if they want me to answer the question I am quite prepared to do it. If they do not, I will sit down. Everything I do is honest and people should know that. The people of the Province know it. The members opposite do not like it, but the people of the Province know it.

Mr. Speaker, the position of the Government, as stated many times, is simply this. We have a very substantial projected deficit for this year. If things stay as they are, that is they do not get any better economically or do not get any worse, it is probable that we will have a \$120 million deficit on our current this year. I do not expect that we will be able to make cuts anywhere near sufficient to deal with that, and we expect we are going to have to borrow a substantial additional sum. Now, I have made that clear before, but I want to restate so that people understand.

The problem is, Mr. Speaker, if the economic recession persists for ten, twelve, or fifteen months, as may well be the case, then we get into next year and instead of \$120 million, we could be facing a \$200 or \$300 million deficit. Now, while we can go to the financial houses and say, look, we are caught in this particular situation this year, we can only cut this much and we expect we will have to borrow \$50,

\$60, \$80, \$90 million, whatever the figure is, they would be understanding of the circumstances. But if we go back to them the next year and say, in addition we are going to borrow another \$200, \$250, or \$300 million on current account because we budgeted for a deficit, they would not be very understanding. Now, that is the Government's purpose, and toward that end we have asked people to try and live within the limits of the Budget. No decision on the extent of the cuts or the nature of the cuts or what will be reduced, or whether there will be any job losses or not, has yet been made. That is pure speculation by the Opposition, by administrators concerned, by unions and so on. No decision has yet been made.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, this is not speculation by the Opposition, these are facts put forward by representatives of the Hospital and Nursing Home Association. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a big difference from Opposition speculation.

Let me ask the Premier this, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that Government has told the Hospital and Nursing Home Association that next year's Budget is frozen at this year's level, how come a freeze is not a cut, Mr. Speaker, when they must reduce their expenditure by 12 per cent of \$60 million?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Mr. Hewlett: A freeze is a cut.

An Hon. Member: No, it is not a cut.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I will go back to the Hansard when we made the announcements in the House, and what we said and what I indicated clearly in the House was that we said to every department of Government and every agency of Government when you are planning your budget for next year, plan to live with an amount of money that is no greater than the amount that you have now. Now, what the final decision will be on any department, on any agency, maybe more maybe less. The Government is going to make the ultimate decisions on how to manage the affairs of the Province. Now, if the Opposition or an administrator of a home or a group of administrators of hospitals or homes or union leaders or anybody else wants to say a decision is made to cut it, they can say whatever they want. There is no validity to it. A decision is not made yet as -

Mr. Tobin: That is terrible.

Premier Wells: It may be terrible, but it is true. It is the accurate statement.

Mr. Simms: You are playing with words, that is all you are doing.

Premier Wells: They seem to have a real aversion to truth, Mr. Speaker. Now, that is the simple state of affairs. Now if the Opposition wants to say that \$60 million and a thousand jobs or whatever, okay, they have responsibility for the statement they made. The Government will make its decision in due course, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, it is becoming apparently obvious to everybody in this Province that the aversion to truth rests with the Premier. That is where the aversion to truth is.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: When Ottawa freezes budgets to this Province it is a cutback, Mr. Speaker. When the Province freezes budgets, it is not a cutback. So where is the aversion of truth?

Now let me ask the Premier this: The Nurses Union in this Province has indicated there will be a layoff of several hundred nurses as a result of this cutback, that there will therefore be a negative impact on the sick and the elderly in our hospitals and nursing homes. Is the Premier standing here today and saying that the Nurses Union and other professional groups in this Province are deliberately lying to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador? Is that what he is up to? Is that the aversion to the truth he is talking about?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying they are deliberately lying, I am simply saying that, like the Opposition, they do not know what they are talking about when they make these statements.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: The Government asked all departments -

An Hon. Member: He is the only person in Canada who knows what he is talking about.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: The Government asked all departments of Government, all agencies of Government to do their planning next year on the basis of trying to live within the amount they got this year. Now, we expect them to do that and come back with a variety of proposals as to how this can be achieved. We are looking at ways in which it can be achieved directly within Government departments; we expect agencies to come back with proposals, as well. Somebody said do you expect there will be cuts? I say yes. I do not expect that we will be able to make reductions of that magnitude without some possible loss of jobs. I hope there are none, but I cannot be so naive as to stand here in this House and say I do not expect there will be any. There may well be some. I do not know what the numbers will be, I do not know what the other reduction of expenditures might be that will allow us live within the budget. And, I say to the Leader of the Opposition and to the entire House, Mr. Speaker, that neither does he and neither does the Nurses Union and neither do the administrators of those hospitals know what the extent or nature of those cuts will be yet.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier, and I assure him it is an issue of which I know what I am talking about. Maybe he does, maybe he does not. Is the Premier aware

that the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs has directed the St. John's Fire Department to discontinue statutory holiday pay to fire fighters who are on long-term sick leave or disability? Is he aware of that?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: I am not aware of the details, but somewhere where I was - I have forgotten now where it was - on some occasion, some event that I attended in the last two or three days, a person who is a member of the St. John's Fire Department, I have forgotten the gentleman's name now - oh, it was at the airport. I saw him at the airport, that is where it was - he stopped and talked to me and made some comment along these lines, but I have not yet had a chance to check the matter out.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I want to put a new question, then, to the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, since the Premier is not fully aware of the situation.

One fire fighter, by the way, in this category is a gentleman by the name of Donald Jarvis who, on February 17th, 1990 sustained severe burns to 50 per cent of his body in an effort to save lives from a burning building.

In fact, on March 12th, in this Legislature, the minister himself spoke very eloquently in the House about the heroism of Mr. Jarvis and the risk of injuries fire fighters face every time they are called out to a fire.

I want to ask the Minister of

Municipal Affairs, can he confirm now that on October 16th a letter was hand delivered to Mr. Jarvis, as well as others, but Mr. Jarvis, a man with a wife and three children at home, on long-term disability, informing him that his pay has been cut by \$2,400 because of this directive from his Department?

Some Hon. Members: What? What? Shame! Shame!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the union was advised that pay could not be received for statutory holidays while a member of the union was on sick leave. That is in the union agreement.

The union agreement had not been followed, was not being followed, and we discovered that people were actually being paid while on long-term disability or on sick leave for statutory holidays not provided for in the agreement, and subsequently we wrote the union advising them that it would not be happening in the future.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I have had a look at the union agreement. My understanding is the way the fire fighters are paid is that they are paid on a formula which includes statutory paid holidays for all members of the force and, indeed, the Minister is simply disputing an interpretation of the agreement.

But be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, it is pretty clear that the minister who spoke so

eloquently in the House about the heroism of fire fighters, and particularly, Mr. Jarvis, himself -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. member is on a supplementary.

Mr. Simms: Is this the type of thanks that the minister is trying to convey, then, to those people who sometimes risk their lives and risk injuries, and so on, to help people in fires? Is this the kind of thanks he is giving to those people? But specifically I want to ask him this: Will he meet immediately after the Question Period today with the fire fighters' executive, who are here in the House today, and try to do everything he can to get this incredibly callous decision reversed? Because it is absolutely wrong.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker, this particular provision is provided for in the union agreement.

Mr. Simms: It is not.

Mr. Gullage: It is not correct for a minister in mid-term, where an agreement is in place, to meet with the executive of a union concerning a matter which has been agreed to between the union and the employer, in this case. And clearly the union agreement does not provide for the payment of statutory holidays while an employee of the union, while a fire fighter is off on either long-term disability or sick leave. Now that is clear.

Mr. Simms: You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. Gullage: It is provided for if the statutory holiday occurs while the fire fighter is employed and at work. It does not provide for it otherwise.

Mr. Simms: But they have been getting it for eighteen years. Will you meet the executive?

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

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, yesterday in answering questions in relation to the student assistants situation, the Minister of Education clearly placed the blame upon the shoulders of Treasury Board. Consequently, I would like to ask the President of Treasury Board if he agrees that the Memorandum of Understanding entered into between Government and the student assistants calls for the re-employment of all those who were employed last year in the program, guaranteeing them the same number of hours that they had last year?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is a while ago, but my understanding is that something similar to that is in the agreement with some other things added. And what is added is this basically: you see, one of the main functions of student assistants is to provide assistance to handicapped people within the system. And I believe the union has agreed, in addition to what the Member just said, the union has agreed that the student assistants have to fit the

situation that they are trying to work under. For instance: if there is a child with a particular type of handicap that needs a student assistant with a particular kind of training, that will be provided, or if the student requires assistance six hours a day instead of five then the six hours will be provided instead of the five previously, or the other way around. So with some limitations and with some additions, yes, that is basically a correct statement.

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the Minister tell us what action he has taken now to make sure that the present impasse comes to an end, because it is having a drastic affect on the handicapped students who are in school?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, I cannot take responsibility for what is happening there now. I can simply reiterate to the Member that the situation as it exists in the schools was brought to our attention. As the Member knows we have school boards and we have district superintendents and we have school principals and so on who are all involved in this process. And in some instances it seems as if the agreement that we signed was not lived up to, and we stand behind that agreement. So we committed to going out around the Province and trying to handle the problems that arose in various areas, because the problem is not universal. In some areas everything is to the union's

satisfaction and to our satisfaction.

The union decided that rather than wait until the situation was straightened out, or perhaps they felt that a week or two was long enough, but they decided then to pull their student assistants out of the schools, and I very deeply regret that.

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well yesterday the Minister of Education said that it is not his fault, he has put in the amount of money required, tell us where the fault lies and what he can do to correct it?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, I am not in the business of ascribing fault or blame. I am simply describing the situation as it exists at the present time.

An Hon. Member: You can't blame it on the Federal Government, that is the only thing I can say.

Mr. Baker: I am describing the situation as it exists at the present time. I say it is regrettable. I say that we stand behind the agreement, and we are currently trying to make sure that in all instances the agreement is lived up to. It may still take some days to do that, but we are currently trying to do it. I am not ascribing blame to anybody. It is an unfortunate situation that should not be occurring.

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

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, the Minister says he will live up to the agreement. Is he telling us now that he will guarantee that all the student assistants who were employed last year will be called back and kept in employment with the same number of hours that they had last year while on the job?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, what I will guarantee is that we will try to make sure that the agreement is lived up to. But the hon. Member knows that it is not as simple as an employee in my Department that I have control over, this it is a bit more complicated than that. We will try to get the agreement lived up to but I can give no guarantee along the lines the Member mentioned, because the collective agreement allows for variances as well. So what I can say is we will try to ensure that the collective agreement is lived up to with all of its variances.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

Mr. Woodford: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Premier. Last night in Corner Brook a meeting was held concerning the Fisher Tech. Institute in Corner Brook. The MHA for Humber East, Mr. Speaker, who has worked so hard and so diligently on behalf of the constituents of Humber East, was barred from the meeting.

Some Hon. Members: Shame, shame!

Mr. Woodford: Mr. Speaker, she went to the meeting representing her constituents - approximately 11,000 people in the constituency

of Humber East - and was treated like a criminal. Unprecedented, Mr. Speaker.

My question to the Premier is this: Was the Premier aware that the Member for Humber East was barred from the meeting, and if so, for what reasons?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I only know what I read in the paper today, or I heard on the radio, I think - the first comment on it. And I have since had a brief chat with the Minister of Justice who was present. If I read the paper correctly -

Mr. Simms: He knows everything about it, too.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: Let me start again, Mr. Speaker. I only know what I read in the paper and what I heard on the radio this morning, and the comment that I have heard recently from the Minister of Justice. And if what I read in the paper is correct, I can only assume that the municipal council did not want her there.

The policy that I have always followed, and I intend to follow in the future, and I expect every other Minister to follow, and if they do not follow it I will ask them to follow it, is that if there is a meeting going on with a municipal council in the district of any hon. Member in the House, and the council wants the MHA to

be there, we should have the MHA there. I have no quarrel with that. None whatsoever.

If however the council does not want the MHA there, or does not invite the MHA there, I cannot imagine that any MHA would be so inconsiderate or undisciplined or unmannerly as to force himself or herself on a meeting.

All I can say to you is that the policy I have always followed is: if the council or any other group with whom I am meeting wants an MHA there, they are welcome.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

Mr. Woodford: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Premier able to confirm whether the Mayor of Corner Brook was instructed not to ask the Member for Humber East to the meeting?

Mr. Tobin: By the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: No, I cannot confirm that, Mr. Speaker. But I will make inquiries to determine whether or not there is any validity to that suggestion.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

Mr. Woodford: A new question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Justice. Mr. Speaker, if there was no hidden agenda, and nothing to hide -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Woodford: I will repeat, Mr.

