



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

First Session

Number 31

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
*(Hansard)*

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Wednesday

12 June 1935

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

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

MR. BARRETT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to report to the House on the meetings of Ministers responsible for international trade, which met recently in Vancouver. I would like to review the position taken by the Province at that meeting and the progress achieved in the export trade area.

As this hon. House knows, the Premier spoke at length on the trade issue at the First Ministers Conference in Regina. Government was encouraged that the freer trade question got a full airing at that time. We were also encouraged by the amount of consensus on trade issues among all First Ministers. This consensus was strengthened last week in Vancouver where provincial ministers and the federal minister unanimously agreed on the urgent need for a comprehensive free trade agreement with the United States.

I will return to that topic but first I would like to repeat to this House the themes this administration has been making since the First Ministers Conference in Regina.

First of all, all governments were committed at Regina to the importance of export

competitiveness. I believe that everyone recognizes the importance of this to job creation and national economic recovery in general. What our Province would add to this is that we must be determined that adjustment to an internationally competitive position in all our sectors will continue.

Secondly, the provincial government wants Canada to pursue freer trade through vigorous participation in multilateral and bilateral trade negotiations. We were, therefore, very pleased to have Canada-U.S. trade discussions underway following the Quebec Summit, and are encouraged at the position the federal government took at the Bonn Economic Summit regarding a new round of multilateral discussions next year, and at last week's meeting regarding the Canada-U.S. free trade.

Thirdly, the Province has sought a balanced export-marketing strategy to meet the needs of the business community in our Province, and to reflect the regional diversity of Canada's export products. The First Ministers agreed in February to the establishment of a national trade strategy for marketing; and I believe that the federal and provincial ministers of trade have made a good start at harmonizing our programmes, and orienting the trade commissioners service to export opportunities.

Officials have been working on more specialized marketing strategies for key areas and to date government can support these efforts. The Province's priority markets are the United States, Western Europe and Japan, in that order, and our priority export sectors are fish products, forest

products, minerals, oil and gas services and consulting engineering.

The next few weeks and months will be a busy time for trade ministers and officials as we come to grips with issues involved in the Canada-U.S. work plan agreed at Quebec, and as all countries prepare for multilateral trade negotiations.

I would like to take this opportunity to say that the Government of Newfoundland places a priority on trade liberalization, and looks forward to the results that may come in this decade. We will do everything possible to assist the federal government to understand the trade prospects for Newfoundland and the industrial sectors concentrated in our region.

In terms of Canada - United States trade policy, the Province is adding its voice to that of the Western Premiers' Conference which spoke two weeks ago in favour of comprehensive free trade. Only such a wide-ranging approach can open opportunities for virtually all sectors and regions of our economy, and, it is hoped, stem the protectionist sentiment which has been such a threat to us in recent years.

As this hon. House may be aware, the window of opportunity for striking such an agreement with the U.S. is narrow. I would like to assure this House that now in the coming months our government will be supporting the federal government in reaching the broadest possible objectives within this short time frame. It is also our hope that bilateral trade discussions with the United States may be broadened in the

next few months to embrace a multilateral set of trade negotiations.

Another area of concern for this Province in trying to expand our exports has been the federal government's monetary policy.

In particular, the present policy of supporting the Canadian dollar through the bank rate is not helping our export industry, especially, the resource-based industries in our Province, such as the fisheries. We are in a very competitive and dynamic market in the Eastern United where our major competitors are Iceland and Norway. Since 1981 these countries have allowed their currencies to depreciate by 86 per cent and 42 per cent, respectively, against the United States dollar. Meanwhile, the Canadian dollar has depreciated by only about 12 per cent to the U.S. dollar and has appreciated significantly in relation to most other currencies, particularly those of our Scandinavian and Icelandic trade competitors.

Furthermore, the significant appreciate of the Canadian dollar vis-a-vis European currencies has undermine our export performance in the European market, which is Newfoundland's second largest export market. In both instances, an artificially high Canadian dollar results in lost export markets and opportunities. Other things being equal, we cannot expect to be able to compete if our products are priced artificially high as a result of our monetary policy.

While on the topic of our export trade to Europe, I would also like to draw this House's attention to the continued difficulties we have

in assessing that market for our fish products. Apart from the exchange rates, the European Economic Community has numerous tariff and non-tariff barriers to our fish. There is a demand for our products, but protectionist policies hinder an increased access to this market.

The only method used so far by the federal government has been a bilateral fisheries agreement negotiated by the federal Minister of Fisheries with the EEC. This agreement, however, bargains resource allocations of valuable fish stocks within Canada's 200-mile zone in return for tariff concessions for our fish products. This is a narrow approach which barter away natural resources badly needed by our industry. And under existing conditions, Canada sells very little fish to the EEC, regardless of tariffs, due to exchange rates, while the EEC gets guaranteed access to our fish stocks. In fact, the benefits to the EEC have been even more one-sided with the overfishing by the EEC within our zone during the past four months.

We opposed this agreement from the beginning. The recent overfishing is further evidence of the one-sided aspect of this deal and an abuse by the EEC fishing industry of international resource management. In light of recent events, the government has asked the federal government to review this agreement.

This situation underscores the need, for fish product liberalization possible through broader negotiations, which do not barter market access for raw resource. This, we hope, will be possible in upcoming multilateral trade discussions.

In summary, I am encouraged that the federal government is looking seriously at the trade issue. Together with many other provinces, our Province is hoping to make significant progress in the coming months towards freer trade with our major trading partners. We are confident that this will mean long-term growth for the Newfoundland and Canadian economy. We are also confident of our ongoing consultations with the federal government on our trade needs and priorities, such as those related to fish products. Only this way will Canadian trade policy be truly national in scope and represent the needs and aspirations of all citizens in our Province and regions of our country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I think if we read between the lines here we can see that there are serious differences arising between the Province and the Government of Canada in terms of approach.

We see a reference to the continuation of agreements with the EEC, trading fish for markets; we see a continuing unwillingness by the Government of Canada to be more sensitive to regional differences when developing monetary policy with respect to supporting the Canadian dollar through the bank rate and so forth; and we see a number of areas arising from this.

I think everybody is in agreement with the motherhood issue of freer trade between nations, as between Canada and the US and between Canada and other nations. It is only motherhood, Mr. Speaker. It is in the working out of this type of principle that we see real statesmanship come into play. Unfortunately and regrettably, we are now seeing the policy of this government bringing harm to the people of this Province. What we have is the Premier of this Province and members opposite, having locked themselves into a very difficult position by stressing their personal friendship and political identity with the Government of Canada - which is basically just a code word for the partisan connection between the two political parties in power - we see members opposite being in a position where they can afford to do very little else except endorse approaches being taken by the Government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, when we see the minister stand up in this House now and talk about the need for improving markets for our fish and not saying a word when Mr. Wilson, as early as last Fall, even before the recent budget, took \$5 million out of the fishery, which was designed purely and simply for improving markets in the United States. When we see the removal of that \$5 million, we see that what is contained in the minister's statement is nothing other than paying lip service to the notion of improving our fish markets.

The Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker, when it took this \$5 million away from the fishing industry did not live up to the confidence which the people of this Province placed in them

during the recent election.

Mr. Speaker, I have to confess I am very concerned whenever I see Mr. Mulroney and President Reagan getting together, whether it be at the Shamrock Summit in Quebec City or otherwise, because I always keep thinking back to Prime Minister Mulroney racing down to New York City to give back that 25 per cent of Hibernia, to give back that 25 per cent back-in, which was held by Petro-Canada, to the American oil companies in order to keep the President of the United States happy.

If this is going to be the approach, we have a double set of coziness here. We have the coziness of the Prime Minister of Canada and the President of the United States where Mr. Mulroney will be afraid to do anything to differ with President Reagan now that he has locked himself into that long-term strategy, and basically President Reagan is going to get whatever he wants in terms of the free trade arrangements; and then we see the coziness between the members opposite, the Premier and this government, and Mr. Mulroney. Basically, we have a three-way incestuous relationship, Mr. Speaker. We have a chain of coziness which unfortunately is going to see very little in the way of open debate on issues, whether it be free trade, whether it be in terms of improving fish markets in the United States of America, in Europe or elsewhere because members opposite are afraid to speak out and speak up for the people of this Province.

Now, we have a few little tests coming, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister must have begun his Ministerial Statement at 3:00 p.m. He ended sharply at 3:10 p.m.

MR. BARRY:

There were minutes to be read.

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, even if that allows a few more, it is half the period of time. The hon. gentleman is trying to use ten and fifteen minutes for one half of the time. Now, the hon. gentleman is not going to abuse the rules of this House and be making a speech when he is responding to a Ministerial Statement. He has had time, Mr. Speaker, and his time has expired.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I took particular note of the times involved and actually the hon. minister started at 3:01 p.m. and he finished at 3:11 p.m. so the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has five minutes and he has one minute left.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

This attempt by members opposite, by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to muzzle the Opposition will not be permitted, Mr. Speaker, in this House. The Chair will determine how much time I have to speak and not the

Government House Leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

If we could keep them quiet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

The test is going to be will the Government of Canada renew these fishing agreements with foreign nations when they come up for renewal over the next year. That will be the acid test, that will determine whether the minister and members opposite are having any influence whatsoever on Mr. Mulroney or whether that chain of coziness from the members opposite to the Prime Minister to the President of the United States will be allowed to subdue the interests and submerge the interests of the people of this Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, before I give my statement I want to say we only try to muzzle people who have a bite. The hon. gentleman has the bite of Methuselah and when Methuselah lived they did not have dentures.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has no bite at all and is ineffective. We have been here thirty days to demonstrate it and we will be here another number of

days to see. That is not the statement I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, because that is obvious.

I want to advise the House about an advertisement that is appearing in the national papers and will be appearing in The Evening Telegram and other papers. And members will be aware that on April 18 the Hon. Pat Carney, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources of Canada, and I, announced that Dr. George Govier had been appointed to serve as advisor to both governments on matters relating to the organization and staffing of the Canada Newfoundland Offshore Petroleum Board.

Dr. Govier is a former Chairman of the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board and is highly respected in government and industry circles for his experience, judgement and expertise. Since his appointment, Dr. Govier has met extensively with government and industry officials in St. John's, Ottawa, and Calgary. Both governments have determined from the outset that the board and staff should be selected on the basis of competence and ability in order to ensure that it enjoys an unquestioned reputation for professional integrity and impartiality.

We have also been determined to proceed deliberately and carefully in our planning and to see that the board becomes operational as soon as possible. We have set a target date of the Fall for this objective.

Now, I am please to announce, Mr. Speaker, and advise the House, that an advertisement will appear shortly in national, local, and

oil industry press, seeking applications for the position of Chairman of the Canada/Newfoundland Offshore Petroleum Board and for two of the board members who will serve on a full-time basis. Our determination to find the best people available will be evident from the high calibre of people we are seeking in these advertisements.

From time to time, Mr. Speaker, I will be informing the hon. House of other initiatives that we are taking to implement provisions of the Atlantic Accord. I know that these will also be met with the complete chagrin of the hon. Opposition who were so much against the Atlantic Accord. But this is another example of an initiative towards future development and operation of the offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:  
First, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minister for his usual courtesy of sending over a copy of his statement. I looked around my desk and I do not find a copy so he is in keeping with his usual courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition welcomes the announcement that the board is about to be appointed, and we are wondering if the minister's statement came as a result of questions put today in the estimates about the board?

But the one prayer, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition and the people of Newfoundland have with regard to the makeup of that board is we hope that the minister is advertising for qualified staff and a chairman and all the rest. We hope that he finds people who are qualified enough, and who can make an argument good enough to convince the minister that Newfoundland is not prepared to live with Clause (54); that Newfoundland is not prepared to have all its oil shipped off for refinery on the Eastern seaboard. We hope that the calibre of people that he has on that board will make sure, Mr. Speaker, that Clause (54) is renegotiated, that Newfoundland gets its share of benefits that can come by refining; and, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, that the board will see to it that Come By Chance itself is maintained and not sold for scrap; that it is used; that feed stock will be available from Hibernia to start up and to refine our oil in Come By Chance.

Without both those things happening, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland will miss forever the real benefits of offshore and, at this point in time, it looks like the minister in negotiating the Accord, in accepting clause (54), sold out Newfoundland's rights. It was an awful price we paid for Mr. Mulroney's success in Quebec, Mr. Speaker.

We welcome the board and we would hope the board will do a better job in making sure Newfoundland gets its right from the offshore than the Minister has done.

### Oral Questions

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. This government has a long, ongoing problem with strikes. Probably one of the reasons why the strikes are long and ongoing came to our attention at a committee meeting when the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) informed us that the markup on imported American beer is higher than the markup on our Newfoundland beer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
What? What?

MR. EFFORD:  
In other words, the Newfoundland Government is making a much higher profit on American beer than it is making on the Newfoundland beer. In view of this fact, can the minister show this House that the government is not prolonging the strike just to make higher profits?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, the cost of purchasing American beer is considerably less than the cost of purchasing local beer by the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation. So there is a bigger spread between what the Corporation pays for the American beer and its selling price than the spread between what it pays for local beer and the selling price.

