

VOL. 1

NO. 44

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1982

The House met at 3 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR.NEARY: Mr.Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. In view of the violent reaction to the government's tax increases, and the lack of consultation with organizations like the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, the school boards and the Restaurant Association and so forth, and in view of the fact that this is unanimous, this criticism of the government for taxing Christmas presents and donuts and hot dogs and footwear and clothing and so forth, in view of the severe reaction against the government for imposing all these new taxes, would the Premier indicate if the government is anticipating dropping their intentions to go ahead with many of these hardship taxes, if they intend to make any changes or amendments to the tax increases that were outlined in the statement that was brought down in a Ministerial Statement in the House last Thursday?

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all when a government takes certain measures either in a full-blown budget or in an economic statement like we did last week, the level of consultation that can be had in that context is limited. There was some consultation with outside interests in the preparation of it, but it is extremely difficult to

PREMIER PECKFORD: get into a full, wide ranging decision making process with various groups within society because obviously most of these matters are fairly confidential and there is a wide range of options available to government. And when you go to one group it is quite easy for them to be able to say the other group should be taxed or different things done to reduce the amount of assistance, it is always somebody else and not them. So I should like to say first of all that it is difficult to do the wide-ranging consultation that would be necessary along the lines implied and stated by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), so that is difficult in the process that we have. There was some consultation but it was not as wide ranging as I am sure a lot of people would perhaps have liked to see it. But nevertheless the government is elected to govern and to take measures. It has to look not only at this year but at next year, it has to look at a whole range of programmes, so what we were faced with, Mr. Speaker, was either to make some changes in taxation, number one; number two, to

PREMIER PECKFORD: allow a deficit to be incurred, a real core deficit to be incurred if one agrees that the \$25 million deficit we now have on current account is a one-shot deal in a payment back to the federal government for overpayments over in the last three years. So we reduced programmes across the board where we could, to the school boards, \$140,000 - \$150,000 out of \$35 million, or whatever was the total we saved, which was not all that much. We reduced by five cents on the first \$2 million to municipalities and another five cents above that, which I think was sort of a reasonable thing; another hundred and - I forget what the total there is, it may be \$600,000 or \$700,000 to all the 109 municipalities and like measure throughout the whole system. And after making all those programme cuts, we cut over \$11 million within government itself. I think that the point is often lost, Mr. Speaker, that there was over \$11 million cut within government itself before we started cutting programmes and before we started increasing taxes. So then you could either increase tax, as I say, incur a deficit on current account in addition to the \$25 million or the third option was to cut other programmes; and the other programmes to cut in order to realize no deficit at all would mean getting into the heart and soul of some of the social programmes in this Province if you are really serious, or otherwise, lay off a lot of people.

So there are really three options available to government to get us out of what could be a deficit by March and those were the three. And what we decided to do was to do a range of all three, not just all taxation measures, define the \$25 million as not being an ongoing deficit, and do a wide range of programme cuts

PREMIER PECKFORD: within government and outside of government for which government is responsible.

MR. WARREN: Sit down, boy! You are wasting our time.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We intend, Mr. Speaker, to follow through on the measures that were outlined in the statement last week.

MR. HODDER: The Premier is taking a long time to answer the question, is he not?

MR. NEARY: Oh, boy! Oh, boy!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to answer the question as reasonably as I can.

So of those three measures that I outlined, those three options, we decided to do something in each one of them and we intend to pursue those initiatives to ensure that we have eliminated the deficit, that we are in a solid financial position. To do otherwise, we can do as the NDP suggest and some other Liberal economists and that is borrow the deficit on current account, spend your way out of your problem, or cut other programmes. But we did not think we could cut any other social programmes, neither did we think we could borrow to try to spend our way out of the problem.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, despite the severe criticism and the backlash and the violent reaction by the voters of this Province, whom the hon. gentleman betrayed,

MR. S. NEARY: whom he duped in the last election, he intends to proceed, to go ahead.

MR. WM. MARSHALL: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is giving a speech, apart from the fact that he is also reading it. The prose is rather bad and whoever has written it for him is rather bad, but that is not an issue. The issue really is, Mr. Speaker, he is asking a supplementary question and making a speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair will permit the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary) a supplementary question which should be very brief.

MR. HODDER: And the answer too, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I understand from the answer that was given to me by the Premier that the government intends to forge ahead with these cruