

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Pursuant to Section 29, Subsection 1, of the Parliamentary Commissioner(Ombudsman)Act, the fifth annual report of the parliamentary commissioner was received in my office a short while ago. I will now table the report and copies will be distributed to all hon. members very shortly.

I would also like to take this opportunity on behalf of all hon. members to welcome to the galleries today a delegation of Grade 10 and 11 students from Dunne Memorial High-school in St. Mary's from the district of St. Mary's-The Capes, accompanied by teachers Mr. Dillon and Mr. Davis. I trust their visit will be enjoyable and informative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it is with regret I have to report that preliminary year end financial statements indicate a significant deterioration in the financial position of the Marystown Shipyard in recent months. As of January, 1980 the loss being projected for the year was \$1 million, which would have been acceptable. By the end of March, 1980, the preliminary year end figures - and I must stress that these are still preliminary and are not finalized - they indicated a loss of \$5.8 million dollars before depreciation and Government advances, which would be some improvement over last year but still unacceptably high.

During the past year work has progressed in implementing internal management and accounting systems, obtaining a full order book and appointing a new Board of Directors. Until March, it appeared that productivity had significantly improved but delays and problems have been encountered in completing Hull 26, the first of a 4 supply ship

MR. L. BARRY: contract. Some of these costs have to be extrapolated for the full contract - in other words, we have to assume the projected costs for Hulls 27, 28 and 29 will also rise and recognize the resulting losses in this year's statements. So that \$5.8 million dollars includes projected losses on Hulls 27, 28 and 29. The best available estimate now projects a worsening, since January, on the total contract of \$4.8 million, made up of \$2 million attributable to additional man hours over the contract, and \$2 million attributable to materials increase and interest charges because of delays, and again we are all aware of the significant increase in interest rates which has occurred in recent months. And also \$800,000 attributable to increased

MR. L. BARRY:

overheads during the period. The sudden deterioration in the financial projection supplied has caused me considerable concern. The new Board of Directors is working hard on the problem but the new members have been in office for only several months. After consultation with the Board, I have decided, with the Board's agreement, to immediately appoint a Task Force of senior public servants from Treasury Board and the Departments of Finance, Industrial Development and Public Works. This Task Force will review the operations of the Marystown Shipyard and report to the Board of Directors on the following: (a) the financial system (b) the production costs system, (c) the material management system, (d) the planning, scheduling and expediting of work, (e) the overheads, (f) the management structure and (g) any other aspect of the Shipyard operations which might be relevant to solution of the problems facing the Yard.

I have also decided to request my colleagues in Cabinet to appoint a Commissioner to conduct an enquiry into the operations of the Marystown Shipyard, the terms of reference to be worked out with the Department of Justice. And because of a question I was asked, I should make it clear that this is not to imply that there is any - I think the wording was 'hanky-panky' going on, but this has to do with an enquiry into the business operations of the Yard.

MR. S. NEARY:  
Inquiries Act?

Will it be under the Public

MR. L. BARRY:  
Inquiries Act.

It will be under the Public

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):  
Placentia West.

The hon. member for Burin -

MR. D. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I might say it is with regret that residents of the Burin Peninsula, and Burin - Placentia West in particular, will receive this statement, although possibly it should be viewed as good news. I remember last year when the minister announced that the Board of Directors would be conducting an enquiry into the yard's operation, the wisdom of that particular move was questioned. And in no way am I diminishing the amount of work that the new Board of Directors and people at the yard have done to date.

I can only say that I feel, without talking to a lot of people in my own riding, that by and large this investigation will be welcomed. There are a lot of people in the area who are very concerned about the future of the yard, not in relation to any downgrading but certainly a sound future for the yard so that the people who work there, the area in particular, will have full faith in its long-term operation. And I can only say once again that this type of investigation was asked for some time ago, and I am glad that the government has seen fit to conduct it and I hope that the people who are directly involved will have opportunity to have ample input into the enquiry. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) I would like to welcome to the gallery today, on behalf of all hon. members, Mr. Joyce and members of the senior management of Bowater Corporation. I trust that their visit has been informative and I welcome them to the galleries today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. JAMIESON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. By way of preamble, let me say that our caucus having met this morning and concluded that the issue of a new flag for Newfoundland is very much a non-partisan one, and one on which there are clearly going to be individual differences of opinion, we for our part would be intending to have a free vote on this matter. May I ask the hon. the Premier, first of all, what his intentions may be with regard to legislation on this question and also when we might expect it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I intend to give notice of a bill today, of course the bill would not be introduced for a number of days from today, I give notice of it today, and I am contemplating the best way to proceed and we too had a caucus this morning in which one of many things discussed, of course, perhaps the most important one was the whole question of the flag, and what the procedure will be as it relates to the House of Assembly and I just sort of reserve further comment as to how I wish to proceed. Suffice it to say right now I appreciate the question, I appreciate the comment of the Leader of the Opposition as it relates to how they are to proceed as a caucus on their side. I will give notice of a bill today and then inform the hon. House tomorrow on how we will proceed as it relates to that. But I appreciate the question and I appreciate the Leader of the Opposition informing the House as to results of their caucus.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Health. Is the Minister of Health aware, or has

MR. HANCOCK: anybody in his department been informed, of the serious health problem that is occurring in the community of Branch where raw sewerage is running out into the drains on the side of the road, in some instances in people's wells?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I have not been informed, I have not been advised of that. I am not saying that the department has not made any inspection of it but it is related to - I think it is related to a disease that the hon. gentleman talks about. He is, I guess, trying to relate it. I have checked on that particular disease and I am advised by department officials that the presence of sewer contamination does not influence that particular condition of

MR. HOUSE: meningococci meningitis which is the disease that one person died from last night.

MR. HANCOCK: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The people in the area are very angry at the lack of action taken by the Department of Health. Some time ago a lady had an inspector come into the area and she pointed out exactly what was happening and the inspector said to the lady, "What in the heck can I do about it?" I would just like to know who those inspectors refer to when they come back and give in their report on such an incident and what action does the inspector recommend to be taken? If this was reported, why was not some action taken on it some time ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, when an inspector goes into a community for a health problem and they do detect that there is a serious problem with raw sewerage, the normal procedure for them is to make a report to the council, if a council exists, and if there is no council in existence they will make the report to the Department of Municipal Affairs, and they do recommend that certain action be taken. They do not necessarily come back to the deputy minister or the minister with these, they go to the department concerned. With respect to this particular incident, there is a public health nurse in the area today. There were two people and this is of great concern and I think it should be aired - that it is not common for two people to have this particular condition. It is not related to tuberculosis, which the member asked me about yesterday. It is not related to the presence of any germ caused by effluent. It is usually a germ that is carried by healthy people.

MR. THOMS: Is it contagious?

MR. HOUSE: It is not highly contagious.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not highly contagious (inaudible)?

MR. HOUSE: Yes. And anybody in close contact is advised to take sulphur drugs. I understand there is a nurse in the area today and they are



April 30, 1980

Tape No. 1153

AH-2

MR. HOUSE: checking it out with the medical people, to advise the people in close contact to get to a doctor and receive these sulphur drugs.

MR. HANCOCK: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary. The hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Can the minister give us some insurance that the sewerage problem has no relationship to the two cases of meningitis which have been detected in recent days and that there is no fear to the people of that area through the sewerage system?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, that was the very specific question that I asked today, and there is definitely no relationship according to the medical opinion that I received it from and that was from the Director of Public Health Services, Dr. Severs and I checked it out with other doctors also. There is no relationship.

MR. NEARY: TB shots (inaudible).

MR. HOUSE: Not TB shots. Sulphur drugs

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social Services and it concerns the situation at the Paddon Memorial Hospital in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. Some weeks ago, I think, during Question Period the minister assured the House that the situation at Paddon Memorial was well in hand and was being taken care of. Now we hear news reports and read in the media that the administrator of that home, apparently with help from the social worker from the International Grenfell Association, has made public a report saying that all is not well. I wonder if the minister would bring the House up to date on the latest situation and tell us what action has been taken.

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, let me first of all say that the levels of care to residents of the Paddon Memorial Home are being provided to those residents in a manner which my department is happy with, notwithstanding the report of a social worker who was employed by the International Grenfell Association.

The whole issue arose when the administrator - or former administrator of that home requested a social worker from IGA to do an assessment of care being provided to the residents. That was done by this gentleman in isolation of my officials in Happy Valley, the very competent, highly trained and professional officials that I have there. There was no consultation, there was no involvement with my officials, it was all done very independently, in total isolation of them.

MR. HICKEY: The report as submitted to the Board of Directors of the home cited a number of areas of concern so far as care of the residents was concerned. One interesting aspect of that report said that when the assessment started the residents were quite happy in their surroundings and in their environment and with the care and services being provided. But toward the end of the report, the same gentleman reported that the residents were quite upset. So one could gather from that that his exposure to them, and indeed his questioning of them, led more to their upset than anything else.

It is also interesting to note that the gentleman who completed the social report left Labrador, or left the employ of IGA, a day after that report was made public. All in all my department is satisfied that the levels of care provided the residents is in keeping with our standards. The Board of Directors are in control of that home and are administering it as best they can under the circumstances. Also, my department has offered to provide temporary help in terms of an administrator pending the recruitment of one by the Board.

Mr. Francis, the  
administrator,

MR. T. HICKEY: I understand his employment concluded a couple of days or a day ago. He had resigned his position to finish his contract in June; however, the board of directors had asked him to wind up his duties, I believe, yesterday or the day before.

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the board of directors received the report some ten days before it was made public and yet I also understand from the minister's statement that he made to the Social Services Committee yesterday morning that he was not advised until he heard it, I believe he said, on C.B.C. Television or somewhere.

My question to the minister, Mr. Speaker, is there perhaps indeed some truth to that report that the senior citizens at that home are suffering hardships? And is there any need for perhaps a future enquiry into the thing?

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

MR. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no need for an enquiry of any nature into conditions in that home. The issue arose in the beginning with a clash of personalities between the administrator and the nursing staff. This gentleman, this social worker, comments on the health of residents, for example. He is not a doctor, he is not competent to delve into some of the areas in which he has involved himself. While he has professional training and is a professional in terms of the emotional conditions of patients or residents, certainly he is not a competent person to assess the medical condition of residents, which in fact was one of the areas that he cited as being one of the concerns.

I have to say that in all of this, notwithstanding the publicity, notwithstanding some of the statements made in the report and statements which were made by the administrator of an earlier date, I am satisfied, having had consultation with a representative of the board of directors, and my staff on a continuous basis of consultation with them, that everything is okay at that institution. And as I said earlier on the issue in which we, and myself especially, concern myself most of all,

MR. T. HICKEY: is that the levels of care being provided are adequate and certainly meet with the standards that we have set down.

MR.S. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Does the hon. member wish to yield?

A supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the question that I would like to put to the minister is a much broader one in connection with the dispute, the internal difficulties that arose in that home. The minister being interviewed on television when the problems arose, made a statement that shocked the whole medical world, the nursing profession and the doctors, inasmuch as he said that as far as he, the minister, was concerned, the administrator of this home - and I presume he was applying it to all the senior citizens homes in Newfoundland - that administrators could administer drugs. I know it came as a complete shock to me, and as I say, I have discussed it with physicians and nurses who are in the Association of Registered Nurses. I would like to know now if the minister has reviewed or revised his position on this particular matter, which seems to me to be of a very serious nature? You cannot have administrators

MR. S. NEARY: administering drugs to patients in these homes in any way, shape or form. What is the minister's position now on this particular matter of administrators and non-professional staff administering drugs to people who reside in these homes?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, my position is unchanged, it is just as firm now as it was then. I suggest to my hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) that he must have gotten part of my statement on CEC at that time or I do not think he would be expressing the concern he is.

MR. S. NEARY: What do you mean?

MR. T. HICKEY: Well, just let me finish now and then he will see exactly what I mean. My statement illustrated our position with regard to institutions and licenced boarding homes and the dispensing or the administering of medication or drugs. And our position, which is twofold - two different positions on both types of facilities-is very clear. The dispensing of drugs is one thing, Taking drugs from a drugstore, prescribing drugs - that is one thing. What we are talking about here is the administering of drugs, the taking of two pills or one capsule out of a container and giving it to a patient. And my position as outlined in that interview is very simply this, that professional people are not required in licenced boarding homes to do that. We have licenced boarding homes, and I am sure my hon. friend is very well aware both under our own programme in my department, under the Community Care Programme, under the Waterford Hospital, wherein lay people are administering drugs on a daily basis and in much larger quantities, I might add, Mr. Speaker, than we could ever think of in the senior citizens' home.

Those drugs are prescribed by a medical doctor and the administering of them is simply the taking from a container a capsule and giving the resident, as opposed to anything like prescribing them or anything of that nature.

I indicated at the same time that



MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon.  
the member for Fogo.

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I would still like to  
come back to my second question. Apparently the minister did not know  
about the report until ten days after the Board of Directors had  
received it. I would like for the minister to tell the House who  
appoints the Board of Directors, what control he has over them and why  
he was not aware of that situation until ten days later?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Social  
Services.

MR. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm or  
deny that the Board of Directors received the report for ten days. Obviously,  
there were a few days, a number of days - I am not sure if it was  
ten or eight or five or whatever. I do know and I confirm now that my  
senior staff and myself were aware of this only on  
the day before the information was made available to  
the committee, and that was the day before yesterday. My Regional Director  
in Happy Valley, my Regional Director for Labrador, is a member of that  
Board of Directors and the report came to his attention a few days before.  
He had not been in a position up to that time to make us aware as the  
Board was dealing with the report and he was in the process of alerting  
us when the issue was made public.