MR. EFFORD:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):



A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

The minister, in his usual fashion, certainly did not answer the question directly. The fact is the government is definitely making more money on imported beer, much, much, more money. To go back to my first question, can the minister assure this House that the strike is not being prolonged for this reason, and that there will definitely be something done immediately to get to the bottom of the strike?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is groping around trying to find a remedy for the strike, he should not look to government, he should look particularly to the protagonists. I am referring to NAPE and the other union, and to the brewers themselves. Those are the people who can settle this strike. Government is only too interested in getting those people back to work. We have reason to believe that the workers themselves wish to go back. I am not referring to the unions or the brewers, I mean the workers themselves would only be too glad to go back to work and we are at one with those workers. We would like them to go back, too, at the earliest possible moment. So if the hon. member really has it in his heart to try to settle this strike, I would ask him to speak to the union executives and also to the management at the breweries.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Once more I will put the question to the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Is the Government of Newfoundland making more profit on imported American beer than it would make if they were now selling Newfoundland beer? I would like a very simple answer, yes or no.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Yes.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn). In August, 1982, the Government of Canada, through Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, entered into an agreement with the Province to undertake the financing of a number of senior citizens' homes, providing bank guarantees and 2 per cent loans. It was an interest subsidy programme. We were told last night in the Social Services Estimates Committee by the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), defending his estimates to the Committee, that plans made to build a senior citizens' home,

for example, in Twillingate, to extend the Agnes Pratt Home this year, to provide thirty-six beds for the Bonavista Senior Citizens' home, and, I believe several others, I think in Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, these plans are now being shelved, the reason being that Canada Mortgage, the federal government, with eighteen months to go in the programme, with a number of homes in the planning stage, have now cancelled that programme, at least that aspect of it. Will the Minister of Housing (Mr. Dinn) tell the House and the people of Newfoundland when he first became aware of that decision on the part of Canada Mortgage, was he consulted by his federal counterpart, and what action he has taken?

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I assume the hon. member is speaking about 56(1) which is the 2 per cent interest write-down programme that CMHC operates in the Province whereby people whether it is with respect to co-operative housing, chronic care, municipal housing like, for example, the City of St. John's, the Legion, all of these people put in applications under 56(1) for this 2 per cent interest write-down on housing. The programme, Mr. Speaker, under 56(1) continues this year as it did last year. Unfortunately there are more requests than there are dollars. I do not know the exact number of units and, as a matter of fact, I do not believe that CMHC could give us an accurate number of the number of units that

will be constructed this year. I think the figure is somewhere around 178 units, but it encompasses many different programmes. It encompasses those requests that would come in from the Canadian Legion to put in senior citizens' accommodations. It involves requests from municipalities like the City of St. John's, the City of Corner Brook to put in housing. It is all under the same programme which is section 56(1) of the Housing Act which is the 2 per cent write-down.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that some requests that have come in will not be actioned this year does not mean that the programme will not continue. The programme continues. Unfortunately there is not enough money to go around to meet all the requests that are in. Now, the problem that is being created or that has been created under 56(1) basically stems from several years ago when the former administration, instead of going through the housing arm in the different provinces, started to by-pass the housing arms in the different provinces and went straight to municipalities and straight to the non-profit groups. Therefore it left the Province with very little control over what monies were spent, number one, and, number two, where those dollars were spent. For example, in this Province we have as a priority chronic care because it was identified by the Royal Commission on Health Costs a year or so ago that chronic care would be the priority of this government because of the need for something like 700 units. So, all of these requests came in. Twillingate was another request that came in from a non-profit group. Unfortunately they could not all be actioned. I

believe this year the programme calls for something like 178.

Now, we are having a meeting of Housing ministers out in Alberta in a week or so and we are trying to put together a new global agreement whereby CMHC will operate throughout the provinces and as a result of that -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Maybe an answer that takes such a long time should be put at a different time. Maybe the minister could clue up his answer.

MR. DINN:  
I can clue up in about fifteen seconds.

Basically, what we are attempting to do is get a new global agreement whereby the federal government will go through the housing arms in the provinces and then the priorities as laid out by this government, with respect to chronic care and all the other housing that is involved in the Province, will get the priority that it deserves and should have gotten over the past few years.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, the statement made by the minister today and that made in the committee last night is at variance. There is no similarity whatever. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, I should direct this question then to the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). Can the minister tell the House, Mr. Speaker, if plans

that have already been formulated to extend Agnes Pratt, to extend the seniors' home in Bonavista, the promise that was made by the Premier to build such a facility in Twillingate - and I have a letter to that effect - can the minister tell the House if those projects will be going ahead this year and, if not, why not?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

No, plans are not underway to extend the Agnes Pratt chronic care home. I am unaware of any of the promises that the Premier made in Twillingate district and finally, I believe from reports that I have read that Twillingate chronic care home has been on the four-year list.

MR. W. CARTER:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, I think this matter needs to be cleared up because at the committee last night it was clearly stated by the minister, and backed up by his officials, that at least that aspect of the Canada Mortgage plan with respect to the construction of seniors' homes, homes for the chronically ill and the aged, at least that section of it was abolished and that they were now concentrating on maybe building cottages. Will the minister confirm or deny, Mr. Speaker, that statement that was made last night and maybe elaborate on it?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:  
Yes, Sir, I did say last night that in my opinion money was being put into social housing.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt). Has the Minister of the Environment asked an interviewer from a local television station to withdraw an unfavourable interview in the past two weeks?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will have to run that one by me again.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:  
It seems the interviewer was requested to run it by him again also. Has the Minister of the Environment ever asked an interviewer from a local TV station to withdraw an unfavourable interview as the minister did in the past two weeks? Has the minister ever asked the interviewer of a local TV station to withdraw an interview that the minister did

not like?

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

MR. BUTT:  
No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:  
The minister stated, "No," if I am correct. Has the Minister of the Environment ever asked a high official with a company that does a tremendous amount of advertising with a local TV station to use his influence with a TV station to have that interview withdrawn?

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

MR. BUTT:  
Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. member is getting at, I really do not. The hon. member is making statements that are certainly unknown to me.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. HISCOCK:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I recognized the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir. Will the hon. member yield?

MR. SIMMONS:  
I yield.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

I will ask the Minister of the Environment again. He stated that he did not request an interviewer to withdraw an interview and he also did not request an official of a company to have the interview withdrawn. Can the minister state that -

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the rules are clear. Questions are to be asked of ministers about matters in conjunction with their responsibilities as ministers. I mean I do not know whether the hon. gentleman wants to ask the minister whether he has been out for a walk with somebody last night or something. What is the purpose of the question the hon. gentleman is asking? I mean, if he has a question, let him state the purpose of it.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if there is substance to the matter raised by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), and there are people outside this House who can talk to that and who can address that, Mr. Speaker,

then the Minister is in the serious position of attempting to influence the news, attempting to influence what goes out to the people of this Province, and any minister of this House better be prepared to answer for that.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, a question should be addressed to a minister purely on his portfolio and directed to that.

MR. HISCOCK:

A supplementary Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

My question is to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt). An interview was done last Wednesday by a local TV station on the environmental issue of cans in this Province which was very unfavourable. Did the Minister of the Environment ask that interviewer to withdraw the interview because it was unfavourable to the minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

No, Mr. Speaker, as I stated before. But just let me elaborate one bit. I did say to the interviewer that I did not want to get into the area of labour relations because that comes under the purview of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). I did not ask him or anyone else to withdraw.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay

d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, to touch back on the nursing homes and senior citizens homes again my question is to the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). In the waning days of the most recent election campaign, the Tory candidate for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir held a meeting in conjunction with the Bay d'Espoir Senior Citizens' Committee at which time a study was announced to establish a senior citizens' home in the Milltown area of Bay d'Espoir to service twenty communities along the South Coast of Newfoundland, and at the time it was agreed that there was such a need. The committee came in and recommended that a fifty-bed senior citizens' home be established there. I have talked to the federal MP for the area since the election and he told me, yes, the money was available through Central Mortgage under the scheme for building them, and the only thing they needed was provincial agreement to go ahead. Now, I understand since this time, this committee has had a meeting with the Premier and officials of government and they were told that, yes, there is a senior citizens' home there, but hold it, we will get it on a priority list. Now my question is, in light of the information that came up here today, is the senior citizens' home for the Bay d'Espoir area a reality or is it another political promise?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

All I can say is that I have no knowledge of it being on the official list. I have no knowledge of any promises that were made by the PC member who ran

in the district against you.

MR. W. CARTER:

A point of order Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, there is obviously a disagreement on the part of the two ministers. There are members in this House who attended that meeting last night - the members for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey), Humber West (Mr. Baird), and the chairman - who distinctly heard the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) and his officials say that

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

That is not a point of order. I wonder if the hon. member has a point of order?

MR. W. CARTER:

I rise on a point of privilege in that case, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I consider that when a member at a committee meeting asks questions and gets answers, the least he can expect is to get back honest and truthful answers. I think the minister last night was being quite honest. I think that is my right. Today in the House the Minister responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn) would give the impression that what was said last night there was nothing to it, and that, in fact, money would still be available for chronic care homes, seniors' homes.

MR. DINN:

I did not say that.

MR. W. CARTER:

You did.

MR. DINN:

I said the 56 (1) programme continues.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Look, whether it is 56 (1), Mr. Speaker, or 56 (10), the fact of the matter is that last night in Committee the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) and his officials -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Is this a point of privilege the hon. member is raising? Because I cannot see any prima facie case that the hon. member's privileges are being affected.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think as a member of the House and as a member of that Committee that I have a right to the facts relating to a subject that is very important to my district.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I have ruled on that.

MR. W. CARTER:

Last night in Committee.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I have ruled on that point.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, in Committee last night the Minister of Health (Twomey) and his officials clearly stated that the present programme would not continue because money would not be available.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I must rule that there is no point of order.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, would you allow me a question then to the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey)?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member is discussing some matter that occurred in Committee last night. I cannot see any point of order in that particular thing. I rule accordingly.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. member for Twillingate -

MR. SPEAKER:

I am sorry, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARSHALL:

I will get up on my point of order yet.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up, in a few minutes

following, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt). Is the minister now saying that he did call up the television interviewer?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I recognized the hon. Leader of the Opposition because I understood he was speaking on a point of order, not raising a question. The hon. President of the Council got up on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

I have a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Your Honour made a ruling on a point of order by the hon. member for Twillingate to the effect that it was not a point of order. The hon. gentleman did not sit down then. He just thought he could stand on his feet and claim a point of privilege, repeat it again, take up the time of the House and, in other words, challenge Your Honour's ruling. Then when Your Honour said there was no point of privilege, then he says he will go back on a point of order.

Now what the hon. gentleman was doing was abusing the rules of this House, Mr. Speaker, with respect to it.

MR. BARRY:

There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Sit down! Sit down!

MR. MARSHALL:

If Your Honour makes a ruling on a point of order, it is completely and absolutely out of order, Mr. Speaker, to bring it up again

under the guise of privilege. The hon. gentleman deserves to be censured for that.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, I think the hon. the President of the Council just took the opportunity of explaining the rulings that I made on a point of privilege and a point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to ask the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) did he ask a television interviewer to delete part of this interview?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

No, Mr. Speaker, and I have indicated that to the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) earlier. When the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) got up just now he asked me if I made a telephone call. No, I did not make a telephone call. I do not know what you are talking about.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I will ask the Minister of the Environment did he in any way, shape or form communicate with a person who had done a television interview concerning cans and did the minister not indicate that he wanted part of that interview deleted, as he just mentioned, with reference to labour matters. Did he or did he not?



MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

I did not ask for them to be deleted, Mr. Speaker, no. I just simply said I did not want to get into the area of labour negotiations. That was just an off-the-cuff comment, Mr. Speaker. You know, I did not buttonhole or finger any reporter and say, 'Now look, I want you to cut that out'. I mean, this is a bunch of nonsense the hon. members there opposite are carrying on with, absolutely nonsense, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Did the Minister of the Environment speak to an advertiser, a person whose company carries advertising with that television station, to ask that person to request that that television station stay away from that point in the course of the interview?

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote to you Beuchesne on the questions. "Questions oral or written must not multiply with slight variations, a similar question on the same point, repeat in

substance a question already answered". And, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman is doing, you know, he is trying to enter into a cross examination or something. I honest to God think he thinks he is a modern-day edition of Clarence Darrow or something. But this is not the place to do it, Mr. Speaker. This is the people's House where you ask questions of ministers on matters of public importance and, having been given an answer, you do not continue to barrage him with cross-examinations.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, I got the impression that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was asking questions that were related to the hon. minister's portfolio but he did appear to be asking a number of questions that were very similar. I feel that they were in order at the time.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Now, the minister has indicated that he made a request to an interviewer to stay away from -

MR. BUTT:

No!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, would the minister state whether he requested an interviewer to delete portions of an interview relating to labour relations matters? Would he state whether he asked an advertiser to bring influence to bear on a television station with respect to

deleting portions of an interview which the minister considered unfavourable or which he did not, for one reason or another, wish to go on the air?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). I have already answered those questions he is posing. I really do not know where he is coming from, nor the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). I did not ask any reporter at any time, or interviewer, to delete any portion of any interview I may have had at any time as long as I can remember in my time in public life, which goes back to about 1977. Now, I really do not know what you are getting at, I honestly do not. I am at a loss. I do not know where the hon. members are coming from. I do not know if you had a bad night's sleep or a good night's sleep.

