



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 51

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

1 November 1985

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Before calling for Statements by Ministers, I have had a chance to look up the details about the point of privilege raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) in connection with a statement by the Premier, the document he tabled but had not read completely. I think the objection was taken to the words, "I had hoped that the politics of innuendo, smear and character assassination was behind us. It appears I was mistaken." There is no direct accusation here. I looked up Beauchesne to see if I might get some objection to this type of thing, but my feeling is that the privileges of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition were not affected and that a prima facie case has not been made.

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today the appointment of Mr. George Skinner to the position of Chairman of the Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission. Mr. Skinner is a native Newfoundlander who received his early education in this Province. He has obtained the degree of Bachelor of Science in Psychology as well as a Bachelor of Social Work degree from Memorial University of Newfoundland. Additionally, he has undertaken post-graduate studies in social work and

addictions at Memorial.

Mr. Skinner has had an extensive background in the field of alcohol and drug addition in this Province beginning as a field worker with the Alcohol and Drug Addictions Foundation in 1973 through to his appointment as the Executive Director and Chief Executive Officer of the Addition Foundation in 1979. When the Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission was formed, through an Act of this Legislature in 1982, Mr. Skinner was appointed Director of Regional Services with the Commission and has played a very vital role in its growth and development during the past three years.

Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in stating that this gentleman is among the most knowledgeable persons in this Province in the addictions field and is eminently qualified for appointment to this position. I am sure that all members of the House join me in extending congratulations to Mr. Skinner and best wishes to him for success in providing leadership in this important area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to get up and welcome and support the appointment of Mr. George Skinner to the position of Chairman of the Alcohol and Drug Dependency

Committee. It is a real pleasure to see once again - and these are becoming more and more the rare exception - somebody being appointed from within the ranks of the public service and somebody who has proven himself within the ranks of the public service. If there is anything that is more likely to demoralize the public service, it is the series of patronage appointments that have been taking place recently.

Mr. Speaker, we hope to see more of this type of appointment, as opposed to the ones that have been brought out over the last several weeks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to take this opportunity to inform this hon. House that I have today appointed six new members to the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council. This series of appointments brings the Council up to full strength. I am sure we are all pleased the Council can now go on with business as usual.

The new appointments to the Council are as follows: Mr. Tom Cahill, St. John's; Dr. D. F. Cook, St. John's; Mrs. Alice Dicks, Grand Falls; Dr. Christopher Pratt, Salmonier; Mrs. June Russell, St. John's; and Mrs. Cheryl Stagg, Stephenville.

I have the utmost confidence, Mr. Speaker, in the ability of the new members to provide sound direction and policies for our Arts Council. I am sure that the appointment of these new members will mean a better relationship between the Council, government and the arts community of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am very pleased to see that there have been some appointments to the Arts Council to bring it back up to its proper level. The only problem is, although it is fine to appoint new members, nothing has been changed in the Arts Council. They are still not able to live up to their mandate. They still have hardly enough money to run their office.

I cannot see what the appointment of six good people will mean when they are not going to be allowed to do their job. We are still in the same situation. The problem still has not been solved. We will see what happens in the next few weeks anyway. We have a few questions. The six new appointments are fine; the people are good, but the situation is exactly the same as it was this Summer. Nothing has been changed. Despite all the promises to solve the problems, as this article in this magazine points out, it is still a mess.

I hope the minister has a few more announcements to make on a number of other things, including improved funding for the arts in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would like to welcome a number of people to the galleries: Mayor Barbara Green and Councillor Tony McCarthy from the Joint Councils of Halfway Point - Benoit's Cove - John's Beach - Frenchman's Cove.

Also sixty students and their teachers, Mr. Shepherd, Mr. Wells, Mr. Budgell and Mr. Poole from F.G. Burse Memorial Collegiate in the district of Exploits.

Also eighteen students from the Seventh Day Adventist School, St. John's, with their teachers Francine Rees and Steward Marks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries in view of the shock that has been brought on us in the last two or three days concerning the Ocean Harvesters thing, the devastating

effect of that not only on the financial part of the district but also the psychological effect it is having on the business community, the people who are dependent on that plant for a living, the people who have bills to pay off, and the fishermen of that area who, if the plant does not open, have no place to sell their crab.

The minister is saying that possibly the plant will be sold. But in order for those fishermen to get ready for next year they must have time to do up their equipment, to repair their boats, make their crab pots and repair their fishing gear, and that takes a considerable amount of money. If the plant does not open, that money is all going to go into waste. They are going to incur debts and spend money that they now do not have.

So I would like to ask the minister, what is he going to do to reassure the citizens of Harbour Grace, Old Perlican and Port de Grave? In the event that the plant is not sold, does the government have a contingency plan in place to make sure that the plant will open next year and that the Harvest Star will sale out in the Spring?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I remind the hon. gentleman of what we told him in a meeting a couple of days ago, what we said in this House yesterday and the day before yesterday, that this government will use every means available to it to ensure that the fish plants previously operated by Ocean Harvesters will be operated by another corporate

entity before the next fishing season starts. Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot stare into a crystal ball and deal with all the ifs that the hon. gentleman put forth, but what I can say to him, what we have said to the people of Harbour Grace and Port de Grave and Old Perlican, is that we will work to the ends of the earth to make sure that those plants are in operation again next year. Now, Mr. Speaker, what more commitment can any government or any minister or anybody else give to those people? We will use every means at our disposal to make sure that that takes place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister did not answer my question. He said he will work to the ends of the earth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. EFFORD:

This is not a laughing matter. If you people want to sit down there and be court jesters, fine, but this is very serious to the 3,000 who have lost their jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

I can assure the hon. gentlemen on

the other side that I do not need to play politics. I won my election by a majority vote and I will win it again the next time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Now back to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). He did not tell me that he will guarantee the people those plants will operate. All he did say was he will work to his utmost to ensure that the plant will be sold. But the possibility is there very strongly that in the next two or three months - in January the season starts - the plant may possibly not be sold. I ask him again, just in case it is not sold, will he guarantee the people of that district that they will have jobs next year in Harbour Grace, Port de Grave and Old Perlican?

MR. TULK:

A good question! A good question!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the only if that exists in this whole scenario exists in the hon. gentleman's mind. The hon. gentleman is a pessimist, Mr. Speaker. We are a government of optimist over here. We will do all we can in consultation with the people in that area to make sure that those plants are open come the next fishing season. Mr. Speaker, the central core of the hon. gentleman's campaign was that he was going to have all the plants open within two weeks. Well, Mr.

Speaker, we are going to do everything we can to make sure that that commitment is kept on his behalf and on behalf of all the people in that area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young). I would like to ask the minister did he oppose a Cabinet decision to put the plant into bankruptcy? And does he now support the decision?

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
The hon. gentleman should know that he directs questions to ministers with respect to the duties of their departments, the mandate of their departments, neither can he ask a minister of the Crown what his position was in Cabinet on anything. The hon. gentleman has been fighting for the people of Harbour Grace for a number of years -

MR. YOUNG:
Fifteen.

MR. MARSHALL:
- for fifteen years, and he will go on for a longer period.

MR. YOUNG:
Right on. Right on.

MR. MARSHALL:
But this is a matter of principle, Mr. Speaker. It relates to Cabinet responsibility, collective responsibility. No member of this House can ask a Cabinet minister what position they took in Cabinet.

MR. EFFORD:
To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
The reason, Mr. Speaker, I asked the question of the Minister of Public Works was not because of the department, but because he represents the people of Harbour Grace district. I again find the minister is not capable of answering a question.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:
The question I asked was does he oppose the bankruptcy?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member cannot direct a question to the hon. minister on something affecting his district. He can only direct a question to a minister on a matter dealing with his own particular department.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
I will go back, then, in my final supplementary to the Minister of Fisheries and ask him how strongly did the member for

Harbour Grace, the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid), and the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) oppose the closing of the Harbour Grace, Port de Grave and Old Perlican fish plants.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, let me assure the hon. gentleman that the strength and the vigor of the hon. Minister of Public Works, the member for Carbonear, and all members who represent that part of the Province in this government, have worked their fingers to the bone, Mr. Speaker, have done everything possible, and will continue to do everything possible - and they will continue to be optimists - to find an operator for those plants. They are not eternal pessimists like the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, they may have spoken out but they obviously were not listened to when it came time to decide on whether to keep the plants stay open. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) a question, but I am not sure if he is with us or if he is lost in his magazine article.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
He does many things at the one time.

MR. BARRY:
Unlike the Premier, I see. Would the Minister of Transportation indicate whether he is aware of the new conditions that have been placed on the tickets for those passengers crossing on the Bell Island ferry, where the ferry operator is attempting to limit liability for any personal injury or property damage? There was no such limitation on the previous ticket but as of September there is now the following condition attached by Newfoundland Transportation Company Limited to its ticket on the ferry.

'Condition of transportation - by tendering this ticket to Newfoundland Transportation Company, Limited, the company, its agents, servants or employees, the tenderer hereby waives all rights of action for damages against the company for any damage or injury to the tenderer, his vehicle, his goods or any other person or thing for which this ticket has been tendered for transportation. Said waiver applies even where the damage or injury results from the negligence of the agents, servants or employees of the company.'

Mr. Speaker, that condition has now been placed on a large sign at the entrances to the ferry both on the Portugal Cove side and on the Bell Island side. I think that this is shameful. That company is earning enough money to pay for insurance premiums, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! Would the hon. member pose his question?

MR. BARRY:
Would the hon. minister indicate has he agreed to this shameful attempt by this company to evade this lawful responsibility in the

event of an accident to the people of Bell Island?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, we have a number of ferry operations which are handled by the Department of Transportation around the Province and we have a section of the department, under the Director of Ferry Operations, which deals with these operations on a day to day basis.

I am not aware, Mr. Speaker, of the matter which the Leader of the Opposition refers to but I will certainly have it checked out. I would imagine since the Leader of the Opposition is no longer practicing law he takes the opportunity in the House to make the House aware of his knowledge as a lawyer. But I will check into it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I have letters from constituents who are very seriously concerned.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You are wasting time.

MR. BARRY:

I have one gentleman, and I will be prepared to show the name of the individual to the member for Harbour Main (Mr. Doyle) who would have to acknowledge he is a very sincere and responsible individual, and he describes just one incident. And these incidents happen quite frequently on the ferry, because often weather

conditions are bad, its rough, the ferries roll.

MR. PATTERSON:

We cannot change that.

MR. BARRY:

I know the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) has never been to sea. I take that back. The member for Placentia is always at sea. But the member for Harbour Main has crossed back and forth on that ferry and knows that from time to time it is so rough that vehicles move, their loads shift and there is risk to the life and limb of passengers as well as to property.

Now, the minister cannot escape his liability as Minister of Transportation by that frivolous response. Will he commit to this House not just to look into it, but when he finds that the situation is as I have set out, will he ensure that that company removes that attempt to limit its liability?

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, since the Legislature resumed, the Leader of the Opposition has taken part in a lot of action and shouting. I must say, though, that the sound system in this Legislature is quite adequate and people speaking in a normal voice can usually be heard rather well and there is really no need to shout.

Unlike members opposite, I will not just jump at a question by the Leader of the Opposition as if it

is gospel. I indicated, I think very legitimately, that I would look into the situation and see what the facts were surrounding it, and if necessary report back to the Legislature, or to the Leader of the Opposition individually, whatever he wishes. I will check into it and find out what the situation is, and if there needs to be - I hate to use the word 'if' like members of the Opposition - a change, or if there is something improper about the procedures that are being followed, they will certainly be changed.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Transportation. Is the minister aware that the CN ferry has not operated on the South Coast for the last four days? Has he made representation to CN to have the by now famous ferry, Marine Courier, the vessel which has operated for nine weeks out of the last nineteen months, replaced by a vessel which is able to do the job?

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker, we are informed on a regular basis by CN Marine of their activities. There have been some problems with that particular vessel, rudder problems and so

on. I understand there is at least a temporary replacement vessel on its way, or if not on its way already in place to take over that service, and the necessary repairs to the rudder of the other vessel are being taken care of as well.

MR. GILBERT:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:
These are the same repairs, Mr. Minister, that have been done three times in the last nineteen months and the vessel has only been in service nine weeks of that period, as I said. I wonder now if the minister would consider asking CN Marine to restore the South Coast service to the pre-1984 level when the Marine Runner and the Marine Sprinter provided a daily service on the South Coast? We must remember that that service is the Trans-Canada Highway to those people who live in the communities of Ramea, Mc Callum and Grey River.