So far as the hon. gentleman's reference  
or question as to what control I have over that Board or who appoints  
them, I have to say that the home is an interfaith home like many others  
run in the Province. The Board of Directors get together as a group,  
cooperatively, under various churches and the Board of Directors is put  
together from that process. I have no authority to appoint or dismiss.  
I have no authority in the administration of those homes unless and only



MR. T. HICKEY:                   wherein there is a question of levels of care or quality of care afforded the residents. That is my chief responsibility. I have responsibility for licencing, the issuing of a licence, the cancelling of a licence, suspending of a licence, etc.

                                  We fund all of those homes, we provide money to keep them going and so on, but to all intents and purposes they are an autonomous body operating on their own at arms length from government and for the most part, and I cannot say really that there has been anything in this issue to change my mind, we are quite happy with that situation and for the most part, if not in all cases, a tremendous job is done by those people at arms length in government, and that is the way we would like to keep it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):           New question, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

I indicated a final supplementary.

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett), but since he is not here I would like to direct it to the Premier. I do not know if I have the Premier's attention on behalf of the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You have it.

MR. L. STIRLING:

The council in Greenspond, after a meeting with the Minister of Transportation and Communications, was given the impression that, providing federal funds were available, the Provincial Government would be prepared to proceed with the start of the causeway to Greenspond. When they contacted the Federal Government, the answer that the council got back was that there is \$2 million available from the Federal Government but to this point the Province has not requested it. I am not sure that the Premier would be aware of it, but I would ask the question in the absence of the minister. Is it the intention of the Province - can he confirm whether or not they have made application and, if they have not made application, do they intend to do so?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That whole area - I do not know if the hon. member knows; I guess every hon. member on the opposite side of the House and every hon. member on this side of the House could ask a similar question, and the problem is that you do not present to DREE one project as it relates to a causeway or a ferry system or road system; you do not present one road, you present a submission which contains a number of transportation projects. And I think over the last number of years the Greenspond causeway was a part of submissions that were submitted and only so many of the projects got approved.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Obviously we are eager to pursue the Greenspond causeway and it will be in the new roads agreement that will be put forward. I think that one is one that everybody has sort of agreed upon as being a viable way to go for a transportation system to that island. The problem right now is, and I respond with some regret that we cannot get, as I said yesterday, any new submissions to DREE unless and until the present submissions that are ready for signing, namely the forestry agreement, namely the coastal Labrador agreement, which contains roads, by the way, namely the Nordco agreement, namely the land mapping and survey agreement, are signed so that they are out of the way, and then the next group takes precedence and are then examined by DREE. So it is not a matter of just throwing off a submission here or there and they clicked off and ticked off and get approved. There are now four holding up the other ones, and one of the those that is being held up is the roads agreement in which consideration is now being given to the Greenspond causeway.

MR. L. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I understand from what the Premier said that he was talking about the DREE agreement. My impression was it was a separate agreement that had to do with the money that the federal government had already committed themselves to spend for the ferry terminals, or the wharf on each end, and that it was an agreement between the Province and the federal government to convert that money that they would normally spend for ferry terminals into money to be used for the causeway. And my impression was that that has already been committed. Is the Premier saying now that that is not the case or he is just not familiar with the case? Is there a possibility that that money has been allocated outside this DREE agreement and, if that is the case, do I understand from what he has said that if the money is available from the federal government in whatever area, that the Province is prepared to proceed with their share?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's first question then was not, shall I say, directed in the right place. I think the hon. member did refer to DREE in his original question.

MR. STIRLING: No, I did not.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh, I am sorry. I thought I gained that. I was listening to two or three and I did not get it straight then. I thought the hon. member was referring to DREE. The ferries agreement is a separate agreement and has nothing to do with DREE. So I will have to take the hon. member's question under advisement and get further information from the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) because, as the hon. member says, there were allocations to ferry terminals that were a part of the agreement. Now if there is going to be a causeway and this money can be transferred directly into causeway money, fine and dandy with us. I will pursue that

PREMIER PECKFORD: for the hon. member and we will have an answer for him the next one to two days.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, the second part of that question, Mr. Speaker was if that is the case, will the Province be prepared to go ahead with their share of it?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes. Well, I thought I answered that. I will have an answer for the hon. member in the next one to two days.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Bonne Bay-Woody Point ferry; I understand about two and a half years ago an agreement was entered into with the ferry operators, an ongoing five year agreement; the ferry ramp is in a deplorable condition. I understand from the operators that they doubt very much if they can go into the up-coming Winter with existing facilities as they are, I am wondering if the Premier and/or the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) will most certainly include in any ferry services or extensions as such, that (inaudible) agreement should certainly be looked upon and the Woody Point one be considered.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken, if my memory serves me correctly, and I will bow to any hon. member present who knows differently, the Bonne Bay ferry service was not a federal ferry service and hence did not come under the agreement of ferries which was signed by -

MR. ROBERTS: It has always been run by the Provincial Highways Department.

PREMIER PECKFORD: My comment was if somebody had information to the contrary then I would be willing to bow, and I do not think that the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) has information to the contrary; I think he is confirming what I have already said. In other words, the Bonne Bay ferry service has always been a provincial service and therefore in the context of the way the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) was talking, which was an agreement that was signed between the federal government and the provincial government in which there was a transfer of jurisdiction for the operation and continued maintenance of the ferry services which hithertofore came under the aegis of the federal government now being passed over, there were some monies as part of that agreement which would allow for the upgrading of existing ferry.

PREMIER PECKFORD: terminals before the Province actually took over the system. In other words, the federal government said, 'We do not want to be in the ferry business any more, we want the Province to take it over, and, if you will take it over, we will ensure that everything is brought up to scratch before you actually take it over.'

Now, the Bonne Bay one is different from that all together and has nothing to do with it. It has always been, as the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) pointed out, a ferry system that has been conducted exclusively by the provincial Department of Transportation and Communications, number one. Number two, the hon. member has a problem with that ferry service which deals with loading ramps and so on there. I will take the matter under advisement, and get on to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) when he gets back. He is presently down on the Great Northern Peninsula and when he gets back I will bring it to his attention and have an answer for the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to ferry terminals and that, in the Strait of Belle Isle and on the Labrador coast we have two new wharves installed there and they are entirely a federal responsibility. But the Minister of Transportation will basically end up saying he has this committee on the go to look into it. Could the Premier advise this House is the Premier and the department recommending that the ferry on the Strait of Belle Isle be looked into, is kept open as long as possible and if necessary, if it needs to be replaced by a new ferry in the future,

MR. HISCOCK: of a new contract. Because what it is is the ice problem and basically experts themselves do not even agree. So if we can get the ferries coming across the Strait all the time, from Port aux Basques to Sydney, surely we should be able to keep them open until sometime in mid-January. Is the Premier going to be looking into that?

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the committee to which the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications referred on a number of occasions now, is one to look into developing - seeing we will have the ferries all in our own jurisdiction, power and authority, then we must develop a ferry policy for the Province dealing with all the ferries. Obviously, that will be one of the things, undoubtedly, that will be considered by that committee, as to just how long you can keep that service open.

I do not know myself if talking about a ferry system from the St. Barbe Coast to the Labrador coast involves the same kind of thing as going from North Sydney to Port aux Basques, as the hon. member just implied. But obviously that would be one of the things. They will be making recommendations on the nature of the ferry systems, the upgrading that is necessary, the kinds of facilities they have now, the kinds of boats they have now and so on and then proposing what should be done for the foreseeable future over the next four or five years.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

I would like to welcome to the galleries on behalf of all hon. members a delegation from the Burin Town Council, from the district of



MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Burin - Placentia West,  
headed by councillor Mitchell. I trust their visit  
will be productive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, this is in the  
form of an interim report, or an interim protest to  
some extent, from the Government Services Committee.

Last evening the Government  
Services Committee met at the Colonial Building to  
discuss the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing  
expenditures, some \$68.5 million, and it was noted that  
there were no members of the press, either the electronic -

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend  
was talking there. I am sure he wanted to raise a point  
of order. But what is the hon. gentleman up to, Sir?  
Your Honour is on Presenting Reports of Standing  
Committees, Is the hon. member presenting a report or is  
he -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Well, is it debatable?  
Usually you table a report. Yesterday we had to give the  
member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) leave to read  
a report. The hon. gentleman is making an oral report.  
Are we going to debate it? Mr. Speaker, I would like to  
a ruling, some guidance from the Chair because this is  
the first time this has happened in this hon. House.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order. The  
hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: To the point of order.  
First of all, let me say that we on this side are quite prepared to give leave to the gentleman from Stephenville. We understand he is to make a statement about some events that went on, or did not go on, I think, would be a more accurate report, but went on in committee -

I think there is an important point and we on this side would ask for a ruling. Our understanding is that under this heading, this part of Orders of the Day, the routine proceedings, all that one may do is simply stand and say, 'Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the report of the standing committee' and then lay it on the table of the House; it may not be commented upon, debated or anything else.

MR. JAMIESON: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: We have no objection at all, in this case, to the learned and hon. gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) making a statement. We may ask that someone on this side be given a like courtesy. I am not sure whether any of my colleagues, who were present at the Committee meeting last night, wish

MR. ROBERTS: to say that or not. Now yesterday I mentioned to Your Honour this question. There are some references in Beauchesne which I think are probably applicable. I am just trying to find them. It is in Chapter 15 but - well, 648 is the relevant one, I think, 648(1), Your Honour, "When a Speaker has called for Reports from Committees, during the progress of routine business, " well here we are, "the Chairman, or in his absence," well, the Chairman is the gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), "will rise in his place and say he has the honour to present the report of the Committee. He hands the report to the Page, who delivers it to the Table. The report is then printed in the Votes and Proceedings." We have no argument against making the reports, we have no argument against a statement being made by leave, but we wish to have it understood, if in fact the position is as we understand it to be, that it is being done by leave and we would ask equally that if one of my colleagues wished to speak we would be granted a like courtesy.

MR. MARSHALL: To the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order. The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if it is done by leave there is no need of Your Honour now making a specific ruling on the matter because it then becomes a hypothetical situation. But the only thing that I would point out is that I do believe it is probably not out of order for somebody in tabling a report to make a few brief comments as to the overall nature of the report, not a speech as to its contents but, you know, what it relates to.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order. The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: I do differ with the hon. gentleman. Perhaps we should make it a point for a ruling. We will grant leave if the ruling goes against us, but let us not make it hypothetical because I do not want to see, my colleagues and I do not want to see an interpretation

MR. ROBERTS: accepted, unless Your Honour rules that that is what our practices are, about this point. Even a few comments, we know full well tend to - the line between a few comments and a debate and one thing and another is a thin dividing line and a wavering one. So let us raise the point of order which says that the hon. gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has no right, as Chairman of this Committee, to say anything except, 'I have the honour to present a report' and he then lays it upon the table of the House. The understanding would be we are not attempting to muzzle him at all. If he wishes to say a little more, let him go ahead and we will give leave. Maybe the way to solve it - Your Honour may wish to look into the matter - is to take it as an actual point under advisement and we will go ahead by leave on this instance and the hon. gentleman say whatever it is he wishes to say.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of order, it has always been my understanding that under this particular point in the routine business, I simply call for reports, the member would get up and make a report and I am sure there have been occasions where they have made other comments.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, that will be a matter that I will have to take under advisement. But certainly the other traditional practice is that there are no allowances for comments afterwards. On that part of it I am certain. But in any event, with respect to the point of order, let me take the matter under advisement for some further comment at a later time. It is my understanding, then, that there is leave for the hon. member for -

MR. NEARY: Our spokesman can then respond.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there leave both sides? Certainly there will be no debate on the matter, but there will be a comment, one from each side.

By leave. The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well as I was saying before I was interrupted by the academics of the situation, we, the Government Services Committee, met last evening to discuss the estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, some \$68.5 million, and we found to our chagrin that there were no members of the press present, the electronic media or the printed media, who generally cover proceedings of the House and cover the estimates committees. So I was asked, or directed, in effect, as Chairman of that committee to make contact with the press gallery and indicate our displeasure and our concern about this matter, and to that end I have written a letter to the press gallery, which I think might be appropriate if I read into the record. The letter is to "The Chair Person, Press Gallery - Chair person or Madam President or whatever is the proper application - House of Assembly, Confederation Building, Re: Coverage of Estimates Committees: Dear Miss Pike; On Tuesday, April 29th the Government Services Committee meeting to discuss the estimates for the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing voted to adjourn debate until Wednesday, 7.30 p.m. in the Collective Bargaining Room in the Confederation Building. The reason for this adjournment was the lack of attendance of any members of the press. It is our view that the press is an integral part of the process whereby the estimates are debated and information conveyed to the general public. As Chairman of the Government Services Committee, I have been instructed to inform the House on the Reports by Standing and Special Committees that this situation exists. We view this matter as most serious since it is quite possible that without the presence of the press and the members of the general public, we would in effect be conducting in camera sittings. Obviously this is the situation that we all strive to avoid.

MR. F. STAGG: I trust that this matter will be given prompt consideration." And in that connection, Mr. Speaker, as a further editorial comment - but I will not abuse the leave given by the House - that section of the media which is funded publicly, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, has been notably absent from all of our proceedings, and I think it is appropriate that today when we are all being called upon to file our income tax returns, that attention be brought to them that they have the duty to inform and to convey information to the public as well as to convey entertainment.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): By leave, the hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say for our part that I was part of the Committee that directed the Chairman to take the action that he took today because it was a very serious matter, in our estimation, that to meet and discuss one of the largest portfolios of government to find out that there was no press present and to find out, of course, that, without the presence of the press, the people of this Province would have no way of knowing what was going on in the Committees. And as the Chairman pointed out in the letter, it would have the same effect as doing them in camera or going to the minister's basement or going to the minister's rec room, almost in discussing the matters that we discuss. So we felt very strongly that the press should be present and there might be some problems which no doubt the Chairman will find in response to his letter, but we consider it to be very serious, Mr. Speaker, and if indeed the Committees are to be successful, I believe that the press must be present because we are discussing the people's business and, hopefully, the matter can be resolved and the Committees can get down to doing the work that they have been doing very successfully up to this point and hopefully, can continue to do.

