



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 57

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

12 November 1985

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I am sorry about the delay in ruling on a number of matters which arose in Private Member's Day last Wednesday. I wanted to check various authorities and also rulings that were made in this House by previous Speakers. In a period of two hours, from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. there were thirty-three points of order raised. That is an average of a point of order raised every four minutes for a period of two hours.

The vast majority of these were spurious points of order. Each member had a right to speak for twenty minutes. If the member's right to do so is impaired by spurious points of order, the privilege of the hon. member speaking is being affected, and, indeed, the privileges of all hon. members are involved.

Many of us have had comments from the general public who visit the gallery about what they perceive to be bizarre behaviour at times. Certainly what evolved last Wednesday did not add anything to our stature or to the esteem in which we should be held. I would like to draw hon. members attention to Erskine May, Parliamentary Practice, 19th Edition, Page 441, and I quote, "On 1 July, 1952 the Deputy Speaker deprecated a growing practice of interruptions of debate by members who, when the hon. member who is speaking refused to give way, think that the only way they can get their word in is by raising a point of order." He stated that in his opinion such interruptions constitute fraudulent points of

order and should be stopped.

I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to rulings made fairly recently by two different Speakers and by a Deputy Speaker in our own House.

On the second of May, 1979 - Hansard pages 2582 and 2583 - the Speaker ruled, and I quote him, "I cannot allow points of order to develop into an alternative method of debate. The hon. gentleman, if he has not spoken in this debate, then obviously he is entitled to do so and make take sharpest issue with what the hon. gentleman to my left has said. But unless an hon. gentleman yields, then it will be necessary for another hon. member to await his turn in the debate in order to refute what the gentleman sitting opposite had said."

On 15 June, 1981, Hansard pages 6696 and 6697, the Deputy Speaker said, "But I want to point out that it is certainly unparliamentary for any hon. member to get up continuously on spurious points of order merely to interrupt another member when he is speaking." On the same day the then Speaker himself observed, page 6715 Hansard: "I do want to make an additional comment, though, if I might and draw to the attention of hon. members the fact that the points that have been made with respect to spurious points of order, I think, are quite accurate and hon. members are well aware that every member of this House has a right to present a point of order if they feel there is a breach of order and if that point is presented it should be presented clearly and precisely but certainly that right should not be abused. And I bring that to the attention of hon. members in the hope that everybody

will consider it and when points of order are raised they should be what they consider to be legitimate breaches of the practices and procedures in this House."

Now to deal with a number of specific points not ruled on last Wednesday. The point of privilege raised by the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) was in connection with comments made on CBC Radio by the hon. member for Menihek. I have checked Hansard and the CBC tape. In speaking to the point of privilege the explanation offered by the hon. member is not in accordance with the CBC tape. However, I accept the explanation offered to the House the next day by the hon. member that his intention was not to criticize the Chair's ruling. I feel the matter should be left at that.

In connection with the point of privilege raised by the hon. the President of the Council, the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) said, "The process of obfuscation was aided and abetted by the Chair." Page 2889, Hansard.

On a point of privilege raised by the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage, the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage said "What has this become, some kind of a kangaroo court or something?" Page 2921, Hansard.

These statements are derogatory and also cast aspersions on the impartiality of the Chair.

My view is summed up very aptly by J. Maingot in his Parliamentary Privilege in Canada, page 215, on breaches of privilege and contempt, and I quote: "Any

suggestion of partiality or bias on the part of presiding officers, such as the Speaker, a Chairman of a Committee of the whole, or a Chairman of a Standing Committee or Special Committee, automatically shows disrespect and amounts to contempt. Other improper reflections on the Speaker are also subject to House action." I ask the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage now to withdraw these comments of his without equivocation. The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. PATTERSON:

Come on, boy. Stand up and be a man.

MR. SIMMONS:

There you go again. Mr. Speaker, I do confess to a terrible weakness, namely, my inability to see the magnificent fairness of your Speakership, and so I withdraw unequivocally.

MR. SPEAKER:

This disposes of these points of privilege. A point of order was raised by the hon. member for St. John's North in connection with comments he heard the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage make. I checked with Hansard and there is no record of the words mentioned by the hon. member, hence I rule there is no point of order.

Statements by Ministers

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister for Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, as Minister

responsible for Housing, I would like to take this opportunity to advise hon. members of housing initiatives and activity occurring in the Province. I feel this information will prove of interest to members since housing starts and related activity not only reflect of the state of the residential construction industry in the Province, but significantly impact the overall economic picture as well.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, the construction or acquisition of a home is one of the most important decisions facing the average Newfoundland family and it is obviously not pursued without careful regard for the future.

This year, 1985, Mr. Speaker, is proving to be a most encouraging with respect to residential construction in the Province. While overall housing starts to date are roughly equivalent to the same period last year, I am pleased to report that housing starts in urban areas are up over twenty-four per cent. In this regard, I am encouraged by the fact that single detached starts in these areas have increased in excess of fifty-one per cent for the first nine months. This is an especially important indicator when one considers the high incidence of homeownership in the Province.

In reviewing the reasons for this improved situation, certainly the moderation and stabilization of mortgage interest rates to their lowest level in several years has proven a major boost. As a result, a restored consumer confidence has produced a positive atmosphere for prospective home builders and home buyers. In addition, local economic prospects

appear to have improved in a number of locations throughout the Province.

In addition to housing starts, Mr. Speaker, one of the more notable factors of the year's housing activity is the number of building lots sold by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. To the end of October, the Corporation has sold more than 390 building lots province-wide. Compared with the same period last year, this represents an increase of close to 80 per cent. These sales have occurred in the following locations: in Mount Pearl and St. John's, 158 and 137 sales were recorded respectively. Areas demonstrating other significant activity are Marystown, with 46 lots sold; Clarenville, where 25 lots have been sold; and Gander, where 17 lots have been sold. As evidenced, while the bulk of these sales have quite predictably taken place in the St. John's Mount Pearl area, I am most gratified to now see renewed activity in these other locations as well.

To illustrate the extent of this demand, Mr. Speaker, members may find it interesting to note that in early September 25 lots were placed in a sales position in Parson's Meadow, Mount Pearl. Fifty applications were received and all lots were sold within an hour. In addition, in mid-October 95 lots were offered for sale in Cowan Heights. In this instance, 150 applications were received and 90 lots were sold within a two hour period. In one case, 18 applications were submitted for the same building lot.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, the corporation has found it necessary to institute a lot draw system to

ensure each prospective purchaser a fair chance to buy the lot of his/her choice. In Clarendville, the construction of the regional hospital has generated an increased demand for new housing and, in other areas, an improvement in the overall economic conditions, it would appear, has contributed to an active housing market.

As a stimulus to further construction and, in particular, to meet the anticipated demand for building lots, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing is proceeding with additional developments. In Mount Pearl, 50 lots of a 130 lot development will be ready for sale within a few weeks in a new federal/provincial residential land development known as Admiralty Wood. In St. John's, plans are now underway to complete another phase of residential development in Cowan Heights. At least 150 serviced lots will be prepared in the coming months with a tentative sale date set for late 1986. These additional building sites will continue to ensure both a timely and affordable supply of residential land in these areas.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I feel this activity is of significant note to the overall economic fortunes in the Province. I am most pleased with the performance of the residential construction industry to date this year and its positive contribution to employment and associated activities. As you are well aware, housing construction is a labour intensive business and creates substantial spin-off benefits in secondary and tertiary opportunities. I am confident that the remainder of this year will prove equally rewarding. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
I would like to thank the minister for supplying us with a copy of his statement beforehand.

I would like to say to the minister that while his statistics are interesting, they are not very helpful, Mr. Speaker, in just referring back one year. You have a situation where an increase of, I think, the minister talks about housing starts in urban areas are up over 24 per cent, while that may be good, but it may not be so good if the starts were down considerably last year or even the year before.

What the minister should do, and what government ministers generally should do when they come in to deliver statistics in the House, is go back a couple of years and set out the trend, set out where housing starts were a couple of years ago. We all know that high interests rates which prevailed for a time kept housing starts down to a very low level in this Province. Unfortunately, housing starts seemed to stay down lower last year in this Province that in other parts of Canada, if my recollection serves me right. Therefore, this news is not as good as it might otherwise seem.

Also, we have to recognize, Mr. Speaker, that housing starts have increased significantly all across Canada because, as the Minister said, of the lower mortgage interest rates. It would be helpful if the minister would give us an indication of how the

Province's activity compares with the activity in other provinces. It is very difficult otherwise, Mr. Speaker, to get up and say that the minister's statement is a good news statement or a business as usual statement.

It does appear however that there is some increase in residential construction primarily, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the lower mortgage interest rates and very little, regrettably, because of any improvement in economic activity in this Province. All statistics show, Mr. Speaker, that this Province is lagging badly behind all the other provinces in Canada when it comes to recovery from the recession. I think references are made from time to time with respect to Nova Scotia, that Nova Scotia's growth this year is not going to be as great as is estimated for the provinces but, in fact, Mr. Speaker, you have to consider that last year saw a tremendous boom in Nova Scotia. Again, those figures are misleading when it is just this year compared to last year for that Province.

The reality is, Mr. Speaker, because of policies of gentlemen and ladies opposite, the economy of this Province has not recovered from the recession as rapidly or as fully as in other provinces. We can understand, therefore, why the minister is encouraged by his colleagues to get up when there is the slightest bit of good news, or apparent good news that can be put out by way of statistics.

One other point I think the minister should have dealt with, Mr. Speaker -

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

time has more than elapsed.

MR. BARRY:
Could I make, just briefly, one further point?

MR. SPEAKER:
Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Yes, by leave, by leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
By leave.

MR. BARRY:
In closing, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the minister could indicate whether it is necessary for Newfoundland and Labrador Housing to be developing lots in light of private developers being able to do this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD:
It is no wonder they are all bad over there. One bad apple can spoil the whole barrel.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that this morning, my colleague, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), and I, met with representatives of the Labrador Inuit Association and the federal government for discussions preliminary to land claims negotiations.

It was the intention of the provincial government to commence tripartite land claims negotiations this Fall, tripartite, of course, being federal, provincial and LIA. This was not possible, however, because of the announcement last Summer of the federal Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs (Mr. Crombie) of the formation of a Federal Task Force to Review Comprehensive Native Land Claims Policy.

I emphasize, therefore, that these were initial talks concerning the administrative process, subject matters, structure, organization, and other items of a general nature to prepare the way for the future negotiations. They are preliminary discussions for the purpose of expediting the tripartite negotiation process. Our efforts were concentrated on establishing a suitable and efficient framework for initiating and pursuing land claims negotiations.

The tenor of these discussions was guided by two factors. First, it is a fundamental principle of provincial land claims policy that, prior to the commencement of tripartite negotiations involving the Native organizations, the federal and provincial governments must conclude bilateral discussions to define their respective roles and responsibilities in that process. Since 1982, federal and provincial officials have met several times. These meetings were cordial and productive. There are still a number of issues to be resolved before we proceed to the tripartite negotiations.

Second, it will be necessary to await the publication of the federal review before commencing

such negotiations. That federal task force review is due to be completed by the end of November and, I assume, will be made public and available to the government very shortly after that.

In the interim, we have decided to utilize our time and resources by preparing the way. There are matters that have to be resolved before full-fledged land claims negotiations actually begin. Today we made good progress in establishing a viable framework for the negotiation process and ensuring that negotiations proceed smoothly and efficiently when they are ready to begin.

Our efforts were marked by a spirit of good will and co-operation. I feel confident that this spirit will continue throughout the long and complex task which lies ahead. Our discussions today have shown that we are not negotiating in an atmosphere of conflict or opposition. We are working together to achieve a just and equitable land claim settlement with the Inuit people of Labrador.

These discussions will be continuing tomorrow and I would expect to be in a position to inform the House shortly after that of overall progress in matters agreed upon.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, again we thank the minister for supplying us with a copy of his proposed statement.

Mr. Speaker, I note that this deals with land claims relating to the Labrador Inuit alone and there was no reference to the situation with respect to the Naskaupi/Montagnais. I would hope that the minister, at the appropriate time, would indicate whether the same approach will be taken, if it is possible to take the same approach with the Naskaupi Montagnais.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They do not recognize us as the government there.

MR. BARRY:

Well, as I say, this is something that the minister could clarify in terms of the bilateral discussions between the provincial and federal governments. Are they dealing only with the manner of approaching Inuit land claims? Do they not discuss at all methods of approaching the Labrador Montagnais land claims? Because the Labrador Montagnais, I understand, have regularly taken the approach that they want to have the negotiations go on between themselves and the Government of Canada. However, they have not been adverse, at times in the past, to communicating with the provincial government.

The Premier shakes his head. It is a number of years ago, but they did, in fact, Mr. Speaker. Not lately, but they did at one time.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You do not know what you are talking about again.

MR. BARRY:

Part of the Premier's problem is that he fails to keep in mind the overall view, Mr. Speaker, and reacts too much on a day to day

perspective. You have to look at what has gone on in the past. I thought the Premier wrote a book about that, something about looking to the past in order to learn what is going on in the future.