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

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker, we have continuously been in contact with CN Marine as it relates to the South Coast service and the inter-relationship between the services that are offered by CN Marine, a federal Crown corporation, and the services offered by my department through its ferry operations on the South Coast, and there has been a considerable amount of overlapping over the past number of years since the Province took

over the service. We are continuing to look at the kind of transportation modes most suitable for the people on the South Coast of the Province, including the possibility of looking at areas such as in my colleague, the member for Burin-Placentia West's (Mr. Tobin) district, to perhaps replace existing ferries with road networks, a ground transportation systems. It is a continuous process. The area of transportation is perhaps one of the areas, Mr. Speaker, which has been changing and which changes our lives as it changes in the past number of decades more rapidly than a lot of other technologies. We are continuing to look at various ways of providing much improved and better transportation for people of the South Coast as well as other parts of the Province. I would like to assure the member that we will continue to do that and not only in his area. Since he asked the question I will certainly have another direct talk with the principals involved in all the agencies to see if there is not something that can be done to relieve the present situation. We will continue to look at ways of improving the overall situation not only next week but next year and in the years to come.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth. What have you done with the Arts Council besides appoint six members? Have you done anything at all about the mandate or anything about the

funding? Can you just inform this hon. House what you have done since June 18?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to thank the hon. gentleman for the question. I would just like to say to him that since I became minister responsible for cultural affairs in this Province I have had numerous meetings with representatives of the arts community in the Province and I put in place a process, some three or four months ago, to try and resolve the issue that was ongoing with regards to the issue of funding for the Arts Council. I would just like to say to him that I have met with the recipients of the Sustaining Grants Programme and met with the publishers' assistance recipients. I convened a joint meeting of the Arts Council and both groups of recipients and consequently we did make some progress in resolving the issue. The Publishers' Assistance Programme will stay as it is and be administered by the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth. There was progress made in the Sustaining Grants Programme and the resolve of the meeting was that the Arts Council and the sustaining grants recipients were to sit down and jointly develop criteria for the administration of that particular fund.

Of course, I do not know what the result will be when the new members of the Arts Council get together with the remaining four to discuss this issue and try to

put it to bed. But there has been progress made.

With regards to funding, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows that the budgetary requirements, the budgetary allocations, were made in the budget last Spring or early Summer, and, of course, we cannot change that in midstream.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just recently the funding was frozen. I would like to ask the minister why the funding was frozen for the Arts Council when it is a Crown corporation and they had grants outstanding they had supposedly given out to people, writing cheques and everything else. Can you give me a reason why you froze the funding for the Arts Council? I would just like to know the reason.

MR. TULK:

The cheques bounced.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that, as Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, I do not have responsibility for and that is if someone else writes cheques and they bounce. I only have responsibility if I write my own personal cheques and they bounce. Then that is my problem.

The other situation, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the funding, as the hon. gentleman and all hon. members of this House know, there was a situation where a number of members of the Arts Council resigned, which basically rendered the Arts Council inoperable. I, as the minister, was faced with making a decision to try and resolve the issue: Were we to continue with the Arts Council or were we to put in place another mechanism to replace it and carry out various functions? After a full evaluation, Mr. Speaker, I decided that the best route to go was to bring the Arts Council up to full membership and try and establish better liaison and co-operation with the Arts Council and the arts community of this Province.

The reason the \$100,000 was not released was because a decision was not made until a few days ago as to whether we would continue with the Arts Council or whether we would have another mechanism to replace it. I put the funds on hold because I thought it would be rather unwise to release \$100,000 when I really did not know who would be administering it.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Recently published articles have shown a lot of disgruntlement with the way the sustaining funds has been run, the direction of that and where the money has been going. I would like to ask the minister, does he have a formal lobbying application that he can give to all the people

who have not received money? There have been all kinds of comments saying, 'what should we do?' A number of people have said, 'We have not lobbied enough.' They were told they did not lobby enough through the minister's department. Is there a lobbying application that you have to fill out that says, 'I had to take the minister out to dinner so we can get money'? What is the situation? We would love to know. Can you tell us?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I would be less than honest if I told the hon. gentleman that I did not like being taken out to dinner, but I must inform him that I have not been taken out to dinner by anyone of the arts community of Newfoundland and Labrador, no one.

On the other situation, Mr. Speaker, he refers to an article in the magazine he has there. I say to him in all fairness and honesty that the spokesman in the article he refers to is not on the Arts Council, but is an employee of the Arts Council. To me, Mr. Speaker, all the negative publicity about the Arts Council over the past two to three months has not come basically from the remaining membership of the Arts Council but the employee of the Arts Council. What that tells me is that the tail has been wagging the dog too long, and, as a new minister in the department, after doing an evaluation, that tells me something is out of whack.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

I recognize the hon. member for a final supplementary.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I am just going to table the article for all members of the House. I would just like to ask the minister to comment on this: "The mandate of the Arts Council is to advise the government on arts policy and to take a direct role in funding the arts community throughout the Province." Does he agree with that statement or does he not agree with that statement? It was in the Throne Speech on July 12, 1979, a prior administration.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that since I have been Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth I have not received one ounce of advice from the Arts Council. I have thoroughly checked with department officials and at least two ministers who preceeded me in the department, and if there is one function that the Arts Council has not carried out since its inception in 1980 was that it did not render any advice to government. And I think that has been a blatant weakness with the Arts Council.

I am not saying here today that we have done everything that we could have done either, but there is one thing I must say, that when you put in perspective the budgetary restraints of this Province I think looking at today's dollars that we do fund the Arts Council

in a fair manner and the Arts Council, with the funding that they have been given to them, have tried to distribute these funds as best they can based on the applications that they have received.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) and it is a question he should be familiar with since we have been corresponding on it for the last couple of months. The question I want to start with is: If there is an overpayment to an individual on social assistance and that individual dies, what is the policy, if any, for recovering that money?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I think I am aware of the specific case the hon. gentleman speaks of. In the past I believe the department has been deducting the money from the widow or widower if the widow or widower was in receipt of assistance or if that person went to work on a community development programme. The matter was recently brought the attention of the department again and we have gone back to the Department of Justice, because we were previously advised that it was okay to do so but the advice we are getting now is that maybe it is not. So we have gone back for further clarification from Justice to see if in fact we should be doing this or not. But up to this point in time the answer to the hon. member's

question is that we have been deducting a percentage from the community development cheque or the social assistance cheque, whichever.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

You might have added old age pension cheques, too. There is an indication that they were trying to attach that one in another case.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, in the case of a head of a family who receives social assistance, if afterwards that family breaks up - in other words, if the head of the family is a male and that male leaves the wife - any overpayments that were accrued to that family while the husband was there are now 50/50 shared by the husband and the wife. Is this also correct, Mr. Minister?

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I cannot answer that question. It is a rather technical one. I would have to check it out and see exactly what is done. I really do not know the answer.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for

Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). Earlier in the session the minister announced some very severe cuts in the staffs of the various hospitals around the Province. He indicated at the time that these staff reductions were done not only to save money but to facilitate the vacation season. Can the minister tell the House, now that the holiday season is over, have the staffs in the hospitals being brought back to full strength?

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, I do not remember making any statement in this House to the effect of a large number of layoffs in the hospitals. I expected that there would be some layoffs, as far as I knew there were a few, and I believe they happened in the General Hospital. To the best of my knowledge not many people were laid off. If you have any other information, I will be very pleased to get it and I will have it confirmed for you.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have the hon. ministers' words here in front of me, but earlier in the year there were layoffs at the various hospitals, the General,

for example. Well, maybe not layoffs but certainly bed closings, thirty-five beds, I think, and layoffs too, I might add. There were closing in the Janeway, the hospital in Carbonear, I think in Twillingate, and in the General. I think one of the reasons given at the time was that it was a good time to do it because of the slow holiday season. Now that the season is over, would the minister indicate whether or not those beds are being reactivated?

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Yes, Sir, they are. There were no beds closed in Port aux Basques, there were no beds closed, to the best of my knowledge, in Western Memorial, there were no beds closed in Bonne Bay, there were no beds closed in St. Anthony, there were no beds closed in Springdale, there were no beds closed in Grand Falls. There are about twelve to sixteen beds closed in Gander, but I believe that some of these are closed because they are renovating the pediatric ward there.

Yes, there are a few beds still closed in the General Hospital. There are about sixteen to eighteen beds closed in the Janeway still, but a number have been opened. There are no beds closed at St. Clare's. There are few beds closed at the Grace Hospital, but they are not closed because of financial restriction, I believe they have one other problem not related to finances.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for
Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Specifically, could the minister say, then, whether the beds remaining closed at the General will be reactivated in view of the fact that there appears to be a pressing need to have those beds reactivated at the General?

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

I cannot give you that assurance at the moment, that is the responsibility of the board of the General Hospital Corporation.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) was the Premier correct when he said that the minister was up in Toronto meeting with management of the brewery industry a few days ago?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have the Hansard for that particular day in front of me and the Premier said I was in Toronto on other business but that I had been, over the past

several days, dealing with the labour dispute at the breweries.

MR. BARRY:

No. No, Sir. No, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if the minister were to check Hansard, or check with the Hansard Editor and go back and get the tapes, the Premier was talking to the brewery workers and the question raised was what is being done? The Premier got up in this House and said that the minister was in Toronto and was meeting on brewery business, I think was the language that was used.

DR. COLLINS:

Maybe he was in a bar up there.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, maybe that is what he meant. Maybe the minister was in a bar up there, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) says. That could be. But the Premier of this Province was trying to give assurance to the brewery workers who were here in the gallery that something was being done to try and settle that dispute.

Now, we take it that the minister was not up, and presumably that is why his Deputy Minister called the union to correct the record, because the Premier had misinformed the House.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to find it here now. I read it yesterday. I did not say that the minister was in Toronto meeting with the breweries, and I have Hansard here somewhere, somebody has it. On page 48 of the Hansard for that day, October 29, 1985, clearly shows, "Secondly, may I suggest that we have been working very hard behind the scenes to try to solve this dispute. It is not a dispute between the brewery workers and Treasury Board. It is dispute between the brewery workers and their employers. But, through the Department of Labour and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard)" - it is in brackets here - "who is today in Toronto on other business, but who has been out of the Province the last few days on the matter of the brewery strike, we have been working behind the scenes with both the leadership of the union and the leadership of the employers to try to bring and end to this dispute." I did not say that the minister was in Toronto dealing with the brewery matter.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I am reading the same thing. I do not know what the Premier is trying to do with the Queen's own grammar. The transcript reads, "But who has been out of the Province the last few days on the matter of the brewery strike."

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Deputy Minister of Labour would

have felt it necessary to call up and apologize for the Premier's remarks to the union because the reference was to Toronto rather than to some other place. Would the minister tell us where he was and what business was he on, and what is he doing to try and settle this strike?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

We are on a point of order at the moment. I would like to rule on that. There is no point of order. It is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

All the Leader of the Opposition is doing continually is taking little things out of context and, you know, trying to put his own interpretation on things. But, in his comments, he accused the Premier of misleading the House. Now I quote Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, page 105. It says: "Since 1958, it has been ruled unparliamentary to use the following expressions." It goes over to page 108 and there are many authorities there. You cannot say somebody is misleading the House. Now if you say somebody is innocently misleading the House, that is one thing. If you say somebody is deliberately misleading the House, that is something else. So you have to take it within the context.

The hon. gentleman, with his soul full of jealousy, every time the Premier says something he gets up. With the venom that is in him, the hon. gentleman has said that the Premier has misled the House and the only -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:
- context in which it can be taken is deliberately misleading the House in that sense and he should be asked to withdraw it.

MR. TULK:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
There is nothing that the Government House Leader can quote to say that misleading is unparliamentary. It is unparliamentary to say deliberately misleading. He should not be so touchy. We know, Mr. Speaker, that he has been under terrible strain in the last few days, that he wants to go around and make believe that the Leader of the Opposition is jealous over the high unemployment rate we have in this Province, over the problems that beset the fishery. He wants to make believe that the Leader of the Opposition is jealous of that.

Now what the Leader of the Opposition said - and do not be so touchy - was misinforming the House. Get it straight.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of order, again I must rule there is no point of order. It is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:
On the question from the Leader of the Opposition with respect to my business in Toronto: In fact, as the Premier stated, I was in Toronto on other business. Specifically that business was the Canadian Standards Association. But I had been out of the Province on the business of the brewery strike. I was out of the Province on Friday and Saturday - I returned on Sunday - on business dealing with the most senior officials of the breweries. I met them in Halifax, specifically.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the deputy minister did not initiate a call to anybody apologizing for anything that the Premier has said. There was no need to apologize for anything that the Premier said, he made an accurate statement. The Deputy Minister of Labour received the call and he straightened the matter out to the satisfaction of the caller.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, that explanation sounds suspiciously like the explanation we got when John Crosbie made the comments about Mr. Mulroney's office. Remember, Mr. Speaker? Remember the explanation? We were all hearing the tape on VOXM, Mr. Speaker, of Mr. Crosbie criticizing Mr. Mulroney's office -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

- and at the same time they were saying, "Mr. Crosbie is denying what he said on the tape that is running on VOXM."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that explanation is the same type that we just heard. The minister and the deputy minister have been told to try and patch up the fact that the Premier here when he had brewery workers in the gallery, tried to pretend that the minister was actively working on the brewery strike when the minister was not doing anything on it. That is the reality.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Again I must rule here is no point of order. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) took the opportunity of explaining his position but there is no point of order. The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition on behalf of constituents in the area of Pennywell Road East.