MR. S. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

With respect to the same matter,  
I understand the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter)

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms): has a similar request from that Committee. Do I understand there is the same leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave. The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, speaking by leave - and I thank the members of the House for giving me leave - I would just like to repeat very briefly what the member for Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg) has pointed out, and I would like to point out to the House that the Estimates of Health were passed last night to the tune of some \$300 million and they went through without any public knowledge, I suppose, any public scrutiny, any attendance by the press. And I would like to point out also that although in this House and in Committee we do address either Mr. Speaker or the Chair or the Chairman, in fact, we are addressing the press or the public. I regard the press as an integral part of the legislative process as much as my hon. friend does, and I would just like to deplore the fact that the press was not present at our meeting last night.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I, as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, would like to add support to the Chairman from St. John's North. Not only did we not have any press in attendance last night, but we also went through the Education Estimates for something like three and one-half hours on a previous night where there was no press present, and on another night we had just one member of the press present.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that if these Committees are going to work properly and if we are doing the people's business in those Committees, then I feel that they should be covered in the same manner in which the House of Assembly is covered, and I think perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it may bring a lesson to us as well, in that I think we have to look at the scheduling as well of those Committees. But I do want to add my support to the Chairman of the Committee from St. John's North.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further reports?

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege, I guess you could call it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):  
member for LaPoile.

A point of privilege, the hon. the

MR. S. NEARY:

My point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is that the privileges of this House are being very seriously breached inasmuch as the Estimates of various government departments have been taken off the floor of this House, put out in the dungeons of Colonial Building and various other buildings and offices and board rooms around this city. The public business is not being properly attended to. The Government House Leader last year when the changes were made in the Standing Orders, said that if they did not work - and they are not working, and I said at the time they would not work -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY:

I am making a case, if the hon. gentleman will just restrain himself.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY:

- if they did not work that the hon. gentleman - and the Premier verified this - would change the rules. Not because the press are not there that the people's business cannot go on.



MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. member has a point of privilege, I believe.

MR. S. NEARY: The point of privilege being, Sir, that the privileges of this House are being breached in as much as the government have manoeuvred the Estimates out of this House into the board rooms, over in Colonial Building and God only knows where else they have scattered the committees and it is not working and it is time to change it and bring the Estimates back on the floor of this House where they should be debated.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of privilege. And with the greatest of respect, I submit that the hon. gentleman is not allowed under the guise of a point of privilege to make a speech before this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. MARSHALL: If he wants to talk about the privileges of the House he ought not to himself -

AN HON. MEMBER: Leadership campaign.

MR. W. MARSHALL: - breach them by breaching the right to raise a point of privilege.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that was dealt with last year. It is ingrained in the Standing Orders. It has been received by everybody in this House, it involves private members of this House all except the hon. member who chooses to boycott them and is beating his own drum in attempting to get his own publicity for his own particular bailiwick. But the fact of the matter is that the Estimates are now being examined in a much more detailed fashion and a much more effective fashion than they have in the history of and in the annals of this House. And the hon. member speaking to a point of privilege was not raising a point of privilege but was making an unauthorized speech which, in effect, is a

MR. W. MARSHALL: breach of the privileges of all member of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of privilege raised by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary), first of all the Chair has to listen to the points made before he can make a ruling on it but obviously there was not a clear cut prima facie case of privilege established in this particular matter therefore I rule there is no point of privilege.

Any further reports?

MR. H. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. H. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report for the year ending March 31, 1979, for the C.A. Pippy Park Commission.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I want to table the report of the Roddickton - Main Brook Task Force on Economic Potential and Development, at the same time the report is being made public in the town of Roddickton by the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. C. Power) and I want to table it to hon. members in the House right now.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further reports?

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Adopt A Flag For The Province."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY:

Haul down the Union Jack.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, as members of the House are aware the compliment of the Public Accounts Committee consists - because of the compliment of the House - of four members on the government side, three members of the Opposition side. The members of the House are also aware the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. T. Rideout), who before his courageous stand a while ago -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

- sat with the Opposition and now sits on the government side, consequently he resigned at the time from the Public Accounts Committee. And also, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition than nominates - and I will point out it is the Opposition's nomination to the Public Accounts Committee and under the Standing Orders it then behooves the government to present the nominee. So consequently, pursuant to the Standing Orders, I move, on the request of the Opposition, that the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) replace the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay on the Public Accounts Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour "Aye, contrary "Nay", carried.

Any further notices.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the trouble to put a total of eighteen questions on the Order Paper and I do not believe I have received one written answer yet. Could the hon. Premier tell us when he is going to instruct the ministers to answer some of these questions?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! That question would be more appropriately asked during Question Period and not at this point in time. The right of the ministers not to answer questions is outlined clearly in the Standing Orders and it is not particularly a matter to be raised at this time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion No. 9

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, when I finished speaking on this particular resolution on Friday, and I would like to just give a very brief comment on what the resolution is all about. It was one that was introduced by my friend from Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) on a very serious matter. This resolution has to do with the fisheries and with the impact and the capability of oil and gas to form the basis of our economy. It is a resolution asking that this House fully debate both developments for the purpose of ensuring that the fishery will not be endangered by offshore oil and gas.

I was disappointed really with the government's reaction to the discussion on this resolution. I did not anticipate, actually, that the government would not support this particular resolution. In a certain sense, I guess, it reminds me of a meeting that I was at back, I think it was, in January, where there was some four or five thousand students from the university and I would say probably certainly ninety-five per cent of those students were Newfoundlanders. And that was when the then Leader of the Opposition of the Federal Liberal party was speaking on the fisheries in Newfoundland. And in the back of the auditorium there were a number of students who wanted the then Leader of the Opposition to get on to talking about oil and gas.

And there was a group of students in the back who were shouting out that man cannot live by cod alone. And as I have said in this House before, the people of the Burin Peninsula and the people of my district, the district of Grand Bank, live on cod alone. There are either directly or indirectly 100 per cent dependent on the fisheries and although I hope we have commercial oil deposits in our offshore, I do not think it is something we can take lightly and what effect it is going to have.

Mr. Speaker, I thought I had five minutes to begin with, but I guess I did not. have a two minutes-

MR. L. THOMS:

If I may, I would just like to quote from the Saskatoon paper of May 11, 1979 dealing with the oil spill - the article is entitled "Oil spill Clean-up Capacity Lacking" and this is what scares me as a representative of a district that is 100 per cent dependent on the fisheries, as is the district represented by my friend from Fortune-Hermitage (D. Stewart). And here they quote: They say that 'a team of scientists has examined the possibility of a major North Atlantic oil spill and they have come to the conclusion that the equipment is not available, it just is not existing, 'for such a clean-up in the case of a spill.'

'If an iceberg, which an iceberg can do, it is big enough to do, 'if it scrapes a seabed and unplugs a well, the oil flows out of that well at the rate of 15,000 barrels a day, 15,000 barrels a day, spewing out onto

MR. THOMS: our fishing grounds. The plugging of that well would take nine months. So, for nine months, oil, at the rate of 15,000 barrels a day, would flow into the -

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave?

MR. SPEAKER: By leave? Agreed.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I just want to finish. I will not take very much time of the House.

As I said, plugging the well takes nine months because of the depth of the water and the rough weather. Meantime it says, "Seven per cent of the oil reaches shore, fouling the Labrador and Eastern Newfoundland sea coast." And it goes on to say that there is not enough knowledge or equipment available now to handle such a situation in storm tossed, ice infested waters.

"The spawning area for caplin, which lay their eggs at the tideline along beaches, would be ruined." And then they go on to say that the smelt-like fish are a main food source for cod. And one of the scientists goes on to say that the actual oil pollution, or fear of damage to the fishery, could bring the industry to a standstill. It is articles like this, from people who should know, that frighten me and it should frighten every member of this House, and others, whether you represent St. John's Centre or not. The fishing industry is as important, really, to St. John's Centre as it is to Grand Bank. But it should frighten every member of this House.

And basically, this is what my friend's resolution is calling for, it is calling for a select committee of this House to look into the impact that oil and gas is going to have on the fishery.

MR. THOMS: It was not very long ago that I was reading where Gus Etchegary was speaking to a group of people and it said that the fishing industry had not been consulted when it comes to the effect of offshore oil, and the possible effect of offshore oil.

Now, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) last year told me that it is impossible to make sure that we do not have an oil spill, but maybe it is. But I think we should take every possible aspect of it and go over it to make sure that at least we have studied every angle, every possibility and, hopefully, that way we can keep it down to a minimum. Because there is one thing that we all have to realize in this Province, that in thirty or forty years time, long after the last drop of oil comes out of Hibernia or Ben Nevis, that the people of this Province, the people of Grand Bank, Fortune - Hermitage, all the other fishing districts of this Province, long after the oil and gas is gone, they are going to be depending on the fisheries. And if we have a major oil spill, I hate to think of what it is going to do to that industry.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, before I commence my comments on the resolution, again I have to say, when we talk about fisheries, which is so important to the economy of our Province, one of the most important resources, it is obvious to see the concern in the press gallery. Unless it is a partisan speech and we are involved in partisan debate, it seems they are not too concerned about what takes place in the House of Assembly, if the present sitting in the press gallery is an indication of that.



MR. MORGAN: Because the fisheries are indeed important and I commend the spokesman on fisheries matters in the Opposition in putting forth the resolution. I understand, I was not here at the time, when he made this speech last week, but I understand it was strictly a non-partisan speech, it was put forward in a very sincere way and its points put forward, and ideas and suggestions accordingly. And I certainly hope that the apathy shown by the media in dealing with the estimates a few nights ago, when three hundred-and-something million dollars went through, Education, without anybody being there,

MR. MORGAN: and last night, apparently, or the last couple of nights, Health went through in the committees with again substantial expenditure and nobody from the press media cared to come, or cared to be there to comment on what was being said by the minister or being said by the Opposition spokesman, or, in fact, members of the House of Assembly. I sincerely hope that apathy is also not here in this matter, because it is indeed a very important matter. It is important to me as the Minister of Fisheries, and I am sure it is important to every single member who has fishermen in his district, that is the possible adverse effect, a potential adverse effect on fisheries and fishery development by the offshore oil and gas development.

Now the resolution, Mr. Speaker, is pointing out of course that the fishery is of paramount importance to the economy, that is very true. Take, for example, that right now we have in the Province 15,000 bona fide fishermen, according to the figures supplied to me by the Fishermen's Union, what they call bona fide fishermen, who fish strictly for a living and for no other income. Then we have approximately 14,000 plant workers who are working in the seasonal plants and in some cases the year-round plants throughout the Province. Combining these two figures, and with the fact that we have many other fishermen who are - well, listed by the Fishermen's Union as moon-lighters but they still earn part of their income from the fishery - that twenty-five per cent of the total population of our Province is being sustained from the fishing industry. And that is the reason why this motion is important, the first part of the motion. The resolution part of it is a question I will come to later on but it is a very important motion.

It is important for the media to be passing along to the fishermen throughout the Province what both parties are saying in the Legislature. In fact, we are almost saying the same thing.

MR. MORGAN: We are concerned. We are concerned over the possible effect it is going to have on the fishing industry, the fishery of course being a renewable resource. For example, this year we are anticipating that the total catch in the Province will be around the figure of 600,000 metric tons, a record, and the total value around - in fact the figure is, our estimates right now, \$540 million, the export value of the fish product. I mentioned the employment figure. No question, no question at all, as pointed out in the resolution, the fishing industry is of paramount importance to the economy of our Province. And that is being recognized clearly by this administration, recognized by the Premier in his statements in the past and the action he has taken as the head of the government, in doing everything possible. In other words, the objective of the Premier in this administration is to make sure there is no stone left unturned that is going to put together the plans, and possible regulations, I say possible regulations, to ensure that there is no adverse effect or at least a minimum effect on the fishery by the development which we think, as the motion also points, that we think it is now very obvious that we are all hoping and it looks very confident that it will take place, the development of the offshore oil and gas.

Mr. Speaker, approximately a month and a half ago the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and myself recognizing that there have been some adverse effects, some, and I will go into that later on, and other areas of the world where there have been oil and gas developments like in the North Sea, in particular, and also some parts of the US, where there is also a viable fishing industry, and there were some effects on the fishing industry. Recognizing that, the Minister of Mines and Energy and myself convened a meeting in March, a meeting consisting of the Offshore Petroleum Operators Association, which included Petrocan, Petro-Canada, and Mobil Oil and others, the Fish Trades Association, the Fishermen's Union, the Saltfish Producers Association, the College of Fisheries, and others, in fact all concerned. We convened a

MR. J. MORGAN:

meeting and at that meeting the sole purpose, the initial action was to indicate government's concern and government's intent to take action to prevent what we saw occurring in places like Scotland and Norway, in these two countries in particular. As a result of that first meeting, as it pretains to fisheries, shortly after that the Premier put in place a system which I think is of the utmost importance because it could very well mean coming to the House of Assembly, the end result of that system, with regulations to protect the possible effects on the fishery. For example, a structure or mechanism-you can call it what you want as it pretains to fishery is the establishment of a Fisheries and Environment Committee appointed by the Premier and his government. It is chaired by the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Gordon Slade. On that committee there is also the Deputy Minister of my colleague's department, the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment, and also the Deputy Minister of Tourism, Culture and Recreation. Now that committee will report to the government through the ministers concerned, and to the Premier. That is the top level of the structure.

Now underneath that it is important to have participation and input from the parties concerned, and the parties concerned, as I mentioned: the Fish Trades Association, the Fishermen's Union on the behalf of the fishermen, the Saltfish Producer's Association, the Independent Processor's Association and the people like the university and the College of Trades and Technology and the College of Fisheries. So that committee is now established as an advisory committee to the official committee, as I mentioned, chaired by the Deputy Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: And, of course, the mandate of the Committee on Fisheries and Environment is to make sure that there will be no negative impact of the offshore development on fisheries, number one. And number two, that the development of the offshore, or the production of the offshore oil and gas, will be done in co-ordination with the fishing industry in the Province. And number three, which is an important one, as I mentioned, the committee will make recommendations and these recommendations may very well be, in the end result, the regulations, recommendations becoming regulations of government which will eventually come to this House of Assembly.

So the Committee and the Advisory Committee involving the private sector and all concerned in the fishing industry will provide advice and recommendations to government. Not only that, it will research and investigate what has been happening in other countries. That committee, in my view, has got a very, very important role and I told them so at my last meeting with them. They have a big task because we have to make sure that there is not a situation as we see now in Scotland. I saw a film a little while ago on Scotland and Norway which was done by the Extensions Services of the University and also by the CBC and it was strictly on the topic of what is happening in the fishing industry in Scotland and Norway as a result of the development of the offshore oil and gas. These films, at least, are an indication of what is happening but they do not give me, at least as Minister of Fisheries, all the answers and do not give sufficient evidence to enable us to make sure we put the proper plans in place. The concerns of the fishermen now, for example, primarily in Scotland and Norway, and us being compensation; they are demanding compensation from the oil companies for lost fishing time, they are demanding compensation for lost fishing gear and lost fishing grounds.

April 30, 1980

Tape No. 1167

DW - 3

MR. J. MORGAN: But it is down to the point now of demanding compensation, and a compensation fund has been established.

But our ultimate aim, Mr. Speaker, and I want emphasize that, our ultimate aim as a government right now is to make sure we put in place and we take every possible step and action to prevent getting down to the stage of having to compensate fishermen for lost gear or compensate

MR. J. MORGAN: fishermen for lost fishing grounds in particular or lost fishing time. That is the ultimate aim.

And looking at, again as I mentioned, the films I saw of the fishing industry in Scotland, in particular, there was substantial damage to fishing gear as a result of the debris on the ocean bottom. Debris from what source? It is being dumped, sometimes lost, I would say, accidentally, but more times intentionally dumped from the rigs, the oil rigs, And in other cases from the support vessels or supply vessels. This is causing damage to fishermen's gear because it is on the actual fishing grounds it is occurring.

There is a loss of fishing grounds and at the first meeting I had with the Fish Trades Association, they put forward their views then and their concerns that, for example, on the Grand Banks, the best known fishing areas of the Province, And really important to the fishing industry on the Southern part of the Province, where most of the offshore supply of raw material comes from that area, the Grand Banks.

Mr. Etchegary of Fishery Products indicated that he felt that 25 per cent of the fish they caught the last couple of years came from the general area where the oil rigs are now working. That is of concern, concern to me and the government and the trade. There is a loss of fishing grounds. The loss of fishing time is another matter which the fishermen are now being compensated for, as I mentioned, in Scotland and in Norway. And then there is the interference with the trawler fleets themselves in the general fishing grounds and surrounding areas.

Another important possible effect is the loss of trained personnel from the fishing industry to go into the more lucrative, in their view, industry of oil and gas. And that is happening to some extent already from my questioning of the offshore or

MR. J. MORGAN: the companies operating in offshore fleets, that there has been some activity but not too much yet of people who, are leaving the fishing vessels, the trawler fleets and going over to work on the supply vessels, and even on the oil rigs, because it is more lucrative for them.

And then there is the competition or potential competition for onshore facilities, port facilities, development of new facilities for the offshore oil and gas. And the obvious potential competition in developing landing facilities for landing of fish in the fishing ports. These are the concerns that are the concerns of government, the concerns of the trade and the fishermen and rightly so. And as I mentioned, all these things are now ending up in compensation being paid in other places. We do not want to see that. We want to take steps now and put a plan of action in place that will prevent us from getting to that stage of paying out compensation, at least taking every possible step.

I mentioned the films were not sufficient in my view, and I have viewed them all now so I am convinced there is a definite need for this advisory committee, appointed by government, to travel to places like Scotland, to travel to Norway and maybe even parts of the U.S., but more so in Scotland and Norway and to thoroughly investigate and research what has been happening over there. We could learn, I guess, from their experiences and maybe from their mistakes. We could learn from these.

That is the reason why, Mr. Speaker, a decision has been made that myself, as the Minister of Fisheries, will lead a delegation to Scotland sometime in June, a delegation consisting of the industry, the union and government. And today I am going to make a recommendation to the legislature which will hopefully meet with the approval of my Premier and my colleagues in government. I think it





MR. MORGAN: travel with the delegation. They will be digging into, be searching out and investigating what is happening over there to make the Legislature here knowledgeable as well as to what is happening. So I am hoping that, with the concurrence of the Premier here, that this will take place. And there will be arrangements made for a delegation from this House of Assembly to travel with me and the other delegation to first of all Scotland and then to Norway.

MR. WHITE: If I am going to go over, I am going to pay for it at my own expense.

MR. MORGAN: Well, I commend the hon. gentleman for Lewisporte (Mr. White) if that is the case because fisheries is very important to the Lewisporte district as well.

So that is the plan right now, Mr. Speaker.

I notice my time is up. There is not too much time to speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave. By leave.

MR. MORGAN: These are the things that concern the fisheries and of course it was mentioned, I think, by the last speaker from the Opposition that looking at the possible effects from these things I mentioned, lost fishing time, the destruction of fishermen's gear with the debris in the ocean, competition for trained personnel, competition for onshore facilities, there is still one major concern as well in the back of my mind, and that is the reason why the committee is now doing an analysis and gathering all information with regard to updating, I guess I could use, the knowledge on marine environment, the marine environment itself, in case of, just in case of the very worst happening and the very worst, of course, we know what we are talking about, a major spill. It is more than frightening to even think of the possible effects that a major spill could have on the marine environment. And that is one of the major reasons why this administration is so concerned over it. And I am saying that we have got to make sure that the proper hardware is there, the proper trained personnel is there, and all the necessary

MR. MORGAN: equipment is in place to deal with a possible spill. And I am not convinced in my own mind today that it is adequate. I am not. I am not convinced it is adequate, that is the reason why the advisory committee is now, as I mentioned, updating all possible knowledge it can possible gather on the marine environment and what plan of action can be put in place to deal with the worst of all situations, an oil spill.

Again we can look at this committee I am talking about, and members from this House could look at what is in place in other areas so we can come back and say, "We want at least what is in place over there now. We want at least that and nothing less to deal with the worst situation, a potential worst situation."

MR. WHITE: (Inaudible) federal department.

MR. MORGAN: There is no - I was going to mention that, Mr. Speaker, although I only have one minute, but maybe by leave I can continue a few minutes more, that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): By leave.

MR. MORGAN: I do not think, although there is a somewhat obvious confrontation today between this administration, this Province, and the federal administration in connection with the ownership of the offshore, but I do not believe at all, I do not think it is necessary, and I think the Premier and others will agree that any matters pertaining to the environment should ever be a means of confrontation with the two levels of government. Environmental matters -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - I think there is no question, and that has been said many times before, but I think it is important to stress the fact that despite all their confrontation on issues of ownership, there should not be any confrontation which would effect or delay the putting in place of measures to deal with potential damage to the environment.

MR. STIRLING: Regardless of the ownership.

MR. MORGAN:                   Regardless of the ownership.   When I say  
regardless of ownership of course we all know our position on ownership,  
but regardless of that matter being dealt with, still every step should  
be taken by both levels of government, in this case the federal government's  
jurisdiction of responsibility for environment. I do not think is even  
questioned.   But if it is there should be no confrontation.   We should  
work in co-ordination to make sure that every possible step is taken  
to protect the environment.

MR. STIRLING:               They should be moving on it now.

MR. MORGAN:               So, Mr. Speaker, this minister is very concerned,  
concerned that I will repeat it again, that I will endeavour to turn every  
possible stone, try every

MR. J. MORGAN: possible means to make sure that when the oil and gas is being developed, will it be tanked from the area or piped in to shore? And the big oil companies who are so powerful, and I mean, so powerful today, they are like an administration on their own and we have to stand firm, and I mean stand firm, in dealing with them and there is no way we will ever let them put in place plans which we will recognize as being potentially hazardous to the fisheries of our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MORGAN: Because the oil and gas will be here and gone. It is a non-renewable resource. It means that the oil companies come in, take what they can and leave very little unless we have the regulations and the guidelines and law to enforce the situation where they will abide by the rules of our Province and our Legislature here.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the oil and gas will mean revenues. It means approximately 40 per cent of the total coming out of the wellhead out there if we maintain our position of ownership. And I say that, as I think, was mentioned by one of the Opposition speakers, we have to take the revenue where we can get it. It may last fifteen years, it may only last ten, it may go on for thirty-five or forty, who knows? But we know it is going to come to an end as it will come to an end in Alberta one of these days, so we cannot depend and put our future economy on oil and gas. We have to take the revenue from oil and gas and channel it into the resources which are so important to this Province, and I cannot think of any more important resource than the fisheries - channel it in and make sure that the funds are taken from that source of revenue but spent in the right way, spent on things that we know can leave a viable fishery, like, for example, improving our catching sector, improving our processing sector, better quality control, new ice making facilities, proper handling facilities, paving of roads to fish plants around the Province. All these kinds of things tie in to develop a better fishery. And the revenue from oil and gas, in my view, has to be used for that purpose. But we must never blindfold ourselves and say, 'Yes, give us the revenue with no controls. Give us the revenue right now,' we really

MR. J. MORGAN: want it because our Province - and nobody here can argue that we need the money for paved roads and water and sewer and new schools and everything else - but it is important that we only get the revenue by means of production with the proper controls in place before it takes place - before any development takes place proper controls are in place to protect what we have for the future of our Province. Again, I will say that, in closing, I want to emphasize again the structure that is in place now. My own personal view right now, I feel that it does not need a Select Committee, but I want the Legislature to be involved in that process, both sides of the House, a Committee established of industry, because a Select Committee would not necessarily involve - and it would not, in fact, having on that Committee representation from the Fish Trades and the Fishermen's Union, from the Salt Fish Corporation or salt fish producers. But right now that is in place. That Committee is in place now. They have representation from the Fishermen's Union, in fact, two members, they have two members from the Fish Trades Association, they have a member from the Independent Processors Association and they have members from the University and from, I think, the Fisheries College. I do not have all the names off-hand, but these are the ones who are involved. A Committee is in place.

MR. STIRLING: Are you going to ask members from this side to that or just take them on one trip?

MR. J. MORGAN: No, Mr. Speaker. A Committee is in place now and that Committee will be reporting to government, making recommendations - giving advice, sure, but making recommendations. What I am saying is, when that Committee, which is now going to be involved in the first stage of doing research and investigative work as to what has happened and what is happening now in other countries, while that research work is being done, so that members of this Legislature can become knowledgeable of what is happening, fully knowledgeable as I am not right now, that that mechanism or structure of the existing committees already formed could have with it representation

MR. J. MORGAN:

from both sides of this hon. House.

And they could go along with the Committee, and myself, the minister, and the deputy minister, to travel to Scotland and thoroughly investigate what is happening over there, also to travel to Norway and thoroughly investigate so that we can come back and learn from their mistakes, learn from their experience, and hopefully, make sure that what has happened in Scotland - I do not like what I have seen by film; what has happened in Norway, also, I do not like what I have seen by film -

April 30, 1980

Tape No. 1171

AH-1

MR. MORGAN: that we can take the necessary steps to prevent that from occurring in our Province to protect our long-term economy in the fisheries for the future.

Thank you.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: I must offer my congratulations to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) on the speech that he made. I am sure listening to it that basically he must have read Hansard of last Wednesday like I did with regard to the motion that was brought in by the member from Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) because last Wednesday this motion was brought in and when it was brought in this House it was brought in out of genuine concern for the impact that the oil will have upon our fisheries. And what did the government do with it? They turned it into a very, very partisan debate -

MR. WARREN: Typical. Typical.

MR. HISCOCK: - a very partisan debate and basically ended up saying that they could not support it and that the Select Committee would be redundant and X number of things.

MR. WARREN: I think the Minister of Fisheries wants to support it though.

MR. HISCOCK: Now, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) himself has basically taken verbatim the speech that was given by the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) and is supporting the thing.

MR. WARREN: Yes, he is pretty well supporting it.

MR. HISCOCK: I am also very pleased with this committee of trade, union and government personnel. And now the minister says that some members of the House will be on it. I hope it will not be one, two or three people, I would like to see half a dozen people on it at least so that they could report to this House.

AN HON.MEMBER: Everybody.

MR. HISCOCK: Everybody. It would be quite pleasing for everybody to go, yes, but I would like to bring up a few questions that the



MR. HISCOCK: member from Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) brought up. The question was asked, "How can the fisheries be protected from the environment with the economic and social hazards of oil?" This was one of the questions.

MR. NEARY: Did you know the minister went against his own fishermen?

MR. WARREN: Yes.

MR. NEARY: He went against his own fishermen.

MR. HISCOCK: If the minister went against his own fishermen today I can say that in the speech he just gave, he went against his own party and government also.

MR. NEARY: Right on! Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: But basically you protect the fishery from an oil disaster. I find it rather amazing -

MR. MORGAN: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) that I stood against my own fishermen today. I am assuming, therefore, on my point of order to say that is totally incorrect because the matters he referred to are in connection with herring quotas, etc., and it should be clarified that my position is that I defend the position taken by the federal minister on this issue and I will stand by that.