MR. BARRY:

What about the labour matters?

MR. BUTT:

No, I just simply said I did not want to get into labour matters because that came under the purview of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). I mean, if you ask me a question about forestry I will say, I do not really want to get into the area of forestry, that comes under the purview of the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms). The hon. gentlemen there opposite are asking very silly questions. Very silly questions!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had a question for the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) but it is going to require a long answer and I do not think we have enough time for it, so I will ask a short question. I have just been listening to a series of radio commercials for Newfoundland sawn lumber and I am rather pleased to hear that we are advertising and promoting our own industries. However, when I heard the end of the commercials I began to wonder exactly what we were advertising, since they both end with an advertisement for the Department of Forest Resources and Lands and the Department of Development and, also, a particular tag at the end for the individual ministers concerned. My question to either of those ministers is why are we taking all the good we are doing in advertising sawn lumber and destroying it by including the names of those two ministers in the radio ad?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

I will be happy to answer that. We have developed an advertising programme in conjunction and in consultation with the Newfoundland and Labrador Lumber Producers Association. They are quite familiar with the content of the spots we are using and the newspaper ads. And because the funds that are provided to pay for

this advertising are cost-shared funds, it is a part of the agreement that requires acknowledgement of the departments involved. And the fact that I happen to be Minister of Forest Resources and Lands is really not applicable at all. But I think it is obvious. If that does not answer your question totally, probably my colleague, the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett), would like to elaborate.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
Seeing as we have some time, Mr. Speaker, and in the spirit of the member for Menihek's (Mr. Fenwick) question, I would like to ask the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) whether he agrees with Norman Snider, who wrote a book called *The Changing Of The Guard: How the Liberals fell from grace and the Tories rose to Power*, where Mr. Snider pointed out that Canadian Conservatives are like a certain kind of wasp family where the daughter is going crazy upstairs alone in her bedroom, the son is getting ready to elope with the Jamaican maid, mother is drowning her sorrows in gin, but not a word about any of these things is mentioned at the dinner table and the front porch stays calm. One day father takes a shotgun to them all and the neighbours say, 'They were such a quiet, private family.' I wonder if the relationship between the provincial Conservatives and the federal Conservatives could be characterized in the same fashion?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, I only half listened to the Opposition, which is 50 per cent more than most people do, but the hon. Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) was telling me that it was a sexist remark so I just pass that on to the House.

MR. BARRY:  
What is sexist about it?

MR. MARSHALL:  
I know that the government in Ottawa is having a difficult time clearing up the mess that was left, but, as far as the provincial Conservatives are concerned, I can tell the hon. gentleman that we have been immensely strengthened by the last defection that was made from this particular party which is going to guarantee our continuance in office for many years yet to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
I will be happy to table that, Mr. Speaker. The member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) would like to have this tabled and perhaps we could lay it on the table of the House. I would not want this lost to posterity, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Carnell's is open. Why do you not table yourself?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH:

I wish to report to the hon. House that the Resource Committee has considered the matters to it referred and has passed without amendment items of expenditure under the following headings: Mines and Energy; Fisheries; Development; Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development; Forest Resources and Lands and Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

In that regard I think it should also be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the estimates, while the press might have been there for one meeting, at most two, by and large were considered without a single representative of the press of this Province being present which, Mr. Speaker, is a sad commentary on the way in which the Estimate committees of this House are

working and, Mr. Speaker, that requires action on the part of the members opposite before the estimates come before these committees again next year.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is really getting exercised, is he not? I mean, it is really getting to him. He cannot even stand the pressures of being in Opposition. Now, Mr. Speaker, he is out of order. He could not take the pressures over here so he skittered over to the other side. He says he wants to be the Premier, Mr. Speaker, but he will never be the Premier because he cannot even be the Leader of the Opposition. So, Mr. Speaker, he is also showing his lack of leadership and decorum in this House, he is out of order, he is completely out of order on Reports from Standing and Select Committees. If he wants to make those points, as ineffective as they may be, he can make them in the concurrence debates, which is the purpose of the concurrence debates.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I am sorry that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is so upset by the effectiveness of the Opposition that is now being waged

against him that he has to resort, Mr. Speaker, to this somewhat tiresome and silly and continuous stream of personal abuse. But, Mr. Speaker, it is fine with me. The only thing I wish is that the Government House Leader would make it a point over the next several years of either doing one of two things: Either having television admitted to this House so that the people of the Province can see him in action; or else would be prepared, Mr. Speaker, to join with the party opposite in sponsoring trips by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) around this Province so that people can see him all around the Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. President of the Council was correct. At the present time we are dealing with Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

### Petitions

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would remind the hon. minister that there is just five minutes left before we call Private Members' Day.

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am aware of the time limits and it will not take too much time because this is another petition in a series that had been

presented to this House dealing with the high cost of electricity in the Province. The prayer reads, "We, the concerned citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador, do hereby protest against high increasing electricity rates in our Province."

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this petition is purported at least to be from my district, although there are no addresses attached to the names, but to give some credence to it I have ensured that it has been signed by myself and the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening), and the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), all of whom are residents of the great, historic district of Mount Pearl, so it is indeed a valid petition. It is indeed valid anyway, of course, because these people are indeed residents of Newfoundland and Labrador. And so now it is indeed a valid petition from the district of Mount Pearl and I take pleasure in presenting and supporting it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

Do you support it?

MR. WINDSOR:

Sign all kinds of things that I do not support? You might but I do not.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is not quite four o'clock yet.

MR. WINDSOR:

Nobody over there even wants to address it. Let the record show there is not support from over there.

MR. SPEAKER:

This is Private Members' Day.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, in the section under petitions I obviously support the petition. I really did not want to go too much farther in it, but I felt that there was an important omission from yesterday. Yesterday during petitions the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) got up to support a petition that I presented and all he got a chance to say was he supported the petition, and the wrath of God -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

- came down upon us. I was wondering if it is possible for him to get his shots in somewhere?

MR. SPEAKER:

We have already called Orders of the Day.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, for the third time now, and I would ask members opposite not to try and throw this down on a technicality and not to try and muzzle the grey power of this Province which is building quickly, and again for the third time, Mr. Speaker, I put forward this resolution and I ask members on all sides of this House to agree unanimously to the resolution so put. And I move, seconded by the member for

Bellevue (Mr. Callan)-

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

- that this House unanimously condemn the Wilson Budget and the Government of Canada for its de-indexing of senior citizens pensions.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Does the hon. member have leave to introduce this motion?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, how can they determine whether or not I have leave until they hear the petition?

SOME HON. MEMBERS

Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS:

We have heard it three times.

MR. BARRY:

The Speaker has to give us an opportunity to present the resolution before members opposite can determine whether or not they support it. For Heaven's sake, what is happening here in this House?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the petulant young man who has been a member of this House for a long period of time should know that, first of all,

you do not challenge the Speaker, and, secondly, there are proceedings. You can move that the House be adjourned on a matter of urgent public importance.

MR. BARRY:

I am not doing that.

MR. MARSHALL:

He says he is not doing that.

MR. BARRY:

Have you decided if you are going to support it?

MR. MARSHALL:

Just calm down! 'On Wednesdays the question period shall commence not later than 3:30 p.m. and the ordinary daily routine of business shall end not later than 4:00p.m., and at that time the private member's motion shall be called by the Speaker.'

MR. SIMMS:

Shall be called.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, that can be superseded by a matter of urgent public importance, if the House agrees with it. But when a member gets up and asks for leave, or he got up and he said, 'I ask for leave,' we do not have to hear what the hon. gentleman says anyway, and we say, no, he has got no leave to interfere with the ordinary business of the House. So, you know, that answers itself. He can get in a fit of pique and petulance all he wants to, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we do not give leave to anything the hon. gentleman wishes to do today, we want to go on with Private Member's Day.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

When I rose to present that resolution I was watching the clock and Your Honour had said it is was not yet 4:00 o'clock. So the point that has been raised by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is spurious, apart from being obnoxious, and what I am entitled to do is to present a resolution and ask for leave to have this go before this House. And if Your Honour has to make a decision, it has to be after I have had an opportunity to present that resolution and determine whether members support it or not. It has nothing to do with Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour could have ruled me out of order, if he so wished, because 4:00 o'clock had arrived. Your Honour did not do that, Mr. Speaker. What this has to do with is whether members opposite are going to try and avoid the embarrassment, Mr. Speaker, of being unwilling to support a resolution to defend the senior citizens of this Province. That is why the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is making such a fuss about this. That is why members opposite have been trying to stall on that resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

I am not giving up on that, Mr. Speaker. If I have to bring it in from now until next December 31 this resolution is coming before this House for members opposite to say whether or not they will support it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

I would just like to say to that point of order -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

- the hon. gentleman can bring his resolution within the orders of the House. But it is silly for the hon. gentleman to say that the House has to listen to a resolution before it can determine, because there are proceedings here, and you ask leave to present something. Now if you want to press the hon. gentleman's argument to its final end, you could have the business of the House suspended forever, in that members could be getting up all of the time insisting on long resolutions being read before they ask for leave. The point of the matter is that is precisely why we have the rules of procedure in the House. And the rules of procedure in the House, if you ask for leave, you ask for leave to bring in something that is not in accordance with the Standing Orders and procedures. It is not a case of a matter of right, it is a matter of consent by the House, and this House does not give consent. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, we are leaving it open for complete chaos.

MR. BARRY:

You are against this resolution.

MR. MARSHALL:

I am against the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), who has had rather a hard day today. I suggest he goes down to his office, have a cup of coffee and whatever else he needs to have to

calm him down, and we will get on with the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

As I understand it, the motion that the hon. Leader of the Opposition was attempting to introduce, he can only introduce that if he gets leave from the House, but that he cannot read this beforehand that he has to get leave.

MR. BARRY:

Oh, no, Your Honour!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I am quite prepared to check into that matter and comment tomorrow on that. But that is as I understand it now. And the alternative is Notice of Motion under which the hon. member could introduce it. But I will be quite happy to look into that and comment further on that matter tomorrow.

This is Private Member's Day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

There is one mistake. All hon. members can see Motion No. 8 should have been deleted from today's Order Paper. We are on the Motion from the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). There is an amendment by the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) has three minutes left.

MR. DECKER:



Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was ready to speak to the member for Port au Port's (Mr. Hodder) motion, if I had to. The last time I addressed this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the motion put forward to my colleague for Fogo. I was expressing some concern because the hon. members across the floor had taken this motion and had watered it down to the point that it becomes meaningless, it becomes more cracky-lapping, it has no substance.

I tried to find why members on the other side would do this with such a solid motion that was put forward by my colleague. I seem to take some comfort from the fact that I found an answer to the question in a letter to The Evening Telegram which showed that members who crossed the floor of this hon. House must pass through a rite of passage, rite de passage. In the case of the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren), in order to prove that he is a good Tory, had to attack the teaching profession of Newfoundland.

I am saying that the Tories in Newfoundland, likewise, have to pussyfoot around with every motion that this side of the House puts forward - to pussyfoot, make them tender tootsies - so that they will not, in any way, offend their masters in Ottawa. This is the reason why the members on the other side of the House take all our good, solid, motions and water them down so they become meaningless. So what we have is an amendment which watered down a motion. But I will not be silent, Mr. Speaker, as long as I have time left. I will back up what my colleague for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) was

trying to do and that was put forward a motion that all fish plants in this Province should remain open for four years. That is what we are trying to say and I shall not be quiet as long as there is an attempt to close up any single, one, fish plant in this Province because, as the hon. member for fisheries (Mr. Tulk) was saying, Mr. Speaker, we cannot underestimate the value of the fishery to this Province.

I will go back to the beginning in 1497 when John Cabot came over to the waters of this country, this island. The fish were so plentiful he was told, Mr. Speaker, that they could dip it up in basket fulls. I have wondered, Mr. Speaker, what they were talking about because obviously we cannot dip codfish up in baskets. I can only assume, Mr. Speaker, that they were referring to caplin. The caplin run must have been on at the time John Cabot discovered this Province. But the thing which stands out in our history is the abundance of fish that the founders of this Province, that the early explorers found. It shows the main reason our forefathers settled on this Island - to prosecute the fishery. From that day until the present, the fishery has indeed been the most important industry in this Province.

You can talk about hooligans. We have a profession of hooligans, according to a member from the opposite side. If we did not have a fishery, Mr. Speaker, we would not have any need to have hooligans in our schools because we would not have any schools for those hooligans to teach in, Mr. Speaker. So the importance of the educational system would have to take second place to the fishery

in our Province.