Mr. Speaker, we welcome the news that there are discussions, although very preliminary. However, we would urge the minister to try and get to hard discussions as soon as possible because I will submit that this is another area, along with the elections financing act, where the Premier has not lived up to a commitment made to the people of this Province. He has not lived up to his commitment to deal with aboriginal land claims. He attempted to pass the buck to the Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker. He attempted to blame the Government of Canada for lack of action on his part when he failed to follow up on his commitment, Mr. Speaker. Now they do not have the excuse, Mr. Speaker. Their blue-blooded brothers are in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, and we have seen the Atlantic Accord, although recently -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I think the hon. the member is getting away from the statement by the minister.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, this is very relevant, if the Speaker would let me finish. It is very relevant to responding because what we are talking about here is the ability of this government to communicate with the Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker. They cannot now use the excuse that it is a government of a different political stripe. We are talking about having these

bilateral discussions with the Government of Canada. Well, there is a new government in Ottawa now. Mr. Trudeau is not there. The Premier is still complaining about Mr. Trudeau. Mr. Trudeau has not been there for close to two years now, Mr. Speaker. What has the Premier been doing during that period of time? He has been dragging his heels, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Well, these claims are going to have to be resolved -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, if development is going to be seen in Labrador, these claims will have to proceed more quickly than they have to date.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

Oral Questions

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for

the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). It appears, Mr. Speaker, that labour relations in this Province have hit an all time low, if not rock bottom. In view of the dramatic action taken by the brewery workers over the weekend, namely, that of a hunger strike, a most unusual if not unprecedented move in this Province if, indeed, not in the Western World to try and get the attention of its employers and of the government, so in view of this unique and unusual turn of events with respect to labour-management relations in the Province, I wonder if the minister can indicate to the House what he has done or what he intends to do to bring about a resolution to this strike, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member will be happy to know that the parties are at this moment in the Department of Labour. I personally met with them this morning. I cancelled a couple of other meetings to meet with both parties separately at first. They are still there in the department. I will be meeting with them again after question period this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of observation, I do not know where the hon. member is getting his readings about labour relations being at an all time low. We recently made a settlement with the Newfoundland Teachers'

Association. And we have made settlements. There was a settlement with the Hospital support staff. We are doing well in negotiations. The only serious strike in the Province, with the attendant lockouts, is the one that he most spoke of. But, other than that, we are not going through any unusually bad period of labour relations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is a sorry day when people have to resort to hunger strikes to start getting attention of members opposite in this Province. You would think it was South Africa, Mr. Speaker, or the Maze Prison in Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask this of the Premier. Mr. Morrissey Johnson, M.P., has said that provincial officials knew of the federal government's decision on factory freezer trawlers at least ten days before the decision was announced. Will the Premier now come clean with the people of this Province and confirm that he in fact knew about the decision before he tabled and/or debated this resolution that he put forward last week in the House of Assembly - I think it was tabled a week ago Wednesday - that he knew about that decision at that point in time. Will he confirm that his motion was merely a charade and part of a plan to conceal from the people of this Province that the Premier had already caved in on

the factory freezer trawler issue?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the basis of that question is completely untrue. We did not find out at all until verbally there was a hint from Mr. Crosbie to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer). Forty-eight hours before we did not know of the decision. There was a hint by our minister in the federal Cabinet at that time that a decision was coming down that would be unfavourable to the position of the Province. We did not know all of the conditions that were to be attached to it, so the information that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) gives is completely brand new to me. We did not know. I know that the Leader of the Opposition is trying most hard to forget about voting again us and for factory freezer trawlers in this House, and now he is using whatever means he can find to try and justify his party opposing the Government of Newfoundland in their position of saying that factory freezer trawlers should not be allowed in the Province. He can try all he likes, Mr. Speaker, but the facts of the matter are that the Liberal Opposition in this House agreed to see factory freezer trawlers harvest Northern cod in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

That pathetic untruth by the

Premier, Mr. Speaker, is not worthy of comment. It is a deliberate distortion of what went on in this House, as Hansard can show, Mr. Speaker. It would seem that what the Premier is going on with would confirm the accuracy of Mr. Crosbie's remarks. Will the Premier agree with our representative in the federal cabinet, where Mr. Crosbie states that what the Premier has been doing consists merely of political theatre amounting to yacking, bawling and hollering? Is that correct? Would the Premier indicate whether he agrees with Mr. Crosbie's assessment of what he is involved in in this issue?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as the Government of Newfoundland did in 1977, as I did personally in 1979, as I did in 1985, and as I will do as long as I have an opportunity to speak as a citizen of this Province, I will oppose actions and policies by the Government of Canada which I believe are not in the best interests of this Province. That is what I have done on the factory freezer trawler issue and that is what I will continue to do. If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is trying to use somebody else's comments as a of camouflaging the fact that his party agreed with the federal government in issuing licenses for factory freezer trawlers, which over time could devastatingly destroy the inshore fishery, then that is his problem. This party, this government will continue to oppose such actions and articulate a position which is in the best

interests of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and in the best interest of seeing as many people as possible in Newfoundland and Labrador prosecute a viable fishery.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot wait until the pamphlet that the gofer behind the Premier is holding up gets out for the people to see the taxpayers' dollars being used now to try to distort the record of this House. Look at the other side. There it is, it is on the other side, Mr. Speaker. In response to that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier whether in view of the fact that he is prepared to have government money expended on setting out the facts, Mr. Speaker, that took place on this issue, will the Premier agree to fund a distribution of the record of this House, of Hansard? Does he have the guts to have the record of this House sent out everywhere he sends his little piece of Tory propaganda, Mr. Speaker, paid for by the taxpayers' dollars of this Province? Will he agree, Mr. Speaker, to mail out Hansard, will he agree to mail out the record of this House, Mr. Speaker, together with his little piece of propaganda and let the people of this Province decide for themselves who was fighting against factory freezer trawlers and who was merely engaging in a political charade, a sham on which he got caught out when even federal MPs admitted that he knew what was going on, Mr. Speaker?

The Premier of this Province knew what was going on and tried to conceal it from the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I mean if this is going to be Question Period, here is a supplementary on which there is supposed to be no preliminary. Is there a question or is there not a question? I do not know if that was a speech or a question.

Now to answer the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), the pamphlet that he refers to was one that he supported. On the front page was myself, "Let us fight for our rights. Equal rights our only chance." And on the back was the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, he supported those pamphlets then.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, hang tough, let us fight for our rights. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition cannot have it both ways. He cannot be for pamphlets on one side of the House and against pamphlets on another side of the House.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order,

the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

This member did not support the use of government funds for sending out pamphlets. If that is a pamphlet that has gone out with my picture on it, it is one that went out during an election or went out without -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

- or went out, Mr. Speaker, without my consent.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It was not during an election. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition supported it completely, never had a negative comment to say about it.

MR. BARRY:

Table it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, I will table it. Here it is. "Hang tough. Brian and Leo together." Brian first, Leo second.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, it was Hang tough, Brian Peckford number one, Leo Barry

number two, and that is where it stands today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

I would like to ask the Premier will he answer the question? Will he agree, Mr. Speaker, to fund the sending out of the Hansard of this House where that resolution, Mr. Speaker, on factory freezer trawlers was debated? Will the Premier of this Province have the courage to send out the transcript, Mr. Speaker, of those remarks so that the people of this Province can determine whether the Premier was engaging in the charade that we all know he was?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Leader of the Opposition is being completely inconsistent. He supported the position on factory freezer trawlers when he was a part of this government and then, when he moved over there, he had his Party vote against it. Now that is the facts of the matter, Mr. Speaker. I cannot help it. The Leader of the Opposition is asking me now to go across the House and support his Party saying that factory freezer trawlers are good for the inshore fishery. Well, I am not going to do it, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition can get up ten times, fifteen times or twenty times, but I am not going to produce material to go out to the Newfoundland people to say that the Government

of Newfoundland is suddenly for factory freezer trawlers. I am not going to do it. The Leader of the Opposition can get up as many times as he likes but I am not going to produce information to go out to the people of Newfoundland to show that suddenly we have joined the Liberal Party.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is again refusing to answer the question. Will he put it to the test? Is he prepared, Mr. Speaker, to show the people of this Province Hansard? Is he prepared to show the comments made in this House by myself and other members of this Party and let the people decide whether or not the Premier is telling the truth? Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have is a continued sham and charade. The Premier caved in on factory freezer trawlers, John Crosbie says he caved in, and Morrissey Johnson says he caved in. Will the Premier fund the sending out Hansard?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition was getting into the realm of debate. The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with your ruling. He was getting into the realm of the debate when he is suppose to be on supplementary questions. The Leader of the Opposition has an uncanny knack of losing his cool

very quickly when he finds he is in the wrong. All I can go by, Mr. Speaker, is that the Leader of the Opposition got up a couple of questions ago and talked about pamphlets being sent out by the government and so on. Now I have produced a pamphlet on which his picture also appeared when he was over here, and the pamphlets were number one then. Now, all of a sudden, he is Paul on the road to Damascus and he has had this great new change of heart. Look Mr. Speaker, this is Hansard, No. 51, of November 1, 1985. "Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? All those in favour of the motion to oppose factory freezer trawlers" Everybody in the House from the government side supported the motion to oppose factory freezer trawlers.

MR. BARRY:

What was the motion?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To oppose factory freezer trawlers.

MR. BARRY:

No! No!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, it was, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

There is the resolution there.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There is the resolution. "Be it therefore resolved that this hon. House go on record in opposition to the application by National Sea Products Limited and this hon. House communicate to the Federal Minister its opposition to this application." There it is, opposing the application for factory freezer trawlers. And then, "All those in favour" of opposing factory freezer trawlers to National Sea, and all the

government members voted for the motion to oppose. "Those against the motion, please rise: Mr. Tulk; Mr. Callan; Mr. W. Carter; Mr. Gilbert; Mr. Efford; Mr. Furey."

I am reading from a copy of Hansard, Mr. Speaker. Now the long and short of it is that the Opposition opposed our resolution which was to oppose the application by National Sea. I know the Leader of the Opposition has heard a lot from around Newfoundland over the last several days that he made a terrible error in judgement. That is normal for the Leader of the Opposition. He made an error in judgement when he crossed the House, Mr. Speaker. Now he has made another error in judgement. Unlike the member for Menihok (Mr. Fenwick) who understood the politics of Newfoundland and who was supporting the amendment, what was the Leader of the Opposition doing? He was willing to allow the messenger to destroy the message. The message was, 'Let us oppose factory freezer trawlers! Because the messenger to go from Newfoundland to Ottawa was not the messenger that he would like, then that was strong enough for him to vote against factory freezer trawlers. Just imagine, to allow a messenger to destroy the message! But the member for Menihok knew the difference and, whilst he supported the amendment to have a Select Committee appointed, when that was turned down by the government side, he knew in his own heart and soul that the main body of the motion, the substance of the motion to oppose factory freezer trawlers, was much greater than who it was went to Ottawa to communicate the decision from this House. That is the problem.

MR. BARRY:

Why did you not strike a Committee

last Friday?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

You were not here.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Just listen to him, Mr. Speaker. He is hurt. The Leader of the Opposition is hurt. I cannot help it if the Leader of the Opposition is hurt. I sympathize with him but there is nothing I can do about it.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Would the minister indicate to us whether he is aware that the Tory MPs in Ottawa have indicated that the Newfoundland Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) was totally ineffective when he appeared before the Atlantic Tory caucus, that we had the federal Tory members sitting on that Committee listening, first of all -

MR. MATTHEWS:

Who told you that, Iona?

MR. PECKFORD:

He has lost here and now he is going after the minister.

MR. BARRY:

Oh, no. I am asking the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

You figure you got it, have you? Will the Premier confirm, as I asked the question, is he aware

that the opinion of the Tory MPs in Ottawa is that the Newfoundland Minister of Fisheries was totally ineffective in putting the case against factory freezer trawlers and that the Nova Scotia representative, who appeared before that same Committee, did a much better job, has a much better documented case, and, Mr. Speaker, when they finished listening to both ministers they concluded that the arguments presented by the Nova Scotia minister were much better than the minister sent up by the Premier because he was afraid to go up himself? Could you confirm that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am some glad that half-way through the supplementary question the Leader of the Opposition directed his question back here because he was afraid I could criticize him for leaving me alone. He was scared that the word would get out that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) could not ask the Premier any more questions, that he lost so badly he had to go to another minister. So I am glad now he has seen the error of his ways and came back and asked me the question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the arguments that were presented in our position paper, is the Leader of the Opposition saying that they are not good arguments?

MR. BARRY:

They were not presented. You were afraid to go up there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you something. Mr. Speaker, I do not dominate the Government of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not dominate the Government of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The Chair just cannot hear what is going on, so I would ask for silence on both sides of the House.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am trying to answer the question. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) presented the Newfoundland argument to the caucus in Ottawa and I am informed and I do not have to be informed anyway, that the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs did an absolutely A plus job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am really amazed that the Leader of the Opposition would say that the Minister of Fisheries could not do a good job on presenting an argument. As everybody knows in this Province, one thing the

Minister of Fisheries can do very, very well, much better than the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), is present his arguments on an issue. Mr. Speaker, since he has taken over that portfolio he has done an excellent job as the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am very sorry to see that all the Leader of the Opposition can say about FFTs today is ways in which he can tear down our position.

MR. TULK:

What position?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

What is our position? To oppose factory freezer trawlers. Here he is trying to tear down that, Mr. Speaker. Tear it down. He is confirming again today that in their heart and soul they go along with National Sea.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier as well and it is on factory freezer trawlers. Since Fishery Products International has indicated that it now has a licence, if it wishes, to purchase a factory freezer trawler, and since, of course, the provincial government is a substantial shareholder in that corporation, I would like to know from the Premier what our instructions will

be to our nominees on the Board of Directors, and what will our actions be in order to make sure that FPI does not avail of that option and go ahead with an FFT?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, number one, that is a hypothetical question and I am not sure whether hypothetical questions are in order in question period, according to the Standing Orders of procedure. But I think it is hypothetical in the extreme in the sense that I think FPI have already indicated to us that they are not interested in factory freezer trawlers at this time. So, therefore, the hypothesis that the hon. member puts forward is just that, a hypothesis, because there is no initiative going to be taken by Fishery Products International to purchase that licence that has been offered to them.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, at a news conference at Hotel Newfoundland on August 24, 1984, at which time the Premier launched his tour across the Province in support of the Mulroney team and in support of the Mulroney offshore agreement, in reply to a question from a reporter the Premier said that if the Prime Minister, once elected, ever dared renege on the offshore

agreement that he would disassociate himself from the P.C. Party. Now that the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, has reneged on another very important agreement, the Restructuring Agreement, Section 12, is the Premier still prepared to make good that promise or does he view the fisheries agreement, maybe, as inferior to or of less importance than the offshore oil agreement?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether that October 24 period was before the member for Twillingate was defeated as a P.C. candidate or since. Where was the member then at that time I wonder? He was defeated.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that we have vehemently opposed this application by National Sea. We have indicated to the people of Newfoundland that we will study whether in fact there are legal grounds for us to take court action and we will do everything else that we can do in order to see that this decision is overturned. Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, it may be that in time, in the next year or two, it will overturn itself because, from everything that we can learn, this present approval by the federal government just cannot work. But we will use every means at our disposal to see that this policy is changed.

We are going to continue, however, to see that the Atlantic Accord becomes legislation not only in this Legislature but in the House

of Commons and that we continue to do other things which are important for Newfoundland and Labrador. But on this particular issue we will continue to oppose it and use every means at our disposal, humanly possible, to see that it is changed.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier failed to answer my question. It is quite simple. The Premier said that if the Prime Minister, once elected, dared renege on any part of the offshore agreement that he would disassociate himself from the party. In fact he said, "I would take my bow and arrow and I would soon find myself behind bars."

