



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 32

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Thursday

13 June 1985

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that a collective agreement has been consummated between Churchill Falls (Labrador) Corporation and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 2351. The agreement was ratified by the employees in the bargaining unit at a meeting held in Churchill Falls last night. The agreement is for a three year period and covers approximately 130 employees at Churchill Falls. The wage settlement in the agreement adheres to government restraint policy inasmuch as there are no wage increases in the first two years. However, it provides for a wage increase of 8.5 per cent across the board in the third year of the three year agreement which expires in November, 1987.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
We are always delighted, Mr.

Speaker, to hear of labour disputes being settled. Indeed, we would like to see a lot more settled much more expeditiously, ones that are presently ongoing. But certainly, Mr. Speaker, we are delighted to see this very important group of workers have their contract settled. We wonder, though, what influence the Minister of Fisheries' (Mr. Rideout) comments had in settling this, how much they cost, whether they had any affect? Did the comments made by the Minister of Fisheries cost the government - CFLCo in this case - a lot more money?

But in any event, Mr. Speaker, we are delighted that it is settled. And we hope that the minister will go around settling many more disputes in this Province.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of short statements.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to inform the House that the loss of bareroot seedlings, which I referred to last week, at the provincial tree nursery in Wooddale this Winter is not quite as severe as first thought and it is hoped that the deficit now can be made up over the next two years.

A close examination of the stock just completed by my officials shows that the total loss caused by lack of snow cover, freezing temperatures and high winds over the Winter months amounted to 1.6 million seedlings. This unusual

combination of Winter weather conditions has occurred very rarely in this area of Newfoundland in the past.

It originally had appeared that the loss would reach 2 million seedlings. However, when all the sorting out of damaged and undamaged seedlings was completed, it was found that the loss was somewhat lower.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that we believe the loss can be made up during the next two years by raising two crops of container seedlings annually, or double cropping as it is known, in each of the nursery's twenty greenhouses and by speeding up the use of healthy two-year-old bareroot stock.

The long-term effects of the weather damage will be assessed over the next few months in detail and subsequently action will be taken to maintain production and reduce the possibility of this occurring in the future.

In any event, I want to inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that we do expect to be able to carry out all of the planting that we had planned for this year.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, the Opposition is certainly pleased that the loss at Wooddale is not as severe as first thought and we are certainly pleased again, Mr. Speaker, that any of the loss incurred for the

reasons the minister gave can be made up during the next two years. I have to say though, Mr. Speaker, in view of the minister's performance this past couple of days re this issue, it appears, Mr. Speaker, that maybe in order to justify the hiring of eighteen people without going through the Public Service Commission and finding himself in a position where he had to defend himself against patronage, he may well, Mr. Speaker, be entitled to and deserve the title of an alarmist. Maybe the minister broke that news too soon in trying to justify and answer the question of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and he chose to come out with these figures. Mr. Speaker, the word alarmist has been used around this House these past few days and I cannot think now of a more appropriate person to bear the title alarmist than the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms).

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the House that this year's spray programme against the spruce budworm has been tentatively scheduled to begin during the week of June 23. The exact date for the start of the programme will be determined by the level of insect development during the next few days.

The budworm programme will involve the use of the chemical insecticide matacil and the biological agent Bt. Spraying will be carried out on about

27,181 acres in the Noel Paul and Birchy Ridge areas. In addition, another 7,277 acres will be sprayed in the Gander Bay area for the purposes of environmental monitoring.

Meanwhile, the general public can obtain information about the location of spray blocks from my department's regional and unit offices across the Province, as well as from the Department of the Environment offices in St. John's, Grand Falls and Corner Brook.

Dates for the opening and closing of spray blocks will be provided through the media on a daily basis by the department's forest protection division. We will also be setting up a system to allow the public to obtain information directly by telephone and the appropriate phone numbers will be announced shortly.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the House that the insect control programme against the hemlock looper has been tentatively scheduled to begin during the first week of July. The exact date will be established by field sampling to determine the level of insect development. I will be making a further statement on that matter, Mr. Speaker, in due course.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to notice that the number of hectares being sprayed for the

spruce budworm is way down and that there is very little infestation of that insect left in the Province.

I note that the Noel Paul area is going to be sprayed and there should be special consideration given to doing studies on the salmon hatchery activities in the area.

We hope that the communication with the public will be carried out at a much higher level than it has been in the past where the whole system was broken down about halfway through. Whereas it is very nice to say that this information process is available, let us hope that that is an accurate information process and, of course, we will be checking to see if, in fact, it is. We will be watching the minister.

I presume environmental monitoring is going to be done in these areas. There is one area that is being sprayed in particular because of environmental monitoring. I would like to point out that no matter what happens with the environmental monitoring that these people have no impact on the programme, they have no ability to either change or stop or slow down the programme if things start to go wrong. And I would also like to point out that they still really do not have workable and proper contingency plan in the event of dumps, crashes and this kind of thing, and they have not yet instituted proper procedures to make sure that they can detect dumps when they do happen. Whereas it is nice to see there is not as much spraying being done against the budworm, it is a bit alarming to discover over the last while that the proper precautions have not

been taken.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table in the House today the federal-provincial joint position paper on regional and economic development, actually it is called the Regional and Economic Developmental Intergovernmental Position Paper. It has been signed by the federal, provincial and the two territorial governments. It is being released simultaneously by the federal and the other governments involved.

The paper is a result of several months of intensive work by officials at the ministerial level and represents a landmark example of co-operation between the federal, provincial and, indeed, in this case, territorial governments. It started approximately a year ago at the Premiers' Conference and was continued at the conference on the economy held some months ago and various ministerial meetings in the interim. Indeed, agreement on the general content of the paper was one of the purposes and objects of a meeting held approximately two weeks ago in Vancouver, which the hon. Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) and I attended on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, the paper recognizes for the first time, certainly in this kind of formal sense, the

fact that each province in Canada is different and has different opportunities and constraints. It also recognizes that disparities in this country are real, that they are pervasive and that they are persistent and that special attention has to be given if we are to reduce them.

It reflects the joint recognition and commitment of all the parties to the matter of reducing disparities and expanding upon the economic strengths of the various parts of the country.

It provides an elaboration of each of the nine guiding principles for regional and economic development and they are all contained in the document. There is no need for me to enumerate them. They were considered and approved by first ministers during the meeting at Regina in February of this year.

It contains, in the second half, an action plan which, among other things, calls for; one, regular, bilateral and multilateral ministerial meetings to review ongoing concerns and the progress achieved in applying these nine principles. I could point out that the next meeting of ministers involved, and that will be federal, provincial and territorial, takes place in Newfoundland at the end of July in St. John's.

The action plan also contains a broad and active discussion of regional development goals and objectives with the private sector for developing policies and programmes dealing with the significant economic disparities between the different parts of the country involving, among other things, the development of infrastructure and services which

will be required to allow the slow growth areas to fully participate in the economic life of the country.

It calls also for measures to develop policies which will stimulate investment by the private sector; for harmonizing federal and provincial government programming to deal more effectively with small and medium size business; and review transportation policies and programmes as they effect regional development.

The document represents a statement of philosophy and approach to regional economic development which has, as a key focus, the addressing of regional disparities in Canada. This is emphasized in the concluding section of the report, that is, in the action plan, which states, and I quote directly from the document: "In those provinces which suffer major economic disparities, the limitations of the private sector to address these disparities are recognized. Therefore, specific public sector policies and programmes aimed at the reduction of regional disparities are required." These statements, Mr. Speaker, are, of course, only so many words until they are made operative through policies and programmes designed for narrowing the economic disparities which exist throughout Canada.

This government is dedicated to pursuing this goal with the federal government through ERDA agreements and other federal-provincial policy initiatives. And this will be tabled and distributed to all hon members.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A nice statement by the minister and a nice glossy cover on this report which has been prepared incorporating the intergovernmental position paper on regional economic development.

I regret however, Mr. Speaker, that I have to say that what we have here are nothing but the broadest of motherhood principles. Unfortunately, even here the principles show themselves to ring very hollow when we look at the reality of what has been taking place in federal-provincial arrangements in recent weeks and months. And I refer, of course, specifically to the impact of the budget.

So there is one thing that I would agree with wholeheartedly in the minister's statement and that is on the last page where he says: "These statements, Mr. Speaker, are of course only so many words unless they are made operative through policies and programmes designed for narrowing the economic disparities which exist throughout this country".

Mr. Speaker, I would submit to this hon. House that these principles have not been made operative and, in fact, during the very period when this agreement was being negotiated, when this position paper was being prepared, the Government of Canada was acting in a spirit and, in fact, in a reality that was completely contrary to the principles set out.

Let me, for example, point out, we have contained in this report,

principle number five, which I will read out to the House. Principle number five, Mr. Speaker, says, "All major national policies should be judged in part, in terms of their regional impact and, so far as possible, those policies should reinforce the goal of fair and balanced regional development."

Now, Mr. Speaker, commentators of every possible political hue, of every walk of life, have pointed out that the impact of the recent federal budget on the Atlantic region is negative, that this part of the country is hurt more than other parts of the country. So what is this nonsense as contained in this principle if the Government of Canada is not prepared to implement what they are saying when they bring down a budget which is really, Mr. Speaker, the true test of a government's intentions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I refer to another principle. Let us look at principle number eight: "Governments should explore opportunities for increasing interregional trade and eliminating barriers between provinces."

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about permitting the wheeling of electricity? The biggest trade that goes on in terms of dollars between this Province and the rest of Canada and we have barriers, Mr. Speaker, to moving electricity from this Province. If we want to move electricity to Ontario, there is a barrier there. So again, we have a hollow word, a hollow phrase, a hollow principle in this document, Mr. Speaker, and until the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) can come in and show us in terms of a

budget, in terms of where the Government of Canada is prepared to spend its money, Mr. Speaker, we will not get too excited about these hollow-sounding principles contained in documents such as this.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I would like to point out that we see, time after time in this document, a reference to the new spirit of co-operation, the new era of consultation. I would suggest to you that this is just a code word, Mr. Speaker, for the Conservative conspiracy that we have in this country between the Conservatives in the provinces and the Conservatives in Ottawa. This quiet and private consultation is a code word, Mr. Speaker, for keeping quiet on the important issues, for fear of offending the Tory Big Brother in Ottawa. And, Mr. Speaker, nowhere is that more clear than to see how silent members opposite have been.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

If members opposite would keep quiet, I would not speak so loudly.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

Well, get your backbench members to keep quiet. Mr. Speaker, I will not be shouted down!

Nowhere has this keeping quiet on important issues been so obvious as with respect to speaking out to protect the elderly and the aged and those who are being hit, Mr. Speaker, by this recent federal budget. Members opposite should hang their heads in shame. Do not get up here and talk about

co-operation and consultation when you are afraid to speak out. There is collusion with their Conservative cohorts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) a question. In light of the fact that we now have the three Maritime Premiers speaking out against the adverse impact of the federal budget, we have the Premier of Quebec, Mr. Levesque, referring to it as somewhat inhuman, we have representatives of at least three different business groups, including Mr. Bullock, who is one of the more small 'c' conservative businessmen in this nation speaking out and saying that there are other ways to deal with the deficit than making the poor and the aged pay for it, and even Mr. Wilson, the Finance Minister, and the Prime Minister of Canada are now questioning the propriety of making the elderly and the aged pay for the deficit, will the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs tell us when the government of which he is a member is going to stop boot-licking and start speaking out for the elderly and the poor in this Province?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, there are very few shoeshine boys on this side, so if hon. members want to have bootlicking they will have to look elsewhere. As the Premier announced last week, there is a review of the federal budget as it impinges upon Newfoundland underway within the provincial government. No later than yesterday, actually, among a number of meetings which have taken place in that respect, there was a meeting of the Premier, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and myself, and the Premier will be making a statement with respect to the federal budget and its impingement upon Newfoundland, its effects upon Newfoundland next week.

The study has been ongoing for the past couple of weeks, it is quite a complex area, and that is now being finalized and the Premier will be making a statement to the House of Assembly next week.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

It is now public knowledge that both the Finance Minister (Mr. Wilson) and the Prime Minister knew before bringing down the budget that the tax increases would take money away from the lower and middle-income brackets and would mean more money, tax savings, for the wealthy in this nation. Now, would the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs indicate is this the philosophy

which the government of which he is a member adopts? Is this philosophy something which the minister can support, and is it something that he will be agreeing with in intergovernmental negotiations with the Government of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is well known by all hon. members, and certainly known by the people of Newfoundland who very recently gave their endorsement to this government what this government's policy is in terms of standing up for the rights of Newfoundlanders-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

- the economic rights, the political rights, the social rights, the resource rights, all of the rights of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. The government's position on that need take second place to none. The people of Newfoundland are well aware of it. They have recently endorsed it. The Opposition is well aware of it. It has not particularly endorsed it because it has never been particularly supportive of this government's efforts to see that the rights of the people of Newfoundland are recognized with respect to their resources, to the development of their resources, with respect to the economic and social and financial benefits which will accrue to the people of Newfoundland. They have not been supportive of the policies, but no doubt when it comes to questions of social and economic justice the

people of Newfoundland are aware of what our policies are.

I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Barry) question, at least in part, was perhaps an invitation to give a preview, if you wish, of what the Premier's statement is going to be next week, but I think the hon. gentlemen will really have to wait until next week because it would not be appropriate for me to do that. That is obviously his prerogative when he speaks for the entire government on that matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Now the minister did not answer the question and is attempting to side-step it, Mr. Speaker. I am not interested, in a preview we will find out when the Premier makes his statement, but I have to wonder why we have to wait until next week in order to get a statement from members opposite as to whether they agree with the reverse Robin Hood philosophy of robbing from the poor to give to the rich. Will he have the courage to answer man-fashion in this House? Does he believe in the reverse Robin Hood philosophy of stealing from the poor to give to the rich?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I would incur the wrath of my colleague, the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge), if I were to reply man-fashion, but I will attempt to reply person-fashion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

When it comes to the philosophy of Robin Hood I can certainly tell the hon. gentleman, and I think from that he can deduce what the social and economic philosophy of this government is, but we certainly do not agree and did not agree with the Robin Hood policy of LaLonde and Chretien and those supported by hon. gentlemen opposite when it was stealing from the poor of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

So when it comes to Robin Hood, the reverse Robin Hoods really are the friends and former colleagues of the hon. gentlemen opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), and in the absence of an answer to my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), let me ask the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) another question. It concerns the

establishment of the 20.7 per cent anti-dumping tariff that the U.S. Commerce Department has imposed on Canadian salt fish being shipped by the Canadian Saltfish Corporation to the United States.

Now, the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Fraser) in his speech to the Fisheries Council of Canada showed a somewhat nonchalant attitude when he said, 'Based on the information that I have, I think it is likely that injury will not be established in this case; referring to the case of the tariffs -

MR. BARRY:

What was the date of that?

MR. TULK:

That was May 4 of this year.

- 'and the US administration will not impose duties on salted cod products.' And he said, 'We have every reason to be confident that the American system is equipped to make a distinction between the George's Bank affair and the Canadian salt fish problem.'

Now I ask the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), did this government make any representation to the federal government on this whole problem since it affects Newfoundland perhaps more than it affects any other province of Canada? Is this nonchalant attitude, the blind faith that the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans in Ottawa (Mr. Fraser) has in the US system, due to nonrepresentation on the part of this government, or is due to the attitude of the central Tory government in Ottawa that believes that they have the government in the palm of their hands?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I really do not think it is due to either of the factors which were suggested by the hon. gentleman opposite, but obviously I would not expect the hon. gentleman to have an objective analysis of the motives of the federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. I do not think that he was necessarily nonchalant - I do not know, I did not see him make it - and I suppose you can only judge that when you see the manner in which a person makes the statement. I suppose that is the risk that anybody runs when they answer in a hypothetical manner a hypothetical question. The man in not infallible, he made a judgement. He was asked his opinion on what he thought the outcome of the American procedure would be and he gave, presumably, what was his opinion and his opinion was wrong. But I suppose anybody is in that position when they do in fact give an opinion before all the facts are known, the facts being how this American body would in fact judge that particular case. Well, obviously his judgement was wrong. I do not think it is fair to attribute to him the fact that he was nonchalant or did not care, which is a risk one runs when one offers an opinion. When a person states something after the fact he does not run any risk. When he gives an opinion before the fact, then obviously there is a risk.

With respect to the first part of the question, certainly there have been discussions and negotiations. Newfoundland's position was put forward from the Provincial Department of Fisheries

to the federal Department of Fisheries, the Saltfish Board and all other interested agencies. Certainly there have been, yes.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Intergovernmental Affairs Minister (Mr. Ottenheimer) that perhaps the whole nonchalant attitude of the federal minister - and I can show him a copy of the speech if he has not read it - was shown in a speech made May 4 in Montreal to the Fisheries Council of Canada. The federal minister did have a nonchalant attitude about this whole affair, and he had blind faith in the American people. Perhaps the whole idea is that we can trade fish for trade concessions for other parts of central Canada, but ask the minister answer my real question to him, and that is what position did the Premier himself, or through the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, take with the Government of Canada regarding this whole matter?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the position the Government of Newfoundland has taken in terms of discussions with the Government of Canada is that, of course, the Government of Canada should use every means at its disposal to influence the American regulatory body not to act in the way which would penalize the Newfoundland fishery,

Newfoundland fishermen or the salt fish product, as is the case here. That obviously has been the position of the government of Newfoundland. I have no reason to doubt that that also is the position of the Government of Canada. Of course, in the final analysis the decision was made by an American board.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, that is a very good non-answer. I wonder if we are getting the same kind of answer that we got on overfishing by the West Germans. Let me ask the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) if he will table - and we hope they are in better condition than what was tabled by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) - any recommendations or any representation at all, written representation or any other kind, briefs or whatever, that he made to the federal government on this whole matter.

MR. FLIGHT:

Specifically on this matter.

MR. TULK:

Specifically on this matter.

MR. BARRY:

And will they stop the shredders in the meantime until he gets down there?

MR. TULK:

And slow down the shredders until he gets down there. Let me be very serious with the minister: Will he table any representation

that they have made to the federal government on this whole matter? Did they in fact make any, or did they just sit down and try to protect their Tory buddies and have the same attitude that they had towards this whole problem?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman speaks accusing the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Fraser) of nonchalance, which really means not taking the matter sufficiently seriously, but then the hon. gentleman himself prefixes all his questions with, 'Or are they trying to save or avoid embarrassment of their Tory buddies in Ottawa'. I think that really shows a nonchalant attitude and an attempt to politicize it in a partisan manner. It really does not betray a deep and ardent and abiding concern with the future of the Newfoundland fishermen, but a deep and abiding desire to try to, in a partisan manner, tackle this issue which is so vital to the people of Newfoundland.

The hon. gentleman says that mine are not answers, but if you get a reasonable question you can give a reasonable answer. If you get a non-question, about the best you can do is give a non-answer. But I think I have been very successful in giving answers to non-questions and that in itself is quite a chore. However, the hon. gentleman did ask if I would table copies of intergovernmental correspondence between the Province and Ottawa on this particular matter. I would have to take that as notice because one would have to review the documents to see specifically what was

there. This is a matter which may be subject to appeal and one would not want to do anything which might be inimical in any further negotiations or appeal process to which this decision might be susceptible.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A final supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs that competence and courage are not matters of partisanship but should belong to a government that has to run this Province. What I am saying to him is does he have the competence and the courage, does his government have the competence and the courage to protect Newfoundland fishermen rather than sit back and protect their own Tory buddies in Ottawa?

Now that this thing has happened, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs this question. What action is he now prepared - and by he, of course, I mean the government - to take to alleviate the serious effect that this is going to have on Newfoundland saltfish markets? What action or action are you recommending to the federal government, since it seems obvious that there has been very little action taken so far by the government? What action are you now prepared to take?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman speaks of competence and sort of makes a suggestion that the competents are on the opposite of the House and the government is lacking therein. Again all I can say is he is entitled to his private opinion but it would appear that the vast majority of the people of Newfoundland do not share that opinion because not too long ago they decided with respect to competence.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a believer in what is called the quick fix or the instant answer to a complex question. The decision was made yesterday. We have not yet seen the written decision. All we have seen is what is reported in the press and obviously we will want to see the written decision. It is a very important matter. We will want to discuss it and consider it in detail from its various parameters. To come up and to say now that we have an instant remedy to it would perhaps sound very impressive but would not be a sensible or intelligent manner in which to deal with a complex question.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to my colleague, the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) responsible for trade, having made a statement in the House yesterday regarding that matter and meeting with other minister of international trade. Mr. Speaker, because this commission in the US has now made its decision

regarding salt fish products, and because that same International Trade Commission is presently looking at the possibility of the same kind of a penalty tariff on fresh fish products, I would like to ask the minister if he would take it upon himself to hold discussions, either by telephone or correspondence, as fast as possible with his counterpart in Ottawa to ensure that same commission will not take a similar decision in the next number of days to impose a tariff penalty on our fresh fish products. Because if that happens, Mr. Speaker, it will be drastic and devastating to our inshore fishery in Newfoundland.

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have had that question from my colleague. It indicates the serious nature of this particular initiative taken unilaterally by officials in the United States with respect to surtaxing the salt cod and the implications that that might very well overflow into the fresh cod as well. As you are aware, the Government of Canada and the Provinces reached agreement in principle as to its attempts to proceed as quickly as possible with a free trade position with the United States, in particular, and that that position was to be addressed as quickly as possible.

This initiative arose from the Quebec Conference, and every effort is being made to proceed with that. Mr. Speaker, officials of my department and myself are

very concerned about this particular initiative by certain segments of the United States Government, and we will be addressing it as quickly as possible.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pretty soon the chemical fenitrothion is going to be sprayed over our forests, and I have a question for the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt). It has been proven that fenitrothion will kill birds, pollinators, other non-target insects and small fish, and I have some of these studies here with me now. This has been proven beyond a shadow of a doubt, and I would suggest that it is very, very important that during the spray programme the proper monitoring programmes be carried out to evaluate the effects of the spray programme. My question to the Minister of the Environment is this, what groups are doing this environmental monitoring study associated with the spraying of this poison over our forests?

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker, when there is a spray programme undertaken, it is the proponent of the spray that has to fund the environmental part of that spray. In this case it is the Department of Forest Resources and Lands which will actually be

paying for the cost of the spray, and the Department of the Environment will monitor the spray. As I pointed out to the hon. member at our Estimates Committee the other night, we will be doing an ongoing monitoring programme on soils, on birds, and, indeed, on pollinators, bees, wasps, those insects.

MR. BAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not understand what the hon. gentleman was saying. You were saying that we are going to monitor; we meaning the Department of the Environment is going to monitor. Is that what you are saying?

MR. BUTT:

Yes.

MR. BAKER:

And there are no outside groups going to take part in this monitoring programme, am I to understand that?

MR. BUTT:

Yes.

MR. BAKER:

Then my question to the Minister of the Environment is if that is so, why are contract documents out with regard to environmental monitoring programmes and why have they been passed around to other groups and so on to submit bids for doing the environmental monitoring if in fact the hon. gentleman's department is going to do the monitoring? My question is who is going to do this monitoring that you have now bids out for

that obviously you did not know anything about?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, competent people who are qualified under the Pesticides Advisory Board will actually do the monitoring under the guidelines set down by the Department of the Environment.

MR. BAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Is it not a fact that six separate scientific groups have been contacted and asked to do this particular environmental monitoring and, to the best of my knowledge, at least four of them have turned this down on the grounds that the terms of reference indicate a very shabby, unnecessary, and impossible monitoring study?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of anyone turning this down. If indeed the hon. member is stating factual information, then I will certainly take his question as notice and I will inform the hon. member if that is so. And if the hon. member has information there pertaining to that, then I would ask the hon. member to lay it on the Table.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

It is a very weak answer, Mr. Speaker. The Department of the Environment is supposed to be on top of all these things that are going on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BAKER:

I would like to ask the Minister of the Environment is it not a fact that Bt, which does not have any of the harmful effects of fenitrothion except against the target organisms, could be used with a very negligible increase in cost? I understand that there is a promise that BT is going to be used within five kilometers of all watersheds and things like this, and Bt is going to be used within five kilometers of all blueberry grounds. That is something I found out this morning, which I did not really realize because the minister has never stated it before but I now have here in writing. Is it not a fact that Bt could be used and is just as effective, with very little increase in cost when you take the whole programme into account, including the cost of the spray plane?

MR. BUTT:

No.

MR. BAKER:

Well, that is not what the experts have told me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Table it! Table it!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of the Environment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BUTT:

Once again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not correct. The hon. member is not correct in that Bt would cost about four or five times as much and considering the amount of the area of forest that we are going to spray this year because of an anticipated major outbreak by this helmslock looper, the costs are astronomical. And fenitrothion is the only chemical registered by Canadian Agriculture-

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Let him finish!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BAKER:

Well, he stopped.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, fenitrothion is the only chemical registered by Canadian Agriculture for use against the hemlock looper, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I did recognize

the hon. member for a final question. Maybe he would make this the final one. The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

All right, Mr. Speaker. I will try. If in fact Bt is the only chemical registered for use against the hemlock looper, much of your programme of spray against the hemlock looper is Bt. Are you breaking the law?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BAKER:

You obviously must be according to what you just said. And why can you not just extend the area that you are spraying, the Avalon Peninsula and Central and Eastern Newfoundland, and call it an experimental programme and use Bt over the whole area? Because, Mr. Minister, whereas the cost of Bt formulation itself is more expensive than the fenitrothion, in light of the total cost of the programme, the cost of spraying, and once you bring in all of those other costs, the end cost is negligible.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is the hon. member knows the difference as well, by the way, because he was a biology teacher, a chemistry teacher, he knows that Bt is not an insecticide. And the hon. member

also knows because I told him the other night in the Department of Environment estimates, that Bt is about three or four times as expensive as fenitrothion. We are using Bt in sensitive areas like watersheds and around communities and so on.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are not allowed to -

MR. BUTT:

Indeed we are allowed to. Mr. Speaker, this spray programme will be monitored with great sensitivity. We will have spotter planes. The hon. member the other night had some concerns about this double swatting and what would happen in the case if we had to dump a load. He suggested having some kind of a colouring device in there. Actually, if that were to take place, there will be a transmitter enclosed in a shock absorbing device and that locator would be dropped so we would have an accurate fixed on where that load was going to be deposited.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Would the minister confirm what he just said, that the Bt spray programme would cost five times as much as any other alternate? Is that what the minister said, five times as much?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Environment.

MR. BUTT:

I said about three or four times as much, I think.

MR. FLIGHT:

The minister said five.

MR. DAWE:

No, he did not.

MR. FLIGHT:

Yes, he did.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

He is not sure what he said.

MR. BUTT:

Three or four times as much. I think that was my answer to that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate that I am a friend of labour, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). I want to ask the minister what steps he has taken in the last day or so to try and resolve this very serious labour dispute with the breweries in the Province?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is aware that on Thursday, June 6, last week, I wrote to the managers of each of the three breweries, I wrote the same letter to the Presidents of the three Locals representing employees at the three breweries, a copy of the

correspondence, the same letter, was sent to the Provincial President of NAPE, which represents two of the breweries, and in that letter I invited them to come to a meeting on Friday, June 7, at 10:30, and I offered the services of the Acting Deputy Minister and the conciliation officer who is knowledgeable about the dispute, who has been active in it all through the piece.

The managers of the three breweries showed up for the meeting, one of the unions showed up, but the other two did not show up, and they gave as their reason for not showing up the fact that they wanted to settle their local issues.

Now, if they wanted to settle local issues they could have come to the table, they could have made that statement at the table, there could have been innovative kind of thinking taking place, or suggestions as to how they should have been dealt with. But since they did not show up, nothing could be done at that time. Now, not to be discouraged, Mr. Speaker, at that, the Acting Deputy has made a couple of other attempts to reach NAPE because, in fact, that is the only strike, the other two are lockouts, and he has been told that they are in Ottawa on another mission but that they will be back to him when that mission is over. So within the next day or so, Mr. Speaker, I can inform the hon. member, we will be making another attempt to try to get them back to the bargaining table. I mean, you can bring the horse to the water but you cannot force it to drink.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I certainly respect the minister's answer, and certainly commend him on his attempts so far. But, Mr. Speaker, is the minister not concerned about the effect that any prolonging of this strike would have on the industry, an industry that employs directly and indirectly 8,000 people throughout this Province, and an industry that generates thousands of dollars for the government?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, when we were going through the estimates of my department last night, we talked about the same thing and the hon. member knows of my concern. The only thing I have to say to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, and I have said it several times, is what else can we do? I mean, we would be walked on and trampled on and everything else if we tried to deprive unions from exercising their right here. The employers are exercising a right also. It is one of those things. We are looking for a solution, and I can assure the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that, yes, I am concerned. I am very fearful. I am fearful that the 500 or so direct jobs that are involved, plus all of the others, the spinoff from the breweries, may be lost to the Province if this strike continues. That is a great fear of all of us. But we cannot deprive them of their rights, and they are on a legal strike.

MR. LUSH:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to the House that the Government Services Committee have considered the matters to them referred and have passed, without amendment, items of expenditure under the following headings: Municipal Affairs; Public Works and Services; Labour; Finance; Transportation; and Consumer Affairs and Communications.

Notices of Motion

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law".

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills: "An Act To Amend The St. John's Municipal Elections Act"; "An Act To Amend The City of Corner Brook Act"; "An Act To Amend The City Of St. John's Act"; and An Act To Amend The Municipalities Act."

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to report that the Social Services Committee have considered the matters to them referred and have passed, without amendment, items of expenditure under the following headings: Justice; Health; Education; Environment; Social Services; Culture, Recreation and Youth; Career Development and Advanced Studies.

Petitions

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here signed by thirteen individuals. I will read the prayer of the petition. "We, the undersigned, would like the museum in the Murray Premises opened from the hours of 9:00 a.m. to 5:00

p.m. without floors being closed during breaks and lunches."

I think this is a very timely petition to be presented to the House. I see the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) is not here but I am hoping that somebody on behalf of the government will answer to it.

As the members of the House may or may not know, at this point the hours for the particular museum in question are extremely inadequate. The fourth floor, for example, is closed from 9:00 a.m. to 9:30 a.m.; is opened again from 9:30 a.m. until 11:30 a.m.; is closed again for four hours from 11:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.; it is opened again for another hour from 3:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m., and it closes again at 4:30 p.m. With the advent of Summer hours the amount of time that the museum is opened is even less. We have, actually, an extremely expensive museum that the government has paid for and, as a matter of fact, paid rent for for years prior to its even being opened.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, a point order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

We have heard nothing in the petition indicate where the petitioners are from. Are they residents of the Province, of St. John's, St. Anthony or Corner Brook or Ontario? Also, Mr. Speaker, the key question in posing a point of order is whether or not the petitioners are indeed employees of government. If they

are employees of government surely that kind of request should have been made directly to their employer, the minister or the deputy of the department concerned, not through a petition in the House of Assembly.

MR. FENWICK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I am wondering where these rules are coming from. I assure you that under the rules of order I am responsible for saying that this petition is in order and I tell you now it is in order and I see no reason I should be questioned.

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) playing games.

MR. FENWICK:

If you wish, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you who it is presented on behalf of.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Are you speaking to that point of order?.

MR. FENWICK:

I have already addressed that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, there is no point of order in that particular matter. I have some observations but I do not think this is the appropriate time to make them. Maybe later I will speak about presenting petitions to the House. The hon. member is in order.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Just to answer the question raised by the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), the individual who brought this petition to me is a person who works in the building but not for the provincial government and has been annoyed over the months by the lack of service in this particular institution.

MR. MORGAN:

Is he losing business.

MR. FENWICK:

No, it is just that tourists continue to come to him, visitors from within the Province come to him and say, 'Why is the museum not open?'

MR. SIMMS:

How many signatures are in it?

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, could I have silence?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

There are thirteen including my own.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is a very serious one. The museum is one of the best attractions we have set up, we have invested an incredible amount of money in it, but because the operation is so badly short staffed the hours that are offered are very, very inadequate. There are no evening operations, for example, and, although the petition does not ask for it, in my opinion it should be open in the evenings as well. The amount of hours are miniscule, only three or four hours for an entire floor. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, since we are looking for means of increasing the amount of

tourism in our Province, we have an attraction that we spent a lot of money on and I think it is time we spent the little bit extra required to make sure that the hours are reasonably decent so that it can be developed into the attraction it should be. I address the petition to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews).

Orders of the Day

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fisheries Loan Act," carried. (Bill No. 21).

On motion, Bill No. 21 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Local School Tax Act," carried. (Bill No. 22).

On motion, Bill No 22 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend Certain Acts Having Regard To The Canadian Charter of Rights And Freedoms," by leave, carried. (Bill No. 1)

On motion, Bill No. (1) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order 3, the Concurrence Motion, the hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:
Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure today to begin the Concurrence Debate on the Resource Committee and to say to the hon. House that it was the Committee that had its meetings clued up first, cluing up yesterday. It was done in a very efficient manner, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, without any great problems.

I would first of all want to take the opportunity to thank the members on the committee from both sides of the House, the Vice-Chairman, the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), the member for Windsor Buchans (Mr. Flight), the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), and the member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford), who co-operated so well during these hearings.

I assume, Mr. Speaker, that I am given fifteen minutes, with the Opposition having fifteen minutes and then it is a ten minute back and forth, I assume those are the rules that we are following. Fifteen minutes for me to lead off, with the Opposition replying in fifteen minutes, then each other member from both sides with ten minutes allotted to each.

MR. SIMMS:
As frequently as they want.

MR. PEACH:
As frequently as they want, yes. One of the comments, Mr. Speaker, that I would want to make at the

outset is that a number of weeks ago when the Estimates Committee were put in places we had quite a lot of complaints from the NDP member in our House, yet at none of our hearings in Resource Committee did the member show up, to my knowledge.

MR. MORGAN:

What? Never showed up?

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I understand the rules of the House are that you are not supposed to make comments about people attending meetings or not attending meetings. I believe that is unparliamentary.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

I think my hon. colleague from Carbonear (Mr. Peach) has hit a very sore point with the member for Menihek. For example, last evening the great friend of labour in the Province could not find time to come and take part in the discussions on the Labour estimates.

The point he is making is that the hon. member stood in this House and complained about the fact he could not take part in Committee activity and he did not have time to deal with all committees. Well, the fact is, as my hon.

colleague just said, on the Resource Estimates, the most important maybe for the whole Province, at no occasion did the member for Menihek appear to take part in discussions and resource issues in the Province. Shame!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, it was, I guess, disappointing that the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), with all of the comments he has made in recent weeks concerning the mining industry in his district, did not show up during the Resource Committee on the Department of Mines. That is a clear indication of the type of interest that he has. I am sure that what he portrays through the media and what he actually does as a representative for the district of Menihek is two different things.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I would wish to point out that it was only on one occasion in the Resource Committee that we had members of the media present. Although our good friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), did make reference on a number of occasions to the fact that the media were not covering the Estimates Committee, I am sure it is not the responsibility of the House of Assembly or of the Committees themselves to ensure that the media are present. I am sure that their staff are adequate for coverage. It was only during the Committee hearings on the

Department of Fisheries that the media did appear. I am sure there are obvious reasons why they showed up. It was something that was somewhat controversial and they did show up and had their camera crews there and so on. So I guess that, in itself, speaks to the way it was.

The Committee, Mr. Speaker, had eight sitting times with seven departments being considered, with six ministers involved. Our hearings began on May 28 and concluded on June 12. There was adequate time for members to make comments to the various ministers and departments. However, I am sure that in the three hours that I understand is allocated to the resource part of the estimates, that members on both sides will not nearly take up that time because I am sure all members agree that ample time was provided in Committee meetings. There was a great deal of co-operation from both sides. I have to admit that. We had very few problems. There was one occasion that we spent several hours on points of order, but apart from that things ran rather smoothly. There was a minor problem a few days ago on scheduling, however, I think that could be attributed to the disagreement that was between several members from the opposite side.

Mr. Speaker, if I might, in the short time allocated to me just to briefly run through the various departments as they were discussed at the Committee stage and make some reference to some points that were brought out in each department without expanding on them because I am sure some of the ones that were not covered adequately by the members opposite in particular, they will wish to

bring them up in the House. So I will try to clue up. I will make the comments very general.

The Department of Forest Resources and Lands, was one, Mr. Speaker, that had quite a wide-ranging area of discussion. Some of the points discussed were relating to the Kruger operation, the Kruger takeover in our second city, the West Coast city of Corner Brook and some problems related to the Bowater and Kruger takeover. So that was one very important matter and I must say that the minister responsible or the Minister of the Department of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) handled himself in his usual good manner.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He told you to say that.

MR. PEACH:

He did not tell me to say that but it is really what I should say on that, Mr. Speaker. One of the other concerns expressed in particular by some members opposite was that of contracting out some of the work with Kruger. Again, that matter was addressed. It probably might arise again during this debate.

Reforestation was another matter. Silviculture, the spray programme came up although it is associated with both departments, the Department of Environment, and the minister has handled that well this last couple of days, and it was also dealt with, of course, under the Department of Forest Resources and Lands. Forest access roads were an issue, I guess, that was brought up by members on both sides because it is an issue that quite often sort of gets put under the carpet in the sense that particularly areas that are not heavily related to

the forests, but have forest access roads around our Province for domestic cutting and so on. It was addressed to the minister.

One point of note in the Department of Forest Resources and Lands, Mr. Speaker, noted by the member for Gander at the time who did have quite a lot of concerns on the spray programme. He did, as a matter of fact, agree in Committee that he was opposed to the spray programme completely. It was pointed out at the time by the minister that to completely ignore the spray programme would have some just as adverse and damaging effects on our forests as some of the concerns that he expressed.

With regard to the Department of Mines and the Minister responsible for the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation (Mr. Dinn), most of the concerns expressed in Committee at that particular hearing had to do with mines. There were some minor questions posed to him with regard to the operation of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing throughout our Province and in Labrador in particular. But the barite situation from the mining operation or the close down of the mining operation in Buchans was a concern, particularly with the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight). It was brought up in the light of the cost of barite from Buchans with regard to it being brought in from other countries around the world and as it relates to the offshore.

The St. Lawrence fluorspar mines and the operation of the proposed operation of Minworth into the St. Lawrence mines was another issue. One of the questions and one of the opinions that came out of it

at the time from the department was that the Minworth operation should be ready by the end of 1985 with production taking place in early 1986.

The Wabush mines, their production capacity was brought up in particular by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight). And again I have to say, Mr. Speaker, shame on the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) that he was not there at that time to lay his concerns out before the Committee and out to the minister and officials in his department concerning the operation of Wabush mines. It is just very disgraceful. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that when the people in his district hear that he had no concern for the operation of the Wabush mines that they will be quite upset.

AN HON. MEMBER:

And the Iron Ore Company of Canada.

MR. PEACH:

The IOC, yes. He was not in the least concerned with coming and making his views known.

The Department of Energy, Mr. Speaker, was one of the last departments that we dealt with. It was a rather short session, I might add. The Minister responsible for Energy and the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) handled himself very, very well. The issues that were discussed at the time were relating to the Come By Chance operation and, of course, it was only several days ago that we realized that those matters were discussed again here in the House.

We spent quite a lot of time on the Atlantic Accord as it relates to Clause 54. That was one of the

contentious issues that was discussed, and considered by members opposite to be, I guess, yes, probably a red herring. The price per barrel of oil was one of the things that was zeroed in on, and I guess that is something that is very, very difficult to give at this point in time, as was pointed out by the minister responsible. It is very difficult for us in 1986 to determine at the time of production what the cost of a barrel of oil will be.

There was some time spent on Hydro. I think most of the concerns of Hydro had to do with our water reserves and the cost of electricity and so on. But it should be pointed out that at one particular time in that meeting of the Estimates Committee on Energy that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) throw his hands up and left the meeting and did not stay around to finish it.

MR. FLIGHT:

I would not blame him.

MR. PEACH:

The other department, Mr. Speaker, is Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development.

MR. MORGAN:

There was very little mentioned of agriculture.

MR. PEACH:

There was very little mentioned of agriculture, yes. My good colleague from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) reminds me. Very little mentioned of agriculture at all. The Labrador stores is one contentious issue. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that is an issue that I had the opportunity to address two years ago when I was Vice-Chairman of the Select Committee on Food Pricing in the

Province. It was one of the issues, I guess, that took up a reasonable amount of that report. The report was very specific in some of its recommendations. The Labrador stores, in some opinions, it should be closed out completely. There were some other opinions expressed that there was probably room for them to be operated more effectively.

MR. WARREN:

What did the Opposition say in was its opinion.?

MR. PEACH:

Well, I think, the records will show my good friend, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) the views of the members of the Opposition as it relates to the Labrador stores.

Grants and loans from the Department of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development, at one point, it was indicated by the members opposite, those loans and grants were passed out on a political basis. Well, I think, it will be shown in the record that the minister put those fears aside, that they are put out to, in most cases, rural parts of our Province to a lot of small business, farmers and so on, to start up their own business and come self-employed and to do things out in our rural community that they normally would not be allowed to do.

Co-ops were discussed as well. Again, that was a matter that we addressed two years ago in our Select Committee in Food Pricing. The hiring of personnel in Labrador was discussed rather briefly.

The Department of Development, Mr. Speaker, that one was very

wide-ranging and, of course, at the same time had some overflow into the Department of Energy. The Burin Peninsula Development Fund was addressed and the Marystown Shipyard. Barite, with regard to the mining operation in Buchans was, again, brought up and discussed at great length with a lot of views being put forth on the fact that we probably should be doing what we can to ensure that the barite that is just lying there in the open pits and on the outside there in Buchans, as the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. FLight) clearly pointed out, we should do what we can to ensure that, if at all possible, bearing in mind the cost factor, that it should be used in our offshore operations.

One of the somewhat unusual issues that came up under the Department of Development, but it does relate to tourism, was that of roadside camping. Roadside camping, it was pointed out by one of the members, I am not sure which side it was on, that we are probably somewhat unique in roadside camping. They point out that we are probably the only jurisdiction in North America that permits roadside camping. I am sure, we all, any of us who are ardent campers probably sometimes get annoyed by the many trailers that are parked around our roadsides and our gravel pits in our Province. But, I guess, to ban it completely has another side to it as well, in that, the people out in rural Newfoundland quite often go out in their camper trailer and so on on weekends to their favourite pond or favourite berry-picking area in the Fall and they like to go there rather than go to our provincial parks or to our private parks. But one of the things as it relates to the environment and quite a lot of

people are not very tidy when they leave, this was one of the concerns that was pointed out by some of the members.

Tourism, as it relates to advertising, promotion, was another concern. As a matter of fact, I think both sides agreed that the Department of Development was doing a tremendous job in promoting tourism in their advertising. A lot of their advertising was considered to be excellent, including their promotional pamphlets.

As I mentioned earlier, the price of oil at the time of the development of our offshore was again brought up in that particular department. As the minister pointed out, our trade missions and the trade missions that will come up in the next couple of years to promote our Province, prove to be very, very valuable indeed. They are not as waste of time and a waste of money, but I think all felt that, conducted in the proper fashion, our trade missions are one way that we can sell our Province, that we can promote our Province, that we can bring people into our Province to help us develop, and that is one way of getting our message out to some countries, and out to foreign investment people who want to come in here.

The Department of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, was one that took over two sessions to complete. We did have to go into the third session in dealing with the Department of Fisheries. We were probably a little unique when we sat down with that particular department, because not only were we dealing with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), but we had two former Ministers of Fisheries on

the Committee, one from each side of the House, and that probably made it one of the more interesting Committee meetings, one of the more interesting sessions that we had.

As I pointed out at the beginning, we did tie up nearly a session on various points of order. We used up seven and a half hours on Fisheries.

For all the Resource Committee we had eight sittings, so we used up something like twenty-four or twenty-five hours on that particular part. We did have, I am sure, as I said in the beginning, and I think all members felt that we had a good rapport going. We dealt with the issues at hand. The members from this side of the House always gave way and gave leave to members opposite, and the meetings were conducted in a very good way, indeed.

Getting back to the Department of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, jurisdiction was brought up and discussed at great length; the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation was another topic. The FPI situation in the Province: I think it was agreed by the total Committee that the higher echelon of Fishery Products International, and the administration, have the situation well in hand and they are doing a tremendous job. However, down through the system, I am sure there are changes which have to take place, right on down through to the floor of the fish plants, I think was the way it was put. But the top management that is in place right now is excellent. Members from both sides agreed that it is the best that could possible be had, yet, as I say, as

we go down through, and I think we all agree, as things go on, and, I am sure, Fishery Products International gets our fishery back on the footing we need, we will see some great things in the years ahead.

One of the concerns was our offshore stocks and, of course, it would have been unusual, I guess, for that particular department to clue up without some reference being made to the Select Committee on Privileges and Elections from which this hon. House is presently awaiting a report. The matter relating was brought up and discussed at no great length, but it was discussed in our Committee meetings.

One of the other concerns, Mr. Speaker, was as it relates to some small independent fish plants that we have in our Province. I think any of us who live in rural Newfoundland, and most of us have at least one fish plant in our district, I am sure if they are among the small plants and plants which did not come under the restructuring programme, we do express some concern and, I think, rightly so. Those small fish plants provide a very necessary part of our inshore fishery operation, particularly during the caplin season. I am not different than most members in that I have a fish plant in my district, Earle's Fisheries, operating out of Carbonear, which has had good times and bad times, but I guess, Mr. Speaker, they have had more good times than bad times in that they have managed to operate their fish plant there reasonably well.

MR. MORGAN:

And without government assistance.

MR. PEACH:

Without government assistance up to this point in time, Mr. Speaker, Earle's Fisheries have operated well. They do operate a protein operation, Earle's Protein Limited. I might point out that that particular operation looks after twenty-two fish plants in Trinity, Conception Bay, Bonavista Bay, and, as a matter of fact, around our entire Province. As a matter of fact, Earle's Protein Ltd. in Carbonear, during the Winter months in particular, pretty well looks after all of the fish offal from National Sea. So that particular operation, Mr. Speaker, is very important. But the small fish plants is a concern no doubt to all of us who do have fish plants in our Province.

As well, Mr. Speaker - and I know my time must be running out, but I can clue up and give the floor to the members opposite - one of the other concerns was the Fisheries Loan Board. The main concern with regard to the Fisheries Loan Board was the fact that the manner in which it operated was changed in that the funding and so on and the operation was transferred to the banks, versus the Fisheries Loan Board. So some concern was expressed with regard to the liability the fishermen and their boats had with regard to whether the banks would repossess their boats and would they give them adequate time to attempt to make their payments. I think it was felt that the Fisheries Loan Board in its present operation with the bank involvement probably has something that needs to be looked at and probably we should revert back to the Fisheries Loan Board again. I noticed a few minutes ago that the minister has on the Order Paper a matter relating to the Fisheries Loan Board, "An Act to Amend The Fisheries Loan Board

Act". I am not sure, not being familiar with that act, if that matter is going to be addressed. But I think it is fair to say that members from both sides of the House did express a lot of concern. And I have over the past number of years come across quite a lot of problems with regard to fishermen not being able to make their payments on their boats particularly, I guess, in bad seasons. Sometimes the amount of money that some fishermen owe on their boats is rather small but two or three bad summers - at the caplin and this last four or five or six years we have not had any great deal of activity in the squid fishery - a lot of them have had a great deal of difficulty in making ends meet. I am sure that they have had to take whatever money that they have made on the fishery and have had to put it towards their actual personal survival. So they have not been able to make the required payments on their boats. So it is a matter that I feel should be addressed and I am sure will be in the coming days and the coming weeks by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and by officials in his department and by members of the Loan Board because perhaps we should revert back to the Fisheries Loan Board rather than operating through the banks. But again the minister did give us his assurance that the matter would be addressed.

The caplin fishery, particularly this Summer, saw a great deal of concern expressed. I guess, Mr. Speaker, we are pretty well in the same situation we were last year at this time in wondering if the caplin were going to come ashore or not at this time of the year. As we look out the weather, for sure, is caplin weather but there

are no caplin. I am sure if we can take the officials from Fisheries and Oceans, there is becoming of recent days, I understand, a reasonable, good indication that our caplin fishery will be as good as it was last year. But the main concern relating to that, Mr. Speaker, was with regard to the price that would be paid this Summer per pound for caplin and, as well, the markets. I guess the markets is one that should and does cause us a great deal of concern.

We know the attempts by the Japanese, I guess, in particular to deal with our caplin and to get into our caplin market. It is - and I can speak for my own particular district - a part of our fishery that a lot of fishermen rely on heavily and we realize that over the past couple of years since the caplin fishery has become such a viable and I guess probably a short-term thing but for our inshore fishermen in particular for the two or three weeks that they can get at the caplin fishery, it goes realize them a reasonable return. We have to be very careful, Mr. Speaker, that the caplin fishery does stay in place, that we do not overfish our caplin stocks, that the price does remain at a level that makes it a viable undertaking and as well, of course, that we hold on to our caplin fishery ourselves, that we do not let it slip out and slip into the hands of some other foreign operators. This, I think, is very, very important. Also we have to realize that that is the particular time of the year when a lot of our small fish plants have a glut of cod fish and with the caplin and so on sometimes they find it very difficult to be able to handle those two species at that time of the year. But we all

hope, Mr. Speaker, that this year the plants will be able to handle that and that it will be a viable operation in the next week or so.

So, Mr. Speaker, without delaying and taking up any more time - I guess my time has just about expired - again, I want to thank all members of the Committee for the great deal of co-operation they showed in dealing with each of the departments.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Especially the member for Fogo.

MR. PEACH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I must say anytime that I had any great difficulties with the members opposite I did go to their House leader, the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) and he did always seem to work out any of the problems very well, very co-operatively, even our time table. I must point out, Mr. Speaker, the problems with our time table were not between the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman or the Chairman and the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). The problem arose when the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) got involved - and he had some matters that I do not think would be fair to discuss here in the hon. House - but the matter was resolved. I did think he enjoyed himself that evening and I am sure by the way he cooperated with us and the next morning and the next day in the committee meetings he was so happy to have spent the evening with some of his family and constituents out in his district that it resulted in a very good feeling.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. PEACH:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. the member for Menihek I would like to welcome twenty-five Grade VI students from Bishop's Falls Pentecostal Elementary School and their teacher, Mr. Hodder.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before I recognize the hon. the member for Menihek, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, there is a Budget Concurrence Debate ongoing here. I do think I still have one or two members here in the House, Mr. Speaker. I do think I did not sleep on my rights. I took the floor before the hon. member opposite took his Chair. What do we have to do here in order to get recognition?

MR. SPEAKER:

The first person standing was the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick).

MR. BARRY:

Sad, sad.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

The Vice-Chairman of that committee is absent and I think it has been tradition in this House since the estimates committees were established that the person replying for the official Opposition should be the Vice-Chairman and, in this case, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is filing in for the Vice-Chairman. I think that has been an established precedent, that the Chairman leads off for the government side and the official spokesman for the Opposition leads off on the Opposition side.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I concur with the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). It certainly has been the practice in the House when you are in the Concurrence Debate of the reports of the various Estimates Committees. It certainly has been practice and tradition. I do not know if there is anything specifically in our Standing Orders, but it has been practice and tradition where the Chairman will present the report and be allotted fifteen minutes, or whatever, and then usually it is the Vice-Chairman or somebody speaking on behalf of the Vice-Chairman from the Opposition who would respond.

Now, granted the situation is somewhat different, I suppose, this time because it is the first time that we have had another party. I am just pointing out for His Honour's information now, just to be perfectly clear, and to let His Honour be assured he is acting on precedent. So, perhaps he might wish to take a minute or two just to check the precedents maybe with the Speaker or somebody like that. I think it would be very wise because you got to make sure. This precedent is going to be established forever and ever and a day and it has been since these rules came into effect. That is the practice and the precedent. Generally, if there is nothing in your Standing Orders then the House goes by precedent. So Your Honour might not have been aware of that.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

On that point of order, I was not aware that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was the Vice-Chairman of that committee.

MR. MORGAN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Of course my colleague is more knowledgeable in the rules than I am, being a former Speaker of the House, but because it has been the procedure over the years with one Opposition party in the House, it has been more or less tradition that when the Chairman of the committee reports, than either the Deputy Chairman, usually in the Opposition, or the Leader of the Opposition, would speak in reply. We are in Concurrence Debate and I would assume, in my own position

as a member of the House, that whichever speaker is recognized by the Chair can stand and respond to the government side.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, further to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) says that it is clear that in this House if you cannot find anything in your Standing Orders to address the situation then you look at the precedents and the precedents of this House has been that either the Vice-Chairman in the official Opposition of the Province or the person replacing that person replies to that address. That has always been the precedent in this House.

MR. SIMMS:

May I offer Your Honour just one final final comment and it might help him. Earlier when the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) indicated that the Concurrence Debate were going to be presented, he did indicate that the practice would be as always it has been in the past, where the Chairman would introduce it, the official spokesman for the Opposition would respond and then there would be ten minute debates back and forth. So I think it is fairly clear but, as I said, perhaps Your Honour might want to check the precedent.

MR. TULK:

You are wrong about the times, it is thirty/thirty.

MR. SIMMS:

Whatever it is.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who are you recognizing?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Is it on the point of order?

MR. SPEAKER:

No.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just on that point I think the same thing is true in the federal parliament if you check -

AN HON. MEMBER:

There is a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

I stated, 'To that point of order, I was unaware that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was the Vice-Chairman of the Committee.' So I recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, thank you.

I do not mean to cut off debate by the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), but the member for Menihek will -

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, just to make sure that the record is straight and we do not get into continuing controversy. My understanding of what just happened was that Your Honour made a ruling. In other words, he recognized a certain member who rose to his feet. That is tantamount to a ruling.

MR. BARRY:

Were you in the House?

DR. COLLINS:

Of course I was.

If someone questions Your Honour's ruling there is a set procedure for that and I am not quite sure the procedure was followed. It could have been resolved and perhaps it was resolved by the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) who was recognized in giving way to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and, if that was the case, I think that is a good resolution of the matter. As a matter of fact, I would suggest that that might be a way of resolving this, which likely arose out of a matter of confusion.

But I think it would be unfortunate if, in this House, we got into the habit of deciding what is the correct procedure. It is not the business of the members of the House to decide procedure, it is Your Honour's place to decide procedure and, if Your Honour makes a ruling, I think the House either abides by it or goes through the proper procedure of questioning the ruling. To my understanding, the way that is resolved is a motion is put before the House. Because once Your Honour makes a ruling, it is no longer Your Honour's prerogative to change it; the ruling then is

in possession of the House and the House can change it. And for the House to be given the opportunity of changing it, a motion should be put before the House.

Now, what I am saying may be looked upon as making a big issue of a small thing -

MR. BARRY:

Right.

DR. COLLINS:

- and to some extent, it is so, but, nevertheless, we have rules in this House. The rules are there for a very good reason. The running of any parliament is very difficult and it can only be run if there is mutual respect for certain rules. If we do not respect the rules, we get into tremendous difficulty and it does neither side of the House, nor any member of the House, any good if we do not happen to have respect for these rules. So I just make the point, Mr. Speaker, that we have rules and we should follow them. If we do not agree with the rules, well, let us decide to change them, but, as long as they are there, we should follow them.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, just briefly to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

There is no point of order. The Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) stood up on a point of order to question.

The Leader of the Opposition should not have to get into this type of imbroglio. If Your Honour considers the practice in the

federal parliament, if Your Honour considers the practice in any institution that follows British parliamentary practice, there are certain procedures that are following having to do with the government and the official Opposition, particularly in responding to the Budget Debate, the Throne Speech Debate and, I would submit - and not just in this House and other Houses - to the Concurrence Debate on the Estimates.

Now, it should not even be a matter of the race to the swiftest, Your Honour. It is not like I was out in the corridor or asleep at the switch, I was standing before the member had taken his seat. Your Honour resolved the point, I think, in a reasonable fashion. It was resolved, so what is the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) getting up and warbling on about? The procedure is there for the government spokesperson to take a position, and then for the official Opposition spokesperson to take a position, and then the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) can take a position. Now, is there anything unreal or unusual or unfair about that, Mr. Speaker? I do not know what the Minister of Finance is going on about.

But I tell you, Your Honour, we have to do this, not just for a matter of getting up and speaking, we have to protect the position that flows from the concept of official Opposition and Leader of the Opposition. We cannot sit on our rights and we cannot sit back and permit precedents to be established. And Your Honour, when the matter was brought to Your attention, ruled correctly. So the Minister of Finance (Dr.

Collins) is unduly extending and wasting the time of the House on a trivial and frivolous matter.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, just starting generally, I would like to say that while listening to the Chairman of the Resource Estimates Committee, I wondered if I was living in the same world that he was. I was wondering if he was in the same world that any of us are in, when he described, first of all, his opinion of how well the Estimates Committees function and, secondly, started to describe the content of the Committees.

Well, I have to tell this House, Your Honour, that the Estimate Committee process this year was a total abomination, a farce, a total and complete failure.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are saying that every year.

MR. BARRY:

No, we do not say this every year and this is the thing that we have to try to get through to members opposite. Members opposite are going to rue the day, I fear, that they so blithely permit a very significant tradition in British parliamentary practice to go by the board, and that is the entitlement of the public of this Province, the entitlement of the public in any democratic country, to be informed as to how government is spending the taxpayer's dollar, be informed as to whether it is spending it

properly and well, and be informed in detail. Mr. Speaker, the only way that that can be done is if there is media present, if there are media representatives present, listening to the detail item by item and point by point as we go through, either matters of policy, analysis of government and departmental policy, or as we go through dollar by dollar the amounts spent on each item in the budget. And, Mr. Speaker, I will submit to Your Honour, and I will submit to members of this House, that this year has seen an all time low. I mean we had last year at times, one or two occasions, when we did not have press coverage and we spoke out and then we saw press coming, at least some representatives of the press. I never, Mr. Speaker, saw before in this Province on a regular basis not a single representative of the press attending Estimate Committee meetings.

Now that is something that deserves comment on the part of members of this House. It is something that as Leader of the Opposition I have to say to Your Honour prevents the Opposition from doing its job in analyzing the estimates.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what can you do about it? I have written each of the major media in this Province and I have asked them is there a problem. I have asked for an explanation as to why we are not getting coverage of the Estimate Committees.

Now I have two responses so far from two of the more prominent, one print and one electronic media, and in both cases they agree there are problems, and they indicate that the matter is of some concern to them. The print

media representative has stated that the difficulties are of concern and they believe that the difficulties may be capable of resolution without infringing upon the right of the House and its Committees to set their own schedules. And they say, 'We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the problems and possible solutions with you at your convenience. We look forward to hearing from you and to reaching a solution as soon as possible.' Now that letter is addressed also to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

I have a letter drafted which I will be delivering to the Premier hopefully tomorrow, and I will be asking the Premier to convene an all party meeting with representatives of the press, either individually or hopefully all together, if they are in agreement, so that we can tackle this problem and deal with it and see if there is a way of resolving it.

The electronic media representative responded in this fashion, he asked for comments from his staff with respect to what was happening, "The general feedback I received relates to the following; first, meetings are being held in various places with more than one being scheduled and held at the same time; two, there is little advance notice, sometimes only a few hours, this results in overtime payments which should not be necessary if there was sufficient notice." Now, of course, this reflects completely on the sad job that the Government House Leader is doing. He is either incompetent and the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is not now listening, but I would like to say to him he is either

showing that he is incompetent or nefarious and devious and deliberately trying to stymie the media from getting coverage of the House Estimates by the way in which he has distorted the schedules of the Committee, by the way in which he has not - Mr. Speaker, a smile on the face of the member for St. John's East is something I would suspect they found when they opened up Mr. Mengele's grave there a couple of days ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader is not doing the job that he owes to this House, not just to members opposite, in providing the media with sufficient advance notice of these meetings. It is either incompetence or it is deliberate interference so as to prevent the coverage by the press which he knows will hold members opposite up to the glare of public scrutiny and reveal their incompetence and their negligence and -

MR. R. AYLWARD:

The press (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we now have, now this is a curious concept now, elevation to the Cabinet a few months ago and already now we have a minister who is prepared to take the position that he and his colleagues are exemplary in all respects when it comes to competence, that there is nothing, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition could find in scrutinizing the policy and programmes of the departments, there is nothing in terms of scrutinizing expenditures that the press would be bothered to report. Now I understand that is the minister's response, that is the arrogance, Mr. Speaker, which is going to see that

minister and many others flung out in the next election, that arrogance, Mr. Speaker, that is a rot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

And, you know, he would not have been like that six months ago.

MR. BARRY:

That arrogance is a rot which has set in. It is unbelievable how early it set in after the recent election. Three months into a new session of the Legislature and that arrogance is there already. Well, Mr. Speaker, while it is sad to see for the people of this Province, from a purely political perspective we welcome that type of arrogance because it is like rust, it is like the effect of salt, Mr. Speaker, on automobiles in this Province; that arrogance just eats away at the underbelly of that government. It has started, and it is just like under your car -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Just, Mr. Speaker, as on your car you get that first little hole through the paint covering, you get that first little speck and the salt gets in there, the next time you look at it, Mr. Speaker, the whole underbelly is gone out of it. Now that is what is happening. The comment just made by the member for Kilbride (Mr. B. Aylward) exemplifies exactly what is going on over there, Mr. Speaker. The rot has set in and I would say that it has already gone

too far for members to retrieve it.

MR. GILBERT:

You are going to see the letter. He is going to table the letter.

MR. BARRY:

No, the member will see the letter tomorrow, because I am enclosing a copy with my letter to the Premier.

MR. TOBIN:

Are we going to see that letter now?

MR. BARRY:

No. What letter? I am referring to some notes here, Mr. Speaker, that the member may be able to -

MR. TOBIN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) in his speech made reference to letters that he had in his hand from both the electronic media and written media - I think he said a print media - and when he does that he has to lay them on the table of the House. I would suggest to Your Honour that he not be permitted to refuse to lay them on the table of the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

To that point of order, my understanding is that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) did not read those letters, so he does not have to table them.

MR. BARRY:

A good ruling. What a Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Sharp! Sharp!

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I am referring to notes and excerpts from these letters. They will be delivered to the Premier tomorrow, but, Mr. Speaker, the little fellow who runs behind him waiting for the crumbs to fall, no, he will not get that letter until the Premier tells him that he is able to see it. If he is a good boy, he may get to see it tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another point that was made, and this is a member of the electronic media, 'cameras are not permitted at the meetings.' Now, this is the same point we have been taking in the House of Assembly, of course. We recommend, Mr. Speaker, that the proceedings of the House and the proceedings of Committees also be televised. That radio be permitted in, that the media, generally, be entitled to attend so that the general public can have an opportunity to see what is going on in the Committees and in the House of Assembly.

The fourth point: 'It is difficult to anticipate the subject of discussion, questioning, or debate because there is no set agenda.'

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, he is reading from the letter.

MR. TULK:
No, he is not reading from the letter.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the little fellow over there across the House is very upset I know, but if he is a good boy, he will see the letter tomorrow.

MR. TOBIN:
I can win Burin - Placentia West, and that is more than you can do.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, we are going to get around to the member. I think the next time we will get around to him.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain members you do not want to get flung out of the House too quickly, because by their incompetence and by their bungling, and by their stupidity and by their arrogance they do more for us in government than if they had been flung out in the last election.

MR. TULK:
That is right.

MR. BARRY:
Now the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is not somebody we wanted to get out of this House of Assembly in the last election, Mr. Speaker, because we want the people of Burin - Placentia West to see the full extent of the Yahooism that is inherent in the approach of the member opposite. We want the people of Burin - Placentia West to get to fully appreciate the incompetence of the member opposite. We want the people of Burin - Placentia West to get a full appreciation of the level of intelligence of the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is supposed to be speaking in the Concurrence Debate here, but it looks like he has chosen to discuss my ability to represent the people of Burin - Placentia West. Let me suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that the people of Burin - Placentia West are quite capable of deciding on the ability of whom they want to represent them. They made that decision, Mr. Speaker, in 1975 when they gave the hon. Leader of the Opposition the flick, when they sent him away to Halifax, I think, for a little while. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition wants to talk about the people of Burin - Placentia West and question their ability to elect somebody, that is unfortunate. I believe the Leader of the Opposition got the flick in 1975 because of his attitude, the way that he looked down upon people in the district of Burin - Placentia West, Mr. Speaker, the way he placed himself above everybody else. That caused the people to give him the type of medicine that he deserved. I do not think he should be permitted to continue, because he is not dealing with what is before the House, which is the Concurrence Debate. And while he thinks he is above everybody else, he still has to abide by the rules of the House and that means he must be relevant to what is being discussed.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I have to mention to the member opposite that unfortunately I decided to concentrate my efforts during the recent election as the Leader of the Party in a few other areas. I think I spent the sum total of thirty-five minutes in the district of Burin - Placentia West. Had it been forty minutes I spent there, the member would have been gone.

I would also, to that point of order, like to point out that the reason why the people of Burin - Placentia West decided to give me my walking papers, which they did, was because they were more far-sighted than I was and they decided that they wanted to join the Liberal Party a few years before I did, because they saw the rot that was setting in at that point in time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Burin - Placentia West is the best thing that we can have going for us in this government. I think he is the best thing, and we had to leave him there. I suspect we will make a choice coming up to the next election, but he may be one of the last people that we go after over there, he is so helpful to us in having the rot start from within, because every time he opens his mouth he wins more Liberal votes for this party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I could get on to the matter of the media. Mr. Speaker, the electronic media went on to describe as the fifth problem they have in attending the Estimates Committees that there was a general lack of resources, presumably for the media, in terms of staff and dollars and so forth. They say other provincial and local public events require coverage and warrant attention. I do not really think that that stands up, because if they were in the House and if the House was open, they would be here. If the House was open that much longer, another fifteen days presumably is what it would take, which is what we may have to do next year, as I say, then they would have to provide the staff, the money, the resources to be here in the House of Assembly. So I do not see the difference to being here and being at an Estimates Committee meeting.

Then the letter goes on, 'The major issues which evolve from committee meetings are often raised in the Legislature and are reported upon at that time.' Well, Mr. Speaker, that does not stand up either, because we can only barely touch upon the points that are raised in committee meetings. There are many more stories. You know, 'There are many stories in the naked city' and this is just one of them. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the sort of thing that goes on in the House. What we raise daily is only one or two of the many stories that go on in the estimates, which the press miss and which the general public then miss.

The electronic media talked about spotty coverage. It is not spotty coverage anymore, Mr. Speaker, it is nil coverage. It is zero,

zilch, zip, no coverage. Forget the spotty coverage, the press has decided that they are not going to attend the Estimates Committees at all. Now, Mr. Speaker, my letter to the Premier, which will be going out to him tomorrow and which I have already given reference to to the press yesterday, will be stating that the official Opposition will not participate. We gave it every opportunity this year but we will not participate for another year in Estimate Committee meetings held outside this Chamber where the press are not present. We will, Mr. Speaker, do our job in the House of Assembly and we will do our thing. That will not mean that the estimates will not be covered, what it will mean is that we will extend, as we are able to do, as members opposite know, we will extend the life of this Assembly every year. We will extend the time that the House of Assembly remains open and we will deal, whether in Question Period, or in debate, or in petitions, or in resolutions, or in points of order, or in any other technical, procedural, debatable, argumentative, or other means at our disposal to bring out matters in the House of Assembly which should be brought out concerning the estimates. So we will not shirk our duty, Mr. Speaker, in terms of bringing out the waste and the incompetence and the negligence, and sometimes the patronage and worse, that can be revealed from an examination of the government's estimates. We will not shirk our duty. We will see that this is done but, Mr. Speaker, we will do it here in the House of Assembly unless arrangements can be made so that there is press and media coverage of the Estimate Committees meetings. We are doing this now,

giving a one-year notice, approximately a one-year notice that we have a serious problem, and we are doing it, Mr. Speaker, because we have no choice. As an official Opposition we have no choice but to ensure that the estimates in their scrutiny are available to the members of the general public of this Province. Mr. Speaker, we can all say, 'Oh, well, the public can attend the public meetings'. Look, a person from Fogo, or Twillingate, or Morton's Harbour, or St. Anthony, or Happy Valley-Goose Bay, or St. Barbe, Mr. Speaker, cannot get in and sit down at committee meetings, but they can turn on their television, they can read their newspaper. And they want to, Mr. Speaker, they want to know what is going on.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Could I interrupt the hon. member for a moment to inform the House that there are three questions to be brought up at the adjournment at five-thirty. There is one by the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), and there are two to the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt), one from the hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), and one from the hon. the member for Gander (Mr. Baker).

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Surprise, surprise! A debate! Mr. Speaker, we do this reluctantly. We do not want to engage in unnecessary procedural debate in this House, we want to be able to debate the issues that are of concern to the people of this

Province. We should not have to be subjected to arguing and debating how the business of the House should proceed. That is not fruitful, Mr. Speaker, that is not helping the 60,000 unemployed, that is not helping our senior citizens who are being ravaged by the budget of the friends of members opposite, that is not helping those businessmen who are barely hanging on by their finernails, waiting for the economy to improve in this Province, which members opposite have brought to a grinding halt. It is not helping our fishermen who are seeing their costs go up, to a large extent because of policies of members opposite or their friends in Ottawa. It is not helping our farmers who are seeing large amounts of money taken out of the budget. It is not helping people generally who are out there trying to get to earn an honest day's living. We want to deal with issues of substance, we want to deal with the content of those issues that will help people in this Province. We do not want to have to spend our time debating procedure and procedural technicalities, but if we have to in order to protect a very important part of the democratic process, and, Mr. Speaker, it is really the very essence and the very root cause of the coming into being of parliament, we will. If, Your Honour, as I know he does every evening, if you go back and look at your history of the British parliamentary traditions and the creation of the first legislature, the legislature was set up in order to deal with the matter of the King raising money and to scrutinize expenditures by the King. The same is true today. It is no longer the King, except symbolically, but our very

reason for being is to analyze how government is spending the taxpayers' dollar, and the policies and the programmes that are behind such expenditures.

MR. WARREN:

Time is up, Mr. Speaker. Time is up.

MR. BARRY:

No, Mr. Speaker, there is a thirty minute debate here. I realize that unless members opposite take their boots off they have difficulty counting over ten. They should check the Standing Orders.

MR. WARREN:

Time is up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I know they would like for the time to be up, because it hurts. I realize that they are guilty. There are some members opposite, a few of them over there, with a conscience that rankles when it is brought home to them what they are actually doing. I really fear for democracy in this Province, and I fear for the future of this legislature. I fear if we do not see an improved system of analyzing the estimates of government, and I am not insisting, I am not trying to turn back the clock and say that we have to have the estimates in the House of Assembly, but we do if that is the only way we get press coverage, Mr. Speaker. If arrangements can be made so that there will be coverage by the press in the Committees, then, Mr. Speaker, we will give it another try, the good old college try once again, but we will not participate in a farce, in a charade. We will

not hold out to the people of this Province that we are doing a job of bringing to the scrutiny of the general public the estimates of this Province if we are not able to do that, if we are handcuffed.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, his time is up.

MR. TULK:

Are you trying to say that the Speaker does not know the time?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, members of this side of the House will be continuing the debate and will be going into the content of the estimates which came before the Committee. I will just point out one example, Mr. Speaker, of how ineffective, as far as content was concerned, the committee system was this year. The Chairman of the Committee got up and he referred to the performance of the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) and he held that out as being an excellent performance.

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has gone far beyond the thirty minutes that was allotted to him, and I think he should be called to order to let somebody else get into the debate.

MR. BARRY:

This is shocking. This is terrible.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To the point of order, there is no point of order. I am keeping a check on the time.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

It is an insult to Your Honour to be getting up with that type of interference.

The Minister responsible for Energy was pointed out as having made an excellent presentation. So you know, Your Honour, that we came into this House and we asked the Minister responsible for Energy to tell the Estimates Committee what would be the cost of a barrel of oil from Hibernia, and do you know, Mr. Speaker, he refused, and we still do not know whether he knows himself what the cost of a barrel of oil from Hibernia will be. And we suspect, Mr. Speaker, the reason he will not answer that question is because that might indicate there is going to be some delay in seeing the Hibernia development proceed. Because, as soon as you know what the cost must be, then you can look at what the international price is, Mr. Speaker, and then you get an answer as to whether the international price is high enough to cover the cost of oil from Hibernia and to give this Province an adequate return. That is the type of basic crucial question we have been putting in the Estimate Committee meetings, and the press has not been there to cover, to put out to the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has now

elapsed.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Your Honour. But I think the point should be emphasized, Mr. Speaker, that we did not get answers in the Committees and the reason they were able to avoid answering was because they knew there was no press there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder the press of this Province does not cover the debates on the Estimate Committees in this House, when they come into the House and hear the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), who has done absolutely nothing to add to the debate in this House since the House opened this year, with respect to bringing the issues before the people of this Province. It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman who covers the House for CBC in the morning said that the Opposition come into this House during Question Period and ask weak, silly, foolish questions of the ministry and basically there are no incisive questions asked. There was nothing that they could report yesterday. They reported more yesterday about what happened at City Hall, and the press galleries were filled. And what

did they report from here yesterday? Well, over half of Question Period yesterday was wasted over a silly little interview with the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) that was covered by NTV, a foolish waste of Question Period. That is what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was so interested in yesterday. Was he asking about Hibernia yesterday? Was he asking about mines in this Province? Was he asking about housing, health, anything like that? No, he wanted to know about a silly, foolish little interview that the hon. the Minister of the Environment had with the press about a week or so ago, brought in by the silly, foolish member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock).

AN HON. MEMBER:

A foolish individual.

MR. DINN:

Yes. A foolish, silly waste of the time of this House. And he got up just now, Mr. Speaker, and spoke for well over his time. He spoke in this House on Concurrence Debate, and what did he talk about? 'The media is not covering me.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what the problem is. The problem is not that the media is not covering the House or they are not reporting what goes on in the House, because they reported yesterday. But it is foolishness that they are getting on with. There were no questions yesterday about mines. In Concurrence Debate today, what did the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) talk about? - 'The media is not covering me.' That is what the problem is. The problem is that he cannot be the Chief. The Leader of the Opposition cannot be the manager, he cannot be No. 1, he cannot be the top dog. Mr.

Speaker, I would suggest that if they wanted a president in Uganda tomorrow that the Leader of the Opposition would bolt the Liberal Party and run off to Uganda, because he wants to be No. 1.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of the Province decided that he was not to be No. 1, the people in the P.C. Party decided he was not to be No. 1. He bolted the P.C. Party and went over there. The people of the Province decided that he is not to be Premier. As my hon. colleague says, he is not to be 'Pwemier' of the Province. The fact of the matter is his big problem is that he is not getting enough publicity. He did not ask, nor did he care, what happens in Labrador City or Wabush, what is happening in the mining industry. He did not ask nor care during the mining estimates what is happening at Cinq Cerf or at Buchans or at St. Lawrence, or what the prospects are for jobs.

MR. WARREN:

He is looking for the press now, he is looking up.

MR. DINN:

Yes. He did not ask or he did not want to know about how many people are working to develop the possible gold mine down at Cinq Cerf, or about employment in the Province. He got up yesterday spurred on by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), and asked about a silly interview that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) had with NTV. And what, basically, did the Minister of the Environment do? Well, he said, 'You are asking questions about labour matters and I do not want to discuss that. We have a Minister of Labour who can do that.' That is basically what happened. One-half page of

coverage - make no wonder The Evening Telegram is not here this afternoon. Make no wonder the CBC does not report what is going on in the House. Make no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that NTV is not reporting or cares what is happening here in Question Period when you get foolishness like that to report. I guess if we were to look at all of what happened in this House, as far as the people of this Province are concerned, since the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and his party came in here when the House opened this year, the most they would get would be, 'The Leader of the Opposition is disturbed that the press is not covering him.' What should we do, drag the press before the Bar of the House of Assembly and have them flogged because they are not covering the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and his questions in Question Period, when all he asks about is the foolishness that he is getting on with here and the foolishness that he got on with today? - thirty minutes of debate, and he talked about nothing. He did not talk about forestry or fishing or mining or housing or health or education or justice or social services. He talked about nothing for thirty minutes only 'The press is not covering me.' Mr. Speaker, make no wonder the press of this Province is not covering that foolishness. That is all he ever says, that is all he ever does. I mean, he does not get up and talk about what is happening in the iron mining industry in Western Labrador, he is not talking about that, he is saying, 'Mr. Speaker, I think it is a disgrace, we should have the estimates back in the House because the press are not covering me.' Now, Mr. Speaker, what kind of an ego does a person have to have to get up day in and day out

in this House and complain about nothing else. With the problems that we have in this country, in this Province, the Opposition should be having a field day. But nothing, all they are interested in is that the press are not covering them. Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe the press would cover them if they were to say something intelligent, if they were to ask some intelligent questions and get some intelligent answers, if they were to pick out a ministry and go through it.

MR. LUSH:

Do you believe you have a monopoly on intelligence?

MR. DINN:

No, I do not believe I have a monopoly on intelligence but I think I could do a little bit better than that. I would think that I could do a little better than what the whole Opposition is doing in this House this year with respect to asking questions, with respect to getting information out to the people of this Province. All they care about is what coverage they are getting. They would get coverage if they were to ask something intelligent, and I say that to the hon. the shadow for labour, which he will always be in this Province, a shadow, and not a good one at that, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), the lead-off speaker for the Opposition gets up here in the House and what does he talk about? 'The press is not covering me.' Did he talk about unemployment? Did he talk about Fisheries? Did he talk about Forestry? Did he talk about Mines and Energy or Housing? No, none of it. Did he talk about the \$117 million in housing we are spending this year, what we are spending it

for, why are we not spending it here, and why are we not spending it there?

The hon. member now for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) wants to get up to see if he can do a better job than his leader. Well, Mr. Speaker, we had his leader say a few words in this debate. He wants to be the new leader. Now there is a challenge to the leadership of the Liberal Party. He wants to get up and show his leader up for doing nothing during this debate and, I would suggest, the hon. member could do a better job than the Leader of the Opposition did here today. I do not know if he could do it all the time, but he certainly could do better than what I heard here today. I certainly could see that.

Everybody, the whole Province, eventually will know that basically the big problem with the Leader of the Opposition is megalomania. That is what it is. He wanted to be the Leader of the PC Party and the Premier of the Province and he could not succeed at that; he went down to Burin - Placentia West and he got elected in '72 and they flung him out in '75; he walked away from Newfoundland then and came back in his reincarnation and got elected in Mount Scio as a PC; he tried to become leader of the party, but, no, they did not want him, so knowing that he could not be Premier of the Province on this side of the House he saw a slot opening on the opposite side of the House - the Liberal Party had a leadership position available and he wanted to be leader - so away he goes. It is megalomania we are dealing with here, a serious problem. The hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) should get up today and start

asking some questions about what is going on in the resources in this Province? What is happening in Forestry? What is happening in the newsprint industry of this Province? What is happening in the Fisheries? What is happening with respect to Mines and Energy? What is happening in Housing? What is happening in Education? Forestry: The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) would love to get up and answer questions but he has not been asked any. He is waiting to get up so he can elucidate on what great things are happening in the forest industry in this Province, the newsprint industry, how he is protecting the forests for future generations in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, if he had to wait for questions to come from the Opposition on forestry, the people in this Province would know nothing about what is going on.

MR. LUSH:

Did you say elucidate or hallucinate?

MR. DINN:

The hon. the great teacher from Bonavista North should sit back in his seat, relax a little bit, not get over-exercised, or exercised, and just relax a little bit. I know he is ready to go, he is in his seat there and he wants to jump up and lay a few things on us, and we will answer his questions if he has anything intelligent to say. All I say to him is this, that you have had thirty minutes during this Concurrence Debate and your lead-off speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, got up and instead of picking different departments and asking questions and putting his policies forward, he talked about the fact that the press are

not covering him, because he cannot stand being ignored.

I would love to be able to get up and answer and get answers if I have not got them. But, Mr. Speaker, I have not been asked any questions since this House opened that I could not get up in this House and answer. A few jobs, now this is the big, important thing about what is going on with the \$117 million that is being spent on housing. I got one question. What was the question? Were any people who got jobs this Summer through Newfoundland and Labrador Housing working on your campaign?

Now there are three hundred and twenty-odd jobs this Summer given out by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing which we will call Summer jobs. There is landscaping and grass cutting and tree planting, something like 320 jobs, 300 of the jobs are covered by union agreement. There are people who worked last year, part of the union, hired back again this year. And some people who normally would have these temporary jobs get a full time job. So they are not available to come back this year. And of this, say, 320 people there are about twenty people who are students who will get jobs, they will be hired this Summer as a student job.

Now of all of that, of the \$117 million, what questions did I get about housing? How many people who worked on my campaign got jobs with the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing. I do not know if there is one.

MR. TULK:

That is not the question we were asking your committee.

MR. DINN:

No, some questions in the committee were very good. But I am talking about the waste of time in this House of Assembly and the fact that the Opposition is not, in my opinion, carrying out their responsibility with respect to letting the people of the Province know what is going on with the \$2.5 million. I suggest -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! It is now five-thirty. A motion to adjourn has been made and seconded.

MR. DINN:

I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question before the House is from the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight). He was not satisfied with the answer from the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) with regard to the Exploits River water levels.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I raised the issue of the water levels in Red Indian Lake and the Exploits River as the result of a lot of experience, over thirty years of experience living in the area and watching the Exploits River and watching Red Indian Lake over that thirty years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I came into this House in 1975 and one of the first things I was faced with was property damage in the Red Indian Lake area; housing fronts in Millertown being washed away by high water levels and wind action, cottage lots on the other side of Red Indian Lake being washed away, and cottages owned by people who lived in Buchans being washed into

the lake, as a result of high water levels and erosion, and because of wave action.

The very next year, Mr. Speaker - I am not sure if it was the next year or two years after - I had to listen to and watch the grief that was caused by the drowning of two ladies from Windsor in the Exploits River above Grand Falls, again as a result of flooding in the Exploits River.

A couple of years later, Mr. Speaker, we had the flooding in Badger with the tragic loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of property in Badger. Most of the houses in Badger spent two or three days underwater as a result of the flooding. All kinds of damage done and there was very little remuneration. Then, Mr. Speaker, last year we had the situation of the flood in Bishop's Falls and the loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of property, again a result of high water levels and flood conditions on the Exploits River.

Now, Mr. Speaker, and I want to be very clear here and I want to be very responsible, the reason I raise the issue of the integrity of the Exploits dam is this: If there is any question about the integrity of the Exploits dam, the people in the town of Badger are the people who will worry the most. If there is any question about the security, given certain weather conditions and certain water levels in the Exploits dam, if the dam were not to hold, then Badger would have no more than four hours lead time to try to protect their property. I would assume there would be lots of lead time in order to protect their own personal safety. On the Buchans - Badger highroad there are places

where it is on the same level as the Exploits River.

What happens, Mr. Speaker, is every time you get those kinds of conditions at Red Indian Lake, where you get a full reservoir, and in one instance we did, and wind conditions that expose the Exploits dam to wave action as a result of that high water, knowledgeable people in the area start to wonder about the ability of the Exploits dam to hold. I do not wonder about the ability of the Exploits dam to hold. As the minister said, I am not a dam engineer. But I feel it is my responsibility to bring the concerns of my constituents into this House, particularly in view of the fact that I have seen my constituents lose hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of property and lose lives in that area below the Exploits dam, between the Exploits dam and Grand Falls, that is my responsibility. And when I have a very responsible community-minded citizen and citizens calling me and saying, 'Are you sure? We hear rumours, we hear this, we hear that, we do not know,' then it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to be my responsibility to raise the question with the appropriate minister. It seems to be my responsibility to raise the question with the owners and operators of that dam,-

MR. TULK:

It is his responsibility to give you an answer.

MR. FLIGHT:

- in this case, Abitibi-Price.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I did. To me it is irresponsible in the utmost when members of the government try to

belittle the fact that I did that, try to paint me as some kind of alarmist, that I am somehow or other on a vendetta against Abitibi-Price, that I am raising false fears. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to be a little belittling and a little irresponsible for a minister or a minister's colleagues to handle that issue in that way.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. TULK:
What a shame!

MR. FLIGHT:
If the Speaker would permit me just a half a minute.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
By leave.

MR. FLIGHT:
All I want today is for the minister to confirm that he is indeed taking the concerns that I expressed seriously and that action has been taken to allay the fears and anxieties of the people who live in that valley.

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:
Heave it out of you!

MR. BUTT:

I certainly welcome an opportunity once again to make a few comments on the Exploits River and the three dams in question. I might add, I did clear it up with the member the other day, he referred to the Exploits dam. Just by way of a brief preamble, I should point out to the hon. member that I did not know at that time if he was referring to the Millertown dam or not, because there are three dams on the Exploits River as the hon. member knows, one at Millertown, one at Grand Falls, the Goodyear dam, and one at Bishop's Falls.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am very much aware of the fears of people in that region because in 1983 it was brought, in graphic detail, to my attention by the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans at that time, a very hard working young man, who brought it to my attention on many occasions. I realize the suffering of people in the area, of ordinary people, Mr. Speaker, governments and company. I believe, it was in 1983, and at that time, I believe, the present member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. FLIGHT) was then employed with the federal government but, in any event, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans in 1983 certainly brought it to my attention. The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans who now sits in the House, I believe, was the recipient of one of those patronage appointments that we hear at this time.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
On a point of order, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
Now, Mr. Speaker, if the

government, if the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) wants to have this place in shambles, I tell you they are looking at a member who is prepared to stand here and keep it in shambles, Mr. Speaker. With all due respect to the Speaker, I represent 8,000 people, and that minister is making a fool of himself. He is insulting the people of Windsor - Buchans by refusing to address himself to the issue, by refusing to address himself to the concerns of the people of Windsor - Buchans, and not talk about patronage and not talk about jobs. Get up and tell us -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

- about that. The minister is indicating his total and absolute ignorance of the issue.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, that is obvious not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

I will be up on another point of order the minute he opens his mouth.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I obviously touched a very nervous and sensitive area with the hon. member. But just let me continue, Mr. Speaker, I want to also because of some media reports address the whole area of this dam issue, and I mean 'd-a-m', so I will not be misquoted as being flippant and everything else tomorrow.

MR. FLIGHT:

Stay with the dam.

MR. BUTT:

Look, Mr. Speaker, I am addressing the issue of the flood and the fears of the hon. member. I just brought in the timing, it was in 1983, and I just happened in passing to mention that it was another member here from Windsor - Buchans at the time, and the hon. gentleman was a recipient of patronage. So what!

But, in any event, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. FLIGHT:

Stay with the issue.