Speaker. It is getting to be a habit now. If there was nothing to hide and no hidden agenda by both the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Education who attended that meeting last night in Corner Brook, and I can say, by the way, after a few months of trying to get him out there to meet with the people, some of the people I met there last night, Mr. Speaker: there were members of the Community Futures, the Humber Joint Councils, the Deer Lake Council, the Deer Lake Chamber of Commerce, the Chamber of Commerce in Corner Brook, just about everybody else in the area was asked. My question to the Minister of Justice is this: Why then did the Minister of Justice tell the Mayor of Corner Brook that if the MHA for Humber East attended the meeting there would not be a meeting?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Dicks: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, let me say that at no time did I tell the Mayor of Corner Brook that if he decided to admit Ms Verge to the meeting that there would be no meeting. And I suggest to the hon. Member that he should withdraw the remark because it has no substance in fact or elsewhere.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dicks: But let me answer the question in full, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Rideout: You better check with the Mayor before you ask for a withdrawal.

Mr. Dicks: What happened in this case was that this meeting was arranged at the request of the Mayor of Corner Brook and we arranged it approximately one week ago, because Government gave its response to the White Paper following the submission of 150 briefs across this Island, some time early in the month of October, I believe it was the first Friday, around October 5. Subsequently one of the decisions was to combine the Fisher Institute with the Western Community College. That has been a source of some concern and the Member we are dealing with here, the Member for Humber East, has been carrying the flag against that particular measure. Now what happened was that the Mayor indicated to me, and asked for a meeting with the Minister, because several groups had asked for a meeting, among them the Humber Joint Councils -

Mr. Simms: He just mentioned all of the groups.

Mr. Dicks: He just mentioned all the groups. Very good. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Guilty your honour.

An Hon. Member: Ignore him.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I would ask the Minister to please clue up his answer.

Mr. Dicks: Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make is that this meeting was arranged at the request of the Mayor of Corner Brook. The objective of the meeting, it was publicized that this was a meeting of these interest groups that were concerned about the change,

because they do not have a forum such as the House of Assembly where they can come in and ask public questions. These people wanted a forum where they would feel comfortable discussing with the Minister what the changes were. There is no hidden agenda. The white paper was published. Ms Verge was there, and she had asked the Mayor, as I understand it, whether she could attend. Her sole object, and her sole purpose in all of this was to cause a disruption, which she did -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Dicks: - arriving with the press in tow.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Simms: Dishonourable.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I want to remind the hon. Minister that now we are getting into an area of debate. The purpose of Question Period is to get information. I think the Minister has satisfactorily addressed the question.

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Warren: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday when the Minister of Health was speaking in the debate I gave him advance notice that today I would ask him a question. The Minister said in the debate, on page R-37, that he is on top of everything that is going on in the health field in the province. With that in mind, I would like to ask the Minister, is he aware that presently in the two isolated communities of Postville and Davis Inlet there is no nurse on duty?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Health.

Mr. Decker: I thank the hon. gentleman for the question. It is pretty lonely over here, Mr. Speaker. Nobody asks me questions these days.

Mr. Simms: It is going to get lonelier, too.

Mr. Decker: It is difficult to get -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) not too long ago (inaudible).

Mr. Decker: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was kind enough to give me a question. If his colleagues could only be quiet and let me answer it, I will attempt to do it.

An Hon. Member: Hurry up. Or you will get no more.

Mr. Decker: It is extremely difficult to recruit nurses for Davis Inlet and Postville and along the Labrador coast. As a matter of fact, there have been some serious problems in Davis Inlet which the Department and Government as a whole are trying to deal with.

What is happening in the interim, the Grenfell Regional Health Services are flying nurses in. They go in there for the day, they conduct the clinic, and then they are flown out. So the hon. Member is right. There is no nurse stationed in Postville or Davis Inlet, where the board is trying to recruit. But, in the meantime, they are doing the best possible thing they can, they are flying the nurse in there who conducts a clinic and is then flown out.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Warren: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My final question - I say question, probably, because time is short. Could the Minister advise this House and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador why two unqualified employees of the Regional Grenfell Health Services are dispensing drugs and making medical diagnoses without any medical training?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Health.

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, that I am not prepared to substantiate. I do not know it is happening. If it is happening and the Member has some facts - because it is a pretty serious accusation that the hon. gentleman is making - if he is prepared to substantiate it, let him go ahead and give me the information which he has and I will see that it is dealt with. But I am not prepared, from that particular Member or from the Opposition, who have been known to go off half-cocked, without having concrete under their feet in the past few days - Mr. Speaker, this would have to be substantiated by more than innuendo. So if the hon. Member has some facts, then let him table them in this House and let him present them. Let him put up, Mr. Speaker, or shut up.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Parsons: We were elected by the people to ask you questions (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Warren: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Warren: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I say to my hon. colleague, that the health and safety of the people in Postville is just as important as the health and safety of anyone else in this province, and I would suggest -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman is on a supplementary.

Mr. Warren: I would ask the Minister to check the qualifications of Mr. Jack Lane and Miss Cathy Sheppard, who are dispensing drugs from the clinic in Postville to the people in Postville via long distance telephone calls from the doctor in Goose Bay?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Health.

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, there is a direct question there, and the answer is yes, I will check. I also warn the House that considering the accusations made by the Leader of the Opposition regarding the Pentecostal home the other day, and other accusations, I am a little bit cynical when I agree. But I will, indeed, check the qualifications of Mr. Lane and Miss Sheppard and try to ascertain whether or not the accusations are correct. I am, at this moment, a little tiny bit cynical, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure you will understand why.

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. Have there been any recent changes to her Department's hiring guidelines for the Employment Generation Program?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Employment Generation Program was given \$1 million by the Employment Stimulation Program, which is a project we are sharing with Forestry, Social Services, and the Department of Transportation. The criteria have remained almost identical, except for the fact that we are now directing it, just as the other groups were, towards social services recipients, people about to go on social services, or people whose UI is about to run out. But we do not do it in that particular order. Because it is a different sort of program, we do not have to follow the same order the other departments have.

Mr. Speaker: Question Period has expired.

Mr. Simms: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader on a point of order.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I did not want to raise a point of order during Question Period, obviously, because we try to refrain from that if we possibly can. But I do want to raise a serious matter that I think is worthy of Your Honour's attention.

During Question Period, in response to a question from the

Member for Humber Valley, the Minister of Justice responded in such a manner as to attribute unworthy motives to a Member of this House of Assembly in my view, making reference to the Member for Humber East and her purpose in attending a meeting was to cause a disturbance or a disruption, whatever his words were.

I want to refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, in particular to two references on Page 19. In one place, under Paragraph 64, and I will just quote the first sentence in the Paragraph, the rest of it is explanatory - "The House has occasionally taken notice of attacks on individual members," and it goes on to say some examples where it was not accepted and not permitted, in fact.

Mr. Speaker, more succinctly, I suppose, Paragraph 481, page 141, Sixth Edition: 'Beside the prohibitions contained in Standing Order 18' - this again refers to attacks on members and so on - 'it has been sanctioned by usage that a Member, while speaking, must not:' - I refer particularly to subsection (e) - 'impute bad motives or motives different from those acknowledged by a Member.' Certainly the member did not acknowledge any such charge. And, (f), 'Must not make a personal charge against a Member.' And, Mr. Speaker, in addition, more to it on page 142, Paragraph 484, subsection (3). "In the House of Commons a Member will not be permitted by the Speaker to indulge in any reflections on the House itself as a political institution; or to impute to any Member or Members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case." I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if ever there was a clear example of a member

being unparliamentary, even though this member has often been called to task for similar situations, this is a perfect example and I would encourage Your Honour to look at the situation and call on the hon. minister to withdraw what are clearly unparliamentary references by that particular member.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am glad to take a moment to respond to the comments by my friend from Grand Falls. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that if one were to listen to the Opposition House Leader, I would suggest that never again will the Leader of the Opposition ever be able to say anything about the Premier, because they are always imputing motives.

Mr. Speaker, if you look back over Hansard of the last two or three days you will find hundreds of bad motives imputed by the Opposition against the hon. the Premier, so I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the Opposition House Leader is really serious about what he is saying, he should talk to his own people first.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: Just one further contribution.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think it is worthy of the President of Treasury Board, in his role as

House Leader for the Government, to get up and make fun or joke about an incident which is extremely serious. The references I have given are clear. 'A Member may not impute unworthy motives.' Now the President of Treasury Board says members on this side do it all the time. Well, if that is the case, raise a point of order, as I have just done, and let His Honour rule on it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: Not one reference (inaudible) Beauchesne.

Mr. Simms: It is unparliamentary, and you should withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

First of all, the Chair certainly agrees with all the references made by the Opposition House Leader in terms of 'not permitted to make reflections on members.' It is something that members on both sides of the House should be very familiar with in making reflections on members. The point is well taken, so that hon. members on both sides of the House can prudently watch themselves when we are talking about these matters.

Hon. members will recall that I stood up when the Minister of Justice got into that area, more because I thought he was entering into the area of debate and certainly saying something that was provocative. And, as hon. members know, questions and answers are not to deal with matters that are provocative, and I took it to be more a provocative statement than purely one of disorder.

I would not want to rule on that

kind of motive, to disrupt a meeting, to be disorderly, but I would certainly rule that it was provocative, and that is why I stopped the Minister as I did.

I want to further elaborate that when a matter of order is raised, as it was raised a moment ago by the Opposition House Leader, the general course is for the Member who made the statement to rise and to speak about the context in which it was raised. There is nothing, of course, wrong with the House Leader standing either, but generally the Member will stand and give an account of him or herself in the context in which it was said, and generally if there was any motive attributed, the Member would certainly withdraw.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table several precommitments that have been made, and I do this under the authority of Section 26.1.4 of the Financial Administration Act. The first precommitment totals \$132,000 for next year to meet the cost of a contract with Gauge Educational Publishing Company for the publishing and purchase of a high school text book.

Another precommitment, Mr. Speaker, in the amount of \$344,325 is comprised of \$287,400 for next fiscal year and \$56,925 for the subsequent fiscal year, to meet the cost of a contract with Ginn Educational Publishing Company for the purchase and publishing of a school text book.

A further precommitment, Mr. Speaker, in the amount of \$78,375,000 comprising \$28,500 for 1991-92, a similar amount for 1992-93, and \$21,375,000 for 1993-94.

A fourth precommitment, Mr. Speaker, in the amount of \$8,937,500 is broken down as \$2.75 million for 1991-92, a similar amount for 1992-93, and a similar amount for 1993-94, and \$687,500 for 1994-95.

And a final precommitment, Mr. Speaker, of \$90,000 divided into \$30,000 for each of the three years, 1991-92, 1992-93, and 1993-94 is to enable the Government to meet commitments entered into under an agreement with the Canadian Space Agency for jointly funding research and development projects by Newfoundland companies under the Strategic Technologies for Automation and Robotics Program - I understand the Minister of Development is going into space. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Orders of the Day

Mr. Speaker: It being Private Member's Day, I believe it is the Member for Eagle River to introduce his Private Member's Motion. The hon. the Member for Eagle River.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure for me today to rise in this hon. House to move this -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Order, please!

The hon. member has been up now for a half minute. Certainly I have not heard a word he said. I do not know about other hon. members. We are starting a Private Member's Resolution, and it is very important that hon. members hear what the resolution is. The hon. the Member for Eagle River.

Mr. Dumaresque: Thank You, Mr. Speaker. I certainly think it is very important that all hon. members listen, and I would hope they will concur with what is being said.

Today, Mr. Speaker, it is very important that the resolution being put forward is supported by the Members of this House. I would like to read into the record, Mr. Speaker, the essence of the motion:

WHEREAS coastal Labradorians are totally dependent upon the fishery for their livelihood; and

WHEREAS not one fish of the Northern Cod stock is allocated to Labrador fish companies; and

WHEREAS not one inshore shrimp licence is allocated to Labrador fishermen; and

WHEREAS less than one per cent of the total provincial caplin quota is allocated to Labrador; and

WHEREAS 80 per cent of the inshore fish in Labrador is taken to Quebec and parts of the Island for processing; and

WHEREAS not one fish is dried on the Labrador Coast; and

WHEREAS no Labradorian gets more

than twelve weeks processing the greatest fishing resources in Canada;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House endorse the principle of adjacency as adopted by this Government and that those closest to the resource must get the greatest benefit;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House condemn the Federal Government for its actions to date and demand that a comprehensive development and management plan for the Labrador fishery be implemented.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that today, with this resolution, is by far the most important day the Coast of Labrador has ever had in this House of Assembly. I would say that today, for the first time, the future of the Labrador fishery is going to be discussed. Today, for the first time, we will have the Government of the day and the members of the day, and I am sure the Opposition of the day, firmly outline their positions as it relates to the principle of adjacency and to the well-being of the future livelihood of the people of the Coast of Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have fifteen minutes at the opening, and twenty minutes to close.

An Hon. Member: No, twenty and twenty, Dan.

Mr. Dumaresque: Fifteen left, I meant.

An Hon. Member: Fifteen left, yes.

Mr. Dumaresque: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to take up that time, I want to touch upon the issues themselves, what is at

stake here. I want to talk about the role I think the House of Assembly should be playing in this particular debate. I want to talk about the role of the Provincial Government and its record to date. Also, Mr. Speaker, I will touch on the role of the Federal Government, its record up to this point in time and what it should be doing in the future. I will conclude with specific recommendations which I hope all Members of this House can endorse, and I hope that once these recommendations are accepted by the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans and by this Government, it will lead to a better day for all Labradorians.

The issues, Mr. Speaker, are fundamental. The issue we are talking about is the people's right to a decent standard of living regardless of where they live in this country. The issue, Mr. Speaker, is the moral right if not the constitutional right which all our citizens have, and I think all Labradorians must have, to garner the greatest benefit possible from the resources which are swimming along their shores.

Mr. Speaker, I would like all hon. members to become aware of exactly the setting from which this particular resolution comes. What we are dealing with are 10,000 people from L'Anse-au-Clair to Nain, some 600 miles of coastline, and some 3,000 to 4,000 fishermen and plant workers who are totally dependent upon the fishery for their livelihood.

And I guess what causes a lot of concern and has caused a considerable amount of frustration for Labradorians over the years, and I would submit what caused the development of separatist feelings

in Labrador as early as 1971, when the new Labrador Party was formed, the basic underlying principles we are talking about and which the people have been totally frustrated with, is the lack of benefit they have gotten from their fishery, right off their shores, as I outlined earlier.

The situation we have is that not one of the plants in Labrador gets more than fourteen weeks work from the inshore fishery, and certainly from the cod fishery not one plant gets any more than ten weeks work.

Now, at the same time we have foreign fishing boats, and other provinces, Nova Scotia and Quebec, and they are there all during the year, whether it is during the Winter, Fall or Spring, harvesting fish from the Northern cod stock in particular, and taking it back to their own plants to sustain twelve-month operations.

Presently, Mr. Speaker, we have had the third consecutive failure this year in the Labrador Straits. We have had a situation this year, again, where the fishermen, even if they qualified because they were able to make a catch during the week, even if they were able to sell that catch and were able to garner the necessary insurable weeks to qualify for unemployment insurance, they never made any money because they just made enough to give them the insurable earnings by virtue of the regulations of the unemployment insurance system.

Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about here now is a real crisis. We are talking about a time where real change has to take place. We are talking about an occasion where leadership has to come

forward, where real political will has to be shown by the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans, by the Province, and certainly by all responsible Members of this hon. House of Assembly. We are looking for changes that I know all members of this House come to try to enact. All members who come here from their districts come with a vision of a better day for their ridings. In my particular case, I would like to enlist your support to see that we do not have the apprehension every year that we have now on the Coast of Labrador.

Starting off every Spring, we know there is not going to be the inshore fishery there that used to be. We know every year now that there is no possibility whatsoever that there is going to be even twelve or fourteen weeks from the inshore fishery. That is a certainty and that is wrong. Families with children have to go to the local merchant every Spring, especially from the Mary's Harbour to Nain area, and stock up on their fishing supplies and groceries so they can move outside to their fishing stations. They have to do that every year, not knowing if there is going to be a dollar there for them or whether there is going to be fish there for them. But they know for sure that there is not going to be a sustainable inshore fishery there to tide them over and to qualify them for unemployment insurance benefits.

Mr. Speaker, what galls the people is that after the inshore fishery is passed, after the lights go out on the plants in those communities, they can look ten, fifteen, or twenty miles offshore and see the big foreign vessels out there dragging up the cod

stocks, dragging up the turbot stocks, dragging up the shrimp off our shores. It is all leaving us, it is all disappearing before our eyes, while our own people cannot get enough work to even qualify for unemployment insurance benefits.

Now, what would be the role of the Provincial Government in this? As I mentioned earlier, a lot of the frustration that has been developing in Labrador over the years has developed because of the insensitivity of Federal and Provincial policies on fisheries management and development in Labrador. The Province has a number of roles to play, but one of the most critical roles the Province has to play, I guess, is one of politics, one of fostering good co-operation and good relationships with Labrador. Labrador is there, and because we are so far away and because we have so few members in the House of Assembly, and often they are divided by party, as we are now, we only have two on each side, and because of the mathematical equation, sometimes decisions are made by the Provincial Government, as well as the Federal Government, which are to the detriment of the interests of these people, through no fault of their own. I think we always have to be conscious in Newfoundland of making sure that the minority we have in this House, through our representatives, and indeed the minority we have in this province by virtue of the 35,000 people in Labrador, their needs are greater and unique, and they always have to be dealt with in unique ways.

Mr. Speaker, apart from the fostering of relationships between the Island and Labrador, the Provincial Government and the

Provincial Department of Fisheries have a role to invest in the future of the Labrador fishery, to invest money directly into infrastructure and community development projects and, at the same time, to issue processing licences, because that is their only jurisdiction, to issue the processing licences which can foster future diversification of the fishery and also be able to give them the necessary equipment and training, because education is also very important.

Education is critical for us to be able to compete as we should, to be able to make the technological transfers that are necessary, and education is where this Province must be, here right next door to them, to make sure that every opportunity that is given to other places in this Province is readily available to the people of coastal Labrador.

The province has to continue, Mr. Speaker, to be on the pulse of what is happening there. I must say that I have been very encouraged by what has happened over the last eighteen months with this Provincial Government. I must say that this province has done a number of things, and I hope that today our Minister of Fisheries will be able to indicate to this House and to the people of Labrador some of the future changes this Province wants to see, some of the things this Province is willing to support, particularly on the principle of adjacency.

At the present time, we have Nova Scotian boats, and Quebec boats in particular, fishing in 2J and taking the fish from that area of Labrador, the northern cod stocks, back to their respective plants

while our own plants are shut down.

The people in Nain and Makkovik, those two big plants there, they have to have resource, as do the people in Cartwright and Black Tickle. Black Tickle has sixty-seven workers there, and not one of them has nine insurable weeks, Mr. Speaker, while twenty miles away hundreds and hundreds of pounds of fish are being harvested, even now. For the remainder of this year there will be forty million pounds of fish harvested off the Round Hills in Black Tickle, and that plant is closed down and sixty-seven workers have to revert to Social Services.

That is not right, Mr. Speaker. So I hope this Government will be able to enlist support, and I also call upon the Leader of the Opposition in particular, who is very familiar with the Labrador fishery because of his past responsibilities as Minister of Fisheries, I hope he will be able to support an allocation of the offshore northern cod quota for the coast of Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to expand on exactly what that would mean. What we are looking for is somewhere between 5,000 to 7,000 metric tons of the offshore northern cod that could be given to the native fishing companies in Labrador, and I think particularly of the Labrador Fisherman's Union Shrimp Company, Torngat Fisheries, and the LIA. I think of these three companies in particular, and I am sure there are others that have had long-standing experience in Labrador and will continue to want to fish there.

If these companies could be allocated that particular quota,

which, by the way, measures up to about 2.2 per cent of the total allowable catch of northern cod as it presently stands, we could see the processing life of all the plants along the coast of Labrador, and therefore the plant workers, being extended from ten to fourteen weeks every year, in addition to what is presently garnered out of the inshore fishery.

This, Mr. Speaker, would be a key and fundamental change to how people have to operate, how the business community has to operate. Because if this was made, there would be absolute certainty that they would be able to look at up to twenty-five weeks of insurable earnings every year. That would be comfort. That would be good, sound management, good, responsible government being outlaid for the people of the coast of Labrador, that would be a substantial change. And I do not think it is unreasonable for the people of Labrador to want access to this offshore cod.

At the same time as we have other provinces taking this fish back to their own ports for twelve-month operations, it is not unreasonable for them to have to give up this for the people who are closest to this resource, the people who are adjacent to it, and certainly the people who are totally dependent upon this resource for their livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, I will close off now and let other hon. members express their views on this particular resolution. And when I have my final twenty minutes to close up, I would like to expand on what I have said by talking about the Federal Government, what they have done to date, how they

have measured up to date on the issues that I have raised in terms of the northern cod allocation, the inshore shrimp licences, the caplin quotas, and the future of the Saltpine Corporation, and a couple of other things. I will expand on what they have done to date, and I will also make specific recommendations on what things could be done for the future.

So I will be back again, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that all hon. members could expand upon their support for this particular resolution.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today, on behalf of my colleagues over here, to begin the debate on the resolution put forward by the Member for Eagle River. Now with all sincerity and honesty let me say to the Member for Eagle River that this is not the first time a resolution solely dedicated to the problems facing the fishery in Labrador has been debated by this House. I believe these were his opening comments, but that is certainly not the case. The record of this House will show that on a number of occasions over the last fifteen years, those are the only ones I could speak of personally, various members from Labrador, on either side of the House, representing the two political parties that are represented today, have brought in motions regarding certain aspects of the Labrador fishery and problems faced by the Labrador fishery, and they were debated. Whether or not they were able to

gleen or garner much success, of course, is another matter. I would not know that.

The member indicates, Mr. Speaker, that the real crisis that he articulates in the Labrador fishery demands a real change. That will have to come by political will, and there has to be, I would say to him, political will on behalf of all the parties involved here. It is not just good enough to say that it is all the responsibility of the Federal Government, that they have been a total and disastrous failure, it is not just good enough to say that it is all because of the Provincial Government and its inabilities to react properly to problems in the Labrador fishery, it is not good enough to blame it all on past administrations, federally or provincially. None of that is good enough, because the problems being faced by the fishery in Labrador are real, and they are urgent, and they are here and now, and they should be addressed here and now by both levels of government, and by all who are partners in that fishery.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the member right off the top that 99.99 per cent of what is contained in this resolution we, on this side of the House, support. The hon. gentleman, maybe inadvertently so, in drafting his resolution, in my view, made a couple of mistakes - only minor mistakes. I am sure, at least in one case, perhaps a mistake he might not even know the difference of, and I do not say that in any derogatory way.

But there are a couple of very, very minor areas where the resolution is misleading, and where it is, in fact, factually

incorrect, and I am going to be proposing over the course of my remarks that we attempt to correct those couple of areas. And if we can correct those couple of areas, Mr. Speaker, then I believe that this resolution can receive the unanimous support of this House.

For example, I cannot and I will not, unless the member is prepared to be co-operative and compromising, I cannot and will not be able to support the first BE IT RESOLVED. Because as the Member has it written on the Order Paper today the first BE IT RESOLVED says that this House endorsed the principle of adjacency as adopted by this Government, and that those closest to the resource must get the greatest benefit. Now, I do not know whether the hon. Member knows it or not but successive Governments of Newfoundland and Labrador, since the imposition of the 200 mile economic zone in 1977, have supported the principle of adjacency and historic dependency. That has been a principle enshrined in the groundfish management plan since there was a management plan. It has been supported by successive Governments of Newfoundland and Labrador, and I am delighted it is supported by this Government. That is not a new principle. That is not cutting new ground. That is not something that only happened in this Province over the last eighteen months, since the last election. I know that civil servants and bureaucrats in the Department of Fisheries Federally and Provincially, as well as political leaders, Ministers at the time, can attest, and can swear also, if the Member so wishes, that every successive Minister of Fisheries in this Province since 1977, including the

present Minister when he was there in the middle 1970s or early 1980s, supported the principle of adjacency and historic dependency. That has never been a political question. That has never been a difference of opinion, as far as I know, between the two main political parties in this Province. I cannot speak for the third party. I believe we have always supported that and therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is incorrect, factually incorrect, to suggest that this is a new thing, this is a new principle that was developed and articulated by this Government.

Mr. Dumaresque: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: I don't think I opened my mouth, Mr. Speaker, when the honourable Member was speaking.

I remember many a time, many a meeting, when there was fierce fights around the Council of Minister's table, the Atlantic Council of Fisheries Minister's table, over the principle of adjacency and historic dependency. I can tell you there was more than one drop of blood on the floor at a lot of those meetings when you had to try to keep the wall up, particularly against Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Quebec, to try to protect for Newfoundland and Labrador the principle of adjacency and historic dependency. Now where the Member is correct is that there has never been a separate allocation for some of the companies, or any of the companies, and I agree with him wholeheartedly, but we have to be careful that we understand the principles on which the groundfish management plan is based, are principles that have been in place and supported since 1977.

Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the recital which indicates that Labradorians are totally dependent upon the fishery for their livelihood. Of course I have no quarrel with that, because it is factual. I have no quarrel that not one fish from the Northern codstock is allocated to Labrador fish companies. That is factual, Mr. Speaker, it is wrong, it is absolutely wrong, because the records and the registry at the Department of Fisheries will show, and I hope it is still continuing, but the records in the registry of the Department of Fisheries will show, as will the records and the registry of Torngat Co-op, as will the records and registry of the Labrador Union Shrimp Company, as will the records and registry of the LIA, all of those records will show, Mr. Speaker, that I supported 100 per cent, as the Province's Minister of Fisheries, a special allocation for companies based on the Labrador Coast.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: The Government of the day supported it, Mr. Speaker. All the Member has to do is get correspondence from the Labrador Union Shrimp Company, get correspondence out of the registry in the Department of Fisheries, there was unanimous support from the Government of the day for a special allocation of Northern cod to companies who were based on the Labrador. It was right, it was proper, and that is why it was supported. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hasten to add that we were never successful. We were never successful with the previous Liberal Government in Ottawa, we were not successful with the present PC Government in Ottawa, but that does not take away from

the fact that the Province tried. I assume that the Province is still trying, but there is a little different situation now with the resource in the shape that it is, but to sit around the table at Fisheries Minister's meetings, Mr. Speaker, and see Quebec and Nova Scotia and other Atlantic based companies arguing for more access to and more allocations from the Northern cod stocks, you would want to be a wimp of the highest order not to sit around that table and say not one cods head unless some of the companies that are based in Labrador and have a historic dependency on the resource and are adjacent to the resource get an allocation first. And that was the position that we took, and that was the position that we argued, at least to the exclusion of anybody else getting in there over the last few years. But it is no credit to any Government of Canada no matter what their political stripe is that they have not seen the sense in doing that because to do it, Mr. Speaker, would be consistent with our principles, it would be consistent with the principle of historic dependency and adjacency, and it can be justified a thousand times over. But the pressure from some of the other players, I suspect, in the Atlantic fishery were such that the Government of Canada would not do what was right, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having pointed out that small, but I think, important for the record, factual misrepresentation in the Member's resolution there is only one other. I do not know if the one per cent of the total Provincial caplin quota is proper, but I can say to the hon. gentleman, that use to be the case north of Cape

Freels, generally speaking, it certainly was the case in White Bay.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: Four minutes? I did not start until 3:00 o'clock, Mr. Speaker. It was 3:00 o'clock exactly when the Member sat down, so I think it is probably fourteen minutes rather than four. Anyway, the Table can check that.

What I was saying, Mr. Speaker, is that I have some understanding of that because when we started to develop the caplin fishery in White Bay first, people just did not have licences. They did not have access to the proper fishing technology and equipment, and we really had to go beating down doors in the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to try to get some allocations for those people, to try to get some licences for those people. And now the caplin fishery in White Bay is just as developed as it is anywhere else in the Province, and so it should be. And so it should be in Labrador as well. If there is a resource there and it can be utilized by the fishermen, then they should have their share. If the quota for Newfoundland and Labrador is 70,000 tonnes or whatever, then they should have a share, a proportionate share of whatever that allocation is, so that they can have the right to access the resource and use the resource for their economic good and the economic good of their area.

Inshore shrimp licence, I do not disagree with the hon. Member. To me it is unconscionable that you have Southern Labrador and 4RST area with a whole bunch - I do not know the number now, I used to one

time - probably fifty or sixty licences on the Newfoundland side and on the Quebec side, but nothing in Southern Labrador. It is not good enough any longer, in my view, for the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to use the argument that those people did not have the technology, they did not have the vessels, they did not have the wherewithal to gear up for that fishery. That has changed, Mr. Speaker. I have known fishermen over the last five or six years in Labrador, particularly during my tenure as Minister, who moved into those new fifty-five footers and the large sixty-five foot steel vessels and so on. And they can be just as good as shrimp fishermen or any other specie fishermen in Atlantic Canada if they were given the opportunity to be able to take part in that fishery. So, we agree with the Member and we support him wholeheartedly.

I do not know if the eighty per cent figure is correct in terms of fish coming out of Labrador, but I do know its significant. It is very, very significant. And what really bothers me, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the present Government added to that problem this year. The Government, when they gave licences or permits, whatever it was the Minister of Fisheries gave to those Quebec vessels, I think, added to that problem.

I have received correspondence recently from a gentleman in Labrador who sent me a whole list of receipts. I am reluctant to bring his name up in the House. I do not mind, but I do not think it would be totally proper. I will tell the Member outside the House if he wishes to know, but I suspect he knows who it was. He

sent me a whole bunch of receipts, Mr. Speaker, that seem to indicate that the Quebec base collector boats, even though the terms, I believe, of their licence was that they were not permitted to buy ahead of Newfoundland processors, that they were in fact in competition with the Newfoundland processors and the processors based on the Labrador coast, and I think that is something that the Minister is going to have to investigate a great deal for next year. I do not know why, I mean, before it is my understanding they would try to get around the law by going outside the twelve mile limit or they would be working on glut permits or something of that nature. I do not know why we would issue them bona fide buyers licences, if that is in fact, what we did. I only know what some people down there have told me and what I have read in the press, but it is something that I believe this Province could tighten up on considerably and that is within the jurisdiction of the Minister to do that and I hope he will do it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am getting close to the end of my twenty minutes, and there is one other thing that I want to mention to the hon. Member who proposed this resolution. As I said 99.99 per cent of it will be supported by this side. I would like with a couple of very minor amendments to ensure that it can be supported by everybody in the House. I cannot support the allegation that adjacency and historic dependency is a brand new idea of this Government. That is not so. The Minister of Fisheries knows that is not so. That has been around since 1977.

The other thing is the last BE IT

THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House condemns the Federal Government for its actions to date and demand that a comprehensive development and management plan for the Labrador fishery be implemented.

Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition in this Province and Leader of the Party of the same political stripe as in Ottawa, I have no hesitation whatsoever in condemning the Federal Government. The present Federal Government like previous Federal Governments have acted no better, in my view, towards the fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador, and the Labrador case in particular, than any other Government. So condemn them, yes. I am quite prepared to condemn them for the things they have failed to do.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must say as well that I cannot in all conscience not at the same time condemn the Government of which the hon. gentleman is a part. For the first time in years and years, Mr. Speaker, this Government has not participated in any kind of a Fisheries Response Program. For the first time in years this government, in my view, has probably harmed the Labrador fishery with the permits and licences that were issued down there to the Quebec people this year. So I believe as is most commonly the case, that there is fault and blame enough to be shared around, and I do not believe that the hon. gentleman can escape totally or, not him, but the Government, he is a supporter of the government, he is not part of it. But I do not believe that the Government of which he is a part can totally escape from some responsibility, and I believe as an Opposition to allow them to do that, that we

would be totally wrong.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to move, seconded by my colleague from St. John's East Extern, seconded I say to my colleague from Eagle River, by the Member for St. John's East Extern.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: I want to move two amendments to this resolution, Mr. Speaker. The first amendment is that the words 'this government' be deleted in the first part of the resolution, and that the following substituted 'therefore', and this is the substitution, 'by all Governments of Newfoundland and Labrador since the 200 mile economic zone came into existence in 1977.' And I want to move a further amendment to the second BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED again, seconded by my colleague for St. John's East Extern. And that after the word 'government' in the second BE IT RESOLVED of the resolution insert the following 'and the Provincial Government', so that the second BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED would read 'Federal and Provincial Governments'. And the first BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED would read 'by all Governments of Newfoundland and Labrador since the 200 mile economic zone came into existence in 1977. I have a copy here for Your Honour if you wish to have a look at it; plus one for the Government House Leader, and plus one for the hon. gentleman who brought in the motion; and plus a couple of extras if anybody else would like to have one.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that is about close to the end of the time that I am allocated. With a couple of very, very minor changes, very, very minor changes,

Mr. Speaker, we I believe and this House could unanimously support this resolution. Ninety-nine point nine per cent deserves to be unanimously supported. There is probably one-tenth of 1 per cent of it, which are a couple of inaccuracies, that should not be supported, but it is a resolution that generally speaking we are very, very supportive of.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Before I recognize the hon. Minister, I would just like to take a minute to check with the table officers to see if the resolution is in order. It appears to be.

Mr. Rideout: The amendments.

Mr. Speaker: The amendments, I am sorry. It appears to be in order, but I just want to check with the table.

The Chair rules that the amendments put to the resolution are in order.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to congratulate the hon. Member for his motion, and I want to commend him as well for the very fine speech he made a moment ago in the House, at which time he articulated pretty well, in my view at least, the problems that are being experienced in Labrador and the need to take immediate action to hopefully bring about a resolution to those problems.

But before I get into the main part of my speech, I want to make reference to some comments made by the Leader of the Opposition, in which he made reference to the

collector boats that are - or at least that were - licensed by the Government of Newfoundland to collect fish from vessels fishing off the coast of Labrador from the north shore of Quebec during the summer period.

Mr. Speaker, you might recall last year when we had this very severe glut in Labrador, Quebec boats were purchasing fish from the fishermen in Labrador during the glut period, and in fact we encouraged it. Because at that time we did not have the capacity onshore to utilize this great mass of fish that converged on the Labrador coast at that time. So naturally it would be better to sell the fish to the Quebec boats than to dump it.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Carter: Only a glut situation. My hon. colleague put his finger on it, of course. But unfortunately of course maybe greed or call it what you want, took over, and after the glut period had subsided, the French Canadian collector vessels from the north shore continued to endeavor to buy fish from Newfoundland fishermen. And it was only after we read the riot act to them, got after them, did they agree to cease and desist from that practice.

So what could we do this year? We did not want to allow that situation to develop. And again, recognizing the rights of these collector boats, either one way or the other, to collect fish harvested by their own vessels from the north shore, we decided that we would issue them with a license. And the terms of the license of course were spelled out in no uncertain terms. Namely

that they were permitted only to collect fish from vessels originating from the Quebec north shore, and fishing, of course, in the Labrador area. And that only in a glut situation would they be allowed to buy fish from Newfoundland fishermen. I repeat, only in a glut situation.

And that seemed to fit the bill. In fact my officials had lengthy discussions with their counterpart officials in the Government of Quebec. And while they had some reservations I think it was pretty well agreed at the end of the day that the terms and conditions under which we wanted their collector boats to operate off Black Tickle and indeed off the Labrador Coast were reasonably acceptable, they would agree to go along with it and that is what happened.

We served notice, Mr. Speaker, earlier in the season, that if we could establish proof that a collector boat from the north shore of Quebec was caught purchasing fish or encouraging the sale of Newfoundland fish to their vessels, their licences would be immediately rescinded. I believe only in one instance we have partial evidence, not conclusive evidence, but some evidence where I believe in one instance that happened, where a Newfoundland fisherman, for whatever reason, and I know there are several reasons probably why some of them would like to have sold their fish to the Quebec vessels, but at least, only in one instance do we have partial proof, if that is the way to put it, that such an action took place.

The hon. gentleman mentioned a number of letters he has had from people in the Black Tickle area,

well, I can only tell him that I would expect if he has that information, and I do not doubt for a moment, he has, if he says he does, then he should pass it on to my officials and if it can be proven beyond doubt that such an action occurred, then you can be sure that we will do what needs to be done to make sure that collector will not get a new licence.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Carter: No, there is no great deal of difference in the price, but there are certain benefits I think that might accrue to Newfoundland fishermen, were they to sell their harvest to the French-Canadian collector boats.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I did not like the idea quite frankly of issuing licences to north shore vessels to collect fish and possibly buy fish from Newfoundland fishermen, in fact, I would have to be awfully sure that every fish plant in Newfoundland had all the fish it needs to operate before I would encourage Newfoundland fishermen to sell their fish to the north shore boats even in a glut situation. That is not to say that we have anything against the fishermen on the north shore, of course not, but charity begins at home, and if the need is there in our Province for that fish, then naturally it must follow that our plants would have first call on it, so, Mr. Speaker, that is not the only problem.

The more serious problem, not with the method by which we issue licences, the most serious problem I think in the whole scenario, involves the number of vessels that converged on the Black Tickle

area this year, in anticipation of another glut situation. In fact, I am told there were, at times, as many as sixty vessels fishing in the Black Tickle area from the north shore of Quebec.

I wrote the Minister of Fisheries and I objected to the fact that that many vessels were allowed to converge on that stock, in fact I went to Ottawa and had a meeting with him, and I discussed that problem and I pointed out to him that while under the sector of management agreement which was arranged between the provinces by the Federal Government, and that of course means when you have two regions where a region overlaps, then there is provision within the agreement where certain vessels from the other region would have a right to fish in the adjoining, the abutting region, the overlapping region.

Mr. Speaker, the understanding that we have is, that will apply only to the vessels that have a tradition of fishing there at the time of the agreement. In fact I am told by people in my Department and Intergovernmental Affairs that there are about twelve to fifteen north shore vessels which are grandfathered under that agreement.

They have the right to fish off Black Tickle, as indeed does the fishermen of Labrador have a right to- at least a certain number of them to fish off the north shore, but, Mr. Valcourt denies that such a grandfathering clause exists and his re-action to me, was, if 100 vessels want to fish off Black Tickle from the north shore of Quebec, well, then, there is not much can be done about it.

Certainly we are not going to let it rest there because if that is

so, then, Mr. Speaker, what does that say for the fishermen of the Labrador Coast, what does it say for them, as the stocks decline in other areas, no doubt, if that is allowed to continue, then we will see a proliferation of fishing effort from other provinces converging on that area, to the detriment of the fishermen and the fish plant workers on the Labrador Coast.

Now getting back to the motion presented -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Carter: Yes, of course, yes.