MR. BAIRD:

What you did was run off.

MR. SIMMS:

You have to table that.

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, I will table it if required to.

Now is the Premier prepared to take the same kind of drastic action now that Mr. Mulroney has seen fit to violate a section of the Fisheries Restructuring Agreement or does he consider that agreement of less importance than the offshore agreement?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have said what we are doing and I think we are

taking the appropriate action as it relates to the violation of Clause 12 in the Fishery Restructuring Agreement. We have opposed it publicly, we used every means at our disposal to oppose it before the decision came down. Since the decision came down, without the help of the members opposite, by the way, who obviously helped to ensure that National Sea got their licence by voting against our position, we are looking at legal ways to manoeuvre, to see whether we can get the decision opposed and that is the way we are going to proceed on this matter, Mr. Speaker. The member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) is trying to take a statement that I made on a completely different issue and translate it over and juxtapose it to see whether in fact I am going to take the same position. Our position is clear on factory freezer trawlers, we are against them; the Liberal Party has voted for them, but we will continue to oppose. We will use whatever methods at our disposal, including legal methods, to see that that matter is rectified.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier will he table the times and dates of all meetings held, and the minutes of such meetings and copies of all correspondence exchanged over the last few months on the issue of factory freezer trawlers? Would the Premier indicate how many meetings there were and just exactly how firmly was the

representation made that factor freezer trawlers should not be brought in? Because, Mr. Speaker, everything that we have seen, including Mr. Speaker, the Premier's comments in that pathetic and defeatist interview he gave on On Camera last Wednesday, that confession, Mr. Speaker, every indication is that he knew at least two weeks ago that this decision was taken and everything he has done since then has been a charade and part of an attempt, of a plan to try and conceal from the people of this Province that he had caved in before the fact? Would he table that information?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I know the Leader of the Opposition is trying to get himself out of a hole because he went along with National Sea in trying to get factory freezer trawlers in this House, I know he is trying to get out of that hole, but, Mr. Speaker, let me make it abundantly clear, we did not have any material in our position or any indication of the decision that the federal government was going to make ten or fourteen days beforehand, as the Leader of the Opposition was saying. We did not know.

MR. BARRY:

That is not true.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is true.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, can I answer the question without being interferred

with by the Leader of the Opposition?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, Oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, can I answer the question without being interrupted?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We, as a government, did not know the decision of the federal government. That is why I wanted to get the resolution passed by everybody in this House because the news had said that a decision was pending within the next couple of weeks. I did not know what day, when, I did not know what the decision was going to be. And that extra support from the House of Assembly could have had a meaningful role in determining what the outcome would be. That is why I brought that resolution in when I did. Unfortunately the Opposition did not go along with that resolution and strengthened the hand of National Sea and the Government of Nova Scotia. But we did not know, Mr. Speaker, and the only letters that are available or pieces of correspondence, are correspondence that I sent to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Nielsen), or the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) sent to the Minister of Fisheries, or that I sent to the Prime Minister. That was the other problem with the decision, there were not meetings held with the Government of Newfoundland on it. We were the ones who initiated our lobbying efforts with the Atlantic caucus, initiated sending copies of the

document to all ministers of the Cabinet, and so on. So, Mr. Speaker, there were no meetings on it.

MR. BARRY:
What?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
We went up to Ottawa, and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) went up to Ottawa, and put documents -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:
You would not go up to Ottawa on the issue.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I did go up to Ottawa on this issue. On September 11 we had a meeting with the Prime Minister at which I opposed it and told the Prime Minister. But after that point, from September 11 on to now, we did all our lobbying efforts and went to Ottawa, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and so on.

MR. TULK:
Why did you not go up there in October?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Just one second, now. I cannot answer the question, Mr. Speaker, I am being harassed.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier has asked on

a number of occasions for silence and perhaps you could give him that courtesy.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I said in this House back three or four weeks ago we took on a number of initiatives to try to ensure that we got the decision that we wanted on the factory freezer trawler issue. We presented a position paper, and we sent that to the Prime Minister, we sent that to every member of Cabinet, and we sent it to every MP. Mr. Speaker, we went ahead -

MR. BARRY:
Where were you since September 11? You went to Ottawa for one meeting, one meeting.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, may I finish?

MR. BARRY:
Resign, boy. Resign. Give it up! One meeting!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
No, Mr. Speaker! No!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I have asked for silence on a number of occasions and I would like for us to have it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, in every meeting that was held since September, by all the ministers and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), about six meetings with the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Nielsen) in Ottawa, every meeting that I had we put forward our position on

factory freezer trawlers. Then we went further than that. Besides the meetings that we held, we then produced a document that was sent to every minister in the Cabinet and every MP in the House of Commons, then we did a briefing of the Atlantic Caucus, and then we wanted a resolution from this House, and, unfortunately, we did not get it. So through all the meetings we held, through all the documents that we produced, except for the resolution from this House, we did what we could. That is the answer to the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Barry) question. I am sorry if it does not please him. But here is the Leader of the Opposition talking about the number of meetings we had in Ottawa or in St. John's, yet his party opposed it.

MR. BARRY:

We were prepared to go to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition on a point of privilege.

MR. BARRY:

In light of these comments by the Premier, Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that we had the Premier get up outside this House and say the reason he would not appoint a Select Committee was because of the expense when members had

agreed to pay their own way to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, in light of that, in light of the fact that he had admitted on On Camera that he knew about the decision, in light of the fact that federal Tory MPs confirm that the Premier knew about it before he ever brought that resolution into the House, I would ask, Mr. Speaker, and I am prepared to move a motion, seconded by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), to ask Your Honour to find, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a prima facie case established on the record of the Premier misleading this House. I am prepared to move, Mr. Speaker, that this misleading was made as part of dishonest, false and untrue statements on the matter of the decision by the federal government to license factory freezer trawlers, especially as it relates to the timing of his knowledge as to when the decision was made by the federal government. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask your honour to examine the record of this House. The Premier has engaged in a charade, Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to cover up the fact that we now have confirmed from his own lips, that the Premier of the Province himself had one meeting since September 11 on this issue. Then has the audacity to come in this House, Mr. Speaker, and refuse to appoint a Select Committee, he says, because of the expense, when members were prepared to pay their own way. Mr. Speaker, the record speaks for itself. The Premier got up as part of a plan to conceal from the people of this Province that he had caved in on that issue, Mr. Speaker, that he was engaging in a political theatre after the decision had been taken, and I ask you to find it is a prima facie case of the Premier misleading this House.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

This is absolute nonsense. I understand what the Leader of the Opposition is saying. He is hurt because his Party voted to support factory freezer trawlers. I had one meeting in September, but we have had innumerable meetings the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, (Mr. Power) the Minister of Fisheries-

MR. BARRY:

How many did you have?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know how many I had. I had innumerable meetings. One in September. Mr. Speaker, I am not allowed to speak in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I never said a word when the Leader of the Opposition got up on his point of privilege.

MR. FUREY:

No, but your cronies did.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Premier has asked on a number of occasions for silence and he is perfectly entitled to that.

MR. BARRY:

Where was he since September?

MR. W. CARTER:

Name him.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

When somebody asks for silence, they are entitled to it. The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there is no point of privilege. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is going on hearsay, rumor, whatever he can pick up in a paper. There is no point of privilege. The Government of Newfoundland did everything in its power to oppose factory freezer trawlers; innumerable meeting, innumerable letters, innumerable booklets going out, whatever we could do. I know that the Leader of the Opposition is hurt. I know that the people of Newfoundland feel that the Liberal Party went along with National Sea, and now he is trying to recoup through a point of privilege. It will not work, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, there is no prima facie case of breach of privilege. I cannot see that the hon. member's privileges or those of the House have been affected.

Notices of Motion

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following resolution:

"WHEREAS the Walwyn Cottage

Hospital has served the health care needs of the people in the general Come By Chance area for nearly fifty years; and

WHEREAS much money has been expended in recent years to bring this facility up to modern-day standards; and

WHEREAS Mobil Oil has confirmed its intention to use the site at Adams Head for the fabrication of concrete platforms, employing up to 1,500 persons; and

WHEREAS the likelihood of the Come By Chance oil refinery being reactivated is appearing to be a reality more as each week passes; and" -

MR. MATTHEWS:

Oh, you believe that now do you?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

"WHEREAS the likelihood of the establishment of a petrochemical plant at Come By Chance is presently being pursued by Dor Chemicals and the Government of this Province;

THEREFORE be it resolved that the above-stated factors be considered before effect is given" -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

- to this government's earlier announced decision to replace the Walwyn Cottage Hospital with a

clinic upon the opening of the Clarenville hospital; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that government, in particular, the Minister of Health, immediately communicate to the citizens of the Come By Chance area news of a deferral of the policy decision already announced and a present decision in the light of all of the above factors to give serious and thorough consideration to maintaining and enhancing the present facility; and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that any other course of action would be inconsistent with the perceived economic growth of this area."

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

I have an answer to a question asked verbally by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) some time ago before he went away.

o o o

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Fogo district (Mr. Tulk) that the Premier be reprimanded - no, that is the wrong one, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
The Leader of the Opposition just stood in his place and made a motion that the Premier be reprimanded. Now, I ask the Leader of the Opposition to remove that from the record of this House. He has made that statement, it is going to be on the record. Now, half-way through it, he tries to go to some other motion. I want that stricken from the record of the House, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
The Premier has been reprimanded by the hon. Mr. Crosbie, the federal Cabinet minister.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I want it withdrawn.

MR. BARRY:
He has been reprimanded by Mr. Morrissey Johnson, the federal MP for Bonavista - Trinity Conception.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Because they support factory freezer trawlers as you do.

MR. BARRY:
He has been reprimanded by Mr. McGrath, the other federal MP, Mr. Speaker. We all know the Premier

should be reprimanded. Any Premier who had one meeting in Ottawa on an issue of this import and would not agree to send a -

PREMIER PECKFORD:
One meeting in September.

MR. BARRY:
No, he said, one meeting since September, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
No, no!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
September 11 was the date of the meeting in September.

MR. BARRY:
One meeting since September 11. He deserves to be reprimanded.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, I am going to reserve judgement and look at that.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I rise to move, seconded by the member for Fogo district (Mr. Tulk), the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 23 for the purpose of debating a matter of urgent public importance, namely, that the Premier of this Province has engaged in a conscious plan to conceal from the people of this Province his knowledge of the time of the decision of the federal government concerning factory freezer trawlers and to conceal that his only firm representation to the federal government on this matter came after that decision was made, as did his request for the support of this hon. House.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that asking for leave to move the adjournment of the House to debate this matter is totally out of order.

The hon. gentleman knows he brought the same thing up as a matter of privilege a few minutes ago and the Chair recognized it for what it was - the Chair did not use the words but I can - nothing more than a mere political attempt to hide their own embarrassment by not having supported the resolution a couple of weeks ago.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is quite obvious that this is totally out of order.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
If there was anything that is crucially important -

MR. DAWE:
Is this to the motion?

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, yes it is to the matter raised. If there is anything that is crucially important, Mr. Speaker, to the integrity of the operation of this House of Assembly and the government it is having the

confidence of people, Mr. Speaker. If there is anything more designed to lose that confidence it is for the Premier of the Province to engage in a charade, in a sham, in an attempt to manipulate proceedings in this House, to disguise the fact, after the fact, after the decision was made, that before the decision was made, he did not have the courage to take a firm stand. He would not take a standing committee -

PREMIER PECKFORD:
(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:
May I yield the floor to the Premier?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:
Oh, the Premier does interject once in a while, does he? I see, Mr. Speaker. The Premier interjects once in a while.

Mr. Speaker, when the Premier of this Province comes in and attempts to subvert the very operations of this House of Assembly for his own political purposes, to engage in a charade and a sham as part of the conscious plan to try and conceal from the people of this Province the true reality which is his ineffectiveness, his neglect of his duties as Premier, then, Mr. Speaker, it is time to have a debate on that point. Lost again and make no wonder you lost. One meeting since September 11. Make no wonder you would not bring up, Mr. Speaker, a standing committee of this House to see what he is like when he gets face to face, Mr. Speaker, with the Prime Minister of this country and the acting Minister of Fisheries (Mr.

Nielsen). A political wimp, Mr. Speaker, is what we have sitting opposite us in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I must rule that this motion is not in order.

Orders of the Day

On motion, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
Order, please!

Shall the resolution carry?

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BARRY:
If anybody had any questions about the Premier deceiving this House and distorting what took place in this House, make no wonder he would leave, Mr. Chairman.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
A point of order, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition knows that he cannot impute deceiving of the

House directly or indirectly. There must be other ways the hon. gentleman can find to make his point. He has already attempted to impute deception by bringing up a point of privilege which the Chair ruled out of order. He has tried again to have an opportunity to impute deception by asking for leave for a motion of adjournment. In this debate - and he is as aware of this as I am - he will have to find ways of taking issue with the government without impugning deception.

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

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Chairman, the Intergovernmental Affairs Minister (Mr. Ottenheimer) must know that since 1958 it is ruled parliamentary to use many expressions. One of them, of course, is 'deceive'. It depends on the context in which it is taken. If he looks he will also find on certain occasions it was ruled unparliamentary. But, of course, what is ruled unparliamentary today may not be unparliamentary tomorrow and vice-versa. It depends on the situation in which it is used.

In this case, I think, any person would have to rule that indeed the Premier has, in more ways than one, deceived this Province. So, therefore, I would submit that the word 'deceive' is parliamentary and perfectly within order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
To that point of order, it is a difference of opinion between two

hon. members.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if anything would show more clearly the Premier's attempt to deceive it is his statements in this House today when we contrast them with what was actually carried in Hansard. In Hansard, Mr. Chairman, in my debate on the Premier's resolution, amongst other things I tabled a Telex that we have sent to the hon. Erik Nielsen, Deputy Prime Minister and Acting Minister of Fisheries and Ocean saying, '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.'

On Chairman, on the previous day I went through and I explained to the Premier how, because of his withdrawing an agreement to have an all-party committee go up to Ottawa and carry directly to Mr. Nielsen our opposition, we concluded that the Premier of this Province was only engaging in a charade. The decision had already been taken. He knew what was going to happen and he was afraid to let us go to Ottawa. We were prepared to pay our own way, Mr. Chairman.