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to apologize to the ladies and gentlemen who came in today because we were in meetings up until the House met at 3p.m. and therefore none of us could go down and meet the fishermen. But the hon. gentleman did go against - I made a statement and I stand by it - the hon. gentleman did go against his own fishermen, the very fishermen that he is supposed to be protecting. Now he is coming out on the side of the Government of Canada. These fishermen do have a point and the hon. gentleman should listen to their grievance, process their grievance and not just shut the door and slam the door in their faces as he did today. He went against his own fishermen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt ): Order, please! I must remind people in the galleries that they are not allowed to participate in debate in any way, that is the clapping of hands, stamping of feet or vocally. And if you continue to do that I will have to clear the gallery.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries. To that point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I was sitting down for an hour and a half before the House opened with the full executive of the Fishermen's Union for this Province including the - every fishermen on the board was there from around the Province - full Fishermen's Union Executive Board, including the President and all the business agents, discussing the fishery. And I can assure you that the topics were of the utmost importance to all fishermen throughout the Province. On the matter of the people who are protesting the herring fishery, which I am assuming is being referred to by the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I had no knowledge with regard to any invitation

MR. J. MORGAN:

to meet with any fishermen concerning the herring fishermen and the herring fishery. I have met with at least four different groups of fishermen from around the Province over the past months and a half and I took their concerns, Mr. Speaker, to the federal minister as of Monday's meeting with them. So today, there was nobody shutting doors on fishermen from my office, I know that from talking to the staff of the Department of Fisheries. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it quite clear that the point of order is that it is giving the House of Assembly misleading information and therefore there should be a correction on it.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

I think I have heard enough to rule on the point of order and I would rule that there is no point of order but the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) took the opportunity to clarify remarks that were attributed to him.

MR. S. NEARY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. S. NEARY:

In the process of the hon. gentleman just making a few remarks in this House, Sir, the hon. gentleman made a false and misleading statement. The hon. gentleman, two days before these people came to St. John's, said they did not have a case, he was not going to tolerate them, he was not going to have anything to do with them, he was coming out on the side of Ottawa. That is true, the hon. gentleman was quoted in the Evening Telegram as saying that he was not going to take sides -

MR. W. MARSHALL:  
privilege.

Mr. Speaker, on a point of

MR. S. NEARY:

No, there is a point of order.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

On a point of privilege which  
supersedes a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

The hon. the President of the  
Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.  
Look, this does involve the privileges of the House. Your  
Honour made a ruling with respect to the disposition of a matter  
that arose when the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) rose  
on a point of order, the substance of it. The hon. gentleman,  
now, after Your Honour making his ruling, gets up and attempts  
to talk about the same subject again. This is a breach of the  
privileges of the House, Mr. Speaker, because, in effect, after  
Your Honour saying the matter had been resolved and there will  
be no more debate, he now gets on his feet and under the guise of  
a point of order attempts to do the same thing. It is a way  
in which the whole decorum of the House will come down if it  
is allowed.

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of privilege, the  
hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

That is not a point of privilege,  
Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman has not established a prima  
facie case that I have breached the privileges of this House.  
I rose on a point of order, the hon. gentleman did not give  
me a chance to finish my point of order. He does not know  
yet what it is I intended to say. He was trying to protect  
the Minister of Fisheries who has gotten himself in hot  
water with the fishermen in this Province and he tried to  
do it under a point of privilege. And I would submit that

MR. S. NEARY: if anybody breached the privileges of this House it was the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) in trying to protect the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, if he is going to carry on -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I have a point of privilege right now that I have to deal with and a point of order. I would like to deal with those now if I may. To the point of privilege I would rule that there is no point of privilege and there is no breach of the privileges of the House in this particular case. To the point of order I would rule once again that the hon. the Minister of Fisheries took an opportunity to rise to clarify remarks that were attributed to him. I would also like to point out that I think it is grossly unfair to the hon. member for Eagle Rive (Mr. Hiscock) to be constantly interrupted when he is speaking to the motion put forward by the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe). The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. S. NEARY: We will have an opportunity to deal with this matter in the future, Mr. Speaker.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to continue.

MR. J. MORGAN: I have to apologize, Mr. Speaker, because on a point of order again -

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

MR. J. MORGAN: - because the House has been misled by a statement from the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who is attempting to leave the impression that I refused to meet with fishermen today which is totally untrue. And number two, Mr. Speaker, that I had said I would not meet with fishermen, that is also not true, Mr. Speaker. And thirdly, is that the matter which the fishermen have problems with is not under my

MR. J. MORGAN: jurisdiction. It is as simple as that.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

I think we have already dealt with that point of order and I would now ask the hon. member for Eagle River to continue.

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard in silence.

MR. WARREN: It is impossible to hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Eagle River wishes to be heard in silence.

MR. E. HISCOCK: With regard to the impact oil is having on our fishery, I think the speeches and the points of order that were given today only point out the importance of the fisheries in our Province. And basically I would go so far as to say that the Opposition itself feels that the government is not really prepared do not have the necessary -

MR. WARREN: Tools.

MR. E. HISCOCK: - tools in motion to prepare for an oil spill

MR. E. HISCOCK: or a blowout in any way. I find it rather ludicrous and amazing that here the Premier of our Province makes claim to total jurisdiction, to total regulations and total control and yet when it comes to environmental impact of Hibernia and Ben Nevis, do we have anybody out there from the Department of the Environment? Basically it is being monitored by the federal government. And what is happening is duplicate copies each day are being sent to the provincial government and well as the federal government. We want all the money, we want all the oil, we want all the jurisdiction but when it comes to the responsibility of looking after the environment and the impact it will have upon our fisheries if an oil spill takes place, we say "no, that is the federal government."

MR. G. WARREN: Right on, right on.

MR. E. HISCOCK: The federal government can look after environment. And I find that myself -

MR. W. MARSHALL: In co-ordination.

MR. E. HISCOCK: In co-ordination, but when it comes to paying because of environment and because of jurisdiction and because of constitutional jurisdiction, it falls under the jurisdiction of the federal government. As the minister just said about the herring, and about the fisheries and the quotas, it is the federal government. But it is also the responsibility of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) and the various other government departments to make representation to the federal government for co-operation.

MR. G. WARREN: Right on.

MR. E. HISCOCK: If the Minister of Fisheries felt, after hearing the case from the federal minister, that basically there should not be any increase in quotas, then fine. But basically, again, it is up to the government of this House and the Opposition not to agree with the federal government at all times. The Premier in many cases has tried to say that our stand on oil and gas is being mocked. One of the federal government piped out what the federal government is saying, that we are lackeys of the federal government, that we are mouthpieces of the administration. And here we have a perfect example

MR. E. HISCOCK: today of co-operation and I am very pleased to see it. I do not necessarily agree or support it but the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan), after having a meeting with his federal counterpart, has seen fit to agree with the federal government.

Now, when we agree with the federal government, what happens? We are called traitors, it is said that we are unpatriotic, that somehow or other we are not Newfoundlanders or Labradorians, that we are letting our birthright down. But yet, as I said, when the minister wants to agree or disagree it is okay. So, I am rather concerned about the impact that this oil is going to have, particularly with regard to last week when the questions were brought up on Ben Nevis and Hibernia, and the finding of some tools down in the wellhead and basically a possibility of a blowout. What backup support does the Canadian Coastguard have, to what extent are we ready for that? I would much prefer this provincial government to have greater co-operation with the federal government on jurisdiction of oil and gas and the regulations and the ownership, to have one of co-operation as Canadians and use part of this money and revenue to have the most modern, ultra-modern, even in research, sophisticated equipment and having, not the Coastguard itself in St. John's stationed with this equipment on the Southside or whatever but have this equipment and have these boats, and I mean boats, have them out stationed by these oil wells. Instead, what are we doing? It is the federal jurisdiction and I find that a little bit hard to palate. And particularly with regard to the North where experts, scientists and government alike all agree that it is extremely hard and dangerous to drill for oil and gas in the Labrador Sea, off Hopedale and off Cartwright and particularly in my district. What happens there? Where is the equipment there? Where is the Coastguard there?

MR. G. WARREN: Ice down there eight months of the year.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Exactly, icebound eight months of the year. And when it is not icebound it will probably be in Botwood.



April 30, 1980

Tape No. 1173

SD - 3

MR. E. HISCOCK: So, I am saying as a Newfoundlander  
now and as a citizen of this Province that I am getting a little bit  
sick when it comes to this political football going back and forth  
MR. G. WARREN: Pussyfooting.  
MR. E. HISCOCK: - about oil and regulations and

MR. HISCOCK: jurisdiction. And when it comes down to the concrete matters of dealing with matters that are going to affect us more, even before it is brought on stream, four or five years, we do not have the equipment to safeguard our fisheries that we should have. We do not have it! And for any member, federal, provincial, Opposition or government to stand up and say that we have the necessary equipment to look after a blowout as was in Mexico, or down in Louisiana or in any other area, we do not have it. And that is my concern. And here we are, bantering back and forth and basically letting our culture, our lifeline, by way of fisheries, go down the drain.

MR. WARREN: Right on! Right on!

MR. HISCOCK: If we did have an oil spill, and we cleaned it up, what would happen to the people with the jobs that are related to the industry? Would we pay them? Would we put them on unemployment? What would we do with them? And I am rather concerned with that matter.

So I think we need to identify how this oil and gas revenue can be used to ensure the best interests and a way of life for this Province. Again, a statement made by the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout).

Again, Mr. Speaker, five minutes and I have probably not even spoken five minutes because of the Minister of Fisheries and the member for LaPoile, the disagreement they had.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. HISCOCK: I am rather concerned about how this money is going to be spent. The Minister of Fisheries himself pointed out that this money from the revenue should be spent and related to the fisheries. We should identify the problems of the fisheries, ways of

MR. HISCOCK: improving the fisheries and some problems of them. We should get into productivity of the fisheries, into the processing sector and also the need for quality control. We need better marketing techniques. That is one of the things that, again, not only in fishing, but in farming and agricultural products here in this Province, we have to get into better marketing facilities. We cannot continue to depend upon the Boston market, or the New York market, or the American market. Why? We have the 200 mile limit and with the 200 mile limit you have India, Argentina, Japan, Peru and various other countries that were not considered fishing countries, that have now got in - Korea, for example - have now got into the fisheries in a large way and due to cheap labour can turn around and put out a product at a much cheaper cost of production and put it on the American market, therefore, undermining and undercutting our own product that we have, traditional.

And with the high cost of living, when an American can go out to the supermarket and buy fish products from India cheaper than he can buy them from Newfoundland, what is he going to do?

MR. WARREN: There is something wrong.

MR. HISCOCK: We do not even buy our own products here in Newfoundland let alone expecting people in foreign countries to give preferential treatment to them.

MR. WARREN: Marinated herring from Niagara Falls.

MR. HISCOCK: Again, Mr. Speaker, another area that I want to get into, and it is of particular concern, is that when it comes to our fisheries here, as many things, you can basically say we depend on the federal government in most cases.

MR. HISCOCK: I hear there is a new experiment in a steel boat that is going to be built. The federal government, 90 per cent. Most of the things in the Department of Fisheries are carried out by the federal government and yet -

MR. MORGAN: Including herring quotas.

MR. HISCOCK: Herring quotas or whatever.

MR. NEARY: They must have the hon. member bought off. They have him bought off.

MR. HISCOCK: Basically I, myself, am rather pleased by the co-operation. As I said, I do not necessarily support the stand, I leave that up to the scientists and that, and I leave it up to the Minister of Fisheries to fight on behalf of the Newfoundland fishermen.

MR. WARREN: Right on! Right on!

MR. HISCOCK: But, again, I do not particularly want to wander into that realm of debate. But I am concerned that so much money from the federal government is spent under the Department of Fisheries

MR. E. HISCOCK: and when it comes to revenue the provincial government themselves spent a fair bit, but the question I am asking now, particularly with relationship to Northern Newfoundland and Northern Labrador and Labrador itself - the minister, himself, he pointed to one of the areas that was going to be a problem in the future and that is competition, competition for money to turn around and decide whether we will build a fort in Bay Bulls or in St. John's, to enlarge it, or take that money and build better wharf facilities, improve fishplants, improve slipways, improve other aspects of the fishing industry.

In my area, as I pointed out, we are now on coastal Labrador, in the district of Eagle River, only now getting into the fishing industry in any major way. And, again, in the area of Torngat district also, the last couple of years. And now so much money, massive amounts of money need to be put into having the impact of oil and gas - I am afraid that that money that basically should be going to the fisheries in Northern Labrador and Northern Newfoundland will be taken and redirected to offshore capacities because, again, it has to come in the next three or four or five years.

We only have so much money, so many dollars. We will again depend so heavily on Ottawa unless we are going to have that arrangement. And I back that up by saying the Coastal Labrador DREE Agreement for the past three or four years, everything is going to be done there on Labrador because of the DREE Agreement, the DREE Agreement, ninety per cent paid by the Federal Government, ten per cent paid by the Provincial Government.

The question I am asking, if it was not for the Federal Government, down in Northern Labrador and Labrador generally, and Northern Newfoundland and Newfoundland generally, if it was not for the Federal Government itself we would not have this standard of living that we have and we would not, basically, be able to enjoy a lot of

MR. E. HISCOCK: the facilities that we have -

MR. BENNETT: Keep it going, keep it going.

MR. E. HISCOCK: And another point I want to bring out, and I think it is a major point and I am glad, again, the minister touched on it and that was taking labour from the fishing sector of our industry and taking those people and going into other jobs by way of supply ships, by way of oil rigs because of larger money.

I was talking to a friend of mine last night, for example, who got a job as an operator to go to Sarnia, Ontario to travel and train and then go to Calgary and then go to Houston. And by the time he is finished he will be making \$50,000 a year. So when you have got that type of money, are you going to work as a person on a supply ship? Are you going to go out in your herring boat? Are you going to look after your longliner? What is going to happen? The temptation is going to be there to go and make the fast money. And that is, again, only human -

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible). Prime Minister (inaudible)

MR. E. HISCOCK: Go and make the fast money and therefore the impact that is going to have on our trawler fleets, the impact that is going to have upon our research here in Newfoundland in the fisheries, the impact that is going to have on all sectors of our environment and what are we doing about it? What are we doing? I asked the Minister of Labour (J. Dinn) Manpower in committee meetings how much money was the Provincial Government taking from the Federal Government to get into programs of training and development for the foreseeable impact of oil and gas that is going to be developed. And basically the minister, if I am correct, took great pleasure in saying not one sou, not one cent is the Federal Government paying to help develop these programs.