EQUIPMENT MALFUNCTION

Mr. Simms:.....made reference to the fact that in those licences there were certain restrictions. Now my recollection of the issue being discussed publicly recently somewhere, I do not know if I read it in the paper or whatever, was some reference by Mr. Kingsley or somebody, that in fact there are no restrictions. I wonder is it possible to have a look; would the Minister be able to table a copy of a licence outlining the conditions - maybe black out the name of the party, we are not interested in that - just to see what it contains so we could make our own judgement?

Mr. Carter: Of course, I would have no objections, Mr. Speaker, to tabling a copy of that agreement. And I can only repeat what I said a moment ago, that notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman has said, there was a condition attached to that licence, namely, that the person holding the licence would not be allowed to purchase fish from Newfoundland vessels only - and I

repeat, only - during a glut situation. And, as was the case last year when a glut situation developed, we were happy enough to have that market for Newfoundland codfish, because were that market not there, then the fish would have had to be dumped, and, of course, that would be totally unacceptable. But that was a condition of the licence and I shall, in the next day or two, bring forward a copy of the terms and conditions under which the licence was issued.

Mr. Speaker, the representation made by my colleague from Eagle River is not an unreasonable one, given the fact that the five principles on which he bases his argument, that of adjacency, historic usage, economic efficiency, economic dependency, are the principles, Mr. Speaker, that Canada used in the Law of the Sea debate. I had the privilege of attending some of those sessions in the early 1970s and I can attest to the fact that Canada, in fact, put great stock in the five principles on which they were basing their case for an extended jurisdiction.

So, therefore, in fairness to my colleague and to the people he represents, it must follow that - what is the saying? - what's sauce for the goose is sauce for the Gander. And if Canada and Newfoundland are going to use an argument based on those five principles, then it is not totally unreasonable to expect the people of Labrador to endeavour to base a case on the same principles.

Now, I have discussed the motion with my colleague, because certainly it would not be to our advantage, I suppose, to balkanize the fishery to the point where

every cove and every island and every fishing community in Newfoundland could lay claim to first call on the resource next to a shore, based on the adjacency principle and on the other principles. That would, I think, have a devastating impact on the fishery. Because it must follow that if Labrador were to follow that principle, then what would stop Fogo Island, for example, or Twillingate, or the Great Northern Peninsula from applying the same principles in advancing an argument whereby they would expect to have first call on fish adjacent to their shores?

But as my colleague has pointed out to me privately, and I think today in his speech, the people of Labrador are not being unreasonable. They respect the historic usage on the part of other Newfoundlanders to fish on the Labrador Coast. They are not greedy, they are not saying we insist on these five principles being applied, and in so doing give Labradorians access to all of that fish. Their position is a very reasonable one, a very unselfish one, in that they are willing and, in fact, quite anxious to recognize the rights of other Newfoundlanders who fished in those waters. I suppose my forefathers fished in that area, as I am sure the Barbours and the Keans from Bonavista Bay, and others, fished in those waters probably 250 years ago, every summer. I know my father fished up off the Coast of Labrador every summer, while I was a boy growing up, in a seventy-five ton schooner, and I am sure that other men opposite have had the same experience. So it would not be fair to say that Newfoundlanders do not have any claim to that fish because they lack an historic

usage of it. Of course, that is not so. And my hon. colleague, being the fair-minded person he is, is not suggesting that.

I tell you, if I were a fish plant worker or a fisherman or a family man living on the Coast of Labrador, or if I were representing that district, as my hon. colleague is, it would gall me, Mr. Speaker, to realize that a large part of that Northern cod stock in the 2J area is being harvested by provinces other than Newfoundland, by Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec, provinces that have no historic claim to that fish - no historic claim. In fact, allowing them to harvest that Northern cod defies the five principles that Canada has used in making a case for extended jurisdiction, because certainly they do not have the adjacency principle on their side.

They certainly do not have the economic efficiency on their side, because surely it must follow that it is not very economically efficient to catch fish off Northern Labrador and transport it whatever distance, a couple of thousand miles, two or two-and-a-half days steam, to some plant in the Maritimes for processing. So that defies the economic efficiency principle.

And then, of course, the economic dependency: Who in his right mind would even dare suggest that a fish plant in either of the other three Maritime Provinces, namely, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Quebec, would have the same level of economic dependency on the cod fishery as do the fishermen on the Labrador coast? It would just be nonsense to even suggest.

Then, of course, Mr. Speaker,

there is the fifth and final principle of - no, I believe I have applied them all. Mr. Speaker, that, I think, pretty well states the case for there being some special consideration to be given to the people of the Labrador coast. As my friend said, you have an area where you have 10,000 people depending on the fishery for their existence, people who live in small coves, in fact about thirty permanent communities and about fifty seasonal fishing stages or quarters, call them what you want, 10,000 people who live in those communities in a very isolated part of our country and our province, most depending on the fishery for their very existence. You have, he says, 4,000 fishermen and fish plant workers who depend on the fisheries for their livelihood.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of that coast historically have been a pretty independent people. In fact, if my friend were here from Social Services, I think statistics from his Department would indicate that at some time back, 5 per cent dependency on Social Services was pretty well the order of the day. Now, I am told, through no fault of their own, maybe as high as 10 per cent of the people of that region have to depend on Social Services for their existence.

Of course with proper understanding on the part of the Federal Government, and I will say, too, help on the part of the Province, it might well be, Mr. Speaker, that that 10 per cent who now depend on Social Services could be drastically reduced.

Mr. Speaker, I am told by officials in my Department that

there are nineteen fish plants operating on the coast. I am told that it would take roughly 1.1 million pounds of fish a day in order for these plants to sustain a viable operation. I am told, as well, that out of a total quota of about 17 - no, wait now, let me make sure I have this correct.

Well, of course, we know what happened to the caplin harvest this year. In 1989, there were 300 tons of caplin allocated to the Labrador coast, 300 out of a total allowable catch of 96,000 metric tons. This year there were 400 tons. What is that, less than half of one per cent of the total allowable catch in caplin allocated to the Labrador coast? Unfortunately, this year, again for reasons beyond the control of the fishermen up there, the caplin were small and were not of adequate or sufficient size to harvest. So the caplin fishery this year meant absolutely nothing to the fishermen of the Labrador straits. Is that correct?

An Hon. Member: Right.

Mr. Carter: Yes. In my view that is shameful, and certainly steps should be taken next year, when the management plan is put together, to make sure that that never happens again. The people of Labrador have as much right to a proportionate share of that total allowable catch of caplin as, indeed, do the fishermen of Notre Dame Bay or St. Mary's Bay, or, in fact, any other part of this province.

They are Newfoundlanders, they need that income in order to augment their income from the fishery, and they have a legitimate right to it. Certainly for my part, and I know I speak

here in unison with my colleague from Labrador, we will be making the strongest possible representation when the time comes to the powers that be in Ottawa to insure that that does not happen this year.

Mr. Speaker, in my colleague's few remarks he made reference to some facts. Try to put yourself in the position of a fisherman or fish plant worker on the coast of Labrador who, as he said, after the lights are turned out in their fish plants, can look out on a clear night and see large vessels, owned by other provinces, indeed by other countries, fishing within a gunshot, as the saying goes, of their dormant fish plants.

That is too much to expect any red-blooded person to accept, and I commend the good people of Labrador for having the fortitude of being able to keep their cool and not do what I am sure people in less civilized countries would do under similar circumstances. So I think they are to be commended.

Mr. Dumaresque: They are good people.

Mr. Carter: They are good people, of course they are, and they are people who deserve a chance to survive and to reap the benefits of the resource that is theirs by virtue of the principles I have outlined here today.

Mr. Speaker, I think Labrador has a good future in the fishery, I think it does, but I can tell you now there will have to be almost revolutionary changes in the attitude of some people and in our approach to fishery development on that coast. I believe it has some potential, for example, in the

processing of shrimp, and we are working with the member now to hopefully see a shrimp operation established in L'Anse-au-Loup, where already a start is made; where a building has been partially erected. And with the help of my colleague, the Minister of Development, who is very sympathetic as well to this proposal, and the Economic Recovery team, I think between us we can hopefully work something out.

I am happy to announce today, Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with my colleague from Eagle River, the fact that this morning the Department of Fisheries made a decision, one that I think will have some far-reaching benefits for the people of Cartwright and that area, where we have decided to issue a crab processing licence to the Labrador Fishermen's Shrimp Union Company. They have been after us now for some time.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister's time is up.

Mr. Carter: May I have another minute?

Some Hon. Members: By leave!

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, we have faith in the Cartwright area. Obviously, the powers that be in Ottawa and in my Department, we both have faith in the availability of a sizeable stock of crab which, according to the scientists, is adequate to sustain a pretty healthy operation in Cartwright for a number of years.

So the Labrador Fishermen's Union Shrimp Company now has been given the go-ahead to start, to identify and train an adequate work force and to do whatever needs to be

done with the physical structure of that building to make it possible to process shrimp. I do not have all the details here, but I believe that plant will employ 125 people. And my friend from Torngat, I am sure, will appreciate how beneficial that is to the coast of Labrador and to the people in Cartwright. One hundred and twenty-five jobs in the community of Cartwright is equal, almost, to the projected economic benefits of Hibernia to the Mosquito Cove area or, indeed, to the whole Avalon Peninsula.

So it is a very important initiative, and I would be remiss in my duty were I not to give a lot of credit to my colleague here for what he has been doing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear hear!

Mr. Carter: He has been haunting my office now for the past number of weeks. There is a report that I am after the job of the Federal Minister of Fisheries. I have been accused of sort of eyeing that job.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Carter: As a matter of fact, I would strongly advise the hon. gentleman, Mr. Valcourt, to stop putting ideas in my head.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: (Inaudible) Audrey MacLaughlin dinnertime and wanted to know (inaudible) put her (inaudible).

Mr. Carter: No. I would strongly caution - I was going to say my friend, but I suppose he might be offended if I used that term. I would caution the hon. gentleman not to put ideas into my head,

because I have been known, before, to change from one jurisdiction to another.

Mr. Dumaresque: Very successfully. Very successfully, too.

Mr. Carter: I think most Newfoundlanders will agree that when it comes to politics, I would make Harry Houdini look like an amateur.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: You are a survivor.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, we are all survivors.

Mr. Speaker: Has leave been withdrawn?

Mr. Carter: I will take my seat now. Mr. Speaker, I like the motion my colleague has presented. I quite frankly do not see anything wrong with it, given the fact, as I said, that he is not being greedy or demanding that all the fish caught in Labrador waters be landed on the Coast of Labrador. I support it.

The very substantial amount of fish being caught by the Nova Scotians, I resent the fact that they are given that allocation. And if even 5,000 tons of that fish were taken from the 17,000 tons or 18,000 tons or more that the Nova Scotian's and others will harvest within that area, if we were to take a fraction of it and have it landed at the appropriate time in a co-ordinated way in Labrador, it would provide 500 to 600 seasonal jobs, and that would work miracles in a place like Labrador, where jobs are so scarce.

Mr. Matthews: If we could only

get the minister to do something like he is talking about (inaudible).

Mr. Dumaresque: Don't you worry about him.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to abuse the privilege that has been extended to me in the leave that is being offered, so I will take my seat now. But I say again, I commend the member for putting forward this motion, and it does not cause me any problem whatever to support it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has recognized the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Warren: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have listened to the last three speakers, and I get the feeling that neither one of the three speakers who spoke are very far away from supporting this resolution. I think we are all of the general feeling that it is a good resolution. It is a resolution that addresses the concerns my colleague and I have witnessed during the last number of years on the Labrador Coast.

However, Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of comments I want to make. I was hoping to table a package in the House today, Mr. Speaker, but unfortunately, Atlantic Airways had to cancel their flight from Goose Bay to St. John's yesterday evening because of some unforeseen circumstances, and subsequently the package is delayed. Mr. Speaker, with your

permission, Sir, when the package arrive I just want to prove that one point in this resolution is incorrect. I say to my hon. colleague that I do not think it was done deliberately, but I guess the old saying is the proof has to be there. The last WHEREAS says, WHEREAS not one salt fish is dried on the Labrador Coast.

Mr. Speaker, I have to be fair to my colleague. I am sure my colleague could have said WHEREAS not very many salt fish are dried on the Labrador Coast. Mr. Speaker, let me tell my hon. colleague that there is a package enroute to me, a package of dried salt codfish, dried on the Labrador Coast, dried in the hon. member's district. Mr. Speaker, there are quintals and quintals of codfish dried in the hon. member's district.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) that?

Mr. Warren: No, I say to my hon. colleague. What he wanted to say there is, not very many salt fish were dried. I say to my hon. colleague there should be more salt fish dried on the Labrador Coast and it should be encouraged by the Saltfish Corporation and by both governments.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution says WHEREAS not one salt fish is dried on the Labrador Coast. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are dried by hardworking fishermen who go out in their boats and sweat day after day hauling their nets, then they salt the fish and dry them because they make more money with salt fish.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to the Minister of Fisheries and a comment he made in response to a question from the House Leader.