Then the Premier goes out and says, no he does not want the committee to go because it would be too expensive, Mr. Chairman. Now if that is not deception, I do not know what is. In this House members stood up and said they were prepared to pay their own way and the Premier of this Province goes out and uses as his excuse

the expense as reason for not taking this committee to Ottawa. That is proof, Mr. Chairman, of the sham, the charade and the deception that has been engaged in by the Premier on this issue.

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, I am looking for a ruling here. This is suppose to be the Committee of Supply, and how the hon. the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) comments about a select committee and about the nonsense that his members are prepared to pay their own way to Ottawa, how that can have any relevance to the matter before the floor escapes me.

I wish you would call him to order.

MR. BARRY:

To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, what we are dealing with here are matters going to the very integrity of government. There is no point of order. When the debate on Supplementary Supply comes up Mr. Chairman, anything going to the integrity of government is essential in order to know whether the money is being spent in a proper fashion. If we have a government that is prepared to engage in sham and charade and deception on factory freezer trawlers, my God, what would they do in the budget?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We concluded, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier was attempting to engage in a little charade and a little theatre to conceal the fact that he had caved in. He had been told by Mr. Mulroney to stay back in Newfoundland after that September 11 meeting. Mr. Mulroney was not going to waste his time speaking to the Premier of this Province any more. He was sent home like a little boy, Mr. Chairman. That is why he did not want to take a committee of this House representing all parties to Ottawa. It was not because of the expense. We were prepared to pay our own way. It was because he did not want to see the way he was being ignored, Mr. Chairman, and how ineffective he was, how incompetent he was, how wishy-washy, how wimpish, Mr. Chairman. That is the reason. And, Mr. Chairman, do you know something? Yes, we would not support that resolution because we would not support deception, we would not support an attempt to deceive the people of this Province, and we will sing that to the roof tops. If the Premier of this Province thinks that people are so stupid, maybe they think they are as stupid as the hon. gophers in the back benchers over there, Mr. Chairman, but they are not a good reading of the understanding and the common sense of the people of this Province. The gophers that we hear shouting out from time to time, Mr. Chairman, maybe they can be fooled by the charade and the sham of the Premier. But the people of this

Province cannot be, Mr. Chairman, and the people of this Province do not want their official Opposition to get up and say, "Me too", to a sham and to a charade.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hold it down.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, I will tell you what, I will make a deal with you. You keep your gophers quiet, and I will not shout.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Could we have silence please while the member is speaking?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, what we have here is outrageous. I think Mr. Chairman, if we go back at least to Confederation - we could probably go back to 1832 - and we would not find such an outrageous attempt to deceive as we have seen in the last few weeks. But you know something, it is not working, and that is the wonderful thing about our parliamentary system, Mr. Chairman, that is the wonderful thing about democracy that people see through those charades.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes, they do, that is why (inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

Do I have to shout or do I not? The member cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Chairman, the wonderful thing about democracy is that we can get up and we can set things out in Hansard and do you know something, Mr. Chairman, the people of this Province will see themselves what has gone on in Hansard. As a matter of fact, we might even send it out even if we do not get

funding by the government. I think we will take the Premier's comments today and attach them to the debate. I think that that would prove it once and for all. It would be better, Mr. Chairman, than the proof used by the great Greek geometers when they got into establishing their theorems, Mr. Chairman.

As a matter of fact I had a colleague who was at university with me, he just had a proof of a theorem accepted and do you know how he proved it, Mr. Chairman? It was not by the normal arithmetic means or the algebraic means, the way he proved the theorem, and it is a little complicated to get into what the theorem is, I can barely remember it from my university math courses, but he got a cover on a Canadian mathematics journal, a Newfoundlander over at the university working away and quietly doing his thinking got a cover in recognition by his peers in the mathematical community of a diagram. It was a geometric proof and it was so beautiful, so simplistic and so obvious that he did not need to write and calculate. It was so evident when you put the diagram there. What it was basically was two circles, a bigger circle and a smaller circle side by side with a few straight lines and as soon as people saw that they said, "Eureka, it is proven."

I think that we will have the same sort of - I do not know if we can call it a geometric proof, Mr. Chairman, what would we have to call it - a political proof I suppose, yes. We will have the same political proof when, Mr. Chairman, we attach the Premier's comments today with the record of Hansard of the debate that went on

on that resolution he referred to. It will be so obvious, Mr. Chairman, that there was deception.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman, just a brief comment on the debate in Committee. We have been dealing with Supplementary Supply now for a considerable period of time. The bill itself is an extremely simple bill. It really is just putting a stamp of ratification on something that has already essentially been accepted in this House.

I am not really complaining about it from that point of view because it has been a tradition of the House that any money matter opens up a wide range of debate and you can cover almost anything. But the reason behind that was to allow matters of importance to be brought before the people. It was not meant to bring this House into disrepute.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I saw a poll a little while ago. It was done by the Law Society, as a matter of fact, because lawyers were a bit concerned about their public image. They did find that they were not at the top of the ladder in terms of regard in the public eye of various categories of society. They were down the list. But one comment really struck me very forcibly and they said, "Thank God! At least we are better off than the politicians," who are

at the bottom of the list.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that that is something that some attention has to be paid to. We have got a responsibility, if not for our own image and our own reputation, that this House is looked upon with some sense of respect and some sense of responsibility. This is not a bear pit. I am not trying to be sort of sanctimonious about this, but this House is not a bear pit. This House is supposed to represent what we in this Province regard as the best aspect of democracy. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this House should be used in such a way that there are words of deceit being thrown back and forth so that people out there will say, "Hey, the House of Assembly is used to accusations of deceit, or used to accusations of attempt at deceit."

In the same way I do not think the people out there want to hear that someone cannot speak in this House without people shouting and barking and trying to interfere with his remarks in such a way that not even His Honour in the Chair knows what is going on and he himself has to rise on a point of protest, almost, and say, "I cannot hear what is going on in this House of the people. Will you please let me hear? I am trying to do my duty".

Mr. Chairman, I think in the last few days this House has come very close to being in disarray. I have been in this House for some time, as some of my colleagues have, we have been here under a couple of Premiers, we have been here under a whole range of Opposition Leaders, and we have been here in the presence of various members of this House and,

in my memory, I do not think this House has ever been in the sorry state it has been in the last few days in terms of trying to bring debate out. We are here to engage in vigorous debate, we are here to engage in cutting debate, we are here to try to present our point of view in the best way we can, but I think we are not here to interfere with the business of the House, with the running of the House, whether by delaying or by interfering with people's right to speak or giving impressions that deceit in this Chamber is an okay thing.

I, as one member of this House, protest against that type of thing and I hope that this bill will get through very soon. There are many other opportunities to discuss the big issues in this House, but if it does not get through very soon, at least let us engage, I am not saying in a gentlemanly fashion - that is too much to expect and probably it would not be right, anyway, to be totally gentlemanly in this House - but at least let us get through the debate in this House without maligning each other's characters and, indeed, without bringing the House into disarray.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Minister of Finance must have read my mind because those are the exact same words that I wanted to start off the debate with. Again it has started already. I am a junior member in this House. I know the hon. the minister over there has been here many, many years, but I am a junior member who came in here with all interest

and ambition to further a political career. But when I sat down here on the first day the House of Assembly opened and I saw the type of display that is being carried on every time you rise to your feet and you ask a question, which you figure is half sensible, pertaining to your district or pertaining to the problems of the Province, and you get people over there shouting insults, all kinds of accusations at anybody who stands to their feet, I think it is totally deplorable.

I have had a number of occasions where I have talked with students who came to the gallery, I have talked with different people who have come into the gallery and they shake their heads in total disgust. "Is that what you people are in here getting paid for? Is that what you people are holding down positions for in the Province to make sure that my future and my children's futures are being well taken care for? Well, if that is the case we are in for a very poor and sad future." Every minister in the government is to blame as well as a lot of members in the Opposition. I for one am of the opinion that until we sit down and start to act like grown-ups and intelligent people, this Province is only going to go down a lot further than it has today, and gracious knows it is down far enough right now. I myself am in total agreement that when people sit down in their chairs in this hon. House they be treated with some respect. Getting more to the problem on the factory freezer trawler and the credibility of the present government, we here in this Opposition are accused of voting for the factory freezer trawlers. That is totally wrong. We are opposed to factory freezer trawlers and everybody in the

Province knows we are opposed to factory freezer trawlers, and everybody on the government side knows it.

MR. DAWE:

Yes, we are finding out now.

MR. EFFORD:

Here we go with another example of what a minister can do. The situation is that as of last week every person in this Province, including the government and the Opposition, was in total shock, total devastation and total despair when they realized the news that came down. Not only one, but three factory freezer licenses came down to the Province. Back in March when the campaign started, the government, the Premier and his Party and all the people who were into the campaign, went around the Province telling the people that they were going to see the best things possible happen to this Province if they voted Tory because there is a Tory government in Ottawa.

MR. TULK:

Tory blue. The Chairman does not agree with that.

MR. EFFORD:

Now a lot of people thought that was sensible. Obviously they must have, because they certainly voted for the government and they got their expectations built up that everything was going to be okay. Newfoundland was going to prosper with the Atlantic Accord; in the fishery we were going to get the necessary agreement for whatever it was with no problems and no fighting. The bickering and the fighting was over. All we had to do was send our Premier and his ministers to Ottawa, and they would sit down and get into a sensible conversation and come to

an agreement on what should happen to Newfoundland. Now we find that everything that was said back in March and April was totally deceiving the people of the Province. They cannot tell us of one thing that we have gained by having a Tory government in Newfoundland and a Tory government in Ottawa. In fact, I would say we have lost ground because when the Liberal government was in Ottawa we got a lot more out of it regardless of what government is in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Right now we have no forestry agreement, we have no agricultural agreement, we have no secondary roads agreements, we have no Forestry Research Center, and we have nothing but total confusion in the fishing industry. We have people in this Province who do not know if they should get up in the morning and get aboard their boats or go out and throw a gallon of gasoline over it and burn it. That is a fact, that is not fun. We have a group of fishermen out in Port de Grave who are very sincere about fishing, who are no longer asking the government of the Province to give them money, and all they want is the freedom to go out on the offshore and fish. They today are not allowed to do that. We have asked the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) to try to get something done about this as the months have gone passed and we still have no ruling on it. The only thing the fishermen have been told as of today is their boats are now tied up and next year they will definitely not be allowed to go out there. They will be allocated a two-month quota to catch halibut

and we have three fish plants out in Trinity - Conception Bay - Port de Grave, Harbour Grace and Old Perlican - closed up because of shortages of stock. Sure, they may have had poor management or they may have had other financial problems but the main reason is the shortage of stock. We have a number of longerliners around the coast of Newfoundland that are quite capable of going out and catching fish, why should those plants close? Why cannot those people be allowed to go out there and catch fish on the condition that they bring it to the plants that are in trouble? Now why is it that we cannot get something sensible like that? The member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young), the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) and the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid) will not open their mouths because they are told not to. I think it is devastating when we have so many people out of work, approximately 1500 people, which is affecting the area drastically. We now find in the member for Carbonear's (Mr. Peach) area that in the Trinity - Conception Mall there is a large business closing out. On December 31 the Bay Store is closing, going out of business because of the economic conditions in the area, and another fifty-seven people are being laid off. That is all related to the poor fishery, no work in the plants this year, and that is having a great effect on all over Trinity - Conception Bay.

MR. TULK:

The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) should be ashamed.

MR. EFFORD:

If this is what is meant by good consultation, by good representation by the Newfoundland Government to the federal

government in Ottawa, then God help us when we get two governments opposing each other.

We have an agreement this year signed with the Ottawa government to create some jobs for the winter. It is no good. It is absolutely useless to the Province of Newfoundland. It is good for industrial Ontario, it is good for, probably, Central Canada, but I can just see down in Comfort Cove, Bonavista Bay, this year taking some people out and putting them in a business and training them to operate computers.

MR. TULK:

Or down in Triton.

MR. EFFORD:

Or down in Triton or down in Notre Dame Bay. Probably now if we could come up with some technicians and some new industries, and probably put in some industrialized plants down there, we could probably train them to operate. But just imagine getting up down in Triton at eight o'clock in the morning and saying to people, "You are going to go out on the wharf now because we have a half a dozen computers out there and we are going to teach you how to operate them." I mean, it is totally crazy.

We are seeing the total neglect of the people of this Province. We are seeing the total credibility of the government leader, the Premier of the Province, the credibility of the Fisheries Minister (Mr. Rideout), the credibility of the Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), the credibility of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. R. Aylward) go down the tubes.

MR. TULK:

They are not being listened to.

MR. EFFORD:

They are not being listened to at all. If they were, I would be the first one to sit down in my chair and say that goods things have come to the Province. I will be the first one to pat him on the back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

What we need to see is for the people of this Province to get some pride back. We need the people of this Province to get some working ability instead of these make-work programmes every winter which are no better than welfare. That is what is being shoved down their throats. Now that is even been taken away and used against them.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, it is time for this government to take a look at themselves and stop throwing these stupid, insidious remarks across the floor. They are only making complete fools of themselves. The people of this Province can see what you are doing. The people of this Province realize when they get up in the morning they have absolutely no food, no clothing and nothing for their children even to go to school with a sensible lunch can. Whose fault is it? Is it the Opposition's fault? You sit over there and you say it is the Opposition's fault because the factory freezer trawlers are in. Well, what you are telling us, in fact, is the Opposition has got more credibility in Ottawa than you people have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

That is exactly what you are saying, that we have more credibility in Ottawa than the government. Just imagine when the Opposition in this Province has more credibility with the federal government than the government has. That is the message I am getting from all of my constituents, "You people have the power in there now. You people got the power to make decisions. Ottawa does not want to listen to the government, they want to listen to the Opposition." Because that what you have been preaching for the last two or three weeks.

MR. BAIRD:

What nonsense!