MR. BUTT:

- my department along with operators of the dam, Price-Abitibi, in this case, and I realize I am running out of time, Mr. Speaker, have inspected the dams. The company, Mr. Speaker, is operating those dams in accordance with the regulations laid out by the Department of Environment, as I said to the hon. member the other day when he questioned me on the matter.

As a matter of fact, I should point out just today there is an engineer from the Water Resources Division of the Provincial Department of the Environment in the area actually inspecting the dam that the hon. member refers to at Millertown.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you know I can only rely on the information I am getting from my staff and it was in that context that I addressed the hon. member the other day. It got kind of blown out of proportion, distorted somewhat by the media, that I was flippant when I said I was a dam inspector. You know, I mean it is just one of these things that comes out, I should have said at the time, Mr. Speaker, that I am not an inspector of dams but rather I have staff who do that and they report back to me.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. BUTT:
Just in conclusion, thirty seconds?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
By leave.

MR. BUTT:
I thank the hon. member for raising it again and I did not wish to get the hair stand straight on his head by just passing along the point that the hon. member was a recipient of a patronage appointment when the flooding occurred at Bishop Falls.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Gander has not been satisfied with the question on PCBs addressed to the hon. Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt).

The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to continue with this rather serious

topic. I am dissatisfied for a number of reasons.

First of all, the issue of PCBs came up in this House and in a reply that I thought was a little bit flippant and so on, the minister talked in terms of taking a PCB out to lunch.

MR. BUTT:
I meant a PC (Inaudible). It just came out that way.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter and I would like it treated that way.

Then another question on PCBs arose from another hon. member of this House and, in answer, the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) indicated that the World Health Organization did not know of any effects from the point of view of humans and cancer, that PCBs have been used as a local treatment for rheumatoid arthritis, and it is used as a cleansing agent, and there have been extensive exposures to PCBs in Japan and leaving the impression that everything was okay with regard to PCBs. After that I decided to do some research, Mr. Speaker, and I checked into the studies that were done in Japan on people who had been eating PCBs and I found out some rather interesting things, and I am sure that environment people in many parts of the world have also looked at this.

It was found that the breakdown products of PCBs in humans cause an awful lot of conditions. The dibenzofurans cause eye problems and nausea, vomiting, darkening of skin, acneiform eruptions and the liver is affected, enlarged, and you get centrolobular necrosis, depending on the level

of the breakdown product. Another breakdown product of PCBs, the arrhenoxides change the nuclear composition of cells and this is the mechanism whereby the PCBs cause cancer in rats, and this has been shown in lab studies.

And then I checked with the United States Environmental Protection Agency and they informed me that they, in fact, do have standards for PCBs in water, they say that fourteen parts per trillion is the maximum acceptable level for fish to be consumed by humans, the maximum acceptable level in water for fish to be consumed by humans.

I know myself that a suspected spill of two litres in a river in British Columbia caused the closing down of the river to fishing. I have also since found out, Mr. Speaker, that 810 litres of PCBs went into the Exploits River two years ago and there was never any complaint about that, that is 400 times as much as they were concerned about in British Columbia. And then I find out that there are 235 tons of PCBs in Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because of all this I was very concerned about the inspection of the PCBs and still, all I got was a general answer from the minister, and what I was looking for was some kind of detail as to when these inspections are done on all of these sites, on the Avalon Peninsula, all over the Province, in Labrador, when these inspections were done, how often and how thorough the inspections were. Did they actually examine each container to see that there is no sweating and no leakage and all this kind of thing? And I was very concerned, Mr. Speaker, that

I did not get an answer because of all this information that I have managed to find that the hon. gentlemen opposite do not know because when the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) made his statement that seemed to treat it rather lightly. The Premier and members opposite applauded and made a comment about what a tremendous answer this was. They were not concerned about the thoroughness of the information because the Minister of Health was accurate in what he said. So it really concerns me that members opposite, and particularly the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt), have not taken this situation as seriously as I believe it to be, Mr. Speaker. So, I was very dissatisfied with the answer given to me by the hon. the Minister of the Environment.

Mr. Speaker, it bothers me even more that I feel that the Department of the Environment is not doing the kinds of things in this area and does not have the capabilities to do the kinds of things that I feel should be done.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, just let me assure the hon. the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) that the Department of the Environment in this Province has a better handle on PCBs and PCB contaminated material than I think any other jurisdiction in this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, just let me refer to the hon. member's comment

on the comments of the Minister of Health. I would much prefer to take the advice of the very competent Minister of Health in this Province than the hon. member for Gander who is an expert on every single subject that comes up.

MR. DAWE:

He gets his information out of National Lampoon.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the hon. member that he refers to 810 liters of PCB material that went into the Exploits River during the flood, well, I want to tell the hon. member that there was considerable testing done there after and there was no traces of PCBs found in the water. A lot of testing was done, Mr. Speaker, at that time by Environment Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also want to inform the hon. member that in a recent meeting I had in Montreal with the hon. Suzanne Blais-Grenier and my provincial counterparts across the country, there was several areas of concern. One was storage, one was where PCB material was stored, how it was going to be destroyed and the transportation of these dangerous goods.

Mr. Speaker, on the whole score of where are those PCBs, how much of them are in use, I believe that the Department of the Environment, Mr. Speaker - and prior to my going there as well - have done an extremely good job on that. We know where all the major PCBs are stored in this Province. We have a good handle on it. One of the major areas where it is stored is in the safest bunker in North America I would say, in Goose air base, and I am very familiar with it because I grew up there. There

are ten drums of liquid PCBs in Buchans and there are ten transformers containing PCB material in Buchans. These sites are inspected on a regular basis. There are occasions from time to time - because this inventory is ongoing, although we feel we have a good handle on most of it where it is, we know where most of this material is - there are occasions and there will be from time to time when a -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Are they in those new forty-five gallon drums?

MR. BUTT:

Yes. New forty-five gallon coated drums. They meet a certain specification.

But I want to tell the hon. member there opposite, Mr. Speaker, that we do not treat this matter lightly at all, unlike the hon. member. I mean he gets up and he makes all kinds of accusations. If the hon. gentleman has it injected in his veins I suppose it might cause cancer but I am saying the World Health Organization is saying that just normal exposure - just walking by it - will not cause cancer and I believe that is what the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) had said.

So the hon. member is not being accurate. He is somewhat of an alarmist, Mr. Speaker. As I pointed out the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) was somewhat alarming the other day. It is a sensitive area I realize. We treat this whole matter of PCBs very, very seriously, Mr. Speaker, and the staff in the Department of the Environment is doing an outstanding job in keeping it under control knowing where it is and having a licenced storage area

for it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) will agree to use Conception Bay South as a storage area.

Mr. Speaker, today during Question Period I asked the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) what we consider on this side to be a very serious question. We have seen some very devastating things happen to the Newfoundland fishery in the last little while. Today's issue was, of course, the state of the salt fish industry as a result of the imposition of the 20.75 per cent tariff that the United States Department of Commerce is choosing to call a dumping tariff on Canadian salt fish and, in particular, the Canadian Saltfish Corporation who I understand are the hardest hit

Now we are concerned not only, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that it happened, but just how did it happen and are we going to see repeated instances of this over and over again? We have seen instances of where the federal Minister of Fisheries has chosen to allow the West Germans, for example, to overfish for two months before even informing provincial government that it was happening. We have seen instances where the federal minister has stood, as I pointed out to the

minister of Intergovernmental Affairs - and as the minister responsible for communication between the two governments it is an appropriate question to ask him - in Montreal, and the Premier (Mr. Peckford) talks about us going to Montreal to make a presentation to the sealing commission, and the federal Minister of Fisheries, in a presentation to the Fisheries Council of Canada's annual meeting on May 4, showed that he was hiding his head in the sand as far as this whole problem of the imposition of the tariff being put in place was concerned. He showed also that he was trusting to the good will of the United States that there would be no problem, a blind faith in the United States. I offer the minister the document if he needs to read it. I am sure he can get it from his provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). But it is a very senseless thing.

And what concerns us on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker - and I suppose the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) will probably get up and give us one of his humorous speeches, but I want to tell him that this is not a very humorous matter - because what we are concerned about on this side of the House. We are concerned about basically two issues in this whole thing that we have seen going on in the last couple of months.

First of all, is the federal government turning a blind eye to foreign countries doing what they want to do in this country? Are they allowing us now not only to trade fish for fish, which we have all objected to in this House, the trading of fish for fish which was done by a former Liberal

government and we objected to it in this House, but are we now seeing the trading of fish or the turning of a blind eye to overfishing and to the kinds of things that are going on in the United States today, are we now seeing a central Canadian, in this case, Tory government, are we now seeing a government in Central Canada, in Ottawa, letting fish go, letting things happen to the fishery in return for trade concessions in other areas? And that is a very important matter and it is one that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) in this Province should take very seriously. I know he would take it very seriously if he sits down and thinks about the consequences of it. It is one that he should think about very seriously.

The other question, of course, is are we seeing politics in this Province and politics in Ottawa, this PC blanket that seems to be spreading over this Province and indeed over Atlantic Canada - but it seems to be particularly worse in this Province - are we seeing PCs in this Province - and I am not talking about PCBs, I am talking about PCs, people as a party - are we seeing Tories forgetting their real reason for being here in this Province, are we seeing them forget what their real duties are and trying to protect a Tory government in Ottawa? Are they themselves sitting down and allowing a Central Canadian government, are they allowing a fisheries minister from British Columbia - is that not where Mr. Fraser is from? - from British Columbia, are they allowing him and his government to turn a blind eye to what is happening, to hiding their heads in the sand, while things go on,

are they allowing that to happen while our fishing industry is going down the drain? And I refer the minister again to overfishing. I refer him as well to what happened today and I refer him as well to the different quotas that have been given out to EEC counties. And I want to make this point to him, that when there was an unfavourable decision in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island the federal Minister of Fisheries -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. TULK:
- he got upset but he could not get upset about the North Atlantic fishery. Terrible.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
The hon. gentleman is very sensitive. He thinks that we should all behave as if we were always in church and if the hon. gentleman wishes that then, obviously, that is fair enough.

I am sorry the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) left because when I looked over a moment ago he was sitting there and I thought how he did grace that seat and sat there with a most statesman like manner. Really, he was an inspiration, and now that he has left. I find the inspiration is gone, as well.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
No, the hon. gentleman behind him

does not yet provide that inspiration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Because the hon. gentleman from Bonavista North had a statesmanlike look about him and I could see that his jaws and his throat were getting exercise and I thought he was getting ready to give one of his Churchillian speeches. But he has left and that has taken the wind out of my sails!

However, even without wind, I will try to paddle along a short distance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

We all have to paddle our own canoe from time to time.

However, the specific matter at issue here, as the hon. gentleman knows, deals with the decision of the United States International Trade Commission with respect to the importation of salt fish; that is really what it deals with. And that decision was given yesterday. We, in the Government of Newfoundland, have not received a copy of it, nor, to the best of my knowledge, has the Saltfish Corporation received a copy of it.

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Well, the U.S. International Trade Commission is a quasi-judicial body within the ambit of the Department of Commerce, a kind of regulatory body within the ambit of the United States Department of

Commerce. I mean, what they decide, you can hardly blame the Tory government in Ottawa or the Tory minister from British Columbia or no matter where he is from, on a decision of a United States International Trade Commission. It really has nothing to do with whether there is a Tory Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa or a Liberal Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa.

As I said, the decision was given yesterday. There is no copy of it in Newfoundland. The government does not have one; neither the Department of Justice nor anybody else has one; the Saltfish Corporation does not have one yet. No doubt we will get one very soon. I was speaking with people in the Department of Justice this afternoon and, obviously, when it is available, they will have a copy of it and an analysis, and we will be looking at the appeal procedures. That is really all one can say until one has seen the document and seen what the reasoning is, seen if the facts are accurate and seen what the dissenting opinion is, because it was a 4 - 1 decision.

Unfortunately, there appears to be a growing trend of protectionism in the United States. Their tariffs now on, I understand, raspberries, on hogs - four-legged ones - and on lumber products.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Footwear.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Footwear, as well, and if this is a continuing trend, obviously, it is going to have pejorative effects for a number of Canadian exports.

But with respect to making any

specific comment on it, until one has seen the decision and until it has been subjected to some legal analysis, then really it is entirely speculation. So all I can say is that when the decision is available and after it has been analyzed and after the appeal procedures have been analyzed and there have been, probably, discussions with the Saltfish Corporation, which is the body, as a federal agency, involved, then obviously, the Province will be in a better position to know what the next move should be. But I do point out that it is a decision of a United States regulatory board, it is not a decision of the federal government or of any other government.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Good show!

DR. COLLINS:

Excellent!

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 14, 1985 at 10:00 A.M.