The Federal Government is paying X number

MR. E. HISCOCK: of dollars under Manpower - under Manpower for various related jobs but when it comes to designing a program for the impact of oil and gas, no, we are not taking a cent because it might probably what? Interfere with our negotiations on oil and gas, on our regulations, on our jurisdiction? And who is going to suffer because we do not have that program and we do not have that cooperation? It is going to be the Newfoundlanders themselves.

MR. BENNETT: The fishermen.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Last year on the oil rigs and supply ships we had 750 people only, 750 people only and over 5,000 people applied for those jobs. Where are the other ones? Where are the other people? What are they doing? They are looking for jobs.

MR. WARREN: They are not on the list.

MR. E. HISCOCK: They are looking for jobs, Mr. Speaker.

If I may, a letter I ended up getting from Cartwright - here I am still sitting around eating my fingers off as I got my nails chopped off and I still have no work and no sign of any work according to Manpower here. 5,000 letters from around the Province and other ones and we are into this problem of oil and gas and ownership. And Ottawa was there for nine months with a Conservative Government, nine months, and what was done?

And the Federal Government now, under Mr. Trudeau, has been there for three months and it is a football going back and forth, back and forth. And the Premier talks about a package, a package that he is going to present to the Federal Government. I will say here now, that that package will not be presented to the Federal Government until sometime late next Fall and then when it is, the negotiations will go on until another year and then the Premier will basically go to the people and say "Look, Ottawa is doing this, we are doing this,

MR. HISCOCK:

go to the people and use that as an excuse. This problem of jurisdiction and control -

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: - as far as I am concerned is being -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The member's time is up. Do I understand there was leave?

MR. JAMIESON: By leave.

MR. HISCOCK: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave.

MR. HISCOCK: This problem of jurisdiction of oil and gas, as far as I am concerned, is out of control and that it is not being done in the best interests of our people, and I say our people. That basically what we need, we need co-operation and not confrontation, and basically the attitude that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is, again, a perfect example. Before he had a meeting with the federal minister, Mr. Roméo LeBlanc, what was he doing? Criticizing him left, right and centre; left, right and centre, and yet here was the Premier, under Mr. Clark at the time, he started basically praising Mr. Roméo LeBlanc as the best federal minister that Canada ever had. Yet, as soon as the minister becomes the minister in this government, he starts taking shots at his federal counterpart.

MR. MORGAN: Who?

MR. HISCOCK: The Minister of Fisheries for Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. WARREN: And now he came back right rosy.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order, the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman cannot find one sentence, one scrap of evidence that I ever criticized Mr. LeBlanc since he became Minister of Fisheries, I never did. In fact, I called for him to be reappointed Minister of Fisheries and look forward to working with him because he stood for the inshore and midshore fishery development. So, Mr. Speaker, it is misleading to the House to say that I was criticizing



MR. MORGAN: the Minister of Fisheries. That is totally untrue.

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

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) Point of order, the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: Yes, I apologize to my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) but, seriously, if in debate in this House, surely if it is going to go smoothly, we cannot on every point on which there is some form of disagreement get up on what is not, I suggest to Your Honour, in any sense a point of order. I have no problem with the Minister of Fisheries making his case clear, and he had a good opportunity during the discussion earlier this afternoon, but if we start interrupting on every conceivable point on which there is a difference of opinion, surely it not only is unfair to the speaker who has the floor but surely there would be other opportunities for the minister or others to make their point. I suggest there is no point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, surely when a member of the House stands in his place and openly lies about something, that the person he is lying about -

MR. JAMIESON: On a point of order.

MR. MORGAN: - Mr. Speaker, has the right -

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order.

MR. MORGAN: - has the right to correct the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order.

MR. MORGAN: I am on the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order.

MR. JAMIESON: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am on the point of order.

MR. JAMIESON: A point of privilege then, it is a question of privilege. I suggest that no one in this House, no one in this House can possibly - perhaps the hon. member was carried away, but surely he would want to withdraw the words which he used 'openly

MR. JAMIESON: lies' to this House. I suggest that that is completely unparliamentary, that there is not a single rule he can find anywhere that, under any circumstances, would defend the use of those words. He can make his point of order, but I suggest that he is under an unquestionable obligation to withdraw those particular words. Surely that is a standard rule of the House that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) cannot possibly argue against.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) To the point of order, the hon. House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we are talking on a point of privilege now. I would just suggest to Your Honour, you know, points of order and points of privilege come up from time to time, points of privilege supersede a point of order. The hon. gentleman was getting up on his point of order to explain something. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) got up about some word that was stated at the particular time, and I would suggest that, perhaps, that might more properly be done after the first point of order is attended to.

In any event, I did not hear what the hon. gentleman said, but I am sure if there was anything unparliamentary, and I say I did not hear what he said, but I know that the hon. gentleman, if anything was said unparliamentary, he would be the first one to withdraw it anyway.

MR. JAMIESON: With respect, and since the hon. Leader -

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

MR. JAMIESON: - has said so, I think he would agree with two things. Number one, that a point of privilege takes preference over a point of order and that it is the privileges of the House which are infringed upon by the use of an expression 'openly lied'. An accusation that a member openly lied is surely, by any, I repeat, any precedent - it is a usage of words which, at the very instant they are uttered, becomes the predominant issue before the House at that particular time. I do not think anybody would quarrel with that. I think if the situation were reversed, I am ready to give the hon. minister the benefit of the doubt and say that he did it, perhaps, in the heat of the moment, but

April 30, 1980

Tape No. 1176

GH-4

MR. JAMIESON: at the same time I have no hesitation in  
saying that it must be withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): To the point of privilege,  
the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege,  
if the hon. maw mouth from LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) can keep quiet a second  
over there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN: What I said was that there were lies  
being told in the House. Now, if the word 'lies' is unparliamentary,  
there is no question. If it is, I will retract that word 'lies'. But  
what I am saying is, I stood in my place on a point of order to point out  
that the hon. gentleman in his debate was outrightly deceiving the House  
of Assembly in giving information totally incorrect, totally untrue, about  
me as Minister of Fisheries, that is what I am saying. The point of order,  
Mr. Speaker, is that the gentleman stood in his place and deceived the  
House and made statements totally untrue about me.

MR. S. NEARY: To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of privilege, the hon. the  
member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman seems to  
be beside himself for some reason. He is awfully nervous and jittery for  
some reason or other. But the hon. gentleman, in speaking to the point of  
privilege, made another unparliamentary remark, that somebody was deliberately  
deceiving this House. That is unparliamentary. The hon. gentleman is being  
contemptible to the Chair - nothing but utter contempt for the Chair.  
Your Honour should direct the hon. minister to retract these two  
unparliamentary statements or name the hon. gentleman and have him flung out  
of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on! Right on!

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of privilege. The Minister  
of Fisheries has withdrawn the word 'lie'. To the point of order, there  
is no point of order. The hon. member took the opportunity to clarify  
words that were stated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The word 'deceive' is also an unparliamentary word. I would ask the hon. member if he would withdraw.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I was of the impression that I carefully said my words. I did not say 'intentionally deceived,' I said 'deceived', and I was always of the impression, from listening to debates in the past, that you can say you can deceive the House but you cannot deliberately, intentionally deceive the House. If you say that you are out of order. So, Mr. Speaker, any words that I said -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member from LaPoile could only keep quiet a second. Mr. Speaker, I was saying that any words that I use in the Assembly, like all members of this House, we have to abide by the rules of the Chair and I withdraw any words that were used which are unparliamentary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has withdrawn the word as was requested.

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Again, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think, as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) pointed out, when you are talking sometimes, one can use words that come out rather quickly. When basically the statement is said criticizing the federal minister, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. G. Warren) basically informs me that he does not necessarily take that as the case. Again, maybe it was a correction of words and words that I used. All that I would say, there was a lot of sabre rattling before one went to Ottawa and particularly with regard to the Northern cod stocks. Not only did the minister but basically the full Provincial government ended up saying that we want total control and if that is not disagreeing with the minister of Fisheries and Oceans for Canada then I do not really see what is. The point I wanted to make was with regard to job training, that here we have the impact of oil and gas coming and not only are we not ready for the environmental impact of a spill-out but we also are not ready by way of environment and also training programmes. And if this government itself do not get into those areas then basically we

MR. E. HISCOCK: are going to have a great social impact upon our way and our style of life, if we do not get into training programmes now. The Minister of Manpower himself basically ended up saying that we do not want to rush into any of these programmes we want to basically have them done in a logical way. Here we are now after fifteen years of drilling, we still do not have any programme, both governments, but still we do not have any programmes in place, and it will be three or four years down the road maybe longer.

So I would like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by only saying that the priority that this Provincial government has on fisheries itself only is reflected in the Budget this year. Last year \$36 million was spent on fisheries, \$36 million, \$12 million over what

MR. E. HISCOCK:

it was but basically that was an election year and they went and broke the Loan Board and we know what happened to the Loan Board itself. Now it is cut back to \$24 million. And basically what I ended up saying was is that the money that should be going into fisheries and should be going into other related programmes, is now being given in the direction of oil and gas.

MR. G. WARREN:

Right on.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

Over \$200 million I believe we are getting from exploration rights - \$200 million. Where is that \$200 million going?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

So anyway, Mr. Speaker, in that regard I would like to conclude and say that I support this motion very strongly and the need to set up a Select Committee of this House to look into this very, very complex problem. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. H. ANDREWS:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this motion I would first like to make a comment or two on some of the things that have been said in the House this afternoon and no doubt the subject of fish quotas is a very important one, however, I perceive the difficulty of the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. R. LeBlanc) in this matter. When a quota is set it is presumably set to the best information available from the biologists who work at this all of their lives and recommend to the minister what the quota should be and on that advice he makes the recommendations that eventually become the quotas. However, it is quite possible that the recommendations by the biologists in the past few years have not been as high as they could possibly be and I say this with this in mind, that since the depletion of the fish stocks off our coasts in the late 1960s and early 1970s, I think that our biologists may be going a little bit cautious

MR. H. ANDREWS: in what they consider to be an optimum quota and probably rightfully so because the worst possible thing that could happen to our fish stocks now is another disaster like happened in the late 1960s and the early 1970s. However, with that in mind, the decision of the biologists, I think, generally speaking, is the best one at this point in time for our fish management. And it is a very difficult thing for a minister not to be able to react to the wishes of fishermen be they in Newfoundland or British Columbia.

However, some of the statements from the other side of the House today are not, I do not think, too pleasant, Mr. Speaker. And it appears to me that the Opposition is attempting to drive a wedge between our newly appointed Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) in Newfoundland and Labrador and the newly appointed Minister of Fisheries (Mr. R. LeBlanc) in Ottawa and it is quite obvious, if we read recent history, that our Minister of Fisheries in Newfoundland suggested that Mr. LeBlanc be appointed, or certainly re-appointed, as the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa for some of the fine work that he has done over the years for the fishermen of Newfoundland and the fishermen all across Canada.

This motion that we are debating is certainly a serious resolution and I do not think anybody on this side of the House is for oil spills or for pollution of the environment and I think this government has proved in its regulations to date, in its gas and oil regulations, and in the committees that have been established, in the petroleum directorate that has been established in the Province, has expressed its concern over the possible ramifications to the environment of offshore gas and oil activity.

The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. G. Warren) mentioned the problems along the coast of Labrador and certainly the difficulty there is much greater than it would be on the Grand Banks in the area of Hibernia.



MR. H. ANDREWS: I am inclined to suspect, although I cannot read the mind of the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), that at this point in time, with known technology available to the petroleum industry and the knowledge that the Newfoundland Government has, and the fear that the Newfoundland Government does have about the environment, that any commercial activity along the coast of Labrador would not proceed other than exploration work at this point in time.

But there are regulations in place, Mr. Speaker, and if we just take a look at this, "An Act Respecting Petroleum And Natural Gas", passed in 1977 - if I could just quote briefly from it, "Every development programme submitted pursuant to section 61 shall include" - and this was one clause - "a detailed impact statement describing the possible environmental, economic and social effects of the proposed development programme including a detailed description of existing biological and renewable resource systems in the area of the proposed development programme". So this makes it incumbent on the oil companies, on the drilling companies to carry out environmental impact studies before they drill, and to continue to carry out those studies as they are drilling on producing the petroleum.

There are also other clauses in this Act regarding inspection and control of operations; that the minister may intervene directly in a licensee's permit when he is causing serious damage to the environment, the renewable resources or property, or is carrying out his operations in such a way that there is a reasonable probability that such damage might occur. And I can go on and quote from this Act where the word 'environment', 'environmental impact' and the dangers that could possibly deride from offshore gas and oil, where those words keep popping up in that Act to protect the environment.

MR. H. ANDREWS: This motion calls for a select committee of the House and as we did hear today from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), committees are already in place. And we have the petroleum directorate where there are, as I understand -

MR. STIRLING: And who got the (inaudible)

MR. H. ANDREWS: Well, I would say to the hon. member that the government is here to govern. It has been said by the Opposition that the government is here to govern and negotiate and these are the governing regulations, this is the Act, it is in place.

There are committees, committees that represent the fishing industry, various government departments; the Department of Fisheries, the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment and the Department of Mines and Energy.

MR. FLIGHT: Come on, speak up.

MR. H. ANDREWS: I would say that the government have made good decisions on those points and the people who are in place are quite capable and competent to administer the Act as the Act is in place right now.

The other thing about this Act, of course, Mr. Speaker, is that without the ownership and control that this government claims and is seeking, this Act is completely redundant. The word 'redudant' should also be used in describing this motion because I believe, that this motion is redudant at this point in time with the protection of the committees in place and this Act. The impact on the environment is feared by every member of this House I am sure. But I will repeat that as I see it, and this is why I cannot support this motion, a select committee is once again redundant. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the galleries on behalf of hon. members Mayor Jeff Duhart from the town of Port au Port West, Aguathuna, Felix Cove, accompanied by Mr. Mark Bourgeoise, both from the district of Port au Port.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. T. BENNETT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the motion put forward by my colleague, the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) and in doing so I would like to sort of revert back to a few comments he made. He referred to the seven oil monsters as just that, being monsters,

MR. BENNETT:

or Seven Sisters and he referred to us as being, so I understand it, fifty-two mice dealing with seven monsters. We might look back to the days when we started school probably, Mr. Speaker, and remind the hon. gentlemen in this House strategy sometimes works not always, and if we go back to the days when we read stories in our books about the lion and the mouse and how the mouse had the sharp teeth—the lion was so big but still the mouse was in a position to free the lion. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we have a similiar circumstance and with proper strategy in place, indeed we may very well be able to tame the lion, the lion, of course, being the oil monsters.

There is another story that comes to mind from way back in school days that the hon. gentlemen on the government side might serve well to remember about the dog and his shadow. And I guess everybody knows the story of the dog and his shadow. Looking into this budget for 1980, I see the government has allocated something in the order of \$24 million for our fishery as opposed to \$40 odd millions for mines and energy. So more emphasis undoubtedly is being placed at this time on mines and energy than on a resource that has brought this Island Province of ours thus far. People all around the Province, Mr. Speaker, have down through the years lived from the fishery. St. John's has basically been built around the fishery, the import of fishery and the fishery through its harbour, both the fishery coming into this harbour from offshore as well as fishery coming in from around the Province, around the Island, from the colony when it was a colony.

I would like to remind the hon. gentlemen who oppose our select committee on the grounds that a committee has already been established by the Premier, that not only on that side of the House, the government side of the House are there a few brains and a few expertise, indeed, Mr. Speaker, if the people on that side of the House like to feel that we have not got brains enough or abilities or expertise enough that we can contribute to a select committee, then I would like to suggest that on the outside of this building, this hon. House, Mr. Speaker,

MR. BENNETT:

that we have people of quite substantial expertise who would like to have a voice in the future of Newfoundland, especially when it comes to oil exploration, oil development. We have others on the outside such as teachers, fishermen, educators, doctors, we have them all. If there is any question, Mr. Speaker, of financing, any question of the government not being able to allocate funds for a select committee, I feel that we would volunteer our services, many of us would volunteer our services and pay for our own travel around the Province, not necessarily outside of the Province, to talk with and document and submit to this House our findings before the end of 1980, what people outside this hon. House feel about the impact of oil and the ramifications of the mixture of oil and fish as it may very well relate to the Province and the future of the Province. I understand, and I think most people do, fish cannot live in oil. That is a foregone conclusion. There is no way that fish can live in oil. You drop a fish into oil and it is going to die very quickly. We need oil, of course, we most certainly need it for our fishery, we need it for industrialization and we need it to help support the hungry world, the hungry Canadian, American and, indeed, the rest - European world - we need the oil. Let us not take so long in developing oil that we shall not need it. It seems to me that the procrastination

MR. T. BENNETT:

and the slowness or the lack of haste with which the present government seems to be addressing themselves and accusing us of being procrastinators and not laying our cards on the table, Mr. Speaker, if I understand correctly is not very long ago that the Ottawa government suggested to this Government of Newfoundland that in the interim they would let Newfoundland take seventy-five per cent of the benefits and they would get along with a meager twenty-five per cent and in so doing, Mr. Speaker, federal authorities would be responsible for patrol, clean-up or whatever may come about from the hazards of oil, and in the meantime, would also take care of our fishery as they have been doing down through the years. So that, indeed, Mr. Speaker, reminds me of a person offering to give you a cow, or offering to support a cow and give you the three teats to milk while they keep one and feed the cow and house the cow and all the rest. In a case like we are faced with at the moment, Mr. Speaker, we are not even sure that the offshore cow has got any teats or, at least, we are not being told it has any teats that we can milk. Let us hope there are some teats out there that we can pull. And let us hope that we can meet agreement with the powers that be, whether they be in Ottawa or whether they be with the oil companies. In our committee meetings the Minister for Social Services indicated to us, to me at least, that the bringing on stream of oil would not soften the blow of his department's work. As a matter of fact, he indicated undoubtedly he would have an awful lot more work to do in his department, yesterday's committee meeting.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(inaudible)

MR. T. BENNETT:

I am sorry, in the morning or evening before, Mr. Minister, but anyway we can always go back and establish the date at which time the minister made that suggestion.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The date is not important.

MR. T. BENNETT:

Well, if that be the case, Mr. Speaker, I

MR. T. BENNETT: think we should place an awful lot more emphasis on development of our fishery. Down through the years we have not been able to become very, very wealthy from our fishery. When we were selling fish for one and one-half cents per pound, and I believe I mentioned this one time before in the House of Assembly here, when we were getting one cent or two cents per pound nobody could buy the big \$500,000 dragger boats then. Nobody wanted to get into it, Nobody would risk money on the fishery. But now there is a world demand for fish and we are into a lucrative business. Everybody wants to get into the fishery. So let us not be like the old people way back some - Another story I read where, I am not exactly sure where, I went to school at one time and I remember a lot of the stories I heard, The first snow fall a certain culture saw come down on top of their camps they would fill their camps full of snow and they would throw out their fish and their meat, Mr. Speaker, they threw it out and the next thing they would know the sun shones and the snow melted and they had no fish and they had no snow. Now let us not let it happen to us. We have the same danger of this happening. Let us not throw out our fishery in favour of offshore oil when indeed the sun might shine for two or three years, or ten or fifteen years, and then we will have nothing to go back to to keep us going for the winter. When the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) was speaking I had every confidence that he would support this resolution. And, Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that if the people in this Province realized that the government of today are opposed to setting up a select committee, I think they would be appalled. I think they would

MR. BENNETT:

be very distressed, I would think they would call for the resignation of the government.

MR. NEARY:

Right on!

MR. BENNETT:

I really do.

MR. NEARY:

Right on!

MR. BENNETT:

Because the people are being led to believe that the government is most interested in the welfare of the people and the Province. They gave them a nice mandate. They have thirty-four seats as opposed to eighteen and no matter what they put on the floor they can outvote us. Now, I think that they should let us participate in the future of the Province by setting up this select committee. And I would love to serve on it and I want no more compensation than the satisfaction of being with the group that studies it and I want nothing from the Province anymore than the wages I already receive and I think most of the members on this side fell the same way.

The hon. gentleman who put forward this resolution, of course, when he described it as of paramount importance to the Province was soft-peddalling. It most certainly is of more than paramount importance to the Province if there is any way to be more than of paramount importance. Because without the fishery, Mr. Speaker, we have not got a lot that we can fall back on if the oil gets to be a disaster - and I am only saying 'if' mind you, let us hope it gets to be the gold at the end of the rainbow. Since we remember, any of us and all of us, a youngster could take a fishing line, Mr. Speaker, and go out in a boat in a bay and catch a fish and bring it home and put it on the dinner table. I have not seen anybody be able to catch a gallon of oil on a jigger line. And I think it is very important, Mr. Speaker, that we protect that which is of so much importance to us and to every level of society in the Province, every age group. A youngster learns to be a Newfoundlander with a fishing line in his hand. He has done it down through the 400 years and let us hope he continues to have that opportunity. Let us not let that opportunity be destroyed for what might very well be pie in the sky. Undoubtedly there is a lot of wisdom that has come from the other side of the House and undoubtedly



MR. BENNETT:

there is no way, Mr. Speaker, that we can have thirty-four hon. gentlemen sit over there without having something to offer. Surely goodness they have got a lot to offer or they would not be sitting there. I also feel that we have a fair amount on this side that we can offer.

When I look back and reminisce a little, back over the years again, they have not always been, in my opinion - I will not credit them with all the wisdom because I doubt very much if the Liberal Government would have cut off mother's allowances and stuff like that, that kind of a thing, I doubt very much if we would have let the Fisheries Loan Board flounder and sink. I do not think we would have, Mr. Speaker. But the Fisheries Loan Board seems to have gone down the drain and we are most anxious to see it reactivated and brought back on stream, Mr. Speaker, so it can fill a function that is so necessary to the lifestyle, the salvation of this Province.

When the Minister of Fisheries is speaking of the employment factor of the fishery, and he is suggesting we have 15,000 bona fide fishermen, something like 14,000 plant workers, that is 29,000 persons employed directly with the fishery. So when you look at the spin-off, you are looking at 150,000 people if you take a ratio of five to one which usually seems to be a normal yardstick to use. So when you realize that we have 150,000 who are so directly and indirectly affected by the fishery and the benefits derived from the fishery, the fishery being a renewable resource, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that every last person, every last hon. gentlemen and hon. lady, member of the House of Assembly will support this resolution and I feel certain they will. It is too bad they have not had time to sleep on it, because this has got to be passed today, because I feel certain if they went home and called to some of their districts, to some of the people in their districts,

MR. BENNETT: they would certainly get the support that we would like to see them get, the moral support to come in and support this resolution. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) also suggested that the Premier himself would see no stone unturned- and I am glad, very glad, and I believe that. So let us prove the point, let us prove the point now. - the Premier will see no stone unturned to see fair play and to see the blending in of the fishery with the offshore oil. So let the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries prove the point now in supporting this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please! I wonder if we could have the Sergeant-at-Arms check the corridors, there seems to be an extra amount of noise.

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will cut my few remarks short at this time, time is running out for today, and give somebody else an opportunity to say a few words. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that the members on this side of the House do get an opportunity to have an input into a select committee that I feel very certain the Premier will see gets put in place and give us the opportunity to have our say in the matter.

Thank you very much, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I want to have a few words on this resolution before the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) clues up. I think I have five minutes in which to speak so that the hon member from Trinity-Bay de Verde can have his required time to wind up the debate on this resolution. I thought I would be remiss if I did not say a few words on it. Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most important point, since time is very brief, the most important point to deal with on this particular resolution has to do with an issue which came up three or four years ago on which, at that time, there was very little debate, really meaningful debate. There were a number of individuals, a number of organizations, said a little bit, but I remember it clearly. It was at the time when the government of the day, through the

PREMIER PECKFORD: Minister of Mines and Energy, published a white paper on the whole question of governing the operation of the offshore development, which led to, then, the regulations which led to what we now have today, and those regulations being passed. There were a number of organizations in the Province at that time, and I think particularly of the Labrador Resources Advisory Council who, perhaps, were the most vociferous and who contributed most substantially to those public hearings and that kind of input process. Unfortunately, it is like so many things that happen as it relates to the creation and development of public policy, that it is not until after things are put in place that suddenly it becomes the hue and cry of everybody, that, holy smoke, we might have an oil and gas development here and at the same time we have a renewable resource called the fishery that is our lifeblood that must be protected, that must be encouraged, that must be expanded over the long term because that is our long-term future as Newfoundlanders and as Labradorians. It is really ironic to think that today in 1980, four or five years later, that it suddenly comes to the attention of some individual that this is rather important. At that time we were crying out - I remember clearly - crying out for more briefs, crying out for people to come forward and present their views as it related to this. Now, simultaneous with that kind of statement, Mr. Speaker, must go and has to go the fact that we are involved in something here over which, number one on the fisheries side, we have no jurisdiction, almost none, almost zero. The Province of Newfoundland and Labrador has just about zero jurisdiction over it. In the environmental end of it, we have some shared jurisdiction, and over the whole question of the mineral resources on the Continental Shelf we are being challenged by the Federal Government as if we have no jurisdiction at all over it. It is because of these particular arguments, especially as it relates to the ownership of the mineral resources and as it relates to fisheries, that we have put forward in the Throne Speech, that we have put forward in the Budget Speech, that we will

PREMIER PECKFORD:

put forward in the five-year plan, that we will put forward at every time that we have an opportunity, that unless and until we can have meaningful input into the fishery of this Province through some changes in the constitution, meaningful input into the mineral resources on the Continental Shelf through ownership of those resources, then the whole process that we have already gone through, and what is now being proposed, is totally irrelevant because we are only going to be bystanders in any kind of development as it relates to the fishery, as it relates to offshore oil and gas, as it relates to a whole bunch of other things that go on on our doorstep. So let us not try to put the cart before the horse. Let us put it proper and let us put it right. The fact of the matter is I want to have that responsibility. This government wants to have those problems. We are crying out for Newfoundlanders to support us so that we can have more problems. We are crying out for Newfoundlanders to support us so that we can have a meaningful part to play in this development. The easiest thing to do, Mr. Speaker, the simplest thing to do is to just say, "We have nothing to do with this" and just continue to blame it on somebody else further away. That is the easiest road to take. But we are taking the most difficult road. We are saying, "We want more problems. We want more responsibility. We want to get head and shoulders into it. We welcome the opportunity to have more say in the fishery and into the licensing of fishermen, in the quotas that have to be established. We want more say. We want more problems because we are closest to it and we want more problems as it relates to the mineral resources on the Continental Shelf." And unless and until, Mr. Speaker, we can get that kind of meaningful power in the hands of people in this Province, then all the select committees, all the parliaments of Newfoundland, all the other committees are going to be meaningless because in the final analysis the authority lies somewhere else and we will be bystanders to see again another Upper Churchill kind of contract being signed, another kind of giveaway being perpetrated on the people of this Province which will mean that once again we have lost again forever and ever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde has the right to close the debate. Does he wish to give leave?

MR. F. ROWE:

I am quite willing to yield.