MR. EFFORD:

It is not nonsense. That is what is being said out there. This resolution, is a pack of nonsense. It is being played and played too far.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

One thing we just heard, Mr. Chairman, is that the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) has acknowledged on behalf of the Opposition, "Yes, we did take a stand in support of factory freezer trawlers. Yes, we did

send a message to Ottawa and, yes, we did meet with success." That is what the member for Port de Grave just said, Mr. Chairman. He said, "Out there now, and we all know it is out there," he said, "Out there now the people are saying that you have more power than the government because the government supported our decision on factory freezer trawlers." He has finally acknowledged, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EFFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

The member is misleading the House. If he wants to use up his ten minutes, I suggest to the member, and I am going to say it very directly, to stand on his feet and say something intelligent for a change.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Chairman, if I may.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

In a debate of this nature, of course, the hon. gentleman can get up after and speak, one can go back and forth, not just one time. All I am doing is recalling what the Speaker said earlier, and, I think, that applies for everybody, that if we are going to have points of order which are points which can be made in debate, I think that really would be preferable for everybody. I know there are hon. gentlemen on this side who have used that

device as well, but I think it is something for all of us, that we should make our points in debate. Really what I am doing is reminding hon. members of the Speaker's ruling.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, let me say to the Intergovernmental Affairs Minister (Mr. Ottenheimer) that as a parliamentarian we have all kinds of respect for him in this House, but there is one thing that he cannot do and that is tell the Chair how it is to govern the conduct of this House. Let me also make another point to him, that if he will agree that members like the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) not give information that is untrue, that is false in this House, then he will not get people on this side of the House getting up on points of order. But those are not spurious points of order.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Not spurious points of order?

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman should be in his seat. Those are not spurious points of order that my friend for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) is raising, which is what the Speaker was talking about this afternoon. They are points of order in order to keep the record straight in this House. If you are going to have people like the member for Burin-Placentia West playing that deliberate kind of game, then, Mr. Chairman, we can all see what is going to happen and that is

unfortunate for this House. So my suggestion to the Intergovernmental Affairs Minister is to keep his own house on that side in order and it will be handled very well on this side.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) has now left the Chamber. If I had made the admission that he made after listening to his Leader today, I am not so sure that I would ever come back in the Chamber. He stood in this House, Mr. Chairman, and said, "We have the power. We voted in favour of factory freezer trawlers, the trawlers are now coming, and we are the ones who convinced the people in Ottawa, not the government."

Mr. Chairman, the member for Port de Grave, Hansard will prove and show that is what he said. And he cannot, under any point of order or under any destruction of the rules of the House, change that statement that he has made. I listened, Mr. Chairman, to his speech, asking us if the government could tell us some of the good things.

MR. TULK:

You mean your mouth was not going?

MR. TOBIN:

There goes the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), Mr. Chairman, another fellow who went out and voted in favour of factory freezer

trawlers, and recorded in Hansard, Mr. Chairman, as voting in favour of factory freezer trawlers. The day will come, Mr. Chairman, when the people of Fogo will make him accountable for his actions. I can assure you that that day will come.

Now, Mr. Chairman, they talk about nothing good happening in the Province, everything in the Province falling apart. The Minister of Housing (Mr. Dinn) got up today in a Ministerial Statement and made reference to a 26 per cent increase in housing construction. In my own district, in my own town, forty-six building lots were sold this year. I can assure everybody opposite that there has never been a decline in housing construction, not in the last three or four years in my district, and this year forty-six building units have been sold. The E.P. Reddy subdivision in Marystown which last year had probably three houses, this year all 50 or 60 lots are all sold. That, Mr. Chairman, is an indication of progress in the district and it is an indication of the type of commitment that this government has to the people of the Burin Peninsula.

Mr. Chairman, he said nothing happens. What about the Cow Head facility? What about the \$13 million spent at the Cow Head facility to create employment and to service the oil rigs? Is that not progress, Mr. Chairman?

MR. FUREY:

What about the \$200 million reduction in transfer payments for this Province?

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, what about the Cow Head project? What about the

Burin Peninsula hospital that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) when he was the member sent down D8 bulldozer before the election and scrapped off the ground, built a platform and for four or five years, Mr. Chairman, 'April Fool' was marked across it?

I remember, Mr. Chairman, when the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) was running in Burin - St. George's as a Progressive Conservative wondering if there was anything he could do with that sign up there, Mr. Chairman. He said, 'It is awfully disturbing to walk up there and see that sign.' Well, Mr. Chairman, we have done something with that sign. We have replaced that April Fool sign that existed under Liberal representation with a new seventy-five bed modern hospital to care for the sick and the suffering people of the Burin Peninsula. That is the type of progress the people of the Burin Peninsula have been used to, Mr. Chairman.

Where was I at last Thursday with the Premier of this Province and the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett)? Where were we, Mr. Chairman? We were in Burin signing an \$8 million agreement with FPI. To do what, Mr. Chairman? We were signing an \$8 million agreement with FPI to develop a magnificent, major, significant secondary processing operation in this Province. That is the company that their leader acted for with the Bank of Nova Scotia when they were put into receivership. That is the company. And that is the government that they supported, the one that came down here.

Remember when Mr. De Bané came down here, along with the member

for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) now, and had the big press conference. What did they announce? Ask my colleague from Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) what they announced, Mr. Chairman? What did they announce when De Bané and Mr. Simmons came down with their unilateral action on the fishery here? What is going to happen to Grand Bank? What is going to happen to Fortune? What is going to happen to Burin? What is going to happen to all of the rest of the places? They were gone, Mr. Chairman. They were never again, Mr. Chairman, going to come alive? That is what happened under the Liberal Government in Ottawa.

What about the secondary processing in Burin? What about that? Right now in Burin, despite the federal Liberal Government of a year ago, despite the Liberal Party of this Province who supported them at that time, there are now approximately 300 people working in Burin. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is what we call progress in our district, to see that secondary processing and to have the opportunity to go through that plant and to see the men and women there at work.

Mr. Chairman, it was almost unbelievable the way they came to the Premier the other day and thanked to him, Mr. Chairman, and said, "You were the man who believed in our town. You are the man responsible for having us here today." That was the type of reaction in Burin.

Also I can say, and let the word go out, there was a very negative reaction towards the Liberal Party on their stand as it relates to the factory freezer trawlers. I can assure the hon. gentleman, Mr.

Chairman, that the people of the Burin Peninsula disagree very strongly on the fact that they have supported factory freezer trawlers in this Province.

If I can just move on, the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) was talking, "Nothing going to happen. Nothing has happened." What about the concrete platforms? What about what is going to happen in the member for Bellevue's district, Mr. Chairman, in Adam's Head? My colleague from Placentia (Mr. Patterson), what is going to happen in his district in Argentic? My own district, Mr. Chairman, where we just signed the other day with the Moss - Rosenberg group a technology transfer which is now going into place. There were advertisements in the Weekend looking for engineers. I would assume there is some relation there, Mr. Chairman.

What about the joint venture of a new company between the Marystown Shipyard Limited and Moss - Rosenberg to get involved in concrete platforms? Is that not progress, Mr. Chairman? Is that not what this government has been fighting for for a number of years, to ensure that Newfoundlanders get jobs that are created and going to happen in Newfoundland? Yes, Mr. Chairman. It is that type of stand by this administration that has brought the Leader of the Opposition to the other side of the House. Because when he was here, Mr. Chairman, he did not care what happened so long as he was front and foremost and on TV every night.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. TOBIN:

By leave, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. TOBIN:

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that we have in this Province today a government that cares, unlike the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and the gentlemen opposite.

There is no excuse, Mr. Chairman, for the conduct of the hon. gentlemen who voted in favour of factory freezer trawlers. I have to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am especially disturbed by the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter). I have known that man, Mr. Chairman, I always believed in him. Oh yes, Mr. Chairman, he was a good man. I have to give him credit for that. He was a good man, he represented the district. I worked in several campaigns for him, but when he stood in this House, Mr. Chairman, and had his name recorded as being in favour of factory freezer trawlers, then Mr. Chairman, I began to question whether or not he was the same person who represented the people of this Province so well in the past number of years.

However, Mr. Chairman, let me say that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) I understand - I have great contacts and great sources and means of finding that information - that the member for Twillingate fought a hard battle in caucus and the member from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) who has now shown up since, fought the same battle. They were told, Mr. Chairman, by their leader that they could not ask questions, particularly on the resolution by the member for Torngat Mountains

relating to the unemployment insurance. They were told that they could not speak and I understand the member for Twillingate was very upset in that caucus meeting, Mr. Chairman. He let it be known to his leader, I understand, that he wanted to support the fishermen. And the leader then got support from the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) in telling the member for Twillingate that he could not get involved in the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the member for Eagle River became very upset because he could not get involved in the resolution dealing with the unemployment insurance and has since boycotted the House of Assembly and boycotted the Liberal caucus meetings. That, Mr. Chairman, is the information that we have.

If you want to talk about progress let us go look, Mr. Chairman, at what has happened in the fishing industry in this Province. The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, went on the radio station and took to the media of this Province immediately after the signing of the agreement between FPI and the government with a new influx of money and he said the places that needed the money the least were where the funding was going. I can go tell the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) that the people of Burin did not appreciate that statement from the Leader, he took to the airways, Mr. Chairman, let it be known and the people of Burin heard it, that the places that got the money from the FPI restructuring programme recently were the areas and the towns that needed it the least.

Mr. Chairman, we understand his

position as it relates to what happened as the lawyer for the Bank of Nova Scotia, but for him to go on the radio stations, Mr. Chairman, and hit the media in this Province saying, well, basically what he meant was that he was against Burin receiving that funding.

Mr. Chairman, is that not almost unbelievable that a community and a town whose people have been down and out, whose plant looked like it would never open again, finally there was going to be an influx of \$10 million, yes Mr. Chairman, what happened? The leader of the Liberal Party in this Province took to the airways and says, "The places that got the money are the places that needed it the least."

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. TOBIN:

By 'leave again?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, there are certain techniques that a person can use in debate. I know because I have used them in preaching sermons.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this Committee of the Whole inside a Cabinet meeting. I would suggest, Sir, that Power in the Cabinet says, "lady and gentlemen, we have blown it. We have just proven beyond all doubt that we have absolutely no influence

whatsoever with Ottawa. We are a group of totally irrelevant people to whom Ottawa will not listen. We have blown it." I am taking you inside the Cabinet, Mr. Chairman.

"Now what can we do? What can we do? The people of Newfoundland are going to crucify us. We have just blown it."

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is that your leak from Cabinet?

MR. DECKER:

That is my leak from Cabinet.

"Now, send for the gopher, send for someone who is big on mouth and short on brains. Someone who will do what he is told, who will micmic. Someone who will micmic at the moon at all night if he is told to micmic at the moon all night." So they go for their gopher. They say, "look, let us take something completely out of context, take anything out of context, I do not care what you take what you take out of context. Take something out of context." So they take where we had a wise plan to send a select committee to Ottawa and took it out of context to take the heat off themselves, and told the gopher, who has got no brains only a big mouth, to micmic every opportunity that he gets, "you voted against, you voted for factory freezer trawlers." Get the attention off the main issue.

The main issue, Mr. Chairman, is this we have an ineffective administration in this Province. That is the main issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

No matter what they go to Ottawa with, the answer is going to be the same. "Sit down and shut up. Mind your own business. We will do what we believe is best for Ottawa and for Newfoundland. Never mind what you think. It is totally irrelevant."

Now, Mr. Chairman, that could very well be laughable, if it was not so serious. The serious part about this, Mr. Chairman, is that St. Anthony could be doomed to destruction. The serious part of this, Mr. Chairman, is that Conche can be forced to resettle. The serious part of this, Mr. Chairman, is that Croque and Englee and Flowers Cove and Cook's Harbour - these are some places in my district - are capable of putting fish on the market just as fresh, at just as high quality, as anything that any FFT could ever hope to do. And lost in all this argument about who was against or who was for, everyone was against factory freezer trawlers. Anyone who has a grain of sense in this Province knows full well that they are going to destroy the inshore fishery. They are going to destroy communities in this Province. Anyone who has a grain of sense left in them knows this.

What we are seeing are tricks of debate and tricks of public speaking trying to divert peoples minds from the real issue. The real issue, Mr. Chairman is that we have a government which is ineffective.

I can point to some of the things right here in this statement that the hon. the Premier presented to the House on November 8, 1985. On page 5 of this Ministerial Statement, Mr. Chairman, the Premier points out that the Provinces of New Brunswick, Prince

Edward Island and Quebec have raised objections about factory freezer trawlers access to resources adjacent to them and so these vessels will be prohibited from operating in the Gulf. The Premier puts this in to somehow suggest that he has a strong point with Ottawa. This tells me, Mr. Chairman, as it tells the people of Newfoundland, that the Premier was totally ignored. Little Prince Edward Island could put up a better argument than our government could put up. Well nobody is surprised about the influence of Quebec, but they put up a better argument. This tells me Mr. Chairman, that when all the Provinces of the Atlantic region went up to Ottawa with a case, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, and Quebec won out, but for Newfoundland, it was just as well to have not gone up whether it was one meeting or one hundred meetings, or whether or not there were one hundred letters that went back and forth. This is the serious thing today which is facing this Province, Mr. Chairman.

We have witnessed once again, the total break down of relations between Ottawa and St. John's. We were told that there could be no co-operation as long as we had a Liberal government in Ottawa and a Tory government in Newfoundland. We were told that if you could change it and give us a Tory government in Ottawa and a Tory government in Newfoundland, then you will see prosperity being inflicted upon this Province.

Welcome, Mr. Chairman, to 1985 because this is the same thing all over again. History is repeating itself all over again because no matter who we put in Ottawa, Mr. Chairman, we have a Premier who I

do not believe can get along with his own mother. He cannot make a deal with his own mother. That is the problem in this Province today, Mr. Chairman, he just cannot make a deal with anybody.

Fight, fight, fight, all you hear is fight! If I want to see a fight, Mr. Chairman, I will watch a boxing match or a hockey game, but I want to see somebody win once in a while. I wish some of this fighting could pay off. Oh great! Fight, fight! What silliness, what childishness, what proposterous nonsense, Mr. Chairman. If I used the kind of language that the Speaker, advised me against using a few days ago, I think it would be a much more appropriate way to describe this nonsense about fighting, Mr. Chairman.

Let us act like adults, grown people. If anyone wants to watch a fight, let them watch television. We want to see somebody deliver and the Premier could not deliver as well as Prince Edward Island could deliver. Could not deliver as well as New Brunswick or Quebec or anyone else. We have a minister who is long on fighting but is short on winning. He cannot negotiate a deal on anything.

This, Mr. Chairman is what happened in our fishery. Let us go back to page two of this Ministerial Statement, Mr. Chairman. "It casts into doubt the security of all agreements thereby, creating a serious precedent with implications for all Provinces in Canada."