We are talking, Mr. Speaker, about this great offshore oil thing. There would not be any people in this Province at this time, Mr. Speaker, to even consider an Atlantic Accord or any kind of accord, if we did not have the backbone of our economy, which is the fishery. And this motion, which my colleague put forward, tries to show some of the importance that we on this side of the House hold when we talk about the fishery. It is unfortunate that the members on the other side have watered down this motion. But let Newfoundlanders know that we, as long as we have a breath, as long as we have strength, Mr. Speaker, we will not be quiet, we will be heard, because we want all fish plants to remain open indefinitely. Let us start with at least a four year period.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, as the representative for one of the more important fishing districts in the Province, I think possibly the district that I represent now is the foremost fishing district in the Province.

I used to be queried on that at one time and I have just forgotten which member tried to take that honour away from me. I believe he is no longer a member of the House. But in any case, I am going to make that claim without fear of contradiction from the members in the House at the present time. So as a representative of that district, the great district of St. John's South, I would like to have a word

on this particular motion, or, indeed, I suppose, on the amendment to the motion.

In case the hon. member forgets the harbour of St. John's, going back to the early fifteenth century, was noted for the number of fishing vessels that used to harbour herein, and, of course, for the fishery that was just outside the Narrows. Things have changed since that time, but still on the shores of the harbour of St. John's was one of the great fishing plants in this Province, the National Sea Plant. There is a tremendous through-put there, there is a tremendous work force there, there is a tremendous product from that plant, and, indeed, it is maintaining a five centuries tradition of the Port of St. John's being a great fishing center in this Province. And as the member who is repeatedly elected to that great and historic district, supported in a very large measure by the people associated with that great plant, I am pleased to speak on this motion. Or, as I say, Mr. Speaker, on the amendment to the motion, because the motion itself does not reflect reality.

If we just look at it, it says here that 'WHEREAS under that restructuring agreement the provincial government has to consent to the closing of fish plants in this Province.' Mr. Speaker, that would seem to imply that the provincial government was totally responsible and had total control when we came to the restructuring agreement. Hon. members will remember that the reason why a restructuring agreement was brought up in the first place was that a certain number of large, private fishing enterprises got into tremendous

difficulties a number of times in the last ten or fifteen years. The first time, of course, was when there was a heavy load of foreign fishing in our district here, and the resource suffered very heavily during that time. The reason why it suffered heavily was because there was almost no control over the resource off our shores.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not have to remind this House that that was at a time when measley little nations like, say, Chile were controlling the foreign fishing off their coast. The great country of Canada, one of the industrialized nations and so on and so forth, felt they were powerless to control the foreign fishing off our coasts, which was much to the detriment of the people of this Province in particular, when minor nations, relatively impotent nations like Chile could chase the Japanese, could chase the Americans, could chase other people off their fishing grounds and do it quite effectively and do it without much reprimand from the international community. That was where the Government of Canada let down this Province, and I am talking about the middle and late 1960s.

However, finally the Government of Canada was shamed into doing something about it when the United States Government, to whom the fishing industry is of considerably less importance than it is to Canada, elected themselves to bring forward a protective measure for the 200 miles off their coast. Following that example, Canada was finally shamed into doing something that it probably should have done ten or fifteen years beforehand. So having gotten over that crisis,

the large private fishing enterprises in this land, and particularly in this Province, had a new lease on life. However, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the 1980s came along and with the '80s came an economic recession such as has not been seen in this country since the early 1930s. The recession in this country was probably more severe than in almost any other land, and, Mr. Speaker, it is important to understand why that was so.

The reason why it was so is that the federal government in charge of the affairs of this country at that time had such a poor and misguided fiscal policy, that is management of their financial affairs, that the Bank of Canada had to bring in a very stringent, very harsh monetary policy which meant high interest rates and a high Canadian dollar.

Mr. Speaker, our fishing enterprises were therefore trying to compete in a very competitive international market faced with almost insupportable high interest rates brought on by the misguided mix of policies in this country, under the control of the federal government, and they also had to compete in the international markets with a high Canadian dollar at a time when other fishing nations were actually decreasing their value of their currencies against the American dollar. So our companies were placed in an almost impossible situation. As a result of that, of course, they got into tremendous difficulties. They got into, essentially, bankrupt situations, and that is the reason why a restructuring agreement had to be brought into play. It could not be done by the fishing companies themselves. It had to

be done by governments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, even though this Province is very reliant on the fisheries, we made a tremendous error when we confederated with the other provinces of Canada. In 1949 we made a tremendous error in this Province.

We took a resource that probably was basic to the survival of the people in this Province, over which we had a very large measure of control, even in the days before there were such things as 200 mile limits, certainly a resource the people of this Province almost to a man relied upon, and we gave away very large parts of that industry.

From one inch offshore, or it may have been a foot offshore, from one inch offshore we abandoned the fishery to someone else's hands. The people of this Province were reliant on the fishery, they had been for centuries. Our communities are positioned in the places they are because of the fishery. If any good times occurred in this Province, it was because of the influence of the fishery at that particular time. With that history behind us, it is almost inconceivable that when we entered into Confederation, the people in charge of the public affairs at that time elected to give away the bulk of a resource that Newfoundland people relied on throughout all those centuries. It is almost inconceivable.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who were those people?

DR. COLLINS:

Those people. I hesitate to mention names but I possibly could mention the party to which they subsequently gave their

allegiance. It turned out to be, of all things, the Liberal party. Despite that name 'Liberal', which has such a ring to it, meaning freedom and meaning broad view of things, the people at that time were so narrow in their outlook that they even forgot their history books and they looked at one small little narrow aspect of Confederation.

MR. FLIGHT:

Who supported Responsible Government? Who built up millions of dollars while most Newfoundlanders died of beriberi and starved to death? That is the history you are talking about.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, there is a certain amount of conversation going on. It is not very accurate or interesting conversation but it is going on anyway and I was just waiting for it to die down.

MR. FLIGHT:

It is very accurate.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order please!

DR. COLLINS:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, despite giving their subsequent allegiance, and really their prior allegiance, because one of the prime movers of our terms of entry into Confederation was associated with the Liberal party back in the Sir Richard Squires days, those days, which are almost a blot on our history in their own right, characterized by corruption, by fraud, by the disbursement of public monies in the most despicable way, and the prime movers of the terms of Confederation for this Province were associated with those days previously.

But I will leave that part aside and I will just say that subsequently, those people tended to give their allegiance to the Liberal party, which is supposed to have about it a feeling for people, a feeling for history, and an openness of spirit. That is what the Liberal party is supposed to be all about, but rather than that they focused on one little narrow aspect of the Confederation possibility and that was: how can we get into power, and how can we distort the concerns of the people of this Province at that time. They were hard times at that time, they were very hard times even though they had improved -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the minister's time has elapsed.

DR. COLLINS:  
I have just got started, Mr. Speaker, but I will get back at it.

MR. FLIGHT:  
The original anti-Confederate is standing there now.

DR. COLLINS:  
I believe, Mr. Speaker, if I can get a word in edgeways to Your Honour, I have a small little bit remaining so if I may carry on for just a few more moments.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
So, Mr. Speaker, in those times, at the end of the 1940s, even though conditions in this Province had improved somewhat over the 1930s, they were still very hard times and the people of this Province were extremely concerned about their future, they were

extremely concerned about their economic welfare, and they were extremely concerned about the future of their families. This concern loomed large in their mind and those people, who subsequently allied themselves with the Liberal Party, managed to distort that legitimate fear and put those people into a position where they supported this very narrow view of Confederation. That narrow view of Confederation was, 'Be dependent on us, we will give you free handouts of money and in payment for that you will put us into power.' Now that was the approach to Confederation by those people. 'We want you to become dependent - and we think, because of your fears, we can play on your fears and drive home that feeling of dependency - you become dependent upon us, we will give some handouts to you, not sort of income from legitimate sweat of the brow or use of your hands or the application of your brains to legitimate problems, we will give you money handouts and for that reason you put us into power.' Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it worked.

It was not a bright day in the history of the people of this Province. It was a dark day. It is an understandable reaction because of what the people of this Province have gone through, but it was a dark, dark day and that is what happened. These people taking that view gave away the resource that we depended on as a people and we had depended on for hundreds of years.

As a result of that, we only had a measure of control over the processing of the resource. We had not control -

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I wonder would the anti-Confederate, before he sits down, the member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins) -

DR. COLLINS:

The great historic fishing district.

MR. TULK:

The great historic fishing district of St. John's South. I wonder would he tell us if now that we have finally been blessed with that PC Government in Ottawa that everything is okay. That is the last statement he has got to make.

MR. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Fogo has given me new encouragement to carry with my discourse.

The people who managed to frame our Terms of Union with Canada gave away the resource at that time so that we were left with just being able to control that aspect of our fishery that related to the on land processing. So, when the difficulties I spoke of earlier came about, and the fishing companies are in great difficulty, we were in a rather weak position -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:

as the people of the Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, carrying on against great odds. I am setting the records of history aright, against great odds.

We were therefore in a relatively weak position when we had to sit down with the federal government to restructure the fishery as a result of those heavy blows dealt it by the ill-conceived financial maneuverings in the capital of our country, and I do not have to remind hon. members what time that was and who was in power at that time. I think that they will recall. So we were in a weak position. So we had to drive as hard a bargain as we could from the weak position we should never have been in in the first place.

So to take this 'Whereas under that restructuring agreement the provincial government has consented to the closing of fish plants,' is really a distortion of the situation. It was not in our power to have our total way in the restructuring agreement. And I am not letting out any secrets. I mean this is something that should be self-evident. If you are trying to negotiate with someone and you are in a weak position you do the very best you can.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we did tremendously well. I do not have to say that I am absolutely, not

only proud, I am really surprised we did so well. We had very little support. Even though we were in this weak position, you would think we could have depended on widespread support. We got it from the vast majority of our people, but unfortunately we did not get it from the rump of the Liberal Party that was still around at that time.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Like the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons)?

DR. COLLINS:

I think the member for Fortune-Hermitage was part of that rump. I do not know which part of the rump he was, but I think he was part of it. We would have been in a somewhat stronger position, although still not in a strong position because of the historical events I mentioned, we would have been in a stronger position if we had heavy support from the Opposition. Unfortunately, we did not get that heavy support. The party opposite was tending to say, you know, 'Grab what you can'.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER

A point of order, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I know that Finance Minister from that great fishing district of St. John's South is not deliberately misleading this House. He would never do that. He is much too honourable a gentleman. If he is misleading the House he must be doing it out of complete ignorance of the facts.

The truth of the matter is, as the

member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) has recently learned that we supported an all-plants-open policy long before ever the Tory Party on that side of the House got around to it.

MR. TOBIN:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I think for the record that that should be clarified. He said, "I agree that they had an all-plants-open policy".

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, and I made it quite clear, that they were far from an all-plants-open policy. They stood by and supported the federal Minister of Fisheries, and their party stood by when he came to St. John's and announced the closure of Burin, Grand Bank in particular, St. Lawrence, and downgraded Fermeuse.

MR. TULK:

Nonsense.

MR. TOBIN:

And he turned around here in this House and said that they have an all-plants-open policy. The fact of the matter is it should not be allowed to stand on the record. The member and his party were totally against an all-plants-open policy.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I thought that finally we had gotten the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West educated but I see he is still in the same condition as the member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins). He still does not know what he is talking about.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I was wondering who was giving this speech. I did enjoy the interjections going back and forth. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, just to cut things short, we ended up with an amazingly good part of the restructuring agreement in consideration of the weakened position we were in. What we managed to persuade the federal government at that time, which was not attuned to the fisheries. I hope that all Newfoundlanders understand that, the party in power at that time would hardly know a fish if it swam into it in the swimming pool up at the Prime Minister's residence in Ottawa. He has a very large swimming pool up there. If he bumped into a fish up there he would hardly know what it was. But in any case, with that feeling about the fishery and with our weakened position in mind, it is amazing what we managed to accomplish.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what did we manage to accomplish. We managed to accomplish keeping all plants open for a period of time, no matter what the accountants, which were engaged by the federal government and by the Kirby Task Force said. Those accountants,

which were paid by the federal government, came in and in many cases said, "This is a non-viable operation." They themselves, many of them, have very little concept of what the fishery is all about and that I think coloured their opinion to some degree. But anyway they came in and said, "This operation in this plant and so on and so forth are non-viable. They should be closed up."

Even in spite of that advice to the federal government, we have managed to persevere and we got an agreement with the federal government that despite what they heard, despite the experts, despite what was written down, despite the volumes of reports, keep the fishing plants open for a good period of time and give each one an opportunity to prove itself. Now, in proving themselves various plants may have to change the way they have traditionally prosecuted the fishery. They may have to get into other aspects of the fishery. They may have to change.

For instance, a particular plant in question was the Burin Plant. The Burin Plant had an honoured history in the deep-sea fishery.

MR. TOBIN:

The first deep-sea plant.

DR. COLLINS:

I suppose if you wanted to characterize the deep-sea fishery, if you wanted to say, "Here is a place that epitomizes the deep-sea fishery, here are the people of a community who are the life and soul of the deep-sea fishery," I think you would have to point to Burin.