MR. SPEAKER:

Yields to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

I thank first of all the Chair and of course the hon. member and I do not intend to make any lengthy comments, I simply want to say in as dispassionate a way as I suggest the Premier tends to get passionate about many of these issues - that it seems to me that there is no fundamental disagreement on the basic points that we are talking about in terms of maximizing benefits to Newfoundland and so on. I think if we could only get the idea across to hon. members opposite that they are in a, by the right of the people, no question, I am not quarrelling with that, a privileged position of governing this Province therefore they have access to a tremendous amount of information that, of course, it is not possible for us to have. I think if there is another alternative to a select committee, I do not know what it is. All we are saying, really, is that there are ways in which we hope that we can be provided with information because in the last analysis what I believe is quite important is that when - and I would hope that we can on a wide range of issues, not play partisan politics with these things, but on a wide range of issues that on the basis of understanding and information, and I emphasize that, I do not think it is a matter of stupidity, I think it is a question of saying, "Look, is there not some fashion through which we can ask questions in a technique that is not feasible in this House", and that is what I am getting at.

If the hon. Premier wants to meet with me or somebody or just say, "Look, how the hell can we do this?", then I am satisfied with that kind of approach. In the meantime, I support this resolution because I think that we have to have a means through which we can say, "Okay, you made certain statements and there are a variety of supplementary questions and a variety of things of that sort that we would

MR. JAMIESON:

like some information on". And I do not believe that the future of this Province is benefited any by simply becoming partisan over issues of this kind or by playing politics with them. And it seems to me that what we have to do is to find a means through which we can rationally and sensibly like adults and patriotic Newfoundlanders, all of us, to do a decent job on the basis of factual information. I will not take any more of the time of my colleague, the hon. member for Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe), but simply say that that is the reason, that is why I asked for a select committee on oil and gas, why I

MR. D. JAMIESON:

welcomed, Mr. Speaker, the indication from the Premier the other day he was planning some briefing sessions. This kind of thing will, I believe, defuse a lot of misunderstandings, a lot, perhaps, of differences of opinion which, in my judgement, ought not to exist and, I believe, will not exist if, in fact, there is a mature approach taken. And I undertake to say that we will take such a mature approach, it will not be a question of exploiting, but if it is simply going to be a question of saying, "Support and we will find out afterwards what certain basic facts are," then, of course, it is quite difficult if not impossible task for people in opposition who do not have access to the facts.

One final point, there are certain things clearly and unmistakably which the government has the right to know and has a right to know in privacy, I do not quarrel with that, but I do suggest that there are a variety of ways in which reasonable men and women can sit down on issues such as this, and the Select Committee seems to be the only one under the legislative process, in any event, that provides that kind of outlet. And that is the point that we are making.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)  
Premier.

To a point of order, the hon. the

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson) in most of his comments has led the House to believe that the administration is not prepared to provide every single bit of information as it relates to the interaction between the fishery and the offshore oil and gas. I just want to clear that up because -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- well, yes that implication was clearly there in my opinion, Mr. Speaker. Now, I tried, over the last four or five days, to keep my commitment as it related to briefing sessions for all members of the House and I ran into the schedule of the Estimates Committees, which themselves by the way are not being attended regularly by all members of this House let alone

PREMIER PECKFORD: the press and, therefore, I have left that off until the 6th of May, I think, when the Estimates Committees come back to the House, and then the backbenchers have more time and there will be a schedule distributed to every single member of this House beginning detailed briefing sessions on everything to do with the whole question of the offshore and its interaction with the fishery. So there is that commitment, it will be kept and as long as the members of this House want that kind of briefing to continue it will continue so that all the facts and figures that the Leader of the Opposition is talking about are made totally available to all members of this House.

MR. S. NEARY: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman does not have a point of order. He merely used that technique to make a point.

Mr. Speaker, there is no fairer way on the face of this earth to deal with these very serious and important matter than through setting up an impartial committee of this House. I have been trying to get on the offshore rig for the last two years. According to what I can hear about them, I would not stay there overnight. And I am told that it is virtually impossible, they will not allow you on the rigs. What does the hon. gentleman have to say about that?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: I mean, will we be taken offshore, shown the rigs, shown what has happened on the Grand Banks and so forth?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: I am talking to the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member must make his points relevant to the point of order.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, what I am saying really, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. gentleman does not have a point of order, that



MR. S. NEARY: he merely used this technique to try to make a point to offset the point that the Leader of the Opposition had made.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) With respect to the point of order I would rule that there is not a point of order but the Premier has taken the opportunity to clarify certain remarks.

The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde. If the hon. member speaks now he will close the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, this really leaves me very little time to complete my remarks on this particular motion but, Sir, may I say that I am extremely disappointed, I am angered and I am saddened and I am almost, I suppose, vicious to the point where the Telegram suggested the other day, "I was uncharacteristically loud and spirited."

MR. STIRLING: Very good, get at it again.

MR. F. ROWE: But, Sir, we saw the Premier of this Province stand up here again today and drag a great red herring across the floor of the House of Assembly by suggesting, what is the sense of setting up a Select Committee when we have no authority over the fisheries, "We have not authority over the fisheries," he is saying, "we are just bystanders," when, during the same afternoon, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) got up and said that we have an Advisory Committee and he is willing to have legislators

MR. F. ROWE: from this House of Assembly sit on that Advisory Committee, or go along with that Advisory Committee on various trips to Scotland and Norway to study the very issues that we are talking about here today. Now, Mr. Speaker, you cannot have it both ways. I am disturbed with the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) who got up and claimed "Why should we have a select committee, because the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry) are taking care of the situation." That was a direct quote from him. The member for Placentia was totally partisan, he went back to ERCO and all that sort of thing, and he made no reference whatsoever to the bill. The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) got up and hurled the insult across the House that we did not have the - we were not worthy of being heard because we were supposedly against ownership of oil and gas off our shores.

MR. WARREN: What has that got to do with (inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE: The only person on the government side, Mr. Speaker, who has come at all close and, in fact, who has, has, in fact, supported this private members' resolution is the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) himself who is in complete -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear !

MR. F. ROWE: - who is in complete contradiction with his own Premier and his own administration. Now, what exactly did the Minister of Fisheries say Mr. Speaker,? And I welcome his remarks. He said that he is going to recommend to this House now, I do not know when he is going to recommend to this House, if it is going to be done this afternoon or how it is going to be recommended, but he suggested that two or three or possibly four legislators, which I think is an excellent idea, are going to be asked to go along with the Advisory Committee to look at the oil and gas situation as it affects the fishery in places like Norway and in Scotland. Now, Sir, if that is not a quasi, if you want to call it, a quasi select committee what is it? In fact, the minister is supporting this motion in principle just as we supported

MR. F. ROWE: the motion on the Northern codstocks moved by the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews).

MR. STIRLING: Yes, they want to play (inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE: We had a few questions, we pointed out a few weaknesses in his particular motion, we raised a few questions, but we had the gall -not the gall, Mr. Speaker- we had the intelligence, We had the intelligence, although we had to ask a few extremely important questions, we supported that particular motion in principle and the Minister of Fisheries here this afternoon has, in fact, supported this particular motion for the setting up of a select committee to look into all aspects of oil and gas as to how it would affect the fisheries of this Province. So, therefore, Sir, I would ask in all sincerity that all members opposite take the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) lead in this respect and support this particular motion in principle because he has, in fact, supported the motion in principle. There might be a few words he disagreed with. I totally disagree with hon. members opposite when they say that because of the petroleum directorate and because of the federal government legislation, the Federal Fisheries Act sections 30, 31 and 33, and because of certain other activities of government, because there had been certain studies undertaken, because there are certain regulations, I do not think it is redundant to set up a select committee no matter how much work has been done in this particular area. Because the fisheries, Sir, will be here a long time after the last cubic inch and the last barrel of oil is gone out of the grounds off our coast.

MR. WARREN: (inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE: I can get sensational, Mr. Speaker, and talk about blowouts and that kind of a thing that would be an obvious disaster, but there are even more dangerous implications than blowouts believe it or not. We have got problems out there now where we have defective blowout preventers, defective blowout preventers that are being looked at, Even before we are into the developmental stages, during the exploratory stages we have defective

MR. F. ROWE:                      blowout preventers. But as I mentioned when I was introducing this bill, Mr. Speaker, we have to address ourselves to a number of things besides the environment and that is the whole business of how oil and gas production will affect the very sociology, the economy of this Province and the inshore fishery. I mentioned the problem of people being dragged away from the fisheries to high paying jobs in oil and gas. I talked about the possibility of people in the inshore fishery going into oil and gas related work, with higher salaries, giving the multi-national fish companies the opportunity to increase the trawler fleets and, therefore, when the oil and gas is gone from our shores here we have left in this Province no inshore fishery and a great offshore trawler fleet. And that is surely against the philosophy of the present administration, the Opposition and the Federal Government, because we believe in the way rural Newfoundland exists at the present time, as it exists with respect to the preservation of the inshore fishery. There is that danger that if people from the inshore fishery are attracted, because of high wages, to the oil and gas related industry, that we will see the end of the inshore fishery, the build-up of the offshore trawler fleets and the complete annihilation of the inshore fishery when every ounce of gas and oil is gone out of our grounds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am really saddened in the approach of the Premier. I just cannot believe it, Mr. Speaker, Daily the Premier of this Province gets up and tries to score political points. Now, I do not mind hon. members trying to score political points from time to time, but when a Premier of a Province religiously and daily, and every minute of his waking hour, and if not his sleeping hour, is thinking of ways to play politics with the Opposition -

MR. D. JAMIESON: I am not sure he sleeps.

MR. F. ROWE: if indeed he sleeps or with the Federal Government, if that is his strategy, I repeat, as I did on the first day when I introduced this bill, that that will do this Province no good. The hon. the Premier has to go to Ottawa and he has to negotiate in good faith. He cannot negotiate over a T.V. set, over the radio or through the printed media, that is not the way to do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE: Right. It is as simple as that. So I am saddened really. I am really saddened, the tack that the Premier has taken today. I must say I was rather surprised when I looked at the present Minister of Fisheries, looked at his activities over the past number of years, he has tended to be probably one of the most partisan individuals in this House and I was pleasantly surprised this afternoon when the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) did, in fact, endorse and support without doubt the principle of this particular resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: There was no doubt in my mind whatsoever, and I would ask his colleagues on the other side to join with the Minister of Fisheries and set up this select committee and support this bill. Now, if there are some little words in the resolution that some members find offensive they can still vote for the principle of the bill, as I repeat, we did when we supported the principle of the bill moved by the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews). We found some of the words, for instance, 'exclusivity', we did not find that particularly palatable and neither did the hon. member because he did not mention that at any point when he moved that bill. But we did support the principle with respect to the Northern cod stocks, and I could expect

April 30, 1980

Tape No. 1187

DW - 3

MR. F. ROWE:

no less from hon. members  
opposite because I repeat once again, Mr. Speaker, and I  
will close the ,

MR. F. ROWE: debate, I repeat once again, that the most important thing, as confirmed by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) this afternoon when he indicated that 25 per cent of our population is sustained directly and indirectly by the fishery; 25 per cent of our total population is sustained by the fisheries of this Province, that if we do not have a select committee of this House, I would go so far as to say that every member of this House on both sides should be put on board planes, probably not all together, for obvious reasons, but put aboard planes and have a first-hand look at the situation in Scotland and in Norway and the Gulf of Mexico. Because, Sir, it is not the petroleum directorate that makes the laws of this Province or establishes the policy of this Province, it is not some study group, we are the people who make the laws of this Province and make the final decisions, set the direction for this Province, and if there is anybody who should know what they are talking about when it comes to the destiny of this Province, it has to be hon. members on both sides of this House. So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask sincerely that hon. members opposite support the principle of this bill, notwithstanding the fact that they might disagree with a few phrases or a few words, and stay in keeping with their own Minister of Fisheries and support this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please! Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion, those in favour 'aye', contrary 'nay'? In my opinion the 'nays' have it, I declare the motion lost.

MR. JAMIESON: On division.

MR. SPEAKER: Division, I need three members rise before division. Call in the members.

DIVISION

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion, please rise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

April 30, 1980

Tape No. 1188

GH-2

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition

(Mr. Jamieson), Mr. Flight, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Frederick Rowe, Mr. Neary,  
Mr. Thoms, Mr. White, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Stirling, Mr. Hollett, Mr. Warren,  
Mr. Hiscock, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hancock.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Is it agreed to stop the clock?

Agreed.

Those against the motion, please rise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!



MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

Order, please!

Order, please!

The hon. the Premier (Mr. Peckford); the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy and Industrial Development (Mr. Barry); the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan); the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mrs. Newhook); the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey); the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young); the hon. the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture (Mr. Dawe); the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn); the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins); the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer); the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall); the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie); the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge); the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. House); Mr. Andrews; Mr. Walsh; Mr. Butt; Mr. Stagg; Mr. Collins; Dr. Twomey; Mr. Doyle; Mr. Aylward; Dr. McNicholas; Mr. Stewart; Mr. Baird.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

With respect to the vote on the motion, fourteen for, twenty-five against. I declare the motion lost.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Just before you leave the Chair, Mr.

Speaker, I could announce or inform the House that the Government Services Committee will meet tonight at 7:30 p.m. in the Collective Bargaining Room to consider the estimates of the Department of Tourism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

I am sorry Transportation and Communications.

I am reading it wrong. My bifocals, Mr. Speaker. The Resource Committee will be meeting tonight at seven-thirty at the Colonial Building to consider the Department of Fisheries. They will be meeting again tomorrow morning from ten to one in the Collective Bargaining Room.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: They will be meeting tomorrow morning between ten and one in the Collective Bargaining Room to consider the estimates of the Department of Fisheries and tomorrow morning between ten and one in the Colonial Building the Social Services Committee will be meeting to consider the estimates of the Department of Justice.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: My sincere apologies, Mr. Speaker, but could the House Leader give an indication, I believe he did earlier in private conversation but I did not get the information, could I hear what the business will be for the next two days.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Yes. We propose to get on with the consideration of the bill that was under consideration on Tuesday and then we will be getting into the residue of the time for Committee of Supply. This is what I anticipate for the balance of the week.

MR. SPEAKER: It being six or the clock this House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday at three of the clock.