Again, I say to the Minister of Fisheries, something is not working right in the executive area of the Minister's department. I would say that either the Minister of Fisheries or his Deputy Ministers are not giving the full facts, and it is confusing, Mr. Speaker. Because I have a copy here of comments alleged to have been made to a reporter by the name of Suzanne Norman, and the comments are from a person by the name of Reg Kingsley, Assistant Deputy Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries that if what he said today is correct, then what is quoted here in the paper is incorrect. One of it has to be wrong.

Mr. Matthews: Yes. The two can't be right.

Mr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, here is the comment that Mr. Kingsley made: He said, 'the collector boats are there under processing licences and nothing in those licences prevent them from collecting fish from the coast of Labrador.' He further goes on to say, 'we have never been restrictive in terms of where a company can buy fish within the Province.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister says the licences do specify, one or the other has to be wrong. So, I say to the Minister in all due respect, until those that are given a processing licence - and I agree with the Minister, by the way, that when there is a glut, yes, but at least give it to the fish plants in Black Tickle, Williams Harbour, Cartwright, Nain, Mary's Harbour, Makkovik and the other fifteen or sixteen

plants. At least give them the first opportunity. But the Department of Fisheries, over a number of years, has not done that.

The Minister said one other thing, Mr. Speaker, and again I have to take him up on it. In his final five minutes he was saying he supports his colleague. I support what his colleague has illustrated in his resolution also, but the Minister should remember, and I brought it up in the House last year and it was brought up by the Combined Councils last year, that the Minister's own department had the opportunity when the boats were owned by the Government and were fishing fifty-two miles outside of Nain, and instead of landing one tail of that fish on the Labrador coast. From Nain all the way down to L'Anse-au-Clair they had the opportunity to land that fish anywhere at all on the Labrador coast, but the Minister's department failed to land that fish anywhere on the Labrador coast and it was landed in St. Anthony instead. Now there was an opportunity.

Mr. Carter: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries on a point of order.

Mr. Carter: I recall that episode last year in the House and the question raised by my colleague, and I know the answer I gave. I believe I can almost give it verbatim this afternoon, that indeed the fish plant operators in Labrador were given an opportunity to access that fish but, for whatever reason, did not see fit to do so. I am not now trying to have selective amnesia, but -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

First of all, I want to say that the hon. the Minister of Fisheries is not on a point of order, he is making a comment. The proper procedure should be to ask the hon. Member if he could allow him a point of clarification, in which case, if the hon. Member allows him, then he is permitted to speak. But I would tell the hon. the Minister of Fisheries this is not a point of order.

Mr. Carter: I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I should have maybe asked for leave to clarify a situation.

Mr. Warren: Sure. No problem.

Mr. Carter: But I shall, without taking any time from the House, produce tomorrow or the next day some documentation to the effect of what I just said.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Warren: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Let me say just one other thing to clarify the whole matter. Let me say to the Minister, and I want all my colleagues to hear this, on both sides, because this is very important. He said other plants were offered but did not want it for whatever reason. Now let me put one thing straight to the minister himself. The plant in Nain is owned by you, by this government. Now you have to answer why it was not taken to the Nain plant, which was owned by the government. That is where I am coming from. Now he is going to come back and say the plant was closed down. The plant can be opened up, because it is owned by the government. So there you go,

Mr. Speaker. I just want to make it clear that the minister has it in his own hands to have that fish landed in the Nain plant.

Mr. Dumaresque: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been good to my colleague, so I would hope he would just hold back. He has the last twenty minutes to get up and say what he wants to say. I am glad the minister announced the crab processing licence for Cartwright. I think it is a good idea. It is long overdue. I compliment the minister on having the crab processing licence for Cartwright. At the same time, although it is a Federal jurisdiction, I would like to suggest to the minister that he encourage Mr. Valcourt, encourage the Federal Government to issue a few extra crab licences, which are needed. We have Mr. Mitchell in Makkovik who has been trying for the last three years for a crab licence and cannot get one.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that I am willing to do my share to encourage the Federal Government to issue more crab licence to the Labrador people. I want to encourage the minister to do one other thing, and this was started by the former Minister of Fisheries in Mr. Peckford's Government. The experiment that is ongoing in the Charlottetown area, in my hon. colleague's district, so far, for the last four or five years, has been giving some good results, and that is the trial with the lobster fishery. Mr. Speaker, indications are that this is on an experimental basis. It has been there for about three or four years, and it is going to be another three or four years before

the lobsters are large enough naturally for a commercial catch. But if it is working in the Charlottetown area, maybe the minister should look at some other areas of Labrador and try similar species to see whether it will work or not.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that for the last ten or eleven years I have gotten up in this House time and time again and questioned ministers about giving the Labrador people a better opportunity to catch the fish that is so close to their shores. This summer alone, just to give you an example, there were fifty-four longliners from Quebec alone in Black Tickle at one time, and that is a bit much. You know, it is not that the fish was scarce on the Labrador this year in that area, because if the fish that were caught were distributed to the plants on the coast, then surely goodness there would be sufficient income for individuals to meet their needs.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal and Provincial Governments, during the last four or five years in particular, have spent in excess of \$23 million - mainly the Federal Government - in building and upgrading new fish plants on the Labrador Coast, and I refer to Nain and Makkovik, I refer to Punchbowl and Smokey.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) Punchbowl?

Mr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, I said I refer to Punchbowl, I refer to Smokey, I refer to Black Tickle. I say to my hon. colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, if we are not careful, this year coming up, with the number of longliners from the Island portion of our

Province, and from Nova Scotia and Quebec, in particular, those three areas, if we are not careful I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Black Tickle fish plant and the Williams Harbour fish plant will not operate. If the Minister does not take some action on the licenses that those boats have, the Quebec boats, the Newfoundland boats, and the Nova Scotia boats. And Mr. Minister I am being serious with you, and I guess you know what I am saying, that there are going to be problems in Black Tickle and Williams Harbour with the operation.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Warren: Five minutes, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Five minutes, yes. The hon. Member began at ten minutes to four.

Mr. Warren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How time flies. But as I was saying to my hon. colleagues, there are problems with those two particular fish plants. We have to realize that the people who live in Black Tickle and Williams Harbour, those fishermen should be supplying the fish to those two fish plants, because if we have developing in Labrador what we had this year we may as well say, good by, to those two fish plants. That is a serious comment to make but it is factual and the only way it can be solved is by the Minister doing what he said was suppose to be done as pertaining to those processing licenses, and I hope not what Mr. Kingsley has been saying to one of the media.

An Hon. Member: There are more ways (inaudible).

Mr. Warren: That is true, Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are, but there are more ways to gut a fish. You can gut it from the head up, or from the tail up.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) five thousand tons -

Mr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, I support every Labrador fisherman having enough fish to meet their needs. I have said that and I will continue to do that, but I say to my hon. colleague, are you saying to your Minister that he has to do his share in order to help the Labrador fishermen as well, which he has not done this past year? If he did it this past year we would not have the problem, the problem would not have been there if the Minister took the initiative of doing what he said was done. The Minister said that those licenses indicated were only for the glut season and there was no glut season up there this year.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) Newfoundland fishermen.

Mr. Warren: But they bought from them. Mr. Speaker, all my hon. colleague has to do is go and ask White Fisheries in Sandy Cove who they bought fish from. Now, the Minister can do that himself.

An Hon. Member: If they are Newfoundland boats you cannot stop them.

Mr. Warren: See, Mr. Speaker, you cannot stop Newfoundland boats. Why not? Tell me why not? What is the reason? There is no reason, Mr. Speaker. I am saying to the Minister of Fisheries, and I say to my hon. colleague, what he has been saying all along is that the people nearest to the

resource should have the first crack at it. That is what we are saying in this House so that is where I am coming from. As long as we continue to see the boats from Nova Scotia, the Island portion of the Province, and Quebec, go up there and take the fish first and letting the Labrador people having the tails, the bones and the heads that are left over, that is not what I want for the Labrador people, and maybe not what my colleague for Eagle River wants.

Mr. Speaker, as I said to my colleague from Bonavista South, when the Lester Mitchells and when the Toby Andersons or when the Jack Merkeratsuks - all those people are fishermen in my district - when they have the opportunity of catching the fish, and when you have sixty-seven plant workers in Nain and only one qualifying for UIC benefits, because the fish is coming back to the Island or back to Nova Scotia, then there is something wrong.

And in closing, Mr. Speaker, I know I only have another minute but I just want to say one other thing, and I want to say this to the Minister of Fisheries, and here is an example of how the Minister of Fisheries can assist the people on the Labrador Coast. The words arctic char are synonymous to the Coast of Labrador. So I suggest to the Minister, and I understand he has received some correspondence from the Labrador Inuit Association concerning that particular resource, but before the Minister agrees with the farming of Arctic char in particular areas on the Island portion of the Province, he should remember this particular species is so important to the fishermen north of Cape Harrison

or north of Cape Rouge that if we continue to support the farming of arctic char in sections of the Island portion of our Province, we are going to destroy another livelihood of the fishermen who have to depend on that special species. So I say to the Minister he should think about it before he gives the okay for such a species to be farmed elsewhere on the Island, if it is going to be farmed let it be back where they come from.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution as amended by my colleague, and I believe it is a good resolution for the people on the Labrador Coast.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. John's South.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Murphy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It certainly is a privilege for me to have an opportunity to rise in support of the resolution moved today by the hon. Member for Eagle River. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to take a non-partisan approach to this resolution because of the nature of its sincerity. I think that we have seen over the last while that the sense of fairness and balance is alive and well, though there are many obstacles, Mr. Speaker, to make all the things that are necessary to fairness and balance happen within a short frame or a period of time. But at least the thrust and the mental will to do that is very imminent.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I look across at the hon. Member from St.

John's East Extern today and it is quite obvious he is more relaxed sitting in his place today than he was last spring, because the concerns that he had with the inshore fishery in his district proved to be unfounded and the fishermen in St. John's East, as the fishermen throughout the Avalon and many areas of the northern Avalon, were extremely fortunate in having what I suspect might be classified as a bumper crop when it comes to the inshore fishery this year.

I ask myself, as I think about what has taken place in the inshore fishery this year, if the Member for St. John's East Extern or the Member for Ferryland or you, Your Honour, in the Chair, over in Bay de Verde, all of a sudden saw a tremendous number of new fishing boats arriving on their shores, setting up fishing communities on islands and coastal areas throughout the north Avalon and southern Avalon how they would feel, how the fishermen would feel. And I say to the hon. Member for Grand Bank the same thing, although he was not as fortunate with the inshore fishery this year in his community. But we must understand, Mr. Speaker, that if we as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are to expect to share the common resource, our biggest resource, then we have to look at the resolution and give it soul searching serious thought.

It is not justice, it is not honest, it is not fair for a man and his family to wait for the ice to leave the coast of Labrador and as my hon. colleague said, to go to a merchant, gather fishing supplies and stock, gather food for his family, move away from his home, whether it is in Black Tickle or Battle Harbour or

Williams Harbour or wherever, cast his nets in the ocean and come up comparatively empty and in realizing, Mr. Speaker, that the same thing has taken place a month or six weeks prior along the coast of Newfoundland, and I suppose historically those areas that have not shown a good fishery, that those with the boats which are capable and for those who do not have boats which are capable to go on deck of coastal boats and what have you, and show up just as the fishing season opens on the coast of Labrador and almost demand to take part in that resource without concern or consideration for those residents who live, not only in the district of the Member for Eagle River, but in the district of the Member for Torngat Mountains.

We have to have a sense of conscience when it comes to the residents and fisher folk on the coast of Labrador. This would only happen, I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, when we understand that we have a sympathetic Government in Ottawa, who understands the plight, and I do not know if I could find words or adjectives serious enough to underline the plight of those residents who survive and what they hope would be a six or seven week industry and to gain enough stamps, spread out over a period of time to survive during the harsh and cold winter months along that Coast.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is almost I suppose sinful, when you think that within the next few weeks we will have to listen to the large fish companies making their presentations and their cases for the allocation and the TAC they will have to draw from in the offshore Northern Cod. The

mere fact that it says Northern Cod, Mr. Speaker, is a total indication that 2J and 3KL have an adjacency to the people of Labrador, and yet Sir, I say to you, not one pound of that resource has been given to these people.

Now along that Coast, and I suppose again historically, and maybe tradition is what is standing in the way of the people on the Labrador Coast. Tradition says, that over the years, livyers and what have you, and my forefathers did it; left Carbonear with their schooner and went to Battle Harbour and found their way through the ice floes and set up and got their motorboats and their cod traps in the water and made their living on the Coast of Labrador. Then to cure that fish, which they had to do at that particular time, bring it back, sell it to St. John's merchants who amassed a fortune I suspect, over the years, from that salt cod industry and reaped the harvest, of what I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, is the resource that rightfully and honestly belongs to those people who have had the courage to settle in Labrador.