Burin almost conceptualized the



deep-sea fishery. Nevertheless, circumstances were changing and one of the things that the restructuring agreement came up with was that possibly Burin would have to change its ways, perhaps it would have to get out of the primary processing and have to get into secondary processing, but at least let us give it a chance, let us give it a few years to see if it can pan out all right. If it cannot pan out all right, well, that is another matter. But at least give them the benefit of the doubt.

The same thing happened in other areas, in Gaultois, in Ramea and so on and so forth. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what was put in place and to say that under the restructuring agreement the provincial government has to consent to the closing of fishing plants in this Province is a travesty of what in actual fact happened.

MR. TOBIN:

De Bane said that in his unilateral statement.

DR. COLLINS:

Yes, as the hon. member points out, it was with this clear policy in mind that the federal government carried out its analysis of the financial statement of the Newfoundland offshore trawler companies. That analysis showed clearly that if the restructured companies were to operate a successful business then a few plants should close. That is what we managed to turn around and say, "No, let us not do that."

We are not saying that some plants may not have to change their operation. We are not even saying that some plants may not, at some

point in time, have to close, but what we want you to do is to give them a chance. We are now in a very unusual situation, we are just coming out of a terrible period for the fishery, let us give them a chance to work their way out of that terrible period and see that even though they now look non-viable, perhaps they will look viable in a few years time. Let us give them the chance. We managed to persevere and get that through.

The fact that we could do it, a small province like this, against all the sort of forces of the federal government, against all the so-called expertise that was available to the federal government - related to finances and business activity and investment and so on and so forth - the fact that we, a small little Province like us could manage to do that, was remarkable and, of course, it was done because we were adamant that we were going to stick to our guns, we were going to go down fighting, if we could not succeed, and, fortunately, we did have to go down fighting, we succeeded.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how have things turned out? I am not knowledgeable enough of the fishery all across the board to give an analysis on how things have turned out, but I can give a summary report on Burin.

That plant that was in tremendous danger of closing, that historically important plant, that plant on which the whole town depended almost to a man, I am in the position to report that they had indeed turned their minds to secondary processing and, Mr. Speaker, they are leading this Province in that regard.

MR. TOBIN:

No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

Call in the members.

Quorum

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I knew my words would gather a throng around me sooner or later and I am glad to see that people have flocked from far and wide to see me finish up my few remarks.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I am afraid that I cannot support this main motion because it really does not reflect the facts, it does not reflect reality. I am more inclined to support the amendment, Mr. Speaker, which reads as follows, -

AN HON. MEMBER:

You hope.

DR. COLLINS:

I hope. "Whereas the government adopted an all plants open policy during negotiations of the restructuring agreement -

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. minister's time has elapsed.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, could I just have a

moment or two?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave. By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the amendment indicates that indeed the government has supported an open policy for all plants to the extent that it is possible and having given a legitimate trial to each plant. And with that in mind, the motion commends the government for it, and, I think, it is an amendment which reflects what, in actual fact, happened. So I support the amendment.

I hope that the fishery this year will improve immeasurably over last year. The indications are good. The season is late in starting. In some areas, the caplin have not come in yet, but, I think, they are beginning to come in. In certain other areas there are local difficulties. But, I think, the outlook for the fishery this year is considerably better than last year.

Our economy relies in no small measure on the fishery. We can see that it is reflected in such mundane things as retail sales tax, revenues which we collect. If the fishery is in difficulty, our revenues, including such things as retail sales tax, are in difficulty. I am not saying that the fishery is only important to us for that very reason, but I am just saying that we can get a measure to some extent of how the fishery is going from retail sales tax revenues. I am glad to say that our revenues to date are picking up. And, I think, in no small way that is because the

fishery itself is picking up.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment. I will look forward to voting on it. Thank you.

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):  
The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker, I feel I cannot support the amendment. All it seems to me is to be a shallow attempt by the members opposite to garner some praise for things that they have done. But, in effect, Mr. Speaker, they are trying to gut the resolution by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), the same as my ancestors from that famous fishing village of Haystack would do with a codfish. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, there is not much in it once they have gone through with the amendment.

The fishery, Mr. Speaker, is the most important industry in our Province. It has been virtually forgotten by the Tory Government. Since this House has opened, we have heard much discussion on the offshore fishery, but we have not heard any solutions. We have heard the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) attempt time and time again to justify his Tory buddies in Ottawa not telling him, not giving him information, like on the overfishing and the latest case is the 30 per cent increase in fishermen's insurance, which he also did not know about. One of the fishermen from his district told him about it.

So, Mr. Speaker, if that is an example of this great 50/50 partnership between Ottawa and Newfoundland, it seems to me it is made up of one dog and one rabbit, and we know where the dog is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Is it a beagle?

MR. GILBERT:  
I do not know, when he jumps, they better hop over there because that is the sort of relationship that we are getting right now out of there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we want to have something positive about the fishery industry in Newfoundland, I am going to refer you to a document which I hold here in my hand. It outlines the policy of the Liberal Government from 1949 to 1972.

MR. TULK:  
A great letter.

MR. GILBERT:  
I am just going to list the example of the policies that were put into effect. All we hear on this side, everytime there is a problem where this government has not done anything, they get up and they say, it is because of the Liberal Government that we had for twenty years. They cannot blame the fisheries, I suppose, on the Churchill Falls agreement, but now they go back to the Liberal Government in Ottawa and they blame it on a man by the name of De Bane that they were awfully close to over there.

But anyhow I will give you a little rundown on the Liberal policy on fishery down through the years now. Number one, establish the Federation of Fishermen. Now I know that the members opposite

really would not be too involved in anything that had to do with unions or the formation of anything. The Federation of Fishermen, as you see, is the thing that the Fishermen's Union grew out of, and is now a very vital force in the Province of Newfoundland.

Another social one that they would not be too concerned about, is the establishment of the Fishermen's Loan Board. They cannot find much wrong with it, but they have not done much about it.

The other thing, number three, they have established a Fisheries Development Association. Now, you know, this was done by the Liberals, the previous bad guys we hear about from those fellows over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. PATTERSON:  
Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):  
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. member for Placentia.

MR. GILBERT:  
They financed the purchases \$3,000-

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order. A point of order. The hon. member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:  
The policy of the Liberal Government from 1949 up until we kicked them out of office in 1972, and by the way I was the man who was instrumental in giving the Conservative Government to Newfoundland because I contained

Smallwood up in the Placentia district and he hauled himself in by the skin of his teeth -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Shame!

-with about 500 votes.

MR. BARRY:  
Then they would would not let you run the next time.

MR. PATTERSON:  
Now the policy of the Liberal Government were two things; burn your boats, create growth centres, and herd the fishermen in from the small coves and inlets of Newfoundland, put them in there and abandon them. And all these poor people were passed over to the faceless banks and the heartless finance companies. They financed their own destruction. So that was the policy of the Liberal Government.

Then they got into the rubber plants, then they got into the magnesium plants, as Joe used to say, then they got into the gurnsey plant, and the chocolate plant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. PATTERSON:  
I will tell you some about -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON:  
And the only -

MR. FLIGHT:  
Tell us who starved rural Newfoundland to death.

MR. PATTERSON

Who starved? The depression we had, my son, in Canada was when the Liberals were in power. The great depression across Canada was when the dirty Liberals were in power.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

To a comparable point of order then, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A comparable point of order.

MR. BARRY:

Surely the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) does not realize that the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) comes from one of those little coves, one of those little inlets, as do I, myself, the member from Haystack, right out in the top of Placentia Bay.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) and the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry) saw a bit of salt water, unlike the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) who never had the guts to crawl off his rock in Placentia, and who would not know what was going on out in Placentia Bay if the people had not come in and told him from time to time.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, on Private Members' Day every member has twenty minutes to speak. The member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) is making a speech. I suppose you could call it a speech. He is making a similar speech to that of one of the former members on that side. The former member for St. Mary's - The Capes, members will recall, brought in Joey's 333 promises and we know where he is now. But, Mr. Speaker, the critical point of order is that in the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Barry) comments in speaking to that point of order he clearly said 'The member for Placentia does not have the guts.' Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that that is clearly out of order and the Opposition House Leader should be aware, above anybody else, that using those words is certainly distasteful if not unparliamentary. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that along the lines they were used, it is clearly an unparliamentary term and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) should be asked to withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

I had already ruled that there was no point of order, so the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was not speaking to a point of order. There was no point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands on a point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

I do not need to repeat myself, I will just say that Your Honour might want to check Hansard and

give a ruling on it at some other time, but clearly the words used were, 'the member did not have the guts.' In my opinion, that is distasteful and unparliamentary. The rulings in Beausheue say that words used which are unparliamentary depend on the tone in which they were used. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the words the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) used in referring to the comments of the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) were certainly unparliamentary and that the Leader of the Opposition should withdraw those comments.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):  
Mr. Speaker, to save Your Honour any further research I will withdraw the term, 'guts,' and substitute 'the stomach contents of a ten cent fish.'

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

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):  
The hon. member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:  
I do not object to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) getting down in the gutter, because he is used to it, and referring to guts, but I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) has more guts than a dory load of codfish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:.  
Mr. Speaker, we now realize that

members opposite cannot stand to be told about progress. We see that now. I was trying to outline the things that great previous Liberal government did, and all of a sudden they get upset about it. I will carry on now and list for you some of the policies that were brought in by the previous Liberal government.

MR. SIMMS:  
You were a Tory then.

MR. GILBERT:  
And you were a Liberal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:  
You hated all those things, now you are supporting them, are you? Is that what you are saying?

MR. GILBERT:  
I am saying to the hon. member that when he was working with me as a salesman he was not a very good salesman, and he is not a very good member now.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, when I was a salesman I worked for somebody who was not a very good manager.

MR. GILBERT:  
I have done alright. Anyway to get back to this statement on the progress that was made under the Liberals, the Liberal government brought fishermen employed on the druggers under Workers' Compensation. That was another step forward in the fishing industry in Newfoundland, I would say. They pioneered the establishment of community stages and inaugurated the marine service stations around the Province. Is this progress? Is this the sort of stuff we hear coming from the

other side? We get the impression that really there was no progress made under the previous government? They introduced longliners, and that is now the backbone of our inshore fishery, the bit left since they have taken over. They introduced the hydraulic systems in fishing crafts, introduced electronic fish finders for fishing craft, introduced mechanical gear. This is all progress that was made by the Liberal government that we do not hear about when we hear the members opposite talking about fishing programmes. This little document here tells about more effort being put into the fishery during that time than those fellows did in fifteen years. They just have not done anything for the fishery. They financed the caplin meal production plants, and they brought the fresh-water fishery authority of Newfoundland in to investigate that. At least it was a progressive step. We hear of aquaculture right now. We hear about it. There is nothing being done about it. It is good to talk about at least, but there is nothing being done about it. They paid the subsidy to ships plying between Newfoundland and the Caribbean for fish markets. They marketed the fish down there to try and establish the market. They appointed the Fuller Commission to investigate the cost and profits of the salt fish industry. They established a mobile fish freezing plant in the Strait of Belle Isle; financed the large pioneering herring meal processing plant at Quigley's Cove, Bay of Islands; appointed the Southwest Coast Fisheries Commission - all positive steps, I am telling you - appointed the Labrador Fisheries Commission.

MR. WARREN:

They are all gone.

MR. GILBERT:

Destroyed by you fellows.  
Destroyed!

Appointed the Sir Albert Walsh Provincial/Federal Fisheries Development Commission. Now, we come to the real steps of it: They built, entirely at government expense, the modern fishing plants at Grand Bank, Gaultois, Trepassey, Marystown, La Scie.

MR. WARREN:

How do you know they were modern?

MR. GILBERT:

They built them. They were built at that time and they were modern.

MR. WARREN:

Yes. That is why the federal government wanted to close them up.

MR. GILBERT:

No, they had no intention of closing them up. You fellows wanted to close them up. They financed the establishment and the enlargement or improvement of sixty-three fish processing plants in fifty settlements at a total cost of \$10 millions. Some of the places where they put those plants were Quirpon, St. Anthony, Englee, Williamsport, Twillingate, Lewisporte, Fogo, Newtown, Valleyfield, Greenspond, Bonavista, Catalina, Old Perlican, Dildo, Harbour Grace. So what I am reading is a list of the things they have done in the fishery. A marvellous job! Members opposite get up and the only thing they can do is talk about something that happened twenty years ago. Well, if you are going to talk about something that happened twenty years ago, be positive, speak about the great accomplishments that were made. What have they

done? Over the last year we have heard much talk about -

MR. WARREN:  
'Burn your boat.'

MR. LUSH:  
No. It was not 'boat' it was 'boats'.

MR. GILBERT:  
There is some doubt that that was ever said.

What have they done now? We, as Liberals, believe that Fishery Products International is necessary for the short-term but it is too large and unmanageable for the long-term. It was pointed out by the minister yesterday that a start had been made on a marketing policy. We feel this is long overdue, but we think it is a positive step. I am sure we will get some support, but the effort must be into the secondary processing sector and into fisheries technology. Mr. Speaker, as Liberals we feel the backbone of the fishing industry in Newfoundland is the inshore fishery. I believe that it has been neglected and every effort should be made to ensure that the inshore fishermen have first call on the resource. I do not think this is being done. As Liberals we support and would never permit the destruction of the inshore fishery. We believe the inshore fishermen should have lower interest rates on loans obtained from the Fisheries Loan Board. It was that great previous Liberal government which established that board, and now we find that this government has tried to close it down and has made the interest rates unbearable so that fishermen cannot get involved in it. Mr. Speaker, there should be fishing gear

subsidies which should be based on productivity. This is a policy that we, in the Liberal party, support. There should also be lower down payments for the purchase of fishing vessels. We look at the budget which just came out and we see that they have decreased the amount of money that was to be spent on the fishing industry. Can you imagine, with an industry so important to Newfoundland, that they would come out with a budget of which less than 1 per cent of the total would be to support the fishing industry, this industry which employs thousands of Newfoundlanders, this neglected industry, this inshore fishery that we have seen go by the wayside?

Under this Fishery Products International we see plants, like the one in Ramea, which are now closed down, while the one in Burgeo, operated by National Sea, is working two shifts. It seems that some effort should be made to see that plants like the one in Ramea be kept open. Why is it closed for six months of the year? What is the trouble? They say it is lack of supply, yet they took the modern draggers out of Ramea and took them to the other Fishery Products International plants and told the people of Ramea they were destined to live on six months employment a year.

This is the sort of planning we see this government put into the fishery. Is this the policy they are going to continue? What is going to happen with Fishery Products International after the four years in review? Is it going to be a situation where we are going back to the crisis we were in last Year, or are we going to try to develop the inshore fishery



along the South Coast? Ramea is near enough to the fishing grounds that if an inshore fishery were developed there it could supply that plant. What seems to be the trouble?

We are shipping from places like Francois and Grey River to Clarendville for processing, and we have a plant in Ramea that is closing. We talk about the glut situation in Newfoundland this time of the year, yet, we are trucking fish half way across Newfoundland, to get it to a plant on the Avalon Peninsula, when we have a plant on the South Coast, within ten miles of it, which is going to close for six months of the year because no thought has been given to it.

As I mentioned earlier, we as Liberals agree that Fishery Products International is a vitally important operation at this time, but a short-term operation, and some effort should be made to ensure that it be brought back to size and that we be able to carry on a viable fishery on the South Coast of Newfoundland. What has been done in the inshore fishery along the South Coast? What has been done in the inshore fishery along the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland? Where are we going with it?

We spend hour after hour here in this House and we talk about the inefficiencies that have crept into the offshore fishery, and this has been as a result of this great partnership, which I referred to earlier, between the federal Tories and their provincial buddies. They have not done anything. They talked about this great partnership.

We hear the Minister of Fisheries

(Mr. Rideout) admit that he heard about it. They told him a month ago that there was a possibility that the Banks of Newfoundland were being pillaged by foreigners, but we cannot get any proof that he ever made any strong representation to them, or if there was any action going to be taken to try to correct this. We get this sort of verbiage every day from across the House: We hear, 'Well, I have made representation.' We used to hear last year that they sent telexes to Ottawa, that they had made strong representation. Last year they were making representations with, maybe, a sledge hammer, now they are making them with marshmallows. Now, that is the difference. We think they should be getting a little tougher.

We now hear that the three Maritime Premiers got together in Charlottetown last week and they are saying that they have to do something about the federal budget that was brought down. Well, we think this is the approach this government should take. And they should take it on the fishery, they should take it on every aspect of their dealings. But they have this love-in now that has been going on since September, so what do we in Newfoundland expect? Do we expect them to sit back and slavishly accept whatever Ottawa sends down to them in this fifty/fifty partnership of one dog and one rabbit, when we know when the dog barks who is going to hop? Why do they not come out and defend the Newfoundland fishery, just defend it? This is the whole deal. I showed them earlier the accomplishments that the former Liberal government made in the fishery.

MR. HISCOCK:

You did not name all of them, though.

MR. GILBERT:

No, not all of them, I only highlighted the most important ones. But, as you know, they are there, thirty or forty of them. The fishing plants we have in Newfoundland were put there by that great Liberal government.

Why does the government not get up and defend their policy on the fishery instead of sending weak letters to Ottawa?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Burn your boats! Burn your boats!

MR. GILBERT:

The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) admitted the other day that he really did not know that the insurance had been increased 30 per cent. The minister in Ottawa did not have the decency -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I beg your pardon, the hon. Minister for Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. FLIGHT:

I will yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

You were recognized. You were not fast enough off your feet, but in the honour and tradition of this House you will yield.

MR. FLIGHT:

In the honour and tradition of this House, Mr. Speaker - I realize I am faster on my feet than the minister - I will yield.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to thank the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans for yielding to me. I appreciate that.

MR. BAIRD:

Which means he lost his turn.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, I think he did. So he cannot speak anymore on the resolution. I feel compelled, Mr. Speaker, to speak on the amendment to the resolution which I consider to be a very significant amendment. Representing a fishing district on the South Coast of the Province, I guess in a comparable position to the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert), and having three plants - two deep-sea plants and a designated inshore plant in St. Lawrence - in the district, and having gone through the whole phase of restructuring, the ups and downs and the effects that it has had on the people of the Province, the fish plant workers and, of course, community leaders and everyone else in a community, because most of our communities are one-industry towns, I guess, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that, I think it was on June 30, 1983, the Premier of the Province outlined the Province's position on restructuring and in that position paper, that statement, he did

outline an all-plants-open policy. We stood by that back in 1983 and we still stand by it today.

Of course, I would just like to draw to the attention of members opposite the statement that was made by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans of the day (Mr. De Bane), a statement made on July 4, 1983, in which he outlined the federal government's position to shut down and close out plants within the Province. So, of course, the positions of both governments were miles apart. We wanted an all-plants- open policy, but, of course, the federal government of the day wanted to close down plants. And I am sure all members of this House fully recognize that.

I would just like to draw to the attention of hon. members some of the contents of Mr. De Bane's statement at that time, and his position and the federal government's position. In his statement he said that those who could not find employment or re-employment in the fisheries, such as the people of St. Lawrence, he said that the plant would remain closed and they would receive severance pay equal to their 1982 plant earnings. Now, that in itself demonstrated to me the federal government's understanding of the fishery of this Province. Because the people of St. Lawrence have not made, in the total open days of the plant, a year's wages since the plant has been put in St. Lawrence. So if they did receive severance pay equal to what they earned in 1982, it would be a very small amount of money. Of course, what they were willing to do was sell the town down the drain. I would say that the federal government's position

as, I guess, articulated and orchestrated by Michael Kirby, Peter John Nicholson, and some people who were involved in the deep-sea industry in this Province, who were puppets of the federal concerns, people who were in high positions with the Lake Group, really what they did was do quite a selling job and quite a con job. What they wanted to do but it did not work, and we have to thank this provincial government, the administration of the day, what they wanted to do was sell these communities down the drain, and I will tell you what they did to try to do it: They tried to put statistics and facts to the powers that be in the federal government showing that a number of these plants, the plants that were in question so-called, were non-viable. I can tell you that the provincial government's stand has been more than vindicated over the past number of months, the stand that they have taken on an all-plants-open policy, particularly with the plants at Burin, Grand Bank, Harbour Breto, which they wanted to really eliminate, or to decrease the operation enough so that it really would not exist. Today, for hon. members' information, one of the most productive plants in the FPI Group is Harbour Breton, and if you had told that to the people of this Province some eighteen months ago, they would have said there was something wrong with you, because they had been subjected to the propaganda of Mike Kirby, Peter John Nicholson, Tim Eburne and all the other people who wanted their own way with the fishery, who did not care about the people. Because of the propaganda that was spread around, no one would have believed that Harbour Breton would be as good an operation as it is

today.

The thing is, of course, the difference with us -

MR. FLIGHT:

How come the member was defeated?.

MR. MATTHEWS:

The member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) was not here at the time we went through the restructuring crisis, and I am sure he knows too much about the fishery, period.

MR. FLIGHT:

I know as much as you do.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

But he should listen, because he could learn something. He really could learn something, because I am telling him that the party that he now sits with did not do too much standing up either, because they were supporting the federal position.

MR. TULK:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I would expect that kind of statement from the somewhat - I do not know what to call the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), but the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) -

MR. PATTERSON:

I know your vocabulary is very limited.

MR. TULK:

Yes. I can get past the word 'hooligan', though.

MR. PATTERSON:

And you are a teacher.

MR. TULK:

I can get past the words 'hooligan' and 'terrorist'. But I would expect better from the member for Grand Bank. I had always thought, and I believe that gentleman stood in this House last year and said, 'Yes, the Liberal Party in Newfoundland is undecided.

MR. FLIGHT:

No, he did not.

MR. TULK:

Well, at least he indicated that. I would expect better from him. I would expect him to realize that the fishery is far too important for him to play his little political games with it, and I would expect him now to stand up and say, 'No, the Liberal Party did have an all-plants-open policy and was the first party to have it'.

MR. MATTHEWS:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To the point of order, the hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order. What I was doing in my last number of sentences and statements, Mr. Speaker, was trying to educate the Member for Windsor - Buchans into the problems that are ongoing in the fishery of this Province, the problems that have been ongoing in the fishery of this Province which is so important and you know it is still important, it will always be

important.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

To that point of order, there is obviously a difference of opinion between two hon. members. There is no point of order.

The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. FLIGHT:

Tell us about why the member got defeated in Harbour Breton.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that the hon. member should not be making quips across the House about people being defeated in districts because his record is not unblemished either. He has not been totally victorious and I would suggest that on the basis of his performance in this House over the past number of months and the questions that he has put to the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) that his stay with us will be short again because I think he is one of those in again, out again members. He should really be quiet I think.

MR. FLIGHT:

Why does not the member resign?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to draw attention to some of the problems that we have gone through in the fishery. I might say that, personally, as a member representing a total fishing district with two deep-sea plants, an inshore plant, that I feel more optimistic about the deep-sea fishery today.

As the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) has indicated, and I think other hon. members before him, that there are some very, very serious problems with our inshore fishery. I have them within my own district. We are working on it, we being the fishermen's committees, the fishermen themselves, the community leaders in the various communities and, of course, aided and abetted by the Provincial Department of Fisheries. And we are making some strides because, for three years, since I have been a member of government, and long before that, fishermen have had a problem with markets, fishermen have had a problem with selling a certain size of fish, people were reluctant to buy the smaller species but, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the members of the House that yes, the provincial government is here to help, and, yes the Provincial Department of Fisheries is here to help, but I think if you see a co-ordinated effort by the fishermen, fishermen's committees, community leaders, their elected representatives provincially and federally, that there are ways and solutions to the problems.

My advice, I guess, to the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) is not to sit back and expect someone else to always address his problems and to try and take his particular communities out of trouble. He himself should show some initiative and work with the respective groups in his community because there are people in this Province and outside the Province who are interested in getting involved in the fishery of Newfoundland. They are interested in getting involved in providing markets that we have never

provided a supply of fish to before. I think if they were to go out and look for themselves that they may have some success in locating markets for their fishermen and also have some of this fish that is not now being processed, processed in the Province. I think that the hon. gentlemen who raised the problems of the fishery should take a little advice and show some initiative themselves because there are solutions to these very serious problems but they will only be resolved if we all work together.

I would just like to say also, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the amendment, which I totally support, ends off by saying, "Be it therefore resolved that this hon. House commend the present administration for adopting a policy encouraging that all fish plants covered in the agreement remain open." I think that is a very commendable amendment and, of course, without the position of this present government, I would say that we have probably somewhere between 8,000 and 10,000 people in this Province who would be unemployed because the plants in their respective communities would not be open today and people would not be employed there.

I would just like to react to a comment made by the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) when he made a quip to the hon. Minister of Public Works about his plant being in receivership. I would just like to remind the hon. member again for his information, something that he should keep in the back of his mind, that if it was not for this provincial government putting up the \$1.3 million guarantee that Ocean Harvesters today would be closed

and we would have another 250 or 300 people in this Province out of work. So I think that, in itself, demonstrates the commitment that this government has to the fishery within the Province. And I say that commitment, Mr. Speaker, is not only to the deep-sea fishery but also to the inshore fishery.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very, very pleased and the people of the district of Grand Bank are very, very pleased that the government took the stand that it did, which I totally supported. I have two deep-sea plants that are now operating at Grand Bank and Fortune, and I must say that both plants are doing very, very well. And the position of Mr. De Bane and the federal government of the time of course was to close down the Grand Bank plant and to merge the work force in Fortune.