I remember some time ago, the Premier was making a big deal about getting something in writing. When Mr. Chrétien was

down here trying to negotiate an oil deal, Mr. Premier walked away from the negotiations because Chrétien would not put something in writing.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that when the big brother in Ottawa wants to tell the little fellow in Newfoundland what to do, it matters less whether it is in writing, engraved in stone or what it is because this administration has been neutered, make useless and totally irrelevant. That is what happens when you get someone who is prepared to toe the line; that is what happens when you get a group of 'yes' men. You know, I see that so often in this House. The Premier gets up and says 'Boo'! What a wonderful boo! The Premier gets up and says, 'Hallelujah'! What a wonderful hallelujah! They are like a bunch of robots, Mr. Chairman.

I would say we are coming into this age of cybernetics, this age of the industry. Do you know what we could see if we ever get another Tory government in this Province? If we do, you are going to see a man similar to the Premier, but instead of all those hon. gentlemen, you are going to see mannequins with plugs in the backs of their legs, Mr. Chairman, and every time the Premier gets up and says boo, we will see them, Mr. Chairman - only it will be speeded up and the control switch will be right there. It will be no different from what it is today, Mr. Chairman, only instead of having real, live people sitting in those seats, we will have mannequins, we will have robots.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Gobots.

MR. DECKER:

We will have 'gobots'.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is a pleasure to speak in this debate again.

After hearing a number of individuals speak today, a song comes to me. The main line of it is, 'We'll rant and we'll roar like true Newfoundlanders.' We have heard that ranting and roaring for an awfully long time, but now that we are getting done in, we are hearing nothing. We are not hearing a whimper. We are not hearing a sound. We had a black armband going around because of a certain court case and now, a decision that is made -

MR. BARRY:

Where is the black armband? Did they bury them on Friday?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I do not know. But, a decision that is made on the future of the inshore fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador without a federal Fisheries Minister appointed, and we do not even get a whimper from the other side saying to the feds, 'Why did you guys not appoint a federal Fisheries Minister?' - not a word, nothing. The inshore

fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador may go down without a federal Fisheries Minister having been appointed to make the decision.

A Select Committee on Fisheries and Forestry came down here last week. They have set up special hearings to talk about the factory freezer trawler, which would be very important, because everybody then would have national press to talk about the factory freezer trawler issue for Newfoundland. They go ahead and make the decision anyway, slap the Committee in the face and say, 'Get out of here, we do not want to hear you,' and they go ahead and make the decision. Now, that is what I call a question of credibility.

I wonder if there was any position put forward by the provincial government here on whether they were going to make a presentation on this factory freezer trawler issue up in Ottawa where we would get national press, where we would get opinion across.

I saw the Globe and Mail editorial today and I could not believe it! That is how well representation has been made from this Province, when a decision can be made without the appointment of a federal minister, without any influence from the administration here in this Province. And then they talk about the Liberals not opposing it, which is an absolute falsehood and absolute craziness. But when I hear the song, 'rant and roar like true Newfoundlanders', I can tell you, the ranting and roaring has stopped on what will probably be the most important issue in the history of Newfoundland over the next number of years. We have not

heard a whimper.

There are twenty-two Cabinet ministers over there making a ton of money. We put an amendment saying, 'Go up there on your own,' and it was not even supported. We, over here, are not doing very well but we are trying our best on what we make, but no way would they even think about supporting our amendment because it was a Liberal amendment. If it were the Rhinoceros party's amendment you should have supported it, because it was action being taken instead of words, or a Telex going up to Ottawa. So, when you talk about politics, you are talking about games. I think that is a game, and you are not playing it very well, by the way. You may think you are, but you are not, and that will be proven true in a number of years to come.

The Finance Minister, Mr. Wilson in Ottawa, is cutting back all across Canada, federal transfer payments. We are going to be hit like you would not believe here in Newfoundland and we have not heard a word here. The Finance Minister in Nova Scotia has expressed his thoughts on it. If that were a Liberal Government in Ottawa, well, I tell you, right now the manufacture of armbands would be a new industry in Newfoundland!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

It would be a new industry in Newfoundland, because we would have them for everything you could think of.

MR. TULK:

Instead of that we get tea and crumpets.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

We have the highest unemployment rate in Canada by far, there is no other province even close; the inshore fishery is being done in, and they are saying the Liberals oppose the factory freezer trawler issue, which everybody knows is not true. So this kind of political game, ladies and gentlemen on the other side, it is not going to work. Down the road you will see it is not going to work because time is going very fast and you are looking bad, bad and bad and more bad every day - very bad, as a matter of fact. That is the word on the streets. Had dog to lap dog - and I am going to end off with this comment because this is exactly what has been happening over there - giving in because there is an administration of the same stripe in Ottawa. That is the issue in Newfoundland right now because we are getting done in on a lot of fronts. We have got a few good things coming out way but we have gotten them anyway no matter what government was in Ottawa.

I expected consultation and co-operation. Well I think that the hon. ladies and gentlemen opposite should look up the words in the dictionary again and try to figure out the meaning because consultation and co-operation does not mean getting dictated to and told to shut up on certain major issues in Newfoundland and Labrador. They should look in Webster's Dictionary - I have a copy of it down there - and send a copy to the hon. Brian Mulroney, Prime Minister of Canada and also the acting Fisheries Minister (Mr. Nielsen) because they have to start co-operating with the present administration down here.

I sincerely hope they do because

if this continues we are not going to have too much left. There is not a great deal but we are not going to have too much left in Newfoundland the way we are going now.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Chairman, I was one of those people who fought in September, 1984, against the Mulroney Government, against them forming the government. I fought hard because I knew deep inside my own heart that Mr. Mulroney had a terrible credibility factor. I had seen him at my university, St. Francis Xavier in Nova Scotia, many times speak. In fact, I was tempted to be a Tory sometimes. But I could see when the real tough questions came, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Mulroney not only had a thin skin but his skin was made of cellophane. You could see right through him. That is why I fought hard back in September against his government. Unfortunately there were given a strong mandate. The hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) fought against him too. I remember him saying, "That Mulroney! That mad man! What are we doing putting him up there." I remember that. I remember him work quasi-hard for Mr. Tobin, that great and powerful member for Humber - Port au Port - St. Barbe. I remember that.

MR. LUSH:
He has said that recently.

MR. DAWE:

Did you not work for Fred Stagg?

MR. FUREY:
Oh, we hit a nerve over there from the Minister for Pavement. Thirty-four of them have their heads in the sand but he has his in the pavement.

I just want to make a comment from the Premier's statement on Friday morning. Here is what it says, "We have witnessed the federal government breaking a federal - provincial agreement that was described, at the time, as the most significant agreement since Confederation. Is that not interesting? It is interesting that the Premier of this Province called that the most significant agreement since Confederation. It was signed by a Liberal government in Ottawa and a Tory government in Newfoundland. But yet he chose to rise above his politics, his normal, narrow-minded, partisan politics and to make that very statesmanlike reflection.

What has happened today?

MR. HODDER:
That is bull.

MR. FUREY:
The hon. the member for Port au Port, I see is taking his French lessons because surely that was not English he just spoke. What we are hearing today is the Tory members from Ottawa breaking faith - can you imagine! - breaking faith with their Tory counterparts in Newfoundland, busting, ripping apart, tearing up Clause 12. The Premier admits in his statement of Friday that there has clearly been a breach of faith.

Now this gives rise to another question. I am sure the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr.

Hodder) will remember this because he was very vociferous, very critical and very well spoken on this issue. You will recall Premier Peckford's crusade for prosperity. You remember you laughed with me when he rented a bus and painted on it 'Crusade For Prosperity'. You and I together called it a charade of prosperity. The wheels have fallen off the bus, have they not? You know deep inside your own Liberal heart, and it still beats Liberal, that the wheels have fallen off it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

Are you talking about the campaign you ran for me?

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman, I ran a campaign for him, sure I did, in 1982. I saved his little ass. I saved him. I was part of it. I was his manager. He was doomed. Brian Tobin and I waltzed in there and saved you during that Peckford landslide. You know it is true, I know it is true, and that is why I know your heart still beats red Liberal, buddy.

MR. HODDER:

'Chuck' you never saved anything anytime.

MR. FUREY:

Let me point out something else. This breach of faith that we have all witnessed, you know what it gives rise to? What else will be contract stripped, what else will be torn away, what agreements are going to be worth their salt in the future?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

None.

MR. FUREY:

Will the Atlantic Accord become the Atlantic accordion and be stretched out and busted and brusied? Because that is all the other side has survived on. You have nothing else, no claim to fame. You have a platform - period.

You know, that side over there, Mr. Chairman, ran an election on a mandate to create meaningful and full-time employment for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. Well, the stats came out the other day. In Western Newfoundland and Northern Newfoundland and Labrador, and areas that I represent and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) represents, the stats went from 19 per cent up to nearly 23 per cent. Is that the kind of employment that you went out to the people and asked for a mandate on? Because if it is it gives a lie to that election. It takes that election and crunches it up and tosses it out of the window. And they are on to you, boys.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Let us talk about the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation for a minute. The Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) comes in. I hope he took heed of what we talked about the other day in the House in terms of the Daniel's Harbour mine. Let me remind him once again. Mr. Nielsen took \$18 million, federal tax dollars, in loans, guarantees and subsidies and pumped it into the Yukon to reopen, reactive a defunct zinc mine there. What kind of an impact is that? Using federal tax dollars, paid to the federal Treasury by the miners in St.

Barbe at the Daniel's Harbour mine, taking their tax dollars, pumping it into the Yukon so that that zinc mine can put zinc on the market for twenty-seven cents a pound when the world price is thirty-eight cents a pound, taking from the right hand and robbing from the left hand, and that is what these governments in Ottawa and Newfoundland, and not a peep from the Minister of Mines.

What happens if this mine opens and we start losing jobs up North, on the Northern Peninsula, one of the highest unemployment areas in this country? Michael Kirby and the Kirby Commission described this area as one of four or five in the country that can be truly described as grossly underdeveloped.

MR. TULK:

And not a peep out of that man.

MR. FUREY:

Not a peep.

So what is happening, Mr. Chairman, is that this whole business of FFTs, this whole business of consultation, co-operation, give us the Blue Boys in Ottawa, we will have the Blue Boys down here, Brian and Brian, eyeball to eyeball, will straighten everything out. She is going up in smoke, boys, and the wheels have fallen off the bus, off that crusade for prosperity. And everybody is on to you. The sham is over. The gig is up. Unemployment continues to climb.

You guys ask the young people out there in the streets, the young men and women of this Province, 19,000 of them, Mr. Chairman, whose unemployment rate hovers at nearly 30 per cent, you ask those young people what have the Tories

done for you in the six months that they have been elected?

MR. J. CARTER:

Sit down!

MR. FUREY:

They will look at you with sad eyes. They will not say, "Sit down!" as the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) says because he knows nothing about unemployment. He knows nothing about that tragedy. He knows nothing about not having bread and butter on his table every night and he knows nothing about having a pair of jeans with the ass out of them. But those young people do.

So we on the opposite side have to ask the question: What other areas of negotiation between this Province and the government in Ottawa will be breached? What other agreements will be stripped? What other little charades will we see like the Premier standing here last week saying, "Your history condemns you"? How ridiculous! What a sham and what a joke! His history is on the chopping block now because it is his last term and history will condemn him. I submit, Sir, that this history will be simply a comma in the Newfoundland history books when they are finally written and when this era is written about.

What about the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation? Why did the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation come about in the beginning? It came about because in the North and in Labrador we have a very, very high unemployment rate. We have no private sector, Mr. Chairman, we have no industrial base, no large corporations. We have to go it

alone, from the fat of the land and from the fish from the sea. The federal government of that time had vision, they were prophetic. They said, "Let us establish a corporation for the North whereby we can pass people's destinies, once and for all, into their own hands." and we tried, as the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) knows, to sign a deal for the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation, Mr. Chairman. We had \$15 million on the table, Ottawa sat down, dipped its pen in the ink and started to sign, and that Premier, that government, those characters over there walked away from it. They said, "It will not work because it is not on our terms".

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. FUREY:
By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Leave is not granted.

MR. FUREY:
So, Mr. Chairman, I will continue to speak. When we were talking about the selling of fish plants, I want to get into that too, because two of the plants in my district were on the chopping block to be sold.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please! Leave is not granted!

I ask the hon. member to please take his seat.

MR. FUREY:
Did he not say leave was granted?

AN HON. MEMBER:
No!

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Chairman, I clearly heard by leave.

DR. COLLINS:
On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The Chairman of the Committee is calling the shots and there is no leave. The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman, I was just rising on a point of order because the hon. member was obviously disobeying your instructions. So I withdraw my point of order as he has finally decided to comply.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Chairman, as I was saying -

MR. CHAIRMAN:
That was a point of order.

MR. FUREY:
To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
I am trying to conclude by saying-

MR. DAWE:
You cannot speak.

MR. FUREY:
I am answering his point of order - that there are other plants on the Northern Peninsula that fear for their lives. We are talking about bread and butter issues in

the North. Two hundred jobs could be going down the tube if FPI close those plants because they cannot find buyers.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

I have heard enough of that point of order. To that point of order, there is no point of order.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Chairman, I guess we have just witnessed the member totally abusing the rules of this House by not listening to Your Honour's ruling. I believe that that type of action, Mr. Chairman, which was being encouraged by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) is certainly not warranted in this House.

MR. DAWE:
They were supposed to create a new atmosphere and deal with the issues in a logical fashion.

MR. TOBIN:
That is right. We have heard, Mr. Chairman, the member getting up in this House and talking about what the government has done for-youth unemployment in the Province.

I have gotten up today, Mr. Chairman, and I guess I have to repeat it again, that this government has taken some substantial steps in promoting employment in this Province and again I look at my own district, Mr. Chairman. I can look at my own district and say with a great

sense of pride that this government has stood four square behind the people of Burin-Placentia West.

It is a long while, Mr. Chairman, since that type of representation existed on the Burin Peninsula. It goes back many, many years. It goes back long before '72, Mr. Chairman, when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) began representing them. The people he represented came to St. John's one time to express their feelings towards government and to everybody else who was involved in the fishing industry, and the member who represented them, what did he do, Mr. Chairman, did he go out and meet them, did he try to encourage the Premier to go out and meet them? Mr. Chairman, they went to the Minister of Public Works and said, "Lock the doors, they are coming in from my district." That is the type of representation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Shame! Shame!

MR. TOBIN:
That is the type of representation, Mr. Chairman, that the people on the Burin Peninsula received.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Would that be the reason he never won in 1975?