Now the hon. Leader of the Opposition stood in his place today and rightfully so, I enjoyed his speech, and I enjoyed listening to his experience as a Minister of Fisheries representing a Government of this Province. For one minute I do not doubt the Leader of the Opposition's sincerity in saying that he, at many times attended many meetings as our Minister has over the years, and fought the good fight to try and convince the bureaucrats and both political parties in Ottawa, that they were not doing what was needed to be

done to give the folks, the fisher folks on the Coast of Labrador, their rightful place in this country that we call Canada. That fight obviously goes on to this very day. I would suggest to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that all of his fighting has not given the adequate share. When you consider that of the total inshore stock on the coast of Labrador this year, in excess of seventy-five per cent was taken away from the fishermen of Labrador and sold, distributed to other plants and offered employment throughout the Island, throughout the Province of Nova Scotia, throughout the Province of New Brunswick, throughout the Province of Quebec, Mr. Speaker, I think, obviously, a new approach is needed.

And I do not fault the Leader of the Opposition. I think, as I said, he was sincere in his efforts. I know the hon. the Minister of Fisheries in this administration must have torn his hair over the last year and half in trying to convince, number one, Mr. Siddon, who I suspect had no understanding or realization of what existed or what went on in the homes of people along the Labrador coast. And I know, watching the Minister today, the frustrations he must have in trying to deal with the new Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Valencourt.

An Hon. Member: Mr. Who?

Mr. Murphy: I do not know what his name is, and it really doesn't matter. I have difficulty in pronouncing it for a reason, because I lose concept when I think about the way he has treated the people on the coast of Labrador. He didn't even consider

issuing a shrimp licence to the fishermen up there in that inshore situation, or providing a new fleet or any new technology for those inshore men to be able to harvest what is a very good, sound, solid resource, which would offer a way of life or extend a way of life to the Labrador fishermen. He has not even considered it, because the lobby is not for the few people who live along the Labrador coast, the lobby, and it goes on and on, day in and day out, Mr. Speaker, in Ottawa is on behalf of the shareholders, the big people who own National Sea Products and who own Fishery Products International, and other big companies which harvest that stock.

Now, I suppose it is ironic in a sense that I, as a Member for St. John's South, number one, am standing to support this resolution. But I suppose in supporting it I could be saying that the new licence to harvest shrimp - offshore shrimp, I might add - on the Southside might be in jeopardy because of my words. But I have to do it, Mr. Speaker, because I know the people in St. John's South who are looking for the opportunity to become involved in that shrimp fishery off the coast of Labrador would gladly give up allocation of that particular species.

Mr. Speaker, it is criminal. I would suggest to you nothing short of that when the TAC comes out this year, that not even 500,000 pounds of fish could at least be allocated from that resource to the fishermen of Labrador. Not only to catch, Mr. Speaker, not only to harvest, but to process. Because therein lies the labour intensity that the people on the coast of Labrador need to

understand that they have taken an equal and prosperous part in this country and in this Province. I do not know, Mr. Speaker. I watched a program on Monday evening on CBC, a forum that took place in Fogo -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) few minutes?

Mr. Murphy: Yes. The hon. member should go. As a matter of fact, he should go more often because it has often been said - no, I will not say that in the House, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: Who are you talking about?

Mr. Murphy: I watched the forum in Fogo. It was too bad the hon. the Minister of Fisheries did not have an opportunity to get to Fogo, and it was explained by the CBC reporter that the Leader of the Opposition was not there. But the same situation, the same scenario, the same problems and frustrations were expressed by the fisherpeople on the Island of Fogo. They even saw the hon. member who offered absolutely nothing new. However, being a school teacher, I do not suppose he knows a whole lot about the fishery. But the same frustrations were there.

Now, this is not the Labrador fishery, Mr. Speaker, this is the provincial fishery, and I suppose it is so evident and so obvious that the lack of concern of the Federal Government historically is the prime cause that Newfoundlanders among themselves, whether they be inshore, middle distance, and/or offshore, are divided as to their share. It is time, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a united front was

taken by all those who harvest the resource and make a sincere effort to Ottawa, along with the fish companies, along with this Government, sanctioned by the Opposition, to ensure that the bureaucrats and the Government in Ottawa know that Newfoundlanders have had enough. If we do not, Mr. Speaker, within the next two or three years ensure that the foreign overfishing that takes place, not on the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks, Mr. Speaker, but on the Grand Banks and on the Coast of Labrador - I know many a captain who works for FPI and National Sea has told me personally that as soon as the sun sets, it is like an armada, with the fleets from foreign countries coming on our grounds and raping, not only our cod, but every species that is out there, and they are all valuable species now, Mr. Speaker.

Where are the federal authorities who are responsible, who adamantly say that we have no business in any part of the jurisdiction on what has been for 500 years a resource of the people of this Province? Where are they when we need them, Mr. Speaker? They are not available. It is criminal to even think that not one caplin licence, because we are now beginning to see that the mighty cod fish is the mainstay our our fishery, but we are also starting to realize that underutilized species, whether they be silver hake, whether they be caplin, herring, mackerel, and/or other species, there is a market throughout the world for these species. And what did we have the other day? The Federal Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa trying to justify the giving away of silver hake because Canadians are not fishing the species.

Back to the caplin as contained within the resolution. We all know that the codfish use caplin as a bait and you can be sure if there is a good caplin fishery on the ground, that nine chances out of ten there will be a good cod fishery on the inshore ground.

An Hon. Member: You do not know what you are talking about, boy. I have seen caplin roll on the beaches for days and there was not a fish.

Mr. Murphy: I would suggest that maybe the hon. member should roll on the beach for a few days. He is built to do it. To know there is such an abundance of caplin along the Coast of Labrador, and to think, just to even try within your own mind to think about not one single licence to a resident on that Coast, is totally unforgivable.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I talked about what was the mainstay years ago in the cod fishery, with the salt cod, the dried cod. Today we have the Saltfish Corporation who control salt cod on behalf of this Province and Atlantic Canada and again we see not an opportunity for one pound of dried salt cod from a fisherman in Labrador being accepted by these people, and absolutely no consideration for their ability to do so.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that as time goes on the people of Labrador will not stay quiet. We can see what has changed over the years, inasmuch as that the hon. Member for Eagle River, I think, is the first native-born Labradorian to sit in this hon. House.

An Hon. Member: Hear hear!

Mr. Murphy: And rightfully so. And we can see the spirit and the representation he brings to this House on behalf of the people of his district. I would suggest to you, that is a light, Mr. Speaker, that indicates the people of Labrador are no longer content to tolerate the indifference and the unjust allocation of what is an adjacency resource that belongs rightfully to them.

You know, Mr. Speaker, how would the hon. Member from Humber Valley feel if people started running up and down the farming lands of his district harvesting crops and what have you? How would the farmers in Saskatchewan feel? Surely heavens, Mr. Speaker, it is time the same concern and consideration was given to those people who - and I hate to say this, Mr. Speaker - but who exist on the coast of Labrador because of lack of concern. Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution from the hon. the Member for Eagle River, because it is not only for the aspirations, but the concern -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Murphy: - he brings to this House.

Some Hon. Members: By leave.

Some Hon. Members: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the few minutes I have, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words on this important resolution which was, I must say, very ably put forward by the

Member for Eagle River. And there is one thing you have to say about this particular Member, and that he has the best interests of Labrador at heart.

Some Hon. Members: Hear hear!

Mr. Matthews: As a matter of fact, I only know one Member in my term in this Legislature who has upheld the interests of Labrador more, and that is the Member for Torngat Mountains. But I have to tell him that he is certainly sincere about representing his district and the people of Labrador.

Mr. Murphy: What is the analogy of a caplin?

Mr. Matthews: There he goes again, Mr. Speaker. The only person in this debate today, Mr. Speaker, to get nasty is the Member for St. John's South, and I do not know why that is. Now I know the Government is under tremendous pressure. With the nurses and the NTA and the teacher assistants, the Nursing Home Associations and all that stuff, I know they are under tremendous pressure.

Mr. Murphy: Talk about Labrador now.

Mr. Matthews: Why didn't you talk about Labrador? I want to say to the Member that my colleague from Fogo was only making a point when he was talking about the caplin. The Member from St. John's South said that as long as there are caplin on the ground, then there are thousands, plenty of fish.

Mr. Murphy: I said it was a good indication.

Mr. Matthews: Sometimes. That is

about as predictable about the Newfoundland fishery as everything else is, Mr. Speaker. Because out in Musgrave Harbour, Hamilton Sound and the Twillingate area this year there were millions and millions of caplin, but not a fish. As a matter of fact, the great deal of the Economic Recovery Commission in re-opening the Twillingate plant, they had to lay off people out there after about six weeks because there was not enough fish. In the meantime, there were millions of pounds of caplin. So I just want to correct the Member on that.

Mr. Matthews: On overfishing, let me say to the Member for St. John's South that I am very familiar with overfishing and the effects of overfishing. As a matter of fact, growing up in the town of Grand Bank I remember being just a boy and having trawlermen who lived on the same street where I grew up coming back from the Grand Banks and telling of the lights out there in the nighttime, it was like a city.

An Hon. Member: That is a long time ago.

Mr. Matthews: That is a long time ago, yes. But we are finally seeing the results of that today, of foreign vessels out on the Grand Banks. A little closer to that, of course, we have the French overfishing in 3Ps, which has devastated the inshore fishery along the south coast, particularly the Burin Peninsula, the District I represent, from Little St. Lawrence to Garnish. So I can readily identify with the Member for Eagle River's concerns about what he considers, I guess, to Labrador foreign vessels, even though they are probably from the same province; they are from

outside of the region. So I understand there are concerns about that. Basically, as the Leader of the Opposition has indicated, we can support this resolution 99.9 per cent.

But I just want to talk for a moment, if I could, and I did not get all of the Minister of Fisheries speech in reaction to this resolution, but -

Some Hon. Members: He gave a good speech.

Mr. Matthews: - the part about adjacency, historically, I mean, all provincial governments have fought for adjacency. But in talking about adjacency they have talked about provincial adjacency. And I think we are walking a very dangerous ground when we get in here highlighting regional adjacency. Because how parochial can you get about adjacency within your own Province? I mean, I know of cases in my own region where people are getting a little parochial of where they put out their own traps, that someone else is infringing on their area. So it makes you wonder how far you can take the argument of adjacency.

An Hon. Member: True!

Mr. Matthews: So when the hon. member talks about -

Mr. Murphy: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: What is he going on about again over there now, boys?

In the resolution, Mr. Speaker, when the member says BE IT RESOLVED that this House endorse the principle of adjacency as adopted by this government and that those closest to the resource

must get the greatest benefit, I would like to remind the member that in essence the principle of adjacency the government has continued to support and endorse with other former governments is provincial adjacency. It is not regional adjacency. So, I mean, it fits in very nicely here, but you have to be up-front about this. The adjacency he talked about here is provincial adjacency. His government is not supporting regional adjacency.

So, Mr. Speaker, having said that and knowing that the member is going to rise and close the debate in a few minutes, I just want to say that we support, basically, the resolution. We know of the difficulties the fishermen and the fish plant workers along coastal Labrador have experienced, not only this year, but for a number of years.

And a lot of it can be corrected. A lot of the problems can be corrected, but it takes the will of certain people to do it. And the Member for St. John's South referred to the Federal Minister. I do not know what he called him. He certainly did not call him Mr. Valcourt, but he called him some name.

Mr. Murphy: (Inaudible) call him worse.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, you probably could have. But what would that have accomplished?

An Hon. Member: Nothing.

Mr. Matthews: Exactly.

All I would like to do is be a little more responsible. And I would like to say to the Member for St. John's South that we on

this side have difficulties, as well, with some of the things, moreso some of the things the Federal minister does not do or has not done, and we tell him that, and when anybody deserves criticism, we will criticize, and when anyone does some good, we will give them credit.

The Member also made a reference to silver hake which is being caught by someone and to which he made some reference. (Inaudible), let me say to the Member for St. John's South and to other Members in this Legislature, that there is a fair resource of silver hake to be caught, but we as Canadians and we as Newfoundlanders, do not have the capability to harvest it. We do not have the capability. I am sure the Minister of Fisheries will agree.

A few short years ago, when we had Mrs. Ting in St. Lawrence, we went to the then Minister of Fisheries, because St. Lawrence was only getting ten, twelve weeks work, and we wanted additional resource for that plant.

We were successful in getting 5,000 tons of silver hake allocated for the St. Lawrence plant, but, you know something, there was no way we could find harvesting capability to get it, and it was never caught.

An Hon. Member: You could make another deal.

Mr. Matthews: Well, maybe you can, I do not know. I do not know why you are so upset about it, because if someone else is catching fish that we are not catching, that is under utilized and bringing it in this Province to create jobs, then that is better than leaving it in the

water, that is better than leaving it in the water.