I keep in close contact with Mr. Vic Young of Fishery Products International, the Chief Executive Officer, and I would like to inform all hon. members here that both plants at Grand Bank and Fortune are doing very, very well. The workers there have taken their responsibilities very seriously and, as a consequence, the company is looking on these two plants as major contributors to the company. I think it just demonstrates once again that of all the statistics and all the arm bending that was done by Michael Kirby and his cohorts to try and close out a number of our plants on the South Coast, how wrong it would have been if the federal government of the day would have gotten their way and closed down these plants. It really, in essence would have been shutting down the whole of the South Coast and throwing that whole part of the island out of work.

So I am very, very proud, Mr. Speaker, to be part of the administration that took that stand. What can you say? I mean the thing is that we have been totally vindicated by the stand that we took. The plant workers are making good wages, there is always a problem in certain plants in the province with supply, but from what I gather, most plant workers are pleased with the hours of work and with their pay. So, I think it is very, very encouraging indeed.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the amendment so ably put forward by my colleague, I think it was the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) - another gentleman with great concern for the fishery in this province, having a fishing district such as myself. The great concern for the member for Burin - Placentia West was the ongoing saga at Burin during the restructuring crisis and, of course, again the Provincial Government of the day, and the former Minister of Fisheries, my good colleague from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) was very, very familiar with all these issues, knows that at the time the federal government, the federal Minister of Fisheries wanted to put an end to Burin. They said Burin should never exist. Send whatever you can down to Marystown to work, but there will be no future for Burin. We opposed that bitterly, and, of course, consequently, we stood up and we negotiated and we said that Burin must be a refit centre for the trawler fleet of the company. And, of course, we must, we must, and it was a priority for this government, have secondary processing in this Province.

We are very, very delighted with

the progress that has been made at Burin over the past number of months with regards to the products that have been turned out there and with the progress and success that Fisheries Products International are having marketing their products, not only in Canada, but also, of course, across the border in the U.S., even when we have got to contend with the tariffs that are there. So we are very, very pleased again, and the people of Burin are pleased that this government stood up and said there must be something done for Burin, and we are very, very pleased that the secondary processing suggestion, we were able to negotiate that, stand up and fight for that. Otherwise, it could have been gone. The fisheries critic knows full well that if we had not stood up for Burin there would be no fish plant, there would be no refit centre -

MR. TULK:  
(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:  
I am sorry.

MR. TULK:  
(Inaudible) House of Assembly.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
House of Assembly, what?

MR. TOBIN:  
They did not (inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:  
No, no, they did not care about Burin. The people of Burin showed them too. The people of Burin showed them about how they cared.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, the thing was if we had not stood up for Burin on this side, and so many times in this House we pleaded to the Fisheries critic of the day, who is still the Fisheries critic, and members of his party, to join with us in standing up for the people of this Province -

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! A point of order the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Does the hon. member remember the day that he stood in this House and agreed with the Fisheries critic on an all-plants-open policy? Can you remember that?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order. Of course, what the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is trying to do, of course -

MR. TULK:

You are being led astray by the cracky.

MR. MATTHEWS:

- he is trying to distract me now because he knows I am making such a great speech, and I am so familiar with the fisheries, the fishing problems, and the problems in the deep-sea, and the inshore fishery of this Province that he

really does not like to hear the truth.

MR. TULK:

No, (inaudible). It is a good speech except for that.

MR. MATTHEWS:

But being as honest as I am, being a most honest individual, I must tell the facts as they are. And I must say without the efforts of this government standing up for the people of Burin, there would be no Burin today. If the federal government of the day had to get their way, they would employ some of the people in Marystown, and what could not be employed in Marystown, they did not care too much about where they went. Of course, we stood up, and the situation is now, Mr. Speaker, that we have a significant number of people from Burin employed at Marystown, as well as another significant number of people employed refitting trawlers, and, of course, the numbers are escalating and growing with the number employed in the secondary processing.

So if things continue as they are going, Mr. Speaker, what I would -

MR. TULK:

There are 225.

MR. MATTHEWS:

- I am very hopeful that what we will see from the workforce that was in Burin that the total number that will be employed in both Marystown and Burin will exceed what was originally employed in Burin. If that can happen it would be the most positive thing. Again, I think, the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) at the time it happens will have to stand up and thank the members of this side, this government for doing such a



noble thing.

MR. TOBIN:  
225.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
225 employed in Burin now?

MR. TOBIN:  
Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:  
So that is very good 225. That is a very good industry in a town the size of Burin. But the key reason for it is we negotiated and pushed and fought for secondary processing and the number that will be employed in Burin will increase. And, of course, I have to get back to my own district of Grand Bank, Fortune, St. Lawrence, because if we had not stood up, also St. Lawrence would not have been even an asset of Fishery Products International. I am sure the hon. member knows that, that the Federal Minister of the day and the federal government did not -

MR. TULK:  
I will tell the truth later.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
This is true and you know it is true. - did not even want to include St. Lawrence as an asset in what was called then the super company. Of course, we were able to do that. St. Lawrence has been opened for the past number of years. We are not satisfied, of course, with the activity in the St. Lawrence plant. There is just not enough employment there. And, of course, the hon. member for

Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) he does not like to hear anything positive. I have never in my life, well I have only been here three years, two terms of government, but I honestly think-

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:  
As long as I keep coming back, I do not care how often it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. MATTHEWS:  
But the other thing, Mr. Speaker, is that I must say, I do not know what the total number of members that actually have been sitting in this House since I was first elected, I do not know how many members there have been, of course, there has been a fair number on both sides that have come and gone, -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
We missed him last time.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
- you were not here the last time, but I have to tell you, and I am honest, Mr. Speaker, that he is the most negative member that I have seen in this House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Yes, he is the most negative member I have seen.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Not as negative as the minister was when he tried to close down (Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

I will tell you something-

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

What I have to tell the hon. member is, there is an old saying in the outports, you know, 'That some people cannot progress, they cannot stand progress'. He cannot stand progress. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be distracted by the hon. member because he has not got a clue about the fishery in Newfoundland. He would not know a fish if he fell on it.

So I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the credit for all these positive happenings in the Province has to go directly to the Premier of this Province and his administration for standing up and fighting for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians for the jobs that the hon. member every day is up criticizing this government for not creating. But I can tell him he would have had a lot more criticizing to do if we had not stood up for the restructuring agreement that is now in place, because we would have had another 7,000 to 10,000 Newfoundlanders unemployed if we had not. And that would have made our statistics look worse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. MATTHEWS:

All ready? Oh, my! Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By Leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I am probably going to surprise my colleagues. I have not decided yet whether I am going to support the amendment or not because I have not read it. Are hon. members provided with a copy of the amendment? I certainly cannot decide whether I am going to support it or not support until I see the amendment. I can speak because while I am waiting for that I will look at the magnanimous resolution that is presented by my colleague the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk).

I certainly cannot fathom, I cannot appreciate, I cannot understand, why anybody would want to make an amendment to that motion unless it is simply a couple of words in the BE IT RESOLVED. If the amendment is working on that I could certainly agree with that, but it is going to have to be a powerful amendment, Mr. Speaker, it is not going to have any words of encouragement and commend in it. I certainly will not support that. And what do I see? 'BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this hon. House commend'. No, Mr. Speaker, sorry. I cannot support a resolution that ever has the word 'commend' in it or the word 'encourage'.

But this resolution, Mr. Speaker, gets to the point. Again, it has got action. 'BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this Honourable House, through approval of this Liberal Policy instruct the present administration to adopt a policy ensuring that all fish

plants in this Province remain open for a period of not less than four years.' Mr. Speaker, that is a resolution that calls for action, it calls for specific action.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will now look at the resolve here. 'BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this hon. House commend the present administration for adopting a policy ensuring that all fish plants covered in the agreement remain open' - that seems to be very narrow - 'covered in the agreement.' It is against this resolution, Mr. Speaker, in every respect and I am afraid that after reading it that I cannot support this particular amendment because it is full of politics. This government wants some patting on the back. They want to be commended. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that this government has done in the fisheries that deserve patting on the back.

They need a boot somewhere, Mr. Speaker, but no patting on the back for what they have done for the fisheries of this Province. I do not believe that you see a lot of fishermen out there today that would be prepared to come in and pat the government on the back. If they were going to pat them it would not be a gentle one, if I believe what the fishermen in Bonavista North are telling me about what the hon. crowd have done for the fisheries of this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of mushy resolutions that we get from members opposite and I just refer hon. members back to the previous motion. I just thought I would take a look and see if I have had any influence with hon.

members in presenting resolutions, and it looks like I have not. I just looked back to number eight, the one presented by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and it says, 'BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this Honourable House go on record as encouraging'. What mushy, weak stuff, Mr. Speaker, and to see hon. gentlemen trying to amend a resolution that is about to create jobs, that is going to help the Premier in honouring his mandate to create jobs. That is what this resolution is all about, to create jobs in the most important industry in Newfoundland, an industry that has been allowed to go down the tubes for the past four or five years because we have had a government that was sold on, a government that had a one dimensional policy, a one dimensional philosophy that did not include the fisheries of this Province. That one dimensional policy, that one dimensional philosophy did not include the fisheries of this Province and, Mr. Speaker, the fisheries have gone down the tube in the last few years under this administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I thought that if this resolution were on the Order Paper two years ago what an acrimonious debate there would have been because the amendment would have been 'BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House demand that the federal government keep the fish plants opened for four years.' That is what they would have said, Mr. Speaker. That would have been the resolution.

Or the resolution would have been 'BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the federal government give this Province joint management or joint control.' That would have been the kind of thing we would have

been getting, but this year we hear nothing of that. What they want done now is to commend them for the policy of all-plants-open. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I want to commend anybody but I want to see the policy of all plants open maintained for the period specified in the resolution. I am not interested in patting anybody's back, I am not interested in commending anybody, I am not interested in heaping praise on anybody, but I am interested in these fish plants remaining open for the period specified in the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

That is what I am interested in, Mr. Speaker, and that is what the fishermen of this Province want. They do not want to go around patting the backs of anybody, be they on this side or on the other side. They want the all-plants-open policy, this is what they want, the all-plants-open policy. This is what they want, Mr. Speaker. So hon. members have decided they do not want that, they do not want to support a resolution of this nature, they do not want this open plant policy, Mr. Speaker, unless they can be given some pats on the back. That is what they want.

So, Mr. Speaker, I again say if this were two years ago we would be in an acrimonious debate, reprimanding, criticizing the federal government for not giving the hon. crowd over there some management, or joint control. Now that is gone out the window. We never hear about that.

Mr. Speaker, if this were two

years ago brought up in this debate this afternoon would be the mandatory buy back of salmon licences from part-time fishermen, that is what would be on the carpet today. Hon. gentlemen would be out blowing themselves mad, having our people in a feverish pitch, wanting to separate from Canada practically because hon. gentlemen would be calling upon the federal government to do away with that policy.

What did they say this time? What did they do about it? When the federal government took that callous measure to buy back licences from fishermen, what did hon. gentlemen opposite do? Not a peep, they just accepted it even though we had a large part of our rights removed from us, a part of our heritage, a part of our culture pulled right out from under our noses and hon. gentlemen opposite never said a word. That is what they would be debating today if it were two years ago, the mandatory buy back of these salmon licences from part-time fishermen, fishermen who are trying to meet the requirements to become full-time fishermen. Not a word, Mr. Speaker, not a word.

Mr. Speaker, there would be nothing but negativity expressed two years ago, if it were two years ago, nothing but negativity. We would think that the fisheries was in such a mess that there was no way of ever bringing it back. We hear now that the fisheries is in great shape. I must say it was the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) who opened my eyes in committee a few days ago. He was the man who opened my eyes. Because the Minister of Fisheries painted such a glossy picture of

the fisheries in this Province that I thought that we had arrived at the new Jerusalem with respect to the fisheries in this Province to hear the Minister of Fisheries speak. But lo and behold, when the former Minister of Fisheries, the member for Bonavista South spoke, Mr. Speaker, he told us that there were problems. He identified the problems. He identified four or five major problems. He spoke about processing, he spoke about marketing, and I thought that we had no problems with respect to processing. I thought that we were performing to our maximum potential with respect to secondary processing in this Province. But the former Minister of Fisheries let us know that that was not the case, he let us know that we had some very serious marketing problems, he let us know that Mr. Speaker.

So all is not rosy in the fisheries today and why hon. gentlemen opposite would want to amend a resolution that is directed to creating jobs, a resolution that is giving some security to our fishermen, our fishermen involved in the inshore fisheries all along the Northeast Coast and throughout Newfoundland. They will not be very high in their praise, Mr. Speaker, of this government when they see this motion in the papers today, when they see that hon. gentlemen would not pass this motion, when they see that the government would not approve this amendment, an amendment which is going to give security to so many communities involved in the fisheries in Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish that I could support this amendment. I would like to be able to support

this amendment for the benefit of the fishing industry in this Province and for the benefit of the thousands of people who are working in the fishery and who are engaged in the inshore fishery, the fish plant workers. I would like to be able to support this amendment because it offers them something. It offers them some security over the next four years. The only thing this government want is to be patted on the backs. For what, Mr. Speaker, patted on the backs for what? For kow-towing to their federal colleagues, that is what they want to be patted on the backs for, for having given up fighting for the fishermen of this Province and now they want to be commended because it sort of a little argument as to who developed, whose policy it was in the first of an all-plant-open policy. They wanted to know, Mr. Speaker, they wanted to get credit for that.