I have raised this matter a number of times in the House of Assembly. I raised it with the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dawe). I have written the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I have had some discussions with the Chairman of Metro Board and they are trying to do what they can to make arrangements with the Town of Paradise and it may be that some temporary arrangement might be worked out. But we have a serious long term problem here. The petition reads as follows:

"To the hon. the House of Assembly, the petition of the undersigned is as follows: that the appropriate government authority take action to improve Pennywell Road East, the road leading to our residences. This road is now virtually impassable in both Summer and Winter. It needs proper ditching to prevent the flooding which regularly occurs there.

"The flooding is a hazard to young people as well as a barrier to transportation." I understand there was a young child who was found unconscious in this ditch and was barely rescued this past Spring.

"Our building permits were originally issued by the Town of Paradise, but it was subsequently discovered that we are outside of the boundary of that town. The Metropolitan Area Board or the Department of Transportation now

has the responsibility but has not acted to deal with our problem."

Now what we have here, Mr. Speaker, are citizens of this Province being caught in a struggle or in a gap which exists as the jurisdiction of Metro Board is being dealt with, along with the jurisdiction of the town of Paradise and the City of St. John's. We have areas which are considered too remote for the Metropolitan Area Board to be able to adequately service. These communities are being ignored, Mr. Speaker. It is not good enough. These citizens are taxpayers and they deserve attention. Once more I ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) for heaven sake show some compassion and deal with this problem on behalf of these people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, could I comment on this?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Some confusion exists because I do not know of any such street as Pennywell Road East. There is Pennywell Road West, there is Old Pennywell Road, and there is New Pennywell Road.

AN HON. MEMBER:

This is old.

MR. J. CARTER:

Now, the very end of New Pennywell Road is in a state of limbo because the City Council is at present trying to implement some plans for large scale improvements.

MR. BARRY:

The member is in the state of limbo, (inaudible).

MR. J. CARTER:

If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is not going to be clear about what he is commenting on, then what else can I do but speculate. I have to cover a number of areas, a number of possibilities. He did not have the courtesy -

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Is the member standing in this House and telling these fifteen or twenty residents that they do not know where they are living?

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not a point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:

I am doing it. To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am telling the Leader of the Opposition that he is not being clear and he does not know where they are living.

MR. BARRY:

It is their petition.

MR. J. CARTER:

Well, he should have made some attempt to find out where the people actually do live.

MR. BARRY:

I know where they live.

MR. J. CARTER:

Well, it could be nice if he would care to inform the members on this side what he is talking about, because he has been very unclear. I will have to cover the broadest

possible range to cover all possibilities.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order. There is no point of order.

MR. BARRY:

North, South, East, West.

MR. SPEAKER:

I think the hon. member is speaking to the petition.

MR. J. CARTER:

I certainly support the petition, if it is on behalf of the people of New Pennywell Road, if it is on behalf of the people of Old Pennywell Road, and if it is on the part of the people of Pennywell Road itself. I will support any petition that will improve roads in this area. I must say that the enquiries that I made at City Hall indicated that because of some large scale plans that they had in mind they were overlooking the relatively small improvements that could have been and should have been made on these streets. I have not been exactly idle, but I have to say that I am not aware of the exact area that the hon. gentleman is referring to. Although, I do know -

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

The member is obviously dozing, Mr. Speaker, as is his wont, as I was reading out the petition. It is not within the City of St. John's. This is the problem. If the member would go back and read Hansard tomorrow and then come and

not waste the time of this House talking about streets within St. John's. The problem is that it is outside of the boundaries of St. John's. It was thought to be within the boundaries of the Town of Paradise. Subsequently, it was discovered it was outside of the boundaries of the Town of Paradise as well. They are in limbo and are under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Area Board which does not have the money to do the work they say that is needed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Have you got it?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I must rule that there is no point of order. As I understand the hon. member is supporting this petition.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

There are parts of Old Pennywell Road that are outside the City of St. John's and there is a small part of New Pennywell Road that is outside the boundaries of St. John's. Both areas do need road upgrading and improvements. So I must, I guess, speak in support of both these areas, although I very much doubt if that petition does come from both of those areas because they are somewhat separated.

However, I will say the Leader of the Opposition is utterly

confused, being very confusing and just trying to waste the time of this House. I think it would be much more important if he would get out a map of St. John's or perhaps visit the area effected and then he could come in here and comment more properly. But I do support the petition, if it is an actual petition and if it mirrors reality.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, unlike the member who just spoke, I would like to speak directly in support of this particular petition.

First of all, I would like to say that there are a number of areas in the environs of St. John's that are in limbo. With the advent of Metro Board, the City of St. John's as well as Metro Board have certain conflicts and there are certain jurisdictions that are not included in either. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is high time that this situation was straightened out.

I think the area in question has been looked at and studied many times when it comes to jurisdiction with regards to the City of St. John's, Metro Board and the Town of Paradise. The whole thing has been looked at by many people. It is kind of unfortunate and it kind of surprises me that somebody did not come up with this particular problem before and this had not been adequately taken care of.

Obviously, with the number of people in the Department of

Municipal Affairs that are available to look at the situation with regards to municipalities in this particular area, the number of people who have looked at it, have gone over maps and have looked boundaries and all this kind of thing - we have heard an awful lot about boundaries around here recently, Mr. Speaker - it seems to me that this should have been picked up a long time ago and jurisdiction assigned so that the people would know exactly, or at least the jurisdictions would know exactly, who is supposed to look out for these particular roads.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would support the petition so ably presented by the Leader of the Opposition. I only hope that somebody gets on its soon, whether it be the Minister of Municipal Affairs, to indicate who is supposed to look out to it, or the Department of Transportation, if it does not come under the jurisdiction of any of the agencies presently set up.

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, by leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
By leave, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to speak to the petition presented by the Leader of the Opposition. I am familiar to a certain extent with this particular problem because I have had some dialogue on the issue over the last couple of months with a few people out in the Old Pennywell Road area. The area in question is the Old Pennywell Road

area. I think it is necessary to outline a little bit of the history associated with that problem.

Back about six or eight years ago, the Paradise Town Council issued permits to the people out in the Old Pennywell Road area to build. They did not have the authority at the time to issue these permits because the area in question was outside the boundaries of Paradise but they did issue these permits and, quite possibly, I would say definitely, the permits were issued unknowingly. Pennywell Road is one of the areas where these permits were issued and, subsequent to that, a commissioner was appointed to examine the boundaries of Paradise. The final outcome of that was the realignment of the boundaries of Paradise. At that time the area in question found itself in Metro Board's boundaries. However, Metro Board, as you say, did not provide the services to those areas and, as a result, the Paradise Town Council undertook to provide basic services in those areas on a temporary basis.

The Paradise Town Council is now saying to Metro Board that this area is within your boundaries and, as a result, we are not going to provide any further services there. That, I believe, was done about a year ago. Since that time, if my memory serves me correctly, a couple of months ago, when I was on this particular problem, we have made arrangements, I believe, and I think I will be borne out on this, with either Metro Board or the Paradise Town Council to continue those services for the winter, snow clearing and what have you, on a temporary basis until we can get the Metro Board problem

straightened out.

As hon. members are aware, we are in the process right now of calling for a feasibility study into a new, restructured Metro Board to try and determine what Metro Board is going to become, whether it is going to become a partially elected or a partially appointed body and to outline specifically what its responsibilities are going to be. That is in the process of being done right now and places like Old Pennywell Road, who find themselves in, I suppose it is fair to say, between the devil and the deep blue sea because they are not in any municipal area, those areas will be straightened out when the commissioner has undertaken his study and makes the determination as to what the final restructured Metro Board will become.

But the area in question that the hon. gentleman is presenting the petition on, the Old Pennywell Road area, I believe that particular problem is either straightened out or is in the process of being dealt with.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
I thank the minister for that. As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, I had spoken with the representatives from Metro Board who indicated that there were some temporary arrangements going into place, but they were temporary and we need a permanent solution to that problem. The people are looking for a permanent solution.

I thank the minister and I hope we will see an adequate arrangement for this winter and a long-term arrangement as the jurisdiction of Metro Board is worked out.

Mr. Speaker, I have another petition here. It is from residents of Normore Crescent, Bell Island, and it is signed by 70 or 80 people requesting assistance in obtaining an adequate water supply for their homes. I will read it out. "The reason being that our present water supply is inadequate, smells, tastes foul and is not safe for human consumption. The well is located near the town dump. The pump trips itself out as there are too many families on the one pump and we are without water 90 per cent of the time.

"We have to call long distance ourselves to complain and are told that nothing can be done until the next day. If they give us a number to call for help, we cannot get any answer there.

"We are renting from Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation and, in our opinion, the water is not up to government standards. We have small babies and young children and we need water all the time.

"How do you tell a small child when he awakens in the middle of the night for a drink or a bottle of milk that there is no water? The water goes at all hours and we never know when we turn our taps on if we will have any water.

"We were on the town council water supply for awhile and, for reasons unknown, we were taken of it. The water was good and we request that we be put back on the town council water supply and not taken of it

again. If we cannot be put on the town water supply we would like another well and we would have to carry drinking water."

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that this be laid on the table and referred to the department to which it relates, presumably, the Minister responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn).

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the hon. member's petition. Where is it with respect to, specifically?

MR. BARRY:
Normore Crescent, Bell Island. They do not have adequate water and it is a Newfoundland and Labrador Housing area.

MR. DINN:
They are run now on a partial well system.

MR. BARRY:
They say they were hooked up to the town council.

MR. DINN:
They were hooked up to the town council water, that is correct, but the problem is the water pressure in that particular area.

Newfoundland and Labrador Housing is endeavoring to correct the situation. As with the petition the hon. member presented in the Spring with respect to ponds over there, we have those filled in. We have been working on that specific problem with the town council to see if there is a way possible to hook back up to the

water system, and, if not, then appropriate action will be taken by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
I thank the minister for that prompt answer. It is, I understand, a serious problem in that the water they are now plugged into is unfit for -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
I am sorry. I just want to thank the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. BARRY:
I appreciate what the Premier is saying, Mr. Speaker, but I do think I have to acknowledge and give credit where credit is due. I also want to thank the minister, as I have done publicly on Bell Island, and I think in this House before, for acting to fill in the holes that were left by the mining operation when this matter was brought to his attention by myself last year. I appreciate the co-operation that he gave to the town council on that matter and worked together with them in keeping me informed as to what was happening. I want to thank the minister but I would ask him, since it is being worked on, if he would give the Housing Corporation a little nudge so that the people do not have to put up with this situation for too long.

Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:
Motion 5.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Environment Act," carried. (Bill No. 45)

On motion, Bill No. 45 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:
Motion 6.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Management Accountants Act," carried. (Bill No. 48)

On motion, Bill No. 48 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:
Motion 7.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications to introduce a bill, "An Act To Convey Certain Trusts And Properties In The Province From Crown Trust Company To Central Trust Company," carried. (Bill No. 47)

On motion, Bill No. 47 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:
Motion 8.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Utilities Act," carried. (Bill No. 51)

On motion, Bill No. 51 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:
Motion 10.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I have just about finished my remarks, but there are a few points that I would like to make.

First of all, I think it is clear by now to everybody in this House that what the Premier is engaged in here is a phony fight. It is a pretense, Mr. Speaker, a charade, that is being carried on. If the Premier were serious about having unified opposition carried to Ottawa, he would have agreed to have a Select Committee appointed which, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, we propose that members individually pay for. We are not looking for a trip to Ottawa. We are saying that we are prepared to finance a trip to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, ourselves, and carry our opposition to Ottawa. And that would be much stronger, Mr. Speaker. I listened to the Premier this morning saying, 'Oh, it is too expensive.' Expensive for whom? Too expensive to go to Ottawa, too much cost. What a weak and flimsy excuse! What a misleading excuse, when the Premier heard us say in this House yesterday that we are prepared to pay our own way! So it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that is not the reason. That is not the reason! Yes, we will be enquiring where various trips have been

taken over the Summer months. And we will see if it is not too expensive to carry individuals to Japan -

MR. TULK:
Iceland.

MR. BARRY:
- or to Iceland -

MR. TULK:
Or Norway.

MR. BARRY:
- Norway. We will be interested in finding out how the Premier justifies these little junkets but feels that it is too expensive for him to go to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker.

We all know the real reason, Mr. Speaker, it is because his phoney fight would be shown up for what it is, just that, a totally phoney fight. He does not want to have any members of this House present when he goes up against that hard character, Mr. Speaker, who has been through the Second World War, has faced down individuals, I am afraid, a lot tougher than the Premier has been in recent months since the Tory Government was elected in Ottawa. When Nielsen fixes his beady eyes on the Premier, the Premier does not want anybody around. He does not want anybody around to see how he turns into a marshmallow, Mr. Speaker, and, in fact, will end up as a toasted marshmallow. The Premier does not want any witnesses to that shameful sight of the transformation, Mr. Speaker, from the fighting Newfoundland to political wimp in one federal election.

That is the main point here. What we are dealing with a phoney fight being brought to the floor of this Legislature when there is nobody

in this Province, Mr. Speaker, opposing the government's stand on factory freezer trawlers. We are all in opposition to factory freezer trawlers. It is a phoney fight because the fight should be carried to Ottawa and not to this House of Assembly, not to press releases and press conferences in this Province - to Ottawa.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take issue with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. He says it is a phoney fight, now if protecting jobs for thousands of Newfoundlanders down on the Burin Peninsula, down on the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland, if defending those people and protecting their jobs, if that is a phoney fight, I would like for the Leader of the Opposition to expound on that. We all know his interest in the fishery when the doors of Confederation Building were barred against the fishermen from down on the Burin Peninsula. Who barred the doors?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is a phoney fight because the Premier is shadow down here, Mr. Speaker. Instead of getting into a real battle in Ottawa, instead of going up and doing his job, Mr. Speaker, with his blue-blooded Tory brothers in Ottawa, which he should have done months ago, he should have done it

as quickly as the Liberal Fisheries critic did it, he would not be into this pickle.

That is why it is a phoney fight. It is a fight that he is carrying on here in the House of Assembly and he is afraid to go up to Ottawa to carry it on. We have asked him, "Come on up to Ottawa, we will pay our own way. We are not asking for our way to be paid." We will pay our own way and go up with the Premier, I am sure the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) will join us, and show that there is a united opposition to factory freezer trawlers. But let us not have this sham and this charade. Let us not pretend. Let us not give credibility, Mr. Speaker, to a phoney fight by supporting a phoney resolution in this House of Assembly. Because that is what is being done.

We had overheated telex wires, Mr. Speaker, when the former government was in Ottawa. The telex wires were melting, the transmitting towers could not keep up with the traffic, all telex business will come to a halt, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier went up to the eighth floor to his telex machine. He blocked the lines when there was a Liberal Government in Ottawa. He has now turned, Mr. Speaker, to sending up phoney resolutions instead of having the courage to go up himself and look at beady-eyed Nielsen right in his eyes. Look at beady-eyed Nielsen right in his eyes and say, "Mr. Nielsen, you are acting Federal Fisheries Minister but I am Premier of this Province and I have here a Select Committee here to back me up, another string in my bow." If he wants a string in his bow, we will give him a string in his bow - person to person, face to face.

Before I forget, I want to make sure that that amendment that I have tabled is proposed properly, because I am not sure I mentioned the seconder. I propose the amendment as tabled, seconded by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), so that there will be no attempts on the grounds of technicalities to evade the essence of this debate.

Mr. Speaker, the other point I wanted to make is that it is time that we had a resolution in this House to save John Crosbie, because that is the other great problem we have on the factory freezer trawler issue, the fact that we cannot find our federal representative in the Cabinet of Canada. Where is the Newfoundland representative? Where is John Crosbie? He is keeping such a low profile he cannot be seen. Now, why is that?

On this issue he says he is supporting the federal Fisheries Minister (Mr. Nielsen). Does it have anything to do with his being hauled before the federal Cabinet and dressed down like a little school boy, scolded, mocked, scorned and shamed in front of his peers? And, Mr. Speaker, how is it that that was leaked? Why was it leaked?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, Oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Why was it leaked to the press, Mr. Speaker, that John Crosbie had been hauled on the carpet. The R.C.M.P. investigated the leak of information to a member by the person who, in conscience, leaked information on the attempt to shaft the Natives in the North.

They sent the R.C.M.P. out to investigate that one. Why did the R.C.M.P. not go out and investigate who leaked the information that Mr. Crosbie had been shamed before his Cabinet colleagues? Because they did not have to investigate very far, all they had to do was go and look at Mr. Mulroney or his assistants and they would know where the leak came from.

Why was it that Mr. Coates was not hauled before the Cabinet?

MR. TULK:
Or Elmer McKay.

MR. BARRY:
Or Elmer McKay?

MR. PATTERSON:
What about Mr. Fox.

MR. TULK:
Get into the present 'William'.

MR. BARRY:
Or Mr. Fraser on Tunagate? Why were they not brought before Cabinet and given a public scolding and have it leaked to the press. I wonder if it had anything to do with the federal leadership campaign that he carried out?

MR. TULK:
No.

MR. BARRY:
I wonder is it because Mr. Crosbie had such a great showing in that and did such a good job as a spokesperson for this Province -

MR. TULK:
He had to be put down.

MR. BARRY:
- and on many issues, that he had to be put down? It is time for

the Premier of this Province to show a little leadership and to go up face to face with the Prime Minister of this country. We will be glad to have that Select Committee sit in on that too, but it is time for the Premier to say to the Prime Minister of this nation, 'We do not want to have our representative in the Cabinet of Canada shamed in this way. We need a federal minister who can be effective, not one who has been cut off at the knees by the Prime Minister.' That is why we are not seeing proper action to reject the National Sea application, it is because Mr. Mulroney has neutered our representative in the federal Cabinet.

MR. BAIRD:

Who neutered you?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Do you support application?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform members of this House that today we have sent a telex off to the hon. Erik Nielsen, and we have copied the Prime Minister and Newfoundland's seven M.P.s on our opposition to the introduction of factory freezer trawlers. We have also requested an immediate meeting.

Mr. Speaker, the telex reads as follows: "Hon. Erik Nielsen, Deputy Prime Minister and Acting Minister of Fisheries and Oceans: Dear Sir, We request, on an urgent basis, a meeting with yourself in your capacity as Acting Federal Minister of Fisheries to discuss in detail our arguments in opposition to any decision to licence factory freezer trawlers.

"An affirmative decision on your part would have the most dire

consequences on the Newfoundland inshore fishery and the 20,000 fishermen who prosecute it.

"We would take advantage of such a meeting to also present a report on the inshore fishery prepared by the Liberal caucus which would provide you with some valuable context for the decision we understand you are shortly to make."

That is signed by myself (Mr. Barry), and by the Opposition House Leader and Fisheries critic (Mr. Tulk) who was Chairman of the report of the Liberal Caucus Committee on the Inshore Fishery.

So we have copied our seven M.P.s, Mr. Speaker, we have copied the Prime Minister, and we have addressed this telex to the Acting Federal Fisheries Minister. We are prepared, we look forward to an early meeting with that minister so that we can bring our opposition to factory freezer trawlers directly to him, face to face, where it should be. We are prepared to carry the battle where it should be carried, to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, and not engage in the phony fights - I will table that telegram, Mr. Speaker - on the floor of the House of Assembly when there is no opposition to the government's position, when we are all united in saying that the application of National Sea should be rejected.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us get away from these petty, silly, partisan political attempts to make a political football out of a very serious issue. It does no credit to members opposite. It does no credit to government. It does not credit to the Premier to drag this issue down to the level of cheap, political theatrics which is what

we have ongoing in this house.

Let us together, all parties, all of us, if we have to, go to Ottawa to express our opposition face to face to those who will be making a decision that will affect this Province for years to come.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition just closed off a full hour of debate with a plea to those of us sitting on this side of the House, I suppose a plea to members sitting on the other side of the House, that this issue is so important that we should not even dare let it enter into our minds, partisan, political debate, he says. The great plea of eloquence, Mr. Speaker, emanating from the lips of the saviour of the fishery of Newfoundland. "Let this be an issue that is above partisan politics," he said. "Let there be unity in this Legislature," he said. "Let us not utter the dirty, scummy word 'politics'." And, Mr. Speaker, he spends fifty-nine minutes and about forty-five seconds doing nothing else only emanating politics. That is the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

I say to the members of this House, Mr. Speaker, and to the people of this Province, if they could have only heard him. There was not fifteen seconds, I would say to the hon. gentleman, spent on the substantive issue of what factory freezer trawlers and their introduction means to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. It was an hour long oration, Mr. Speaker, of nothing only partisan politics. Then he has the gall, Mr. Speaker, to end up that diatribe in the last five minutes

MR. YOUNG:

He is getting out. He is leaving.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, yes, he should depart. Because he had the gall then, in the last thirty seconds of his speech, Mr. Speaker, to implore us not to mention politics.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when I sat in another place in this House, I remember a former, former, former Leader of the Opposition saying to me, "Do not worry about the gentleman from Mount Scio, he is a schoolboy debater with a short fuse," and how true he was, Mr. Speaker, a schoolboy debater with a short fuse. Because, Mr. Speaker, we saw him shadowboxing yesterday. We saw him looking down behind his desk for rats and mice. Mr. Speaker, the man is losing his marbles.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

I mean, the hon. gentleman was talking about the mace. He was scurrying around behind his desk,

almost down on his knees. Mr. Speaker, the man is unstable. One of the greatest political issues that has faced this Province for years and the hon. gentleman is shadowboxing, looking for rats. Mr. Speaker, the man does not know what he is talking about. The former, former Leader of the Opposition was certainly right, school boy debater with a short fuse, and you can add to that, Mr. Speaker, somebody who blows his top very, very quickly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to take that anymore because I have twice gone to my constituents and they have sent me back here saying, "Carry on the good work Tommy boy." That is what they said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will say one other thing, I did not interrupt the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) when he was speaking and I will not be interrupted by the hon. rabbit when I am talking about elephants, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that on an issue that is so vital to the life blood of people living in all parts of this Province we had the Leader of the Opposition spend about fifty-nine minutes delivering a blatant, partisan political speech.

MR. CALLAN:

What are you doing now?

MR. RIDEOUT:

I am answering. It is one time in my ten years here, Mr. Speaker, that I wished both yesterday and for a few minutes this morning there could have been TV cameras in the House. I wish they could have been here because let the word go forth, Mr. Speaker, to the fishermen, let the word go forth to the fish plant workers, let the word go forth to the trawlermen, let the word go forth to the Rural Development Councils, let it go forth to the town councils all over Newfoundland and Labrador that the fisheries policy of the Opposition is dictated by the fact that they want a trip to Ottawa. That is their policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, there was no substantive debate from the alternate Premier, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman on the other side who holds himself out as the saviour to Newfoundland and Labrador, who wants to dispose of this gentleman and come over here, the alternate Premier never had a substantive word to say about the effect of factory freezer trawler technology on the fishermen and fish plant workers in this Province, not a word, Mr. Speaker. So let that word go out today, let it go out today to all parts of Newfoundland and Labrador that the fishery policy of the Opposition is framed around a Select Committee on which two or three of their members sit, getting a jaunt to Ottawa. That was the only point that the hon. gentleman made in his debate.

MR. W. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

On a point of order, the hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

The hon. member is misleading, and maybe deliberately misleading. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), Mr. Speaker, made it quite clear a moment ago that we have requested a meeting and it will be at our own expense. We are not asking that the taxpayers finance a trip to Ottawa. We are not asking that. We are prepared to go at our expense, as we did when we took the trips around the Province on our select committee. So I think the hon. member should retract that and set the record straight.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) what we are doing here. We are debating an amendment put down by his leader, Mr. Speaker, which wants to send a Select Committee to Ottawa and I am responding to the fairy tale hour that the hon. Leader of the Opposition spent in this House yesterday and today. That is what I am doing, Mr. Speaker, and that is what I will continue to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, let that word go out that the Opposition in this Province has no policy. Their policy on the fisheries is based around sending a Select Committee to Ottawa. That is what it is all about.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

The Speaker has to rule on the point of order.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I am sorry, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:

I ruled on that point of order.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, I thought you had.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

So, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the hon. gentleman standing up in his place for an hour yesterday and a few minutes this morning saying, "We are all beating as one heart, we are all on your side on factory freezer trawlers, we are against factory freezer trawlers," when there is an opportunity for the Liberal Opposition and every political party in this Province to unanimously support a resolution going forward from this House to Ottawa saying that the Legislature of Newfoundland is unanimously united against the bringing in of that policy, and what does the Leader of the Opposition say? The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) says, I am not going to support that resolution because I want a trip to Ottawa, that is what the Leader of the Opposition is saying.

We saw again, Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, in this Legislature how dedicated the Liberal Opposition was to fisheries and fishery related matters in this Province when there were only members from this side of the House who would debate a private member's resolution that impacts so much on fishermen in all parts of the Province. So, Mr. Speaker, let us

be clear, there will be, if the Opposition carries out their announced intentions on this resolution, there will be a clear and unmistakable message go from this Province to the lobbyist who are lobbying in favour of that application, that Newfoundland, the Legislature of Newfoundland and Labrador is not unanimous against the introduction of factory freezer trawler technology. That is the bottom line, Mr. Speaker. And let me say further, Mr. Speaker, if by some stretch of the imagination that application should be approved, the only break in the string of opposition in Newfoundland and Labrador to that application will rest on the heads of the hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Speaker. Let there be no mistake about that, because everybody else in this Province that you can mention agrees. They may want to say, 'Me too!' Well, Mr. Speaker, the time has come to get off the fence on this issue. You cannot have it both ways. There is an opportunity here now for the Liberal Party to put its money where its mouth is, there is an opportunity for them to do that and not to go dancing around looking for mice or other hidden articles in the Legislature, but to concentrate their efforts on supporting this resolution. It has nothing offensive in it, there is no political partisan 'whereas' in it. There is nothing in it that you cannot support. It is a motherhood resolution on a motherhood issue, on an issue that is vital to Newfoundland and Labrador. But the small minds opposite cannot even wrap themselves around the smallest of principles, and that is the problem with the Opposition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN:

How about the Baie Verte mine operation?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I will be quite happy to speak on the Baie Verte mine at the appropriate time in the legislature.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The Minister of Fisheries has been up spouting off about the fact that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) did not get into the substantive issue of this debate. Are we to presume he is? Now I do not want him to let his blood pressure boil and get carried away over there, but I ask him if he would get into the substantive issues in this debate rather than talking this partisan nonsense he is getting on with over there.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman cannot take the heat let him leave the kitchen. I spent an hour listening to his Leader, about fifty-nine minutes and forty-five seconds, Mr. Speaker, listening to his Leader do nothing else only shadowbox and talk about partisan politics. Mr. Speaker, I will use my time as I see fit.

MR. TULK:

Good! So will we.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Sure you will, and there will be no objection, Mr. Speaker. So that is a lot of foolishness. Let me answer some of the other inaccuracies that were contained in the hon. gentleman's speech. It was difficult to find anything other than political nonsense, but let me try to answer some of the other inaccuracies that were contained in his speech.

MR. CALLAN:
Get on with it.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, is there anything in Beauséjour that could be used to sort of either choke or silence the hon. gentleman for Bellevue (Mr. Callan)?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Minister of Fisheries wishes to be heard in silence.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:
The Leader of the Opposition Mr. Speaker, likes to tout himself and his party as being the first people in Newfoundland to raise an objection to the National Sea application for factory freezer technology, the first people he said, Mr. Speaker. Well let the Leader of the Opposition go back to the Fishermen's Broadcast on the same day that the news broke. The very same day, Mr. Speaker, that the news broke, in an interview done with me from Hawkes Bay, where I was up visiting the opening of the shrimp festival, among other things -

MR. DOYLE:
Was the member there?

MR. RIDEOUT:
No, the member was not there, as a matter of fact. Let him go back

and check the tapes of the Fishermen's Broadcast on that day and see what the official position of this government was. The very same day, Mr. Speaker, that the news broke that the application had been sent to Ottawa, and I made no bones about it, mentioning the restructuring agreement, mentioning the previous policy that had been in place since 1979, that this Province would stand four square against an application by National Sea to introduce factory freezer technology to take Northern cod.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the very same day, the same day that I was made aware of it, the same day that the news broke that the application had been filed, I said, again in that interview, that I had already registered our opposition to the federal Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa and I was seeking more details on the application. How more competent than that can you be? You hear the Leader of the Opposition and his spokesman trying to suggest to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that they had been the first to stand up, Mr. Speaker, for the rights of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians against factory freezer technology. Well, we can see what they are doing, Mr. Speaker. They will take to the airwaves saying, 'We are for you.' They will take to the airwaves saying, 'We are against this application.' But when the time comes to stand as one in this Legislature then they have to straddle the fence, Mr. Speaker, either that or look for a trip to Ottawa. That is the bottom line on it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition also said that the fight has to be carried to

Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, let me tell this House that the fight has been carried to Ottawa. The fight has been carried to Ottawa because that is rightly where it should be carried. There is no debate on that. But it has been carried to Ottawa by the Premier, by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) and by myself, and we will continue to carry the fight to Ottawa. And never let it be said, Mr. Speaker, unlike the Liberals, unlike the Opposition, that we are afraid to tangle with people of our own political stripe if we think they are about to make a decision that is injurious to Newfoundland and Labrador. We are Newfoundlanders and Labradorians first, Mr. Speaker. We stand up for the rights of Newfoundland and Labrador first. If from time to time that may cause us to have some disagreement with our federal colleagues, then, Mr. Speaker, we will do it because it is right and proper that we do it because we have been elected to this Legislature to serve the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and not serve the people of the Yukon or the Northwest Territories or British Columbia. It does not make you any less a Canadian to stand up for Newfoundland and Labrador.

So we have taken the fight to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. We have done it time after time, day after day, week after week, since this whole application process started, starting on the first day that it was made public that the application had been filed. So, Mr. Speaker, we have not been lax in our duty. We have not sat back and waited for the Liberal Opposition or somebody else to take the thought and run with it. We have done it ourselves because

it is right and proper that we do it.

What are we doing here, Mr. Speaker, in this resolution now? We are asking this Legislature to unanimously support the rejection of that application. Yet we find, Mr. Speaker, in our own House, in our own Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, with the Federation of Municipalities behind us, with the Federation of Labour behind us, with the Fishermen's Union behind us, with the Rural Development Council behind us, with every town council and community council in Newfoundland and Labrador behind us, that we can get Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to unite, Mr. Speaker, we can get them to stand up for a cause, we can get everybody to stand up for Newfoundland but fifteen or sixteen Liberals. It is a shameful day for Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

It is a shameful day, Mr. Speaker. It would almost make you ashamed to say that you are a Newfoundlander, that they cannot put partisan politics aside for a day - not even a day, Mr. Speaker. They cannot put it aside for a couple of hours. They cannot throw it out for a couple of hours.

I would not be giving this kind of speech today, Mr. Speaker, if I never listened to the lead off speech by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. I would not be giving this kind of speech.

MR. CALLAN:

I thought the Premier led it off.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The Premier led it off for this side. I am talking about what was led off from the other side. The Premier talked about Clause 12 of restructuring. Mr. Speaker, the Premier talked about the quality argument on FFTs. The Premier talked about the displacement of employment, he talked about the regional development concept and the natural advantage concept, he talked about the French factory freezer trawler issue, enterprise allocation - all substantive issues, Mr. Speaker, because it is on those intellectually substantive issues that we should make our argument. It is on those intellectually sound issues, Mr. Speaker, that our arguments should rest. It is on those intellectually sound issues that our case should rest. There should be no argument about that. There should be no argument about the effect of Clause 12 in the restructuring agreement. There should be no argument about the quality issue. National Sea are cursing themselves for even mentioning quality. They got blown out of the water by Fed Fish, they got blown out of the water by the Province, they got blown out of the water by the industry, they got blown out of the water by the market place, yet Mr. Cummings still takes his two pieces of fish and goes into meetings. That is what our argument should rest on, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

That is what it does rest on.

MR. RIDEOUT:

But what did we find in this Legislature yesterday and today? We found no debate from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). He never talked about quality. He

made a very, very cursory reference to Clause 12 of the restructuring agreement. He never talked about quality, never mentioned it, and I listened attentively to all his speech. He never mentioned the fact that one factory freezer trawler will displace about 300 jobs.

The Leader of the Opposition never mentioned that, Mr. Speaker. I believe he gave every indication, at least he did not say otherwise, that he and his party are willing to accept National Sea's argument that this is an application for one FFT. He never said otherwise, Mr. Speaker. He certainly never said otherwise, when National Sea, in their own road show, Mr. Speaker - I saw it in Ottawa last week, their own road show, their own Show and Tell, with their cameras and their video and their packages of fish under their arm - are saying, 'We want three.' They are saying, Mr. Speaker, 'That is just National Sea.' Well, if you are going to displace 300 jobs on one FFT, three are going to displace 900. And if National Sea gets three, FPI is going to want one or two, Mr. Speaker. They are going to have to compete in the market place.

Mersey Sea Foods are going to want some and other independents in Nova Scotia are going to want some. But that is a substantive issue, a sound intellectual argument that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) did not even refer to, Mr. Speaker, never mentioned it.

It is crazy. It is criminal, Mr. Speaker. It is criminal that the alternate Premier, the person over there who wants to come over here, could spend an hour debating an issue that is vital to

Newfoundland and Labrador and not mention the substantive issues at all. It is shameful. The whole gist of his argument was we have to have a Select Committee,

MR. TULK:

You thought you had an agreement.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) will speak next, I assume. I will tell you right now, before he gets up, he will not be hearing me shouting at him. He will not hear me because, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I can be courteous in this House if I cannot be anything else. So perhaps the hon. gentleman should remember that. He can make his points with all of the flare and rhetoric that he possesses and he will not hear a word of intervention from me. That is the way it should be in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) never referred to the disaster that could face this Province on the French factory freezer trawler issue, never made one reference to it in his speech. Mr. Speaker, if there is anything else, leaving aside the quality arguments, leaving aside enterprise allocations, leaving aside the displacement of employment, if there is anything else that has the capacity to so detrimentally affect the future of the fishery in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and along the East and Northeast Coast of Newfoundland is the potential of having ten St. Pierre - Miquelon registered factory freezer trawlers fishing off our coast.

MR. TULK:

He mentioned that, you were not

listening.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The Premier mentioned it, Mr. Speaker, but there was not even a 'me too,' I agree, there was not even a 'me too' from the Leader of the Opposition. Because they are fishing there now, Mr. Speaker, under the treaty rights on equal footing with Canadian vessels.

Mr. Speaker, the minute we licence one FFT, then the equal footing clause is changed and that treaty allows up to ten other vessels of French registry, registered in St. Pierre and Miquelon, to demand that they be restored to an equal footing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it registers with members of this House how important that is? Never mind what could come in belonging to ourselves, from Nova Scotia or Newfoundland or whatever, but there is the potential for ten others to demand that they remain at equal footing with the Canadian vessels.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you can say goodbye to Fogo, or LaScie, or Twillingate or dozens and dozens of other communities around this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, let me say as well that External Affairs - talk about supporting Ottawa - are the people who are really, really concerned, in addition to Fisheries, about the effect that this could have on the fishing interests of Atlantic Canada. But we do not hear anything about that. I mean, that is a substantive argument, Mr. Speaker, that is something that you can go before anybody with and intellectually defend your argument, but we did not hear that, we did not hear that at all.

MR. BAIRD:

What is the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) going to do about it?

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, anybody who researches, and the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) would know this, the case that Canada made for the 200 mile economic zone -

MR. BAKER:

Thanks to Don Jamieson.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thanks Don Jamieson. - would know that Canada's argument was based on natural advantage and access to the stock by the people most contiguous to the stock. That was Canada's argument leading up to the declaration of 200 miles in 1977, and that has been the argument of Newfoundland ever since.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) speak for an hour and from time to time he and his Fisheries critic will get up in the House and they will rail about extension of jurisdiction to include the Nose and Tail of the Banks. Mr. Speaker, by voting against this resolution they will vote against that. There is a clause in this resolution saying that we should carry on and intensify and continue to intensify our efforts to have the 200 mile economic zone extended not only to include the Nose and Tail of the Banks but also the Flemish Cap. Then the Leader of the Opposition will throw up his arms and say because I cannot get a trip to Ottawa I am going to vote against that, too.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come. Everybody else in this Province, including verbally the Opposition, say that we are one. Everybody says we are one, Mr. Speaker, on this issue. Well, whenever this resolution comes to a vote, today or the end of next week, or the end of the week after, or whatever, whenever this resolution comes to a vote the people of Newfoundland and Labrador will know whether we are one. The lobbyists who are lobbying for approval of this application in the corridors of Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, will know whether we are one or not. As I said in my introduction, Mr. Speaker, if the universe unfolds as it should and the Opposition carry out their threat to vote against his resolution, then in the final analysis if it should fail, the failure will rest on the heads of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, there is a non-partisan speech, I tell you! I am at a complete loss to understand what all the shouting is about. It is no secret that members on this side of the House are not prepared to support the factory freezer trawler concept. Our House Leader (Mr. Tulk), the Chairman of the Caucus Committee on Fisheries, made it quite clear publicly where we stood immediately after the announcement came out of Ottawa that an

application was being considered for factory freezer trawlers. The Premier, of course, waited two weeks. I think he had to sit around and study the application and maybe gauge public opinion on it before he made any comment on it. But, certainly, for the party of which I am a member, my friend, the House Leader made it quite clear where we stood on it. There is no we are opposed to factory freezer trawlers. We are opposed to the application by National Sea for one, five, ten, fifteen or twenty.

MR. TULK:

Or even half a one.

MR. W. CARTER:

Or even half a one. We are absolutely opposed to it. And that is why this resolution is a waste of time. What is wrong, Mr. Speaker, with a delegation from this House going to Ottawa to eyeball the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Nielsen) and the Prime Minister? What is wrong with an all-party delegation from this House going to Ottawa and maybe having a national press conference? What better way to focus public attention on the problem and what better way to let the people of Canada know where we stand on the issue of factory freezer trawlers?

But no, the Premier is not willing to do that. The Premier is not prepared to go whole hog and have a delegation go to Ottawa. He would rather bring in, as my friend, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), said a moment ago, this Motherhood resolution - and that is what it is, it is a Motherhood resolution - bring it in, get the House to agree to it, maybe hope that the Opposition would not vote for it, it might

very well be that kind of a trap, and, at his leisure, then, to stick it in an envelope and mail it to the acting Minister of Fisheries and maybe to the Prime Minister.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Via Hong Kong.

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, as my friend says, probably via Hong Kong.

Mr. Speaker, that, in my view, is not being serious. If the Premier is serious about opposing this application, then why not let us go to Ottawa, like I said, eyeball the ministers concerned, if necessary, have a national press conference, focus public attention on the problem and then, let us see where we stand?

Instead of that, we are going to be here wasting time discussing an issue on which we all agree. I notice in The Evening Telegram, by the way, a few days ago, on page 3, one of the captions on a story, 'Peckford taking FFT battle to the House of Assembly'. What battle? Mr. Speaker, I presume to do battle there must be an opposing force. There is no point in doing battle amongst yourselves. There is no point in the House members doing battle with themselves. I do not believe I can speak for my friend, the member for Behibek (Mr. Fenwick), or maybe I can, when I say that there is nobody in this House favouring factory freezer trawlers. I will go even further and say that there is probably nobody in this Province who would favour that kind of a concept. The Premier on April 2 was given a decisive mandate to govern this Province. It may be his last one, but at least, he was given that

mandate on April 2 to govern. He does not have to put on this charade about going to the various municipalities and service associations conducting this paper war, soliciting the people's views on this issue. Newfoundlanders have already made their position known on it.

MR. FUREY:

They are ducking their responsibility.

MR. W. CARTER:

They are ducking their responsibility. They are killing time.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) final issue (inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

That is right, we are killing time now, soliciting the views of the various service clubs and others. That is valuable time lost.

I am inclined to believe, Mr. Speaker, that this motion, like a lot of other motions that have been brought in by the Premier and by the government, is nothing more or less than a cover-up, a smoke screen. They are trying to take the heat off themselves for their neglect of Newfoundland's most basic industry, the fishery.

What about the plants in Harbour Grace and Old Perlican and Port de Grave? What about the fifteen orphaned plants now owned by Fishery Products International? I do not see any great outcry from the Premier or from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) or from the government, as to what just might happen to these plants. I do not think there is too much concern being expressed by the members opposite as to what is

going to happen to the 3,000 or 4,000 people in Harbour Grace who depend on that plant for a job. The Premier, of course - and this is his style; he has used it before, we all know that - stripped to the waist, giving the impression of being the 'fighting Newfoundlander', the Whipper Billy Watson of the Newfoundland House of Assembly and Newfoundland politics, coming in here fighting an issue with people who agree entirely with what he is saying.

I want to make it quite clear, Mr. Speaker - I do not equivocate whatsoever - that I oppose the entry of factory freezer trawlers into the fishery off our coast. I think it is wrong. I think Newfoundland is a factory trawler, as it were, anchored and stationed right in the middle of the North Atlantic. If there is anything we do not need here in this Province it is factory freezer trawlers.

What the government should be doing, rather than wasting their time trying to create issues, trying to pick a fight in a House where there is no need for a fight, they should be spending their time and effort trying to rescue what is left of the inshore fishery. If Newfoundland has a future in the fishery, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that that future lies with the inshore fishery, the best way of catching and processing fish. I might add, probably the freshest fish that is ever landed and processed comes in by way of the inshore fishery.

The Minister of Fisheries made reference to the speech of my leader suggesting that he did not make any reference to some of the real issues. He talked about the French freezer trawlers and how the Leader of the Opposition did

not have the interest to even make reference to the problem that these trawlers are posing. There is one thing I have noticed - and I have seen it frequently in the past few days - that the hon. members opposite, maybe it is the result of being scared; maybe it is what happens when you are running scared; they become personally abusive.

It is one thing to get up and criticize a minister for his conduct as a minister or the way in which he is administering his department, but the ministers and the Premier seem now to have resorted to abusive type politics, using words like unstableness and other words which I will not even repeat. They are becoming blatantly personal, Mr. Speaker, and blatantly abusive. These same people, including the Minister of Fisheries, have the audacity to get in the House and to accuse the Opposition of being political and making political speeches. I do not think the people of Newfoundland are going to buy that.

I wish the members opposite and I wish my friend and namesake, even though we are no relation, I wish they would have taken the time and trouble this year, I wish the member for St. Mary's - The Capes, for example, would have taken the trouble this year, to have gone out, as we did - and I might add, at our own expense, we did not have our fingers into the government till when we went out to get money to travel and to live it up - and to mix with the fishermen, to have meetings with them and to listen to them. I wish, Mr. Speaker, that these members would have taken that time and trouble because they would have learned one very important fact, as we did.

In the debate a few days ago, on Wednesday, the Private Member's Bill, when the member for Labrador debated his motion, Mr. Speaker, with respect to unemployment insurance, they were absolutely flabbergasted that the members on this side did not take part in that debate. Well, let me tell you why, Mr. Speaker. If there is one thing that we learned on our trips around the Province this year as a caucus committee, if there is one very important lesson that we learned and one very important point that was being driven home at every meeting we went to, on every stagehead and wharf that we congregated, it was that it is time to stop talking and time to do something about the fishery. Action not words, Mr. Speaker, is what the fishermen in this Province want.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

They are not impressed with members opposite getting up and expressing or displaying their new found interest in what is happening out there. The fishermen of this Province want action and we made it quite clear, when we attended our meetings, in the introductory remarks -

MR. BAIRD:

Who is we?

MR. W. CARTER:

The Opposition Caucus Committee on the Fishery.

MR. BAIRD:

There are no fishermen at the wharf in Gander. That is crap.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, when we had our meetings in eighteen or twenty places along the Province, we made it quite clear to the people who were in attendance that we were not there to talk to them, we were there to listen. That impressed them, I think, and that is why we learned so much. We gave them a chance to loosen up and to unload their problems and to tell us some of their thought and views. Like I said a moment ago, one of the very important messages that came through without a doubt at all the meetings was that "we are sick and tired of talk. All you fellows seem to do in the House of Assembly is talk. You do nothing else."

That is why we are not going to get involved in any long debate on the motion that was presented to this House by the member for Labrador because there is no need of it. What point is served by standing up here and wasting three or four days discussing a problem with which we all agree anyway? And the same thing applies now. We are here a couple of days talking about the factory freezer trawlers, the smoke screen resolution introduced by the Premier.

I would like for some of the members opposite, by the way, to enlighten the House and the people of Newfoundland. Where does John Crosbie stand in all of this? Where does Jim McGrath stand? Where does Captain Morrissey Johnson stand on the factory freezer trawler application?

MR. CALLAN:

Captain Morrissey Johnson does not stand anywhere.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that it is not in this House that the fight should be taking place.

MR. BAIRD:

Where does Brian Tobin stand on it.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, this should not be the battle ground of this resolution. I contend, Sir, that the fight is in Ottawa and we should take that fight to Ottawa. Mr. Crosbie, if he had any guts or any real interest in this Province

MR. BAIRD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BAIRD:

I think the word that hon. member just mentioned, "guts," is certainly in Beauchesne and it is not a parliamentary comment. I ask the member to withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, if my words have offended the hon. minister, I know he has a very sensitive attitude and very sensitive ears, may I rephrase and say that maybe if the minister in Ottawa, if our Cabinet representative had the intestinal fortitude then maybe we would be much better off. Maybe our fight

to save the Newfoundland fishery and to ward off the application of Nat Sea for a factory freezer trawler licence would be much further advanced. That is to the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAIRD:

He ruled there is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have already ruled there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting by the way that the Members of Parliament who represent the Liberal Party from Newfoundland in Ottawa are on record. They have made their views known on it without any doubt whatever, without any qualification. They are absolutely opposed to the application of Nat Sea, as we are, but I have not heard the same, except, I believe, for one exception, the member for Burin-St. George's (Mr. Price). I believe he has in a way, at least put himself on record, as being against the application. I have not heard one syllable, not one word from the member for St. John's West (Mr. J. Crosbie), Newfoundland's representative in the Federal Cabinet. I have not heard a word. Yes, I have heard something from the member for St. John's East (Mr. J. McGrath), representing the PC Party in Ottawa. I believe his contribution to the whole debate was that, "Well, I am glad I am not Minister of Fisheries." That was said with tongue in cheek, no doubt. I think the member would like to be Minister of Fisheries. But what he is saying, Mr.

Speaker, that he did not want to have to deal with that problem. And like I said, the other gentleman, the member for Bonavista-Trinity-Conception, I do not think he said a word about it. There has been no utterance whatever from that member as to where he stands on the issue.

Mr. Speaker, the problems facing the Newfoundland fishery today are very, very serious, and try as the Premier will and the government will, the problems of the factory freezer trawler is not the greatest problem facing the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, like I said a moment ago, the debate that we are involved in is absolutely unnecessary. It is a waste of time. A complete and utter waste of time.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That will go around.

MR. W. CARTER:

That will go around. I hope it does. And the people in Twillingate district know where I stand on the matter of factory freezer trawlers.

MR. BAIRD:

Do they know how you are going to vote?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

They know where I stand on it, Mr. Speaker and how I vote is my own business. I do not think the hon. members opposite have the right to presume how any of us will vote. Maybe, that is what they will want. Maybe they want our party to vote against it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You will vote as your Leader tells you.

MR. W. CARTER:

Why would they be afraid to vote to send a delegation to Ottawa? If they are serious, if they have any interest at whatever in preserving the Newfoundland fishery and in doing anything that will be beneficial to the Newfoundland fishery, in stopping the application of National Sea for the factory freezer trawler, what is wrong with going to Ottawa as a delegation representing the people's House? This is an issue bigger than one party. It is bigger than the governing party or the Opposition Party. It is bigger than the Premier. It is bigger than the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and others on the other side of the House. So why not go to Ottawa?

It is insulting, absolutely insulting and beneath a minister of the Crown to stand in his place, Mr. Speaker, and to suggest that all we want is a free trip to Ottawa. You know that is hardly worthy of comment. Probably I should not even dignified its author or the comment itself by commenting on it.

The hon. minister can take an entourage of officials with him to Dallas, Texas. He can take an entourage of officials with him to Iceland, Norway, a few days ago, I believe, to West Germany, he and the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), I believe, the Minister of Forest Resources and Land (Mr. Simms). They can travel around the globe, they can become world travellers at the people's expense. Yet, when it comes to, maybe, and I say maybe because I think most members here, certainly

on this side, if the crunch comes, we will pay our own way to Ottawa, if we have to.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

If we have to we will. And we will. If the meeting that we have requested is agreed to, we will be going and we will be paying our own way to the Nation's Capital.

In light of that, Mr. Speaker, for the minister to get up, a member for government who is not to shy when it comes to world travel, and to suggest that all that we want is a free trip to Ottawa is beneath a minister of the Crown. I know I have been to Ottawa enough that a free trip to Ottawa does not mean that much to me. I will tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minister of Fisheries Acting (Mr. Nielsen), and I underline the word acting, accedes to our request for a meeting, I am prepared to go and buy my own ticket, if I have to.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

That is what I will. I will buy my own ticket and I will go to Ottawa. I view this problem as sufficiently serious and important, that I am prepared to put my money where my mouth is.

As my friend from St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) reminded me, we did it this Summer, the committee, by the way, that has caused the members opposite so much unrest. It stirred up so much unrest in them, oh, they have been petrified. We met one of their members in Gander and he was almost afraid to ask where we were.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, we met one of their backbenchers in Gander during the visits we were having and he was literally afraid to ask us how many meetings we were having and where we were going. He did not want to hear about it. He was petrified. He was absolutely petrified that we were going around taking the time and effort to visit the fishermen in our Province and to give them a chance to express their views on their very serious problems. We brought back the report. We tabled it. I suppose the members opposite are unwilling, even in their own minds, to accept the fact that such a report exists. Certainly they are not prepared to make any comment on it.

MR. BAIRD:

You are not a bad fellow, you are just with the wrong party.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I will clue up in a couple of minutes, others want to speak. I say to you now that the Premier of this Province, the government of this Province were elected to govern. They have a decisive mandate given to them by the people of Newfoundland on April 2. They know and I know and Mr. Speaker knows where the people of Newfoundland stand on this issue. They know that Newfoundlanders, to a man and to a woman oppose the application of National Sea for factory freezer trawlers. They know that we oppose it. In fact, as I said earlier, our position in that regard was made known to the Newfoundland people long before theirs. In fact, while the Premier was equivocating, sitting around,

waiting, wondering what was going to happen, how he would react with respect to his friends in Ottawa on such an application, while he was begging for time to study the application, we were publicly opposing it. So our view are well known and to even suggest that we are in favour of factory freezer trawlers, like I said, is hardly worthy of comment.

I would like to know, as I said a moment ago, the position of our federal Cabinet minister. The members opposite very carefully, by the way, avoided that question. Maybe the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) can tell us how Mr. Crosbie feels on the application or maybe the Minister of Finance can tell us? Certainly the people of Newfoundland do not know where Mr. Crosbie stands on the application or where the other Tory members in the House of Commons stand on it, with maybe one exception. I think they are afraid to ask. I actually believe that they are afraid to ask because they are afraid of what the answer might be.