There has been so much talk in this Province over the last number of years about under utilized species and that is all that has happened, it has been talked about, it has been talked about, talked about, talked about.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: It has to be frozen immediately upon being taken out of the water, or else it just wastes away to nothing. You cannot do anything with it, that is the problem, it has to be frozen as soon as it is taken out of the water and we do not have that capability, so if we could find someone else to catch silver hake or any other species for us, and bring it into this Province to process, then to me, that is a step forward.

Now we would hope that we would develop the capability so that we could catch it ourselves and bring it in for our people to process. That is the ultimate dream, but as of now we do not have it, that is getting away from the resolution, Mr. Speaker, but I just wanted to make some references to what the Member for St. John's South said.

So, Mr. Speaker, in concluding, realizing it is now twenty to five, and the Member for Eagle River is going to conclude the resolution, I would like to say very strongly that as fisheries critic for this side and as the Member for Grand Bank, representing the historic traditional district of Grand Bank, that I certainly support this resolution as amended by my colleague the Leader of the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Eagle River.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to use the remaining time I have to expand upon some of the things that I said at the beginning and particularly now to touch on the role that the Federal Government has played in the development of the Labrador fishery, and indeed the management of the Labrador fishery to date, and conclude with some recommendations of where they can go specifically. But at the same time I would like to remind the Members of the Opposition, and particularly the hon. Leader of the Opposition, to remind them of some of the reasons why I cannot support that particular amendment that he has proposed.

The particular part that I want to illustrate, Mr. Speaker, and it is awful interesting, you know, to see the scathing, to see the political games being played, to see the little waffling that obviously has to happen every time, that it has to come back to roost. You know, that is what is ironic about all this. And when the Leader of the Opposition says that the Governments of the past, the Provincial Governments of the past have adopted the policy of adjacency, I submit that it was nothing more than lip service that they paid to it.

And to illustrate the point, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take the case of the Resource Short Plant Program. The Resource Short Plant Program was set up where the northern cod was used to be able to give that fish to the Resource

Short Plant Program. Now, out of that Resource Short Plant Program there were nineteen plants designated. Was there one designated for Labrador under that plan? Not one, Mr. Speaker, not one. Now, did the Province have any authority? Did the Province have any authority whatsoever? Sure, Mr. Speaker, they had authority. They had the authority to licence these particular plants that were designated to receive that fish like they did with Triton, like they did with other places. That is where the authority came in. This is where the Government of the past could have said to the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans, no. We are not going to accept the fact that there is going to be nineteen places on the Island of Newfoundland licensed under the Resource Short Plant Programme using northern cod. We are not going to accept that. We want to make sure that the principle of adjacency and the coastal dependency is adhered to and we want to have four or five plants in Labrador designated under that programme.

That is the kind of consideration, that is the kind of responsible Government that we would expect from our own Provincial Governments of the past.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Dumaresque: That is the kind of thing that we would have expected -

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Dumaresque: - from the Member for Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Dumaresque: How could he sit there -

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Dumaresque: - Mr. Speaker, and see nineteen plants designated on the Island of this Province and not one in Labrador? Nain, Makkovik, Rigolet, Cartwright, Black Tickle, Williams Harbour, Red Bay, West St. Modeste. All those places that had eight to ten weeks of work from the inshore fishery, and they took 3,500 tons of the northern cod and distributed it to nineteen plants on the Island. Signed under the name of the hon. Tom Rideout when he was Minister of Fisheries, that is what it is.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Order please!

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Rideout: Point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have been listening to the hon. Member for the last few minutes, and no hon. Member is allowed to say something to this House that is not in fact the truth. The hon. Tom Rideout did not sign up the Resource Short Plant Programme, Mr. Speaker. The Resource Short Plant Programme was in being long before I became Minister of Fisheries. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the (Inaudible) and the raving and the ranting of the hon.

Member now, should be directed to the person who is now Senator Romeo Leblanc. That is who brought in the Resource Short Plant Programme.

An Hon. Member: Apologize, boy.

Mr. Rideout: And if the Provincial Government of the day did not do anything about it, that is one thing, but I was not the Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

An Hon. Member: Apologize!

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order. The hon. Member for Eagle River.

An Hon. Member: Be man enough.

Mr. Dumaresque: Mr. Speaker, obviously there is no point of order. Obviously it is just the truth getting to close to the nerve. That is what is happening here again.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Dumaresque: That is what is happening here again as it has happened many times before. While the Minister may not have signed all of the particular plants, he signed a number of the licenses for sure, that were there to be able to get this in place. And he was there when this consultation process was in place. And he could have stood up in his room then, Mr. Speaker, and said that we are not going to have nineteen plants on the Island. We are not going to accept any new places on the Island of Newfoundland under the Resource Short Plant Programme before Nain, Makkovik, Cartwright, Black Tickle - before these places are brought

in first. That would have been a real show. That would have been a demonstration of this past Government's commitment to the people of Labrador and to the principles of adjacency and coastal dependency on the fishing industry and the northern cod.

An Hon. Member: He pulled a Pontius Pilate, he washed his hands.

Mr. Dumaresque: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have submitted what I believe is a realization that all we have seen over the last seventeen years from the past Provincial Government has been total lip service and they could have exercised their responsibility. Now what are we saying today about the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker. What are we saying when it comes to managing the resource and quota allocations and licencing. What are we having now? We have had the Federal Minister of Fisheries come out and say that we are going to have a total freeze on groundfish licences in Labrador. That is what the Federal Minister is saying. And he is saying to the people of Labrador that you are going to have, to the existing fishermen there, he is saying, you cannot go into the bigger boats, you cannot go out and harvest the crab fishery that we hope to get off the ground in Labrador. You cannot go offshore and be able to get into those bigger boats, because we are going to freeze those licences. Those licences are frozen, Mr. Speaker. Also the Minister of Fisheries has said to the people of Labrador, to the young people who are growing up there, tell me where the future is in Cartwright or Black Tickle, if it is not in the fishery. Tell me where it is, Mr. Speaker, and we

will gladly go to work there. But there is no other future for the people of the coast of Labrador other than the fishery and now the Federal minister is saying you have no choice, you have to leave Labrador. We want to resettle you. Go to Toronto or somewhere else, Mr. Speaker. That is what he is saying to the people of Labrador. That is what the Federal Minister is telling them, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Dumaresque: That is where it is.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Dumaresque: Mr. Speaker, at the same time as he is doing this he is also saying to me as he said in a letter, we cannot incorporate into the inshore fishery the inshore shrimp plan, management plan in this Province. We cannot incorporate four inshore shrimp licences in the Straits of Belle Isle, in the Labrador Straits. We cannot do that. We can allow fifty-nine licences to be on the other side of the Straits. We only have five possible boats that can even harvest it. But no, why should we let you have any opportunity to prosper, to diversify, to change technology, to be able to expand and progress. Why should we have the opportunity? Is it because of where we live? Is it because of how we voted before? I do not understand how hon. Members over there can stand up so bold faced and substantially support the Federal Government's actions to date in this particular area.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Dumaresque: Mr. Speaker, what

we have seen here again today is nothing more than a political game, where the Members opposite are willing to go to any length to support their Tory colleague in Ottawa, to any length to be able to prop them up. And I suspect the people of Labrador are going to take good comfort today when the Member for Torngat Mountains will stand up and vote against this particular resolution.

Some Hon. Members: Shame! Shame!

Mr. Dumaresque: I say they will take good cold comfort in that. I know they are going to take great comfort in him saying that he is so proud of the Federal Government spending in Punchbowl, Labrador, I know they are going to be extremely pleased that he is expounding the virtues of that project. That was the comments of that hon. Member. I am sure they will be very happy to hear it, Mr. Speaker.

However, Mr. Speaker, while I recognize there are deficiencies and there are breakdowns in the overall management of the Labrador fishery, I would not want to leave today without making some specific recommendations. Now to my hon. colleagues opposite I would say, particularly to the Leader of the Opposition, and the Member for Torngat Mountains, I would say write your letters, put your pen to paper, substantiate your support for the Labrador fishery by writing the Minister of Fisheries and saying yes, when you put in the groundfish management plan for 1991 give 5,000 tons of that quota, 2.2 per cent that is all we are asking, have the Member do that, document it and circulate it to the people so the people will know where they are coming from. If they could do the same

thing on the inshore licences, Mr. Speaker, and ask him to lift the freeze so that the young people, the people they have to look towards, some of them are here in the gallery today, people who want to see us prosper, want to see our coast be able to progress and be competitive and also be able to have some degree of social and economic security. Give them people some hope and be able to recommend to your federal colleague, who you have such coziness with, tell them to change their draconian policies and give us some hope. When they go about setting the total allowable catch for caplin next year let the Federal Government again show their consideration for the Labrador Straits and indeed along the Coast of Labrador, and instead of 300 tons of the quota, which is less than 1/2 per cent of the total allowable catch, give us 1200 ton. We are not asking for much. It would be 1.4 per cent of the total allowable catch. That is not very much to ask. We are not asking for the moon. We are not saying to the rest of the people who have traditionally fished on the Coast of Labrador that they have no rights there. We believe they have rights. As a matter of fact there are many long-standing relationships between people on the Island of Newfoundland and the Quebec north shore that have to be sustained. We have no will whatsoever to say to them that they should not continue to come to the Coast of Labrador but it has to be done within reason, and that is all we are asking for.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes again to continued support for the Labrador fishery I think that the Members opposite should show, particularly the Member for

Tornгат Mountains, that before the next time he takes another jaunt up to Ottawa to see his federal counterparts, that he check with the people to show his concern for their opinions. Get together the hopes and aspirations of these people and carry them up there and forcefully, I would submit, make that presentation to his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I must say I listened with interest to the Minister of Fisheries today, and I thank him very much, and the Government of this Province, for again today taking significant steps.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: I say for the first time in this House this Government has come out and said, yes, we do stand up and say to the Government of Canada that before we allow other provinces to go into the 2G+2J area off the Coast of Labrador and take our Northern cod away from our shores, we want to see Labrador plants served first. That is a significant documented gesture on the part of this Government that will not be forgotten, I can tell you, by the people of Labrador. Also today, Mr. Speaker, this Minister announced that he has approved a crab processing license for Cartwright, another significant step in keeping with this Government's policy of diversifying the fishery where technological change is good and useful. Also, Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are going to see continued funding for community development projects like we have seen when the Minister announced a new community stage for Black Tickle and a new fish plant for Williams Harbour. These are the kinds of things that this Government has

done since we took office, and the things that I am proud to stand up here and support. I hope there is absolutely no way that Members opposite today can get up and fly in the face of all the progress and vote against this particular resolution, Mr. Speaker. I hope there is no way they would be able to face the people and do that.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated when I stood up here today, today has been a very important day for the Coast of Labrador. Today we have had all Members become more conscious of the situation we have along the coast of Labrador, and the aspirations we have to be able to better further our social and economic well-being. Today we have had Members show support and good support. I would like to compliment the Member for St. John's South who, coming from a St. John's riding, Mr. Speaker, and who knows what has happened here in the past, was able to stand up here and speak from his experience in working with Fishery Products International, and now working over there to get a shrimp peeling plant in place for the people on the Southside.

That is commendable stuff, Mr. Speaker, for him to be able to stand up here and support the principles and the allocation of Northern cod that I have asked for. At the same time, I tell him that I am very happy that we are able to support the plant in St. John's South and the 100 or 200 people who are going to be working there by virtue of the shrimp from Northern Labrador. I am very happy that we are able to do that. And we will always be very, very happy as Members of this House, and certainly I can speak for the constituents in my riding, we will always be proud citizens

of this Province to know that we have contributed greatly to the economy of this Province, and we will continue to contribute greatly to the economy of all Newfoundland and all Labrador.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: Mr. Speaker, I suppose since I am coming down there I should make note of some observations, but one in particular that I would like to think will be telling. When it was noted on Monday that this resolution was going to come to the floor, I looked around in interest to see what the expressions of Members opposite would be. There were particular exclamations from the Member for Grand Falls, and that is telling to me. There are particular expressions that I see. Well, what is that about? What resolution is that? What meaning has that? How are we taking up the time of the House for things like that? Get on with it. Drop it. Let us forget it, eh. This is the kind of attitude, Mr. Speaker, that has symbolized the past Government and this is the kind of expression that we can no longer stand in this House here.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: In a concluding comment, Mr. Speaker, I can remind all members opposite that there will never come a time when I will drop our issues for the sake of the Member for Grand Falls and his centralist vision that he is espousing here in this House. That is not the kind of thing the people of Labrador will be taken for, I will tell you that.

We have seen it in the past, Mr. Speaker, and unfortunately we are

seeing it displayed again. The arrogance, the total disregard, the total ignorance of the people and the conditions on the coast of Labrador that is being espoused here today by the Member for Grand Falls, it will be remembered, Mr. Speaker.

In closing I would ask all hon. Members to please rise and stand in support of this resolution, stand in support of progress on the coast of Labrador, and for the further social and economic well-being of Labradorians from Nain to L'Anse-au-Clair. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

On motion, amendment defeated.

On motion, resolution passed.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

This House now stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 2:00 p.m.