MR. TOBIN:
There are a lot of reasons why the hon member did not win in 1975, a lot of reasons, Mr. Chairman. The people had a lot more respect, Mr. Chairman, for Mr. Canning, I can assure you that.

MR. PATTERSON:
A great member, boy.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, he was. He was a good member, Mr. Chairman, far better than they had from 1972 to 1975, but not half as good as they had since 1982, Mr. Chairman.

However, Mr. Chairman, if he wants to talk about what this government has done let us look at the fishing industry in this Province. Grand Bank, that was supposed to be closed is now open with a future. Fortune has a good future. Harbour Breton, Gaultois, Ramea, Mr. Chairman, they all have a good future in this Province. Trepassey, Mr. Chairman, was another place that was supposed to be gone. Marystown and Catalina, excellent plants, Mr. Chairman, big plants. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the operation in Marystown is one of the biggest plants in Atlantic Canada. I think we have got more trawlers and more people working there than most places in Atlantic Canada and by far the most in this Province.

What happened to Burin, the place, Mr. Chairman, that if the Liberal Government of Ottawa and the Liberal Party of this Province had their way, would never have opened again? What happened? There was action taken, Mr. Chairman, action taken by the provincial government and by the Premier of this Province. When somebody had to stand up for the people of Burin we could always go to the Premier, Mr. Chairman.

The Mayor of Burin, Mr. Chairman, whom I would suspect in another few hours will be mayor again, could come Mr. Chairman, to the Premier of this Province whenever he wished with his case and his plight and as a result of that type of action by the Premier, Mr. Chairman, and by myself, Burin is

once again a very viable operation. The secondary processing in Burin, the refit sector now employs approximately 300 people, that combined Mr. Chairman, with the numbers of people who are now employed in the construction industry in my district, as well as the Cow Head facility that is taking place, Mr. Chairman, and as well as the Burin Peninsula Hospital which the Leader of the Opposition is not too familiar with. The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, is not familiar at all with the new Burin Peninsula Hospital. The only thing he was familiar with was the D8 dozer that scraped off the lot prior to his election campaign in which he was not successful. It is that type of action, Mr. Chairman, that type of method of trying to hoodwink the people that is why the Leader of the Opposition had to take a leave from politics in this Province.

Let us look at the future. Let us look at what we have talked about in terms of the concrete platforms in this Province. How many people are going to be employed in the concrete platforms and why, Mr. Chairman, do we have concrete platforms going to be constructed in this Province? The answer is simple, we have got it because the Premier of this Province, together with his Cabinet and his party, stood firm against all odds when the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party in this Province were saying that concrete platforms will never come. They were hoping, Mr. Chairman, that they would never come. It was the Premier of this Province, together with his Cabinet and party that insisted Mobil Oil and others use concrete platforms as the method in which the oil development would take place.

MR. SIMMS:

What about the Nova Scotia agreement? You wanted to sign that too.

MR. TOBIN:

That is right, Mr. Chairman. The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands makes reference to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) wanting to sign the Nova Agreement. That is true, Mr. Chairman. We all know the pressure. As a matter of fact he left our caucus because we would not sign the Nova Scotian agreement. Well, Mr. Chairman, are we ever happy.

MR. DAWE:

He did not like the messenger then either. That was his problem, he never liked the messenger.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He never did say why he left us.

MR. TOBIN:

Oh he left because we would not sign the Nova Scotian agreement.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that this party, this caucus, was a lot better off because we did not sign the Nova Scotian agreement and the fact that the Leader of the Opposition is no longer here.

Let us talk about the concrete platforms. What is involved in the concrete platforms for the people of the district of Placentia, Mr. Chairman, the Argenticia area. The people, Mr. Chairman, from St. Mary's - The Capes district will be employed there. People, I am sure, from the Trinity - Bay de Verde district will find employment there. People from the district of Harbour Main, I am sure, will be commuting there on a daily

basis, getting employment. People from the district of Conception Bay South and I am sure from other areas of the Province.

MR. SIMMS:

Maybe even Grand Falls.

MR. TOBIN:

Maybe even Grand Falls, Mr. Chairman. We have had people from Grand Falls working in the Marystown Shipyard. Mr. Chairman, look at Adams Head. Look at the concrete that will be done in Adams Head feeding into how many districts, Mr. Chairman. In Adams Head you have the Clarendville district, the Bonavista South district, Trinity North. You have got the Bellevue district where it will have a substantial impact.

MR. PATTERSON:

Placentia district.

MR. TOBIN:

Placentia is okay. They will be well looked after. There will be more employment in Argenticia than there will be people available in Placentia to go to work. The same thing holds true for my own district, Mr. Chairman. The joint venture programme that we just did the other day with Moss - Rosenberg, a very reputable company, Mr. Chairman, that has been involved for decades with the construction of concrete platforms, will show long term gains, I am sure, for the people of the Burin Peninsula.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Chairman, we have heard members opposite talk about the relevancy of these discussions on the Supplementary Supply. So I have just listened to the hon. member and he did not mention anything at all concerning Supplementary Supply. They have changed their tactic a little bit which I will get to later on.

I think it is a disgrace to be standing here in this House right now in November, 1985 discussing Supplementary Supply from last year's budget which was supposed to be straightened up by March for the last fiscal year, March 31 of last year. We are standing here talking about \$56 million of a deficit that was left over and was not discussed and was not passed last year. Since that time we have got a budget and we are half way through the other year. We still have not heard from the minister on how we are going this year. Was it a large enough budget? Does he know how to budget now so that he will not have to admit defeat again? How much did he miss it by this year? Will he come in and make the admission that he once again was defeated in his attempt to bring in a balanced budget in Newfoundland? This to me is an admission of defeat on behalf of the minister. Every time that he gets up to bring in a budget, he fails and he has done it all the time.

Factory freezer trawlers to me should be classed by members opposite as another defeat. The Premier campaigned for his Tory buddies in Ottawa and he went and said, 'Put them in there and all

the problems of Newfoundland will be solved.' I think it was 'hand in hand.' He did not say that one of the hands was going to be in our pocket like it is. Hand in hand and Mulroney was not going to be afraid to inflict prosperity on Newfoundland. Well the decisions that they have made since they have been there, if that is inflicting prosperity on Newfoundland, God help us. Hand in hand. One hand in our pocket or, as my colleague from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) says, two hands in our pockets.

The Premier used to be classed as the fighting Newfoundlander. In this case we have seen him carry on his fight with marshmallows instead of the cannon balls that he was aiming at the previous government in Ottawa. We are getting used to the fact now, we heard him admit that he has only had one meeting concerning the factory freezer trawlers with Ottawa, one meeting in September. He admitted that today. He refused the offer made by members on this side of the House when we offered to pay our own way to go to Ottawa to present Newfoundland's case on the factory freezer trawlers.

MR. TOBIN:

What was there to stop you? Why did you not go?

MR. GILBERT:

We offered to go but it was refused by the Premier because the gopher was there with his glass up to the wall. We asked the Premier. We wanted to go to Ottawa and pay our own way but he refused. He did not want us to be in Ottawa. He did not want us to see the way that he had to cow down and bend down to his buddies in Ottawa. He has not got the

right to stand up anymore. He is fighting with marshmallows instead of cannon balls right now. He has not got any guts left to go up there and fight. He is told to sit down and accept what we give you. I sometimes wonder if this factory freezer trawler issue is a sham that was put up and he started to fight when he realized ten days ago when he brought this into the House that the battle was lost. He wanted again to put forward a sham to the Newfoundland people that 'I am a fighter' when he knew that he was fighting a losing battle. That is the sort of stuff that he has been involved in since his Tory buddies took over in Ottawa.

If this is the way he is going to inflict prosperity on us it is something that I think we can do without. We have heard since his government took over in Ottawa, the one that he went out and campaigned for with the 'crusade for prosperity,' we have heard him stand up in the House and admit that the federal budget that was brought in last year in May was going to cost Newfoundlanders \$200 million a year. Is this the way to inflict prosperity on us? If this is what we have, it is an infliction, but I do not know if it is prosperity.

This is a very monumental week for the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Simms) because there was an article in The Evening Telegram of last year on November 16 where the minister had gone to Ottawa. It was his first meeting with his federal counterparts since the new régime had taken over. He went and he said there was some difference now in the treatment he received in Ottawa than there was when the previous Liberal administration was there. As a

matter of fact, not only was he talked to but he sat down and talked to the minister for three and a half hours. Can you imagine that? He had a three and a half hour talk. This was a year ago this week. It is a very monumental week for the Minister of Forestry. He should remember this - a very monumental week.

MR. DECKER:

Is that when he got his hair teased?

MR. TOBIN:

Is he not the fellow who worked for you?

MR. GILBERT:

No, unfortunately he punched in time there, he never worked.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

If he were still there, Newfoundland would be better off.

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible)

MR. GILBERT:

No, Sir, if you had been there working, you might still be there and the people of Newfoundland would be so much better off because you could have made a good car salesman. Anyhow, that monumental week last year, a year ago now, he had a three and a half hour meeting with the Minister of Forestry, and he came back and he said how glad he was that now he has established relationships with Ottawa and it was much better than in the previous régime. Then one of the press asked him if he had discussed the forestry center for Newfoundland. 'Well, I really did not want to put him on the spot. I did not think this was the

time.'

These are the sort of negotiations that we are seeing from across there. Just imagine, the minister stood up and said he did not want to embarrass the federal minister by asking him about the forestry center for Newfoundland. Can you imagine that? He did not want to embarrass him. Then someone asked him about the forestry agreement that was to expire in December. 'Well, I really did not but I think we got really good negotiation plans going now and I have a six month extension.' There was a six month extension given at that time. Now, that was a year ago and we have not seen a forestry agreement yet. Of course when the minister admits that he would not want to put the federal minister on the spot by asking him about a forestry center, maybe it is the same way about an agreement? Maybe we will never see an agreement and just have a continuation of the one that was signed five years ago, that expired in December.

MR. SIMMS:

You can hope all you want, but not on your life.

MR. GILBERT:

Well, that is the sort of stuff that we are seeing.

He also said in that article he had the minister's home phone number. I think it is about time he used his home phone number. Why do you not use his number and see if you can get an agreement?

MR. TULK:

Give him a call.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. GILBERT:

It was an excellent brief and well received.

MR. SIMMS:

Was it?

MR. GILBERT:

Yes, Sir.

MR. SIMMS:

Did anybody tell you that?

MR. GILBERT:

Certainly.

I was not there to present a brief on behalf of fisheries, I did one on the forestry which was an excellent brief. I am quite proud of it.

The other thing that could happen if he used the Minister of Forestry's phone number is get an agreement in place. There are thousands of Newfoundlanders out there walking around that we could give jobs to if we had a forestry agreement.

MR. TULK:

At least go up and have some tea.

MR. GILBERT:

Oh, yes. The next time he should go for tea and crumpets, just not tea. He had a cup of tea that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. TULK:

What a shame! By leave!

MR. POWER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Career

Development and Advanced Studies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

Mr. Chairman, I just have to stand up and say a few words. I listened to that nonsense for a little while. The member seems to be more concerned about his former employee and his business than he really cares about the future of the Province. It is just a terrible attitude.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. POWER:

Well, the hon. member who sits behind the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is, in my understanding, considering the recent poll that we did showed his former boss in pretty good shape from the opinion poll point of view, I would suggest that the Leader of the Opposition neither to play squash or have you seated directly behind him. Either could be very, very dangerous. So if you -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. POWER:

Oh, the knives are out. Mr. Tobin has his polls done and he knows exactly where he is going. He has sort of got a fifth column there now, behind the scenes and we are going to make sure that his ambitions are pursued.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. POWER:

Well, it was just as a natural, you know, when the member here talks about the forestry centre

for Newfoundland and this member always churps in the one that Brian Tobin delivered to Corner Brook, the one that he lied about blatantly, the one that he could not deliver, had no influence, could not get a Liberal person in Ottawa for two years during the last two years of the Liberal Government, could not get a single, solitary soul to support Brian Tobin's glove-in-hand approach to the forestry centre for Newfoundland. Now our forestry people are out there. We have moved their offices, we have moved their headquarters, we have moved some of our training for forestry projects to Corner Brook. We did our part. Now the member opposite, his old boss could not deliver. His old boss had no influence. His old boss could not get in the Cabinet when they were scrounging around everywhere looking for a Cabinet minister for Newfoundland. They finally went back and put in the reject, the guy they had kicked out and Mr. Tobin wondered why he could not deliver in Corner Brook and it was obvious that he could not deliver.

MR. FUREY:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

On a point of order, the hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

The minister continues to fussify, cloud, distract, and put up mirrors and smoke and do whatever he wants, the fact of the matter is that the Liberal Government in Ottawa prior to Mulroney's arrival, -

MR. POWER:

Promised! Promised!

MR. FUREY:

- delivered \$16 million.

MR. POWER:

I have not seen it out there.

MR. FUREY:

It was passed in Treasury Board. You know about it.

MR. POWER:

What happened to it?

MR. FUREY:

You know, Mr. Chairman, in terms of leadership, one wonders awfully loudly why the Premier had this particular minister sitting in front of him.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Chairman, to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Chairman, there are two issues that that good member just mentioned. One is the fact that somehow or other in the federal government's system they approved \$16 million. Brian Tobin and the federal minister went to Corner Brook and lied to the people of Corner Brook. Could not deliver, did not deliver, did not have any prior approval, did not have a Minute of Council, did not a Treasury Board Minute and told the people of Corner Brook they have \$16 million. They did not have it and have never had it. Show me the Minute of Council, show me the Treasury Board minute where the money was approved legitimately in the federal system and I will take back, Mr. Chairman, what I said as being incorrect. But there is no point of order. The member tries

to defend his old boss in so many ways as he does on a daily basis. As the polls get done more and more down towards the next election then, obviously, he will continue to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman that the members opposite are so testy today. I suppose if I had betrayed some of the districts in this Province, if I had voted against the factory freezer resolution, which was trying to preserve and protect the inshore fishery in Newfoundland, if I had done that I would have been somewhat testy today too. Even the Leader of the Opposition has to try and -

MR. FUREY:

Why did you oppose the amendment?

MR. POWER:

Why do you not do what is obvious and straightforward and say, "We were against factory freezer." Forget your silly little trips to Ottawa! It seemed that it was more important for one or all of the members opposite to get a week or two or three day holiday to Ottawa. So you give up being a government in Newfoundland and you get some of these fellows who obviously do not have many travel privileges now and they wanted to get a little trip to Ottawa, to go up and see a hockey game or something. I do not know why the members wanted a special committee so bad. Why did you want this all-party committee to go to

Ottawa?