We all witnessed, of course, quite an event here in September. The Premier's Conference was held here in St. John's and our Premier was front row center as he was the man who headed up the conference this year. It is rather interesting to note - and this is one of the points that was made in the course of our trips around the Province - that more discussion took place at that Premier's Conference on South African wine and whether or not there would be sanctions imposed against South Africa than what took place on the fishery. In fact, when the conference ended, the Premier made a point to say that there was some discussion on it but that he would make sure

that the matter would be placed on the agenda at the next Premier's Conference to be held in Halifax some time in November. Now there is a sense of urgency I will tell you. That is a great sense of urgency.

Mr. Speaker, that is about all I have to say on this resolution except, in winding up, to say that we are opposed to factory freezer trawlers. We believe that Newfoundlanders should fight the concept with all of the vigor and the strength that we have. We believe that that can be better done by going to Ottawa, sitting down with the Cabinet, if necessary, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Fisheries and having it out up there.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I had intended to speak on this motion. I thank the invitation from the hon. member opposite who just spoke that I do speak to the issue. I really did not need it. I intended to speak on it anyway but only relatively briefly because I know that there are many people on this side of the House who want to address this important issue.

It is an important issue and it is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that most of the comments coming from the other side have such a strong political tinge to them. If you just listen to the comments from

the members opposite you would think that this is just a little political game, a little political football, an issue to be used for just scoring a few points and of no particular consequence. That is a tremendous shame, Mr. Speaker, because it is an extremely important issue to the whole fabric of life in this Province.

Now, I am not saying that there should not be politics in the fisheries. There should be politics in the fisheries. It is such an issue that it requires political content. I have no objection to political discussion in regard to the fisheries because the fishery has always been important to the politics of this Province. People expect politicians and people in public life to be concerned about the fisheries and there always will be politics connected with fisheries in this Province. But I think it is important that it be the right type of politics, that the political content should move the thing forward, the interest of the people forward, it should not be there just to score ridiculous little points that we are finding from the other side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, just to underline the seriousness, I have had the opportunity of going to a number of meetings in other parts of the country and it is amazing the number of people who will come up and, out of the blue, quite gratuitously, and these are people who really know what is going on, they will come up and say, "I guess the factory freezer trawler issue will have to be resolved in National Sea's favour will it not because this is the way to go, this is the way of the future. We understand there is some

opposition in Newfoundland on it but, of course, it does not stand up to a logical argument. Is that not the case?"

Now those remarks are made by people you would expect to know better, and the reason why they make those remarks is because there has already been put in place a tremendous campaign throughout Canada to convince decision-makers to go in favour of the National Sea approach to factory freezer trawlers. That campaign has been ongoing, I presume, for six months or longer because people who really have no particular connection with the fishery or those whom you would not expect to have to many views on the fishery, they are already parroting the National Sea line. It is an extremely important issue and it has to be dealt with extremely seriously. We have to get away from this scoring little points, you know, I am going to put you down and that type of thing. We cannot deal with this issue on that basis.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to come back to that a little bit later on because I think there is another very important point in regard to politics in the fisheries to be made. But before doing that, just again to underline what is going on here.

We all know that Ontario and Quebec have very large and important pulp and paper industries. Just supposing some other province went to Ontario or Quebec and said, "I am going to take your wood supply away from your pulp and paper industries. I am going to take that supply out of your Province." Mr. Speaker, I am not referring to wood that is surplus to the needs of the paper

mills in Ontario or Quebec, I am saying the wood that is now being used by those operations there. What would be the response of the governments in those provinces? What would be the public response? What would be the outcry across the country? The outcry would be, "you cannot do that, you cannot take the supply away from a plant and have the workers in the plant come in the next morning to carry on their job and there is nothing to do. That is totally and utterly ridiculous! Whoever would dream up such a foolish scheme and who would ever allow it?"

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the factory freezer trawler situation is coming to here. The National Sea are coming and saying, there is a supply out there that is needed in Newfoundland - I do not even think that National Sea would deny it is needed in Newfoundland - however, we are going to take that supply away from you and bring it elsewhere. Of course, our natural response is that is that if you do that, you are immediately impacting negatively on our workers.

Mr. Speaker, how did this come about? Why did this come about? Why is it that it is totally inconceivable in Ontario and in Quebec in regard to the wood supply but it seems to have an aura of sensibility when it applies to our supply in this part of the world in regard to fish. Why has that come about? The reason why it has come about is because of the Terms of Union with which we entered into with Canada.

When we entered into the Confederation we passed over the

authority for the allocation of the fishery supply to the federal government. It should never have been done. It is stupid that it was done. I might say it was done largely because of a certain persuasion in this Province. It was not done by most people in this Province. It was done by a certain persuasion in this Province, a persuasion which ultimately gave rise to the Liberal Party in this Province. It was a stupid thing to do, but it was done.

The important point, though, is that it was never done in a way that was intended to take the supply away. If there was any sense to it at all, it was done to control the thing for the benefit of the people of this Province, in a maximal way, and perhaps for other areas of the country, also, but it certainly was never intended to be done so that the supply could be taken away from this Province and given somewhere else. It was never done to create a situation here that no one would think of creating in regard to the wood supply in Ontario or in Quebec.

So what we are seeing here is a perversion. The National Sea application is a perversion of what is allowed under the Canadian Constitution, as it is reflected in our Terms of Union. It is not something that those people who have been brainwashed in other parts of the country have learned from the campaign that has been put forward by National Sea over the last six months, it is not something that is sensible and logical and has to come about and is proper and right, it is a perversion of what we allowed to misguidedly happen. We should never have allowed it to happen,

but we did allow it to happen. It is a perversion of what we misguidedly allowed to happen when we entered into the Confederation in 1949.

I would just like that to be clear. We are on the most high moral grounds in fighting this. We are not doing it greedily. We are not even doing it from an economic benefit point of view. We are doing it to protect this Province against another perversion of our Terms of Union with Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just let get back again for one moment, because I said I was not going to speak too long on this, to the politics of this situation. The politics of the situation here, coming from the other side, is "we want to go up as a Liberal Opposition in Newfoundland and meet with the federal government and we want to bring forth our case." Now, that is the politics that is coming through from there. That is, of course, a totally transparent type of politics. The type of politics that should come through from the opposite side is the politics that says, "we are going up and we are going to hammer the Federal Liberal Opposition into speaking out strongly against factory freezer trawlers." That is the proper politics that should come from over there. That is the politics that we did in opposition, or at least we did when the Liberal government was in control of the federal levers of power and the P.C.s were in opposition. We went up and we said to the P.C.s in opposition, "You stand up there and defend the rights of this Province in regard to the offshore." And they came forward. The federal P.C. Party in opposition came out strongly,

to a man, and demanded that Newfoundland get its rights. Now, that was the proper politics of that situation, and what the proper politics of this situation should be from the Opposition point of view. They should be up there meeting with Mr. Turner and his cohorts and saying, "We want you to make it clear every day of the week in the House of Commons, in public statements, that we are totally behind Newfoundland's case on the factory freezer trawlers."

Now, where have we seen that? Are we seeing the members opposite doing that? And there are some good members over there who, I am sure, in their hearts feel that way. The hon. member who just sat down, I am sure he feels in his heart that way.

I implore members opposite to get your politics straight on this issue. Go and see your Liberal friends in Ottawa and tell them, "for God's sake, do not continue this perversion of our Terms of Union, get behind Newfoundland in this fight and make the people of Canada stand up in one voice saying that Newfoundland is right and their rights should be protected."

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is a very interesting debate because we have a resolution put

forward by the Premier and we have an amendment put forward by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and the Liberal caucus, and since I am not a party to the origination of either of these documents, I think I am probably in the unique position of being able to look at it maybe a little bit less subjectively, or less from a particularly partisan point of view.

Quite frankly, I have a hard time seeing what is wrong with the amendment, I really do, if the argument can be made on financial grounds, which I think maybe is the argument for it. I remember looking at the particular amendment and it said, 'Mediator in the Province or Ottawa'. It says 'in the Province or Ottawa', so I was not quite sure what was meant by the kind of cost that would be involved if, of course, the work could be done here. I am not sure if we can tie this together, but I have a press release from the Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) who indicates he will be making a formal presentation Monday to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry in St. John's. So we actually have a Parliamentary Committee from the House of Commons here on Monday and Tuesday and that would probably be an appropriate time for whatever committee here to make at least representation to that body.

MR. WARREN:

I have already done it.

MR. FENWICK:

The member for Torngat Mountains is always well ahead of the game.

If that is the case, then it seems to me a very simple matter to say,

"Well, let us have three-party representation to this particular committee or put our case on the factory freezer trawlers," and it can be done with virtually no expense whatsoever." But if that is not enough, even if we have to strike a committee that has, say, five or six or seven individuals or whatever the number would be, and they have to go off to Ottawa in order to make the presentation, then let us do that. Although the former Speaker was talking about the politics of it, I agree with the particular point he was making, that the Liberal members of this House should be pressuring the federal Liberal members and the NDP members of this House should be pressuring their cohorts on the federal level - as of course, I have, and the PC members should also be doing the same to their cohorts. The problem is, as I understand it, that the decision on the factory freezer trawlers is not going to be made by the Liberal caucus in Ottawa or the New Democrats or, I understand, even the PC members there, but by the Minister of Fisheries - or at least the Minister of Fisheries prior to his recent demise because of problems he had with tuna.

So the question is, where do we then direct our efforts? It seems to me if the decision is being made by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Neilson), whether he is the member for the Yukon, which he currently is, or whether he is some new person, then maybe it would be more appropriate to direct the efforts to that particular point. The way I look at it, is this a serious issue or not? Now we hear from the Premier and we hear from the members opposite that it is a very serious issue, and I do not quibble with that. The suggestion is that one

factory freezer trawler would be followed by a fleet of them and that the impact on our inshore fishery, the impact on our shore jobs, would be tremendous and we might lose thousands of jobs. Well, is that serious? I suggest it is and I think everybody in this House would. If it is a serious matter, then surely serious measures should be taken. And, quite frankly, one resolution that takes perhaps two or two and a half days to debate in the House, and is immediately passed, whether it is passed unanimously or less than unanimously is not really, in my opinion, a very serious approach to it, other than using up some of the time of this valuable House.

I refer you back to other cases, other disputes that we have had. For example, it seems to me that we had a dispute between this government and the federal Liberal Government about offshore oil a number of years ago. If I recall correctly, piddly little discussions about how much it would cost to send a committee to Ottawa never were raised at any time in that particular dispute. Yet if you balanced the two, offshore oil and the job creation that is involved - hopefully a lot but unfortunately not that great so far, at least it does not seem that great - and the impact that the factory freezer trawlers could have, it seems to me that we have a much more substantive issue in terms of total number of people employed or, in this case, unemployed. If we were willing to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars, indeed I would suggest probably millions of dollars, with the court cases and the lobbying and the Premier going right across the country making speeches to all different organizations, then

surely we can afford the few dollars it would require to implement this particular resolution either here in St. John's or in Ottawa or wherever else it is necessary to go for it. So I really do not understand that.

I was going to look at some other ones, too, by the way. We have a major dispute going on with electricity. We are trying to develop more Labrador power, we are trying to get back some of it and so on, and indeed we will be able to get jobs out of it because with cheap electricity, of course, we will be able to create additional industry which will employ people and so on and so forth. I would suggest to you that we have spent hundreds of thousands, maybe millions of dollars, on our court cases and other lobbying efforts on the electricity issue. Yet it is hard to see how as many jobs are affected there as they are in this particular factory freezer trawler issue.

I could go on. The constitution, I think, is another example where we had trips back and forth across the country by the Premier, expensive trips, I would suggest. But I do not think it is necessary. The question is simple: Is this a serious issue? Does it impact tremendously upon employment in this Province? Is it worth doing everything we possibly can and is it untoward to decide to set up a committee in order to make representation, here or in Ottawa or wherever, with the Minister of Fisheries or wherever, in order to make maximum impact?

Now I think there are a lot more things that can be done beyond that, but I am not going to get

into them. But I would suggest that that amendment is not particularly out of line, and it is not particularly partisan either. That is probably the worst part of it because we have heard accusations that it is a particularly partisan one. Far be it for me to be in the position of defending a Liberal motion, but quite frankly it is not a partisan one. It is a reasonably decent one that says more should be done than just this debate. It is extremely difficult, in my mind, to see how anyone can vote against that particular amendment. And by not voting against it, it would seem to me that the government members opposite, if they do not vote for it, are really voting to weaken the presentation to defend the issue. In other words, they are given succor and sustenance to those who would want factory freezer trawlers all around our Province.

So it seems to me that if in this vote that comes you vote against that then you are doing as much damage as the Liberals would, I think, to vote on the substance of the issue even if the amendment went through.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Move down! Move down!

MR. FENWICK:

I think it is important that you stand on the record on the issue. I intend to vote for the amendment, I intend also to vote for the motion even if the amendment does not go through, because I think it is important to be on record. And, of course, I just want to spend only a minute or two on that because I think it has been hashed again and again.