Well, the fishermen of this Province are not concerned again as to whose idea it is. They are not a bit concerned about that. They are concerned about whether this idea is carried out. This is what they want, Mr. Speaker. They want to see this plan carried out. Well, it looks like it might not. It looks like this government is not going to give the fishermen that assurance. It looks like the hon. crowd opposite are not willing to give the fishermen of this Province and the plant workers the kind of assurance, the kind of bright future, that they can be looking forward to over the next two, three or four years.

Mr. Speaker, this policy would help the government to create jobs and they do not want to honour that commitment. They are afraid,

Mr. Speaker, that they would create some jobs and this government does not want to create jobs. This is what this resolution is all about, Mr. Speaker. It is a resolution with heart and soul. It is a resolution that has got heart and soul and has spirit. It is a resolution that is going to touch the very heart and soul of the fishermen of this Province, the plant workers, and everybody engaged in the fisheries. But, Mr. Speaker, as proposed the amendment is nothing, it is cold, it is callous, it is frigid, Mr. Speaker. It self-serving, that is the word, it self-serving.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave. By leave.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

It is now twenty to six and unless the hon. member has leave, I have to call on the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) to close the debate.

The hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) by leave.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I simply want to say that this resolution is a resolution that has meaning. This is a resolution that has meat on it. This is a resolution with substance. This is a resolution that is going to mean something to the fishermen of this Province.

But, Mr. Speaker, the other resolution that is looking for back patting, the other resolution that is looking for handshaking, the other resolution is absolutely cold and callous and will mean nothing to the fishermen of this

Province. Mr. Speaker, it should be soundly defeated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, how can you follow such a speech as has just been given with such eloquence, and such preciseness as has just been given to us by the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). The other side of the House were enraptured by what he was saying, they were completely drawn into what he was saying. And how right he was in pointing out to this House how weak the amendment put forward by the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) was. How right he was. What a speech he made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he also pointed out several areas of weakness besides the back patting. He also pointed out several areas of weakness in this amended resolution as was put forward by the member for Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). How right he was, what a speech he made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he also pointed out several areas of weakness besides the back patting, he also pointed out several areas of weakness in this amended resolution as was put forward by the member for Burin - Placentia West when he pointed out to this House that all the amendment covers are the plants that are covered by the agreement. He asked a very pertinent question and I know that after the member

for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) hears this, with all the fish plants that he has desires to get in Grand Falls.

MR. SIMMS:

We have a squid plant.

MR. TULK:

I know you have. He will vote for the resolution and not for the amendment. He will vote against the amendment because his fish plant, his squid plant, is not covered by the restructuring agreement, among other plants in this Province. There are several plants that have now become known as the independents and those plants can close down.

For example today in Petty Harbour, in yesterday's Evening Telegram, there is a plant being auctioned, put up for sale on the auction block, and yet the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) and the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) will stand in this House and say that the government has an all-plants-open policy. And yet we see fish plants being sold on the marketplace yesterday, being advertised in the paper.

Now the member for Burin - Placentia West made a great ado, and especially the member for Burin - Placentia West, he said nothing in his speech, except, as the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) said, back patting. The member for Grand Bank is fairly logical, fairly intelligent, but he is getting to a place where he is getting a little bit political. He is getting too partisan. He is putting his party before the fishery in his area and that is not commendable in the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews). He

knows full well about what I asked him this evening. 'Could he remember the day that he rose in this House and agreed with the member for Fogo?' He knew that that was exactly right, that he did agree with the member for Fogo when I said that we should have in this Legislature an all-plants-open policy.

MR. MATTHEWS:

(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:

Do you know the date? Do you want to know the date? You agreed right in this House. You were sitting there, I believe, where the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) is now sitting when you rose and agreed that that had to be the case.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) made a great ado about the fact that - and I believe the member for Grand Bank repeated it - De Bane, and God knows I have had my few disagreements with Mr. De Bane, but that De Bane and that crowd in Ottawa were against an all-plants-open policy, that they were out to close down plants. He said that that took place all of 1983, that was happening in all of 1983. He accused the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) who at the time was the federal member for Burin - St. George's -

MR. SIMMONS:

He was hiding.

MR. TULK:

He was hiding, the member for Burin - Placentia West was hiding. But he accused the member for Fortune - Hermitage of going along with those who would wish to close down fish plants in this Province.

When, as a matter of fact on May 5, 1983 a presentation called 'Restructuring the Fishery,' a detailed presentation - by whom? - by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador - to whom? - to the Government of Canada - clearly stated, and I would hope that the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) is listening because I am trying to educate him. In a presentation made by your government of which you were a member to the federal government, do you know what it said? Did it say that Mr. De Bane and his federal colleagues wanted to close down fish plants? Did it? Let me read it to you.

"We were encouraged to learn recently that notwithstanding" - and that is very important - "notwithstanding the Price Water House analysis" - that is very important because the Price Water House analysis did recommend closing down fish plants - but notwithstanding that "the Government of Canada has no fixed position with respect to plant closures. We understand that the federal government is prepared to give consideration to various means." Is the member for Burin - Placentia West listening to this? I am trying to educate him.

AN HON. MEMBER:

And then De Bane came down and made speech.

MR. TULK:

After you walked away from the bargaining table.

I am trying to educate you. What your own government said on May 6, 1983. "We understand that the federal government is prepared to give consideration to various means whereby an effort can be made to upgrade as necessary and

continue the operation of apparently marginal plants through a joint effort by all parties." Now does that sound like a government in Ottawa that really wanted to close down all of the fish plants? For the member for Burin - Placentia West to stand in his place and suggest -

MR. CALLAN:

Or any place.

MR. TULK:

Or any place. - to stand in his place and suggest that any Newfoundlander would want to close down a fish plant is despicable. It is totally despicable that a member of this House would do that when it is obvious, regardless of whether you are a Liberal or a PC or an NDPer, nobody in this Province would want to see one single fish plant close. That is not unusual for that government. That is not unusual, Mr. Speaker, for that government.

We have heard words like 'traitor' being used for the former member for the Strait of Belle Isle when he dared to stand up and question something. I think that came from that good parliamentarian, that clean parliamentarian, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter).

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is worth noting as the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) noted, that what we have here is a very watered down amendment. It is back patting, slapping themselves on the back. There is something that really this whole House was for and that was put forward by the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador initially in this Province. There is absolutely no doubt about that. The dates are there. They are clear. I am



going to send my friend from Burin - Placentia West a little gift. It is called Hansard. It is a blue book and I believe the date on it is - I am not sure if it is January 13th or November 13th, one or the other - but I will send him that little book for his own edification.

I do not know if the member for Burin - Placentia West realizes what he said in that amendment. What he actually said in that amendment was that only those plants, and they are on the list, covered under the agreement, that is all the provincial government is now agreeing should be open for a certain number of years, just plants covered under the agreement. May I point out to him that a place, for example, like Beothuck Fish in Valleyfield or a place like Fogo Island Co-op are not included under the restructuring agreement, and what it indicates, Mr. Speaker, is very clearly this government's -

MR. SIMMS:

How is the Fogo Island Co-op doing, by the way?

MR. TULK:

The Fogo Island Co-op is doing very well. It always has done very well.

MR. MARSHALL:

With this Government's help.

MR. TULK:

Government has helped. With this government's help.

I want to tell the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) one thing, that in terms of the amount of help that was required for Fogo Island, the number of people that are involved in it from an employment point of view and the

amount of fish caught, the amount of help that was given to Fogo Island was considerably small when compared to other plants in the Province. They did very well. And I want to tell him that Petty Harbour, another co-operative movement in the Province, modelled after Fogo Island, is also doing very well. They are doing very well.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

When they went to Fogo their co-operative was already in operation.

MR. TULK:

No, no. They came down to Fogo and learned a few things. But I am sure that they would be very interested in hearing what their member had to say the other day in Committee on co-operatives, they have to be treated exactly as any other private enterprise business.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

I told them at a Federation of Co-ops meeting in Gander about three weeks ago and they all loved it.

MR. TULK:

That is the reason Don Best agreed with you.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Don Best was there -

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman is bluffing and he knows it.

MR. FLIGHT:

And misleading the House.

MR. TULK:

He is bluffing and he knows it.

But I say to the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) that when a fish plant in this Province

closes down, and I want to remind him of that, a fish plant that is outside the agreement - and the government will use its majority to pass the amendment, of that there is no doubt - but when a fish plant that is outside the agreement is closed down in this Province, I want him to remember that it was he, the member for Burin - Placentia West, who brought an amendment into this House to a policy that said we keep all plants open in this Province for four years - all plants, not just plants covered under the agreement - that we keep all plants open in this Province for a period of not less than four years to see if they are going to be economically viable or not and then make whatever decision has to be made.

I want him to remember that he was the person who brought in the amendment to the resolution saying - I do not want them to come back in this House and say something different - that only those covered under the agreement should remain open. I want him to remember that, and not come in here and try to say something different from what he has said today.

MR. FLIGHT:

We will remind him.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the restructuring agreement for some parts of Newfoundland may have very well been a good deal. And, indeed, we agree that the restructuring agreement was necessary for, in particular, the South Coast of this Province, the home of the deep-sea fishery. Make no mistake about that.

The Minister of Fisheries (Mr.

Rideout), and I wish he were in his seat, because I do not believe that the hon. gentleman intentionally misled this House when he spoke in the debate, but he made the point in debate that there is contained in the restructuring agreement now a policy that all plants have to remain open. That is not true. That is not in the restructuring agreement, that all plants in this Province have to remain open for a period of time. He made a good point when he said that they should remain open for three or four years to prove whether they are going to be economically viable or not. But it is not true, it is absolutely not true that the restructuring agreement says that all plants have to remain open for a period of three to four years.

What it does say is this, Where plants are closed down for economic reasons, if either of the two governments, federal or provincial, wishes to keep that plant open for social reasons, then either the provincial or federal government, whichever wishes to keep it open, has to be prepared to pay the difference between the profit that should be made and a loss. That is what it says, it has to make up the difference. So to say otherwise is to mislead this House. If we are going to see FPI fulfil its mandate, if we are going to see the independents protected against FPI, I think it is important that this House pass a resolution - and that is the reason for putting it on the Order Paper - that all fish plants in this Province be given an equal chance, as we agreed that the fish plants in Grand Bank, in Burin, and in St. Lawrence be given an equal chance as well.

But what the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) has done through his little bit of politics he may one day live to regret is, he as said, only those plants covered by the agreement will remain open. That is what he has basically said. I do not know whether he realized it when he wrote it, I am not even sure that he wrote it, because I do not believe that the member for Burin - Placentia West would wish to see any fish plant in this Province closed. I do not believe he would. In spite of all the politics that he gets on with over there, in spite of all his political rhetoric, I do not believe that the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) would wish to see that. But he has introduced an amendment to the resolution which, when his side of the House votes in a couple of minutes time they will carry because of their majority, excludes a number of fish plants in this Province from being covered under that all-plants-open policy. And that is sad, that is sad for the people of Newfoundland, and, I suggest to him, it may even be sad for some people in his own district.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Come on, boy, sit down. Sit down.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, one other thing I would like for this government to do is buy some wigs for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Aylward) and his Executive Assistant.

MR. FLIGHT:

And the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett).

MR. TULK:

No, the Minister of Development does not need one, he will have a sun tan. If he is like the former Minister of Development in this Province, he will spend most of his time in the Far East, travelling around in a rickshaw.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on that basis -

MR. TOBIN:

That is not fair.

MR. TULK:

It is in your amendment only those plants covered by the agreement are to remain open. 'We commend the government for having this policy that all plants covered by the agreement rather than those that are outside the agreement.'

Now, the member for Burin - Placentia West, just look at the thought that he put into his amendment. He is over there now sitting down, holding his paper up in front of him with his amendment on it saying, 'I wonder did I put this there? Is this what really happened? Is this what I really did?' Did he write it himself or did somebody else write it for him? - is the question that you have to ask him. One of those days, when some fish plant closes down in this Province and we rise to speak on it, that member will be the first member to stand in this House and say, 'No, we believe that all plants should be open.' The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the member for Burin - Placentia West does not know, in this case, what he is talking about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would move that we put the question.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Is the House ready for the question?

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, resolution as amended carried.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns I would like to advise the House as to the meetings of the Estimates Committees. This evening at 7:30, here in the House, the Government Services Committee will consider the estimates of the Department of Labour.

MR. FLIGHT:  
By the way, where was the minister all day? Preparing for his estimates, is he?

MR. MARSHALL:  
The minister has been prepared for his estimates for years. The minister has prepared the estimates for years.

MR. FLIGHT:  
I hope he is better prepared than the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) was.

MR. MARSHALL:  
I would hope so, too.

Tomorrow morning, at 9:30 in the Colonial Building, Social Services Committee will consider the estimates of the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies. So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I guess the House should adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 13, 1985 at 3:00 P.M.