You wanted to go up so you could have a little look at Ottawa, maybe to do a little shopping before Christmas, a little shopping for the fall, or something like that, but obviously to try and take major issue in Newfoundland and to say that the only way to deal with major issues in the future is to have those special all-party committees.

MR. TOBIN:

They wanted everybody to go first.

MR. POWER:

Everybody? So we were going to have some kind of love in in Ottawa with all those fellows opposite.

Mr. Chairman, there are different ways to run places in this country. One of the ways we have in Newfoundland is a duly-elected government. Besides the other part about the members opposite being testy today because they voted against factory freezers, they are still testy about April 2. They still cannot believe that their minority position, their minority opinions and their minority policies were not accepted by the majority of Newfoundlanders and that is why we are here. In the next election the majority feeling, the majority positions about factory freezers and others issues will maintain a sensible balance in a democratic country and minority positions will be over there and majority positions will be over here.

MR. TOBIN:

And there will be less.

MR. POWER:

And there may even be less. If you continue to do factory freezer

turnarounds like you have done in the last week or so, there are many places where you are going to get less votes. I think in Ferryland, the Liberal candidate had 700 votes and I would say that after I send around my little pamphlet and tell them all about the factory freezer position of this Party over there, I would say that you would not get 700 votes in the next four elections up there. The only opposition we might have up there is down here along the corner where you have some people who seem to have an interest in what is really happening in Newfoundland.

MR. TOBIN:

The member for Twillingate at least.

MR. POWER:

I might add, there was a time when I supported with member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) with some enthusiasm when he represented rural Newfoundland, and St. John's West and in certain places he did that very well, but I cannot believe that that member would stand up here, have his name called, and vote against what was a very straightforward inshore district protectionist kind of measure which was a resolution to make sure there were no factory freezers. Now unfortunately, we have -

MR. TOBIN:

It was not his fault, it was the Leader. But we can give him credit because he tried to fight.

MR. POWER:

I would say he did. We get our little caucus stories and the bug tells us different things from time to time. It is a fairly loose caucus.

MR. SIMMS:

And Walter tried to fight it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. POWER:

Certainly, in four or five minutes when I finish, you can have all of the next fifteen minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Do not let them ask you questions.

MR. POWER:

That is why you guys wanted to go to Ottawa. I might have bought that tie in Ottawa or something and you guys wanted to go up during the fall and do a little shopping. Is that the question, where did I buy my tie?

MR. BAIRD:

They are some jealous over there!

MR. TOBIN:

Boy, that is shocking. Here we are trying to talk about factory freezer trawlers and Newfoundlanders employment and they are wondering where he got his tie.

MR. POWER:

I thought it was as question from the hon. the member for Fogo. Is there a question? Were you going to ask me a question?

MR. TOBIN:

Get up!

MR. POWER:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I still have the floor, I was only sitting just to let the member ask a question which he said he wanted to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order was called so that we can have silence so that the minister can carry on his debate. Rather than talk back and forth, I will ask both sides to be silent while the minister is speaking.

MR. POWER:

Again, the point I was trying to say is why people would change his position. I understand why the Leader of the Opposition changed his position when he went from over here to over there. That is understandable at certain times to change your strategy and your tactics. But the member for Twillingate (Mr. Carter), a member who used to represent the inshore part of St. John's West of which I was a resident. I could not believe that that person could vote against the resolution no matter what the silly excuses were. He has been around parliament too long, he is probably one of the most experienced persons in this House both here and up along and to be connived into trying to vote against something that his heart and his soul knew exactly what was being done, shows that there is something wrong in the Liberal Party of Newfoundland. Any person who would give that kind of control to one or two individuals says there is something wrong with that democratic process. And all I can say, Mr. Chairman, is what we are doing today here in this House, is trying to make sure that the record is absolutely crystal clear with everyone who has been involved in this factory freezer issue. If Newfoundland has lost a battle, and we have lost other ones before and we will lose battles again. It is not necessarily in losing that counts, Mr. Chairman, it is how you did your job and we did our job

extremely well when it came to factory freezer trawlers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

The Liberals had had one opportunity as an Opposition to contribute to the factory freezer debate, one opportunity only and that was to give an all-party resolution from this House to people in Atlantic Canada and to the Government in Ottawa, one opportunity as an opposition to really contribute to a very important matter and do you know what they did, Mr. Chairman, as they have done so frequently in the last twenty years, they made a very bad error in judgement. They did not realize that the issue was more important than the simple message, or the messenger or how it was to be carried. We did not get a special committee then somehow or other we shoot the messenger and forget the message. That is wrong. And by doing that either deliberately or inadvertently, they played directly into the hands of National Sea Products and directly into the hands of that lobby group who want to destroy the inshore fishery in Newfoundland.

Mr. Chairman, that is very tragic and very sad but I hope the record will be clear - it will certainly be loud and clear in the district of Ferryland.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When we discussed that factory freezer trawler resolution I recall the caucus on the other side, the PC Caucus, applauding my stand on it and quite frankly it was sorely tempting at that point to sit down because it was very embarrassing to be in that situation.

What I would like to contribute the next eight or ten minutes or so is a little bit of clarity on this because there is a lot of half truths that seem to be coming from that side and then, at the same time, some other half truths coming from this side. Let us go back over the issue a bit.

I have not heard a single Liberal on this side, not one, ever say he was in favour of factory freezer trawlers. I have not heard one in this entire debate. I did, however, hear them vote against the resolution that was against factory freezer trawlers and it is not quite the same thing. Quite frankly I thought that was a foolish thing to do. Maybe even more than foolish, maybe it was even slightly stupid to vote that way. But the fact is the Liberal Party of Newfoundland has very clearly said time and time again it is against factory freezer trawlers. But what we have been hearing today is a half truth coming from most of the speakers on the other side. They say again and again that they voted against the resolution which was against factory freezer trawlers and it is true. That is true. But that is just taking one little section of it and looking at that one little section and saying that is all there was.

MR. TOBIN:

Could I ask a question?

MR. FENWICK:

Let me finish it off, no because if you do you are going to distract me. You have been good at distracting me and I do not want it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

I am sorry, come again.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! If any member wants to speak in this hon. House I would ask him to speak from his own seat.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

You see the problem is that the Liberal Party was foolish enough not to realize the trap that was being set for them by the Tories on the other side. It was a great trap, quite frankly, but it was a trap. Because they refused to agree with the amendment which would have strengthened the resolution and quite frankly it was an error made, and I hate to say it, but the House Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Tulk) made a mistake.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

And since he makes so few mistakes it is really shocking.

MR. TULK:

I am so grateful that you are concerned about me.

MR. FENWICK:

But the fact is there was a

mistake made. The fact of the matter was that the resolution that the Liberal Party had presented and put forward, well, there should have been a recorded vote. If there had to have been a recorded vote we would not have this one way diatribe coming from the Tories today, we would be able to have it dished out back and forth. So both of you could indulge in half truths and say, "You did not support our resolution to go down there and fight the lousey federal government." And you could, at the same time, say you did not vote for a resolution. Both of you could be half right because really that is all you are.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. FENWICK:

I know you did. You guys did it better than they did and that happens to be the problem with it.

All I am trying to say to you is this, that you are playing games. The fact of the matter is - and I say this without trying to rub it in at all - that the Peckford Administration in that particular issue has suffered one of the major defeats that it has ever suffered in this House, that it has ever suffered in its administration. Quite frankly, the Premier has marshalled virtually every single living group in this Province from the development associations to municipalities to all kinds of volunteer organizations in which everybody was on side, everybody was fighting for this particular issue and we lost on it.

I think that the administration should realize it has taken a bad beating on it. Not only the

administration, the Province as a whole has taken a beating on it. Because, quite frankly, I think that the factory freezer trawler issue was an important one and we lost on it. But the government took the beating.

What is particularly galling today is that the people who are asking questions today should have been rubbing your noses in it. But because they made a strategic mistake you guys kept on throwing it back at them again and again and again. Very clever! But the fact remains, you did take a bad beating on it. We took a bad beating on it in terms of the whole Province. The people who are going to pay for it are the communities that may end up with their fish plants being closed and the people who will have to work on those godforsaken factory freezer trawlers, who will end up in a situation where they will have to go two months at a time out to sea on these factory freezer trawlers. They will miss their families and they will end up with a much deteriorated way of life.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. FENWICK:
I know, despite the fact that I have yet to hear a single one of those Liberals ever say they were in favour of factory freezer trawlers. The important thing to remember about that is that that is the way it was.

Anyway that is pretty well all I wanted to say about it. The fact is I think it was a foolish mistake.

AN HON. MEMBER:
You know, they do not tell the

truth all the time.

MR. FENWICK:
No more than you guys do.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I thought I would just wind it up then and let anyone else who wants to speak on it as well speak. Those are the only comments I wanted to make.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
He was up.

MR. DECKER:
I have been recognized.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
I am sorry but the Chair did recognize the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take up too much time of the House. We have only got a few minutes left. But there are a few words I would like to go down through and I am sure the House will allow me to pick it up some other time between now and Christmas, if this bill is passed.

I want to draw the hon. House's attention to the phrase, "Spirit of Co-operation." Mr. Chairman, co-operation, as I understand it, is when men and women of good will sit down and co-operate with each other. It is called give and take, Mr. Chairman. I might feel one way. Somebody else might feel another way, but we co-operate.

A few months ago, Mr. Chairman, we heard about the co-operation between the federal government and the Province. We were told elect a Tory government in Ottawa and we will usher in a new age of co-operation where men and women of good will sit down and co-operate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we have seen a totally new meaning given to the spirit of co-operation. We have seen coercion is possibly a better word. Co-operation now, Mr. Chairman, is where one party says to the other party, 'Do what you are told. Do what we tell you to do,' the spirit of co-operation, Mr. Chairman.

I have a few minutes left, Mr. Chairman. I want to look at the word 'Prosperity'.

Prosperity, Mr. Chairman, is where men and women sit down with two cars in their driveway or ten, coloured television sets, Mr. Chairman, similar to the Arabs, and there is all kinds of wealth and all kinds of riches. Mr. Chairman, some months ago I heard the leader of the government, the Prime Minister, about to inflict prosperity upon Newfoundland. Mr. Chairman, can you imagine the way I felt. Here I was, a Liberal, and here was the other guy going to inflict prosperity on Newfoundland. I said to myself, "Decker, why are you a Liberal? Goodness man! Look what they are going to inflict upon this Province. Think of the two cars in the driveway. Think of the paved driveways." The biggest argument I could think of for

Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, was this, whether we were going to settle for two inches of pavement or four inches of pavement. The biggest danger I could see was being run over by a steam roller, Mr. Chairman. I had visions of prosperity being inflicted upon us to the extent that we have never seen in the history of this Province before.

Mr. Chairman, the infliction of prosperity has taken on a completely new connotation. The infliction of prosperity, Mr. Chairman, means that you take away our largest industry and you crucify it. The infliction of prosperity has shown us, Mr. Chairman, that you destroy your Conches and you destroy your St. Anthonys and you destroy your Cook's Harbours. Would to goodness that they had tried to inflict poverty upon us, Mr. Chairman. I venture to say that we would have been an awful lot better of.

We have seen a new meaning given to the infliction of prosperity, Mr. Chairman.

I will now adjourn the debate.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. DECKER:

I moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I will move the adjournment of the Committee at the appropriate time if the House would allow. We have a couple of minutes, Mr. Chairman. I think I am allowed until the clock pretty well runs

out to move the adjournment.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, it is a long and hoary tradition in this House that members, as the clock is approaching six o'clock, request -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, we have a situation here that goes to the very root of the Parliamentary process. Let us set this out. The historical context is important first.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Extremely important!

MR. BARRY:

We have the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) sulking, Mr. Chairman, because, with all due respect, it is an insult to Your Honour, because it is an attempt to undermine Your Honour's authority.

You recognized the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) -

MR. DECKER:

And he is jealous!

MR. BARRY:

- and the member for Baie Verte, Mr. Chairman, was spitey.

MR. SIMMS:

It is six o'clock. Sit down, boy!

MR. BARRY:

If we do not adjourn now, we can keep going, Mr. Chairman. We can

come back at 8:00 p.m. I think that is the procedure if members do not want to adjourn.

It is an attempt by the member for Baie Verte to undermine the Chair's authority, when you recognized the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, by coming in and attempting to get up and take the floor, Mr. Chairman, by that subterranean technique of ignoring the fact that members are entitled to get up -

MR. DECKER:

I have fifteen more words there, I could have gone on all night.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Did I hear the member ask that we adjourn the debate?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, he did not.

MR. BARRY:

He did. He said, 'I adjourn the debate.'

MR. FUREY:

He said it is near six o'clock, so we adjourn the debate.

MR. BARRY:

But, Mr. Chairman, we cannot have Your Honour's authority undermined by the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) by the use of these techniques.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please! I will rule on that point of order.

My understanding is that the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) did not adjourn the debate, did not speak for his full ten minutes, and the hon. the

Minister of Fisheries came in and decided to speak before the time was up.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:
Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred, have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted. Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 13, 1985 at 3:00 p.m.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

November 12, 1985

ANSWER TO VERBAL QUESTION FROM M.H.A. MOUNT SCIO - BELL ISLAND

APPROXIMATE LAND AREAS EXCLUDED FROM PIPPY PARK

| | <u>CIVIC NO</u> | | |
|---|-----------------|----------------|--------------------------|
| P. MARTIN | 38 | 70 x 450 ft. = | 0.72 ac |
| J. SALLIS | 36 | 70 x 550 ft. = | 0.88 ac |
| C. BUTLER | 34 | 70 x 550 ft. = | 0.88 ac |
| B. KINSELLA | 32 | 70 x 250 ft. = | 0.40 ac |
| BACKLAND, UNKNOWN OWNERSHIP | | 70 x 300 ft. = | <u>0.48 ac</u> |
| | | | <u>3.36 ac (1.35 ha)</u> |
| W. PARKINSON | | | 1.15 ha |
| VERA HALL | | | 4.525 ha |
| FAIRVIEW INVESTMENTS LTD. (former Mackey property) | | | 7.848 ha |
| ACHARYA HOLDINGS LTD. | | | 25.475 ha |

1985 11 08