The only point I would like to

make is that I would appreciate in the future if we have a major issue like that that the Premier's Office contact my office as well to ask for support. We offered the support voluntarily, but we were not asked in the first flush of letters that emanated from the eighth floor of this building. I am not exactly resentful, but a little bit put out that we were not on the list of people who were being asked, because we would have given it willingly. We recognize, quite frankly that it is a threat to our industry the way it is now, and it must be opposed. But we are somewhat upset that we did not get asked. That is about all.

Anyway, just to recap, if it is a serious issue, if it as serious as the Premier says it is, and I believe it is, that it deserves all the efforts we can make in order to make sure that the factory freezer trawlers are delayed or not allowed in at all. And if it means putting together a small committee and if it means going to Ottawa to lobby whoever the Fisheries Minister is, I think that is a small price to pay for the damage that could be inflicted. So I intend to vote for the amendment. I also intend to vote for the resolution afterwards.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, just on a point of procedure. The Premier is here.

We realize the urgency of this vote one way or the other. I would like to speak myself, as a matter of fact, and we have many other members that would want to speak. The Premier has to close this debate. We would like to see the government support our amendment. Does the Premier want to take the next ten or fifteen minutes to clue up so we could have the vote before 1:00 o'clock? Is that acceptable to the Premier?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Yes, but there might be a few other members over here who want to speak, too. We could have a couple of five minutes speeches back and forth. We could agree to that -

MR. TULK:
Or you can close it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Or I can close it now. It is twenty-five minutes to one. We could have somebody from here speak for twenty to one, and then somebody else from the other side until quarter of one, and then we could call the vote.

MR. TULK:
No problem.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Say it is ten minutes there, so five from this side and five from the opposite side. I think the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) wants to speak.

MR. SPEAKER:
Is that agreed?

MR. TULK:

Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Then we can call the votes.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to enter the debate on the amendment to this very important motion which was put forth today. I realize I only have a few minutes to be able to speak on this motion, but I think it is a very important issue that faces the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. When we are talking about the people of Newfoundland and Labrador who are going to lose their jobs because of this technology, I think it is very serious.

We see this resolution today, put forward by the Premier and this government, which deals with the application for a factory freezer trawlers, which deals with the over effort of fishing the Northern cod stock, it deals with fishermen and plants in Newfoundland and the viability of their operation, it deals with cod stocks being landed outside of this Province in other areas of Eastern Canada, and it deals with the overfishing by foreign dragnets of our fishing stocks, then I think that this is a very, very important issue. As I listened to the debate today we had the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) saying that they would like to see other MPs come out in support of this resolution. I think it was two

days ago I got up in answer to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Barry), when he asked where were our federal MPs on this issue, and I had to remind him that the MP for Burin-St. Georges (Mr. Price) had stuck with the Premier. When the Leader of the Opposition says, and I have a record of it here in Hansard, that only one MP in Ottawa has come out and voiced objection to this application, we all know that there are seven Newfoundland MPs in Ottawa and I would like to know where the Liberal MPs stand on this issue. Have they submitted letters to this government on their opposition to this application by National Sea? I think one of the reasons why the Opposition is hurting so bad is because we are a government that is governing this Province responsibly and, as this session of the House opened just a couple of weeks ago, they have not found anything that they can criticize the government about. We presented a resolution in the House to try to rectify the injustice in the UIC programme and have it come in line with the national policy across Canada so all Canadians can be treated equally, and what did they do? We saw them over there brandishing around a report that they spent three months travelling around Newfoundland collecting information for. I do not know, but I understand that there were seven members, or something like that on that Committee, and I would like to break down this report, I really would because the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) made reference to it in his speech. We have thirteen pages in this report. If you take out three pages of the introduction - I suppose you could call them Rexograms - and then you take out the double spacing, then

you take out the half pages, you would probably be left with six full pages in this report. To have seven men going around the Province for three months and they could only compile a half page on the fishing industry in Newfoundland is a shame and a disgrace. I would never stand in this House and brandish such a report.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, the problem with the gentleman who just sat down is that in reading that report there he was not reading between the lines which would have taken up a lot more space you see.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:
And that is the problem with members on the government benches. In supporting the Premier's resolution, they are not reading between the lines in the Premier's resolution.

This has nothing to do with putting factories on trawlers, it has nothing to do with that. It is a political issue for the Premier and rather than this phony issue putting another string in the Premier's bow, I can tell you what it will do, it will put another nail in his political coffin, Mr. Speaker.

The people in this Province have seen and the people in the district of Bellevue have seen the

Premier's phony speeches for years and years. 'I will keep the Markland Hospital open. I will keep the Come By Chance Hospital open. I will have the refinery in Come By Chance open in ninety days.' The people in Bellevue district have seen through the Premier's charade and the Premier's phoniness for years and years. But I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of thinking Newfoundlanders will read between the lines in this resolution and they will see it for what it is.

Mr. Speaker, it was only six or seven months ago that the Premier was on Province-wide television in his paid political ads, 'Send us back to power in Newfoundland. We have a PC Government in Ottawa and, of course, everything will be hunky-dory, we will get whatever we want.' Mr. Speaker, why is it then that the Premier cannot go to Ottawa or cannot simply pick up the phone and phone John Crosbie and say, 'John, we cannot have factory freezer trawlers come into this Province. You have to get that message through to the Cabinet. You have to get that message through to the Prime Minister, the acting Minister of Fisheries and the cabinet. It cannot happen.' That is what the Premier was telling us, Mr. Speaker, six or seven months ago, that whatever we want we are going to get if you send us back to power in this Province.

Now, the people across the Province are gradually, and it takes some of them longer to wake up politically than others, are beginning to realize that the Premier was a phony when he promised an Elections Act back in 1979, six and a half years ago and we still do not have it. He told

the House of Assembly, he told the member for Menihek yesterday that it is before Cabinet. Now, Mr. Speaker, how long has it been before Cabinet?

The member for St. John's North will remember - he was the Chairman of that committee, I was the Vice-Chairman - that it was in November of 1983, two years ago, Mr. Speaker, that this report was presented to the House of Assembly. It has been before Cabinet for two years. How many more years? We had an election go by last Spring. The Premier had ample opportunity and his Cabinet to bring in a new Elections Act before the last election let alone the next one.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:
Mr. Speaker, I think we have a very important resolution certainly to the fishermen of this Province. The resolution we have now, I would suggest that the member certainly, when he is talking about the Elections Act, has not got much to do with the fishermen and the factory trawlers for this Province. I would suggest that the member get on with the issue at hand.

MR. CALLAN:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, I would like to point out to the hon. member he has about a minute

left.

MR. CALLAN:
So, have you ruled on the point of order. Is there no point of order?

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no point of order.

MR. CALLAN:
Obviously, Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order because what we are talking about here - and this is what the resolution is all about - is the Premier's credibility and his believability and whether or not the people of this Province can trust him.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, is phony. The Premier can go to Ottawa and get his colleagues in Ottawa to do what he wants done, if it is true what he was telling us last Spring or, if it is not true, then, of course, the Premier betrayed the people of this Province in the same way that he betrayed the people in Come By Chance about the future of their refinery. Clause 54 has killed it eternally. He said he would have it open in ninety days and that was back in 1979, the same time that he said he was going to have a new Elections Act, and we still do not have it. It has been before Cabinet for two years and that is no excuse.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. CALLAN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate the comments by all hon. members on the resolution and the debate on the amendment, just let me say this: this is to the hon. members opposite. What we have been able to do in the last year or so, because we have had the same government in Ottawa as we have in Newfoundland, is the Atlantic Accord which protects us, which gives us all kinds of rights that we never had before from Mr. Chrétien and Mr. Lalonde. That is a fact, everybody knows that. The evidence is overwhelming on that. There is no question and the Liberal Opposition know that as well.

We signed a \$180 million roads agreement, the largest one we have ever signed with a government. We have done more on training in the last year and have more say over training in this Province now than we have ever done before. We could not do it with the previous government in Ottawa, not just because they were Liberals, it was just because of their attitude towards the country. It was not the Liberal Party of Canada necessarily, it was those people who were part of a party who happened to be the Government of Canada at the time. That is the better way of saying it. But for whatever reason that is what it was.

But, Mr. Speaker, just imagine - we have an application from National Sea. The Liberal Opposition know as well I do the kind of lobby that this company and their friends have been engineering in Ottawa. Now, the Opposition are trying to accuse me of just using this as a political football, but if we did absolutely nothing and then the application

was approved, I would be accused, and this government would be accused of not doing its work on behalf of the people of Newfoundland, of engineering as much pressure as possible, regardless of the Government in Ottawa. I would be then accused of knowingly not doing anything to support the opposition to factory freezer trawlers. Just imagine that scenario. If I took the advice of the people opposite, the Government of Newfoundland would do nothing, we would do nothing. This is only a political football. So we would do nothing, therefore we would not be putting forward our arguments and all the rest of it and then let us just conjecture that National Sea were given the application.

The first thing that the Liberal Opposition and the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) would be saying, "Were was the Premier? Where was the fighting Newfoundlander? Why was he not asking for support from the people of Newfoundland? Why was he not doing all he could to ensure that our side of the argument was placed before the Government in Ottawa? Why? Why?" And that is what we have been doing, Mr. Speaker, and we have been doing it on an organized basis.

The only reason why the Liberal Opposition want a select committee is so that they could go to Ottawa and make this a political issue. That is what they want to do. They want to go up and attack the Government in Ottawa and attack the Prime Minister and attack the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Nielsen) and so on. That is what they want to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, that is what they want to do because we have learned that we cannot trust them on things like that. If there was a different Opposition over there that had shown over the last couple of years that they were serious, it might be different. It is like some of the committees that we have established, more often than not they are split right along partisan lines when there is a decision that comes up. It is done by partisan lines it is not done on the merits of the case that is put before them.

If the Auditor General says 'beep,' somebody on the Opposition has got to howl. They do not look at the issue, they make politics out of it. And that is the reason. It is not that we are against a bonafidé select committee but knowing the people opposite and the way that they have acted, Mr. Speaker, that all they are going to do is to try to make it a political issue.

This is what we want to do. We have already briefed the federal government, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and the Atlantic caucus. We have got the support now of all the organizations in Newfoundland and we want a resolution to go forward from this House. We have in Intergovernmental Affairs, and in the Department of Fisheries, the people, the experts, who can argue the best way and the best case from Newfoundland's point of view, that is part of government's job. We have the experts there. We do not want to just have a number of politicians going up to Ottawa and then doing a press release or a

press conference and making a political issue out of this.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
I can understand some of the Premier's fears but would he agree, let me ask him this question, in the urgency of this whole matter would he agree to the select committee if there was unanimous consent of this House that the Premier himself would head that select committee?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
No, Mr. Speaker, that does not solve the problem.

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no point of order.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
That does not solve the problem. Some of you people will go up to Ottawa and for your own purposes then, with the Liberal Leader and all the rest of it, be having press conferences and press releases and attacking the Prime Minister and making the issue and attacking it in such a way that we are not getting our rational arguments across at all. It will be lost in the politics of the situation.

we should have unanimous support for the resolution which, by the way, also attacks the federal government to do more to stop overfishing. You look at the

position that this party takes with the federal government and remember when the member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) was in the Cabinet of Canada. He was a part of our party but did we go along with everything he did. Look at what the Liberal Party did as a disservice to Newfoundland over the last three or four years when you supported Mr. Chretien and Mr. Lalonde on a proposal which would give us nothing out of the offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Shame! Shame! Shame!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
What did you do? Look at your history. What have we done as a party? When that party was right, like on the National Energy programme, supported them. When they are wrong or are going to be potentially wrong on factory freezer trawlers, we will oppose them for legitimate, rational reasons. We are not lap dogs. We will support where it is good for Newfoundland. We will oppose where it is bad for Newfoundland regardless of who is in the Government of Canada in Ottawa because we are members of the House of Assembly in Newfoundland and Labrador and represent the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. Your history-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Your history condemns you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Your history condemns you because you went into the lap of Mr. Chretien and Mr. LaLonde on every

single issue. You did not stand up for Newfoundland. Your party came before your Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
That is why we cannot take a chance on seeing this amendment go through because all you are going to do is try to tear Newfoundland apart for your own Liberal partisan reasons and aspirations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I say no to the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Is the House ready ready for the question?

Shall the amendment carry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:
Shall the main motion carry?
Those in favour "Aye"?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye

Those against 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

It is carried.

MR. SIMMONS:

Division, Mr. Speaker.

Division

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Call in the members.

The amendment has been defeated.

MR. TULK:

Let it be known that it was defeated by the government members.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I think it is agreed that we proceed now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the House ready for the question?

All those in favour of the motion, please rise.

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge), the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn), the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communication (Mr. Russell), the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. the President

of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett), Mr. Baird, Mr. Greening, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Reid, Mr. Carter, Mr. Peach, Mr. Warren, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Woodford, Mr. Fenwick.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against the motion, please rise:

Mr. Tulk; Mr. Callan; Mr. W. Carter; Mr. Gilbert; Mr. Efford; Mr. Furey.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion is carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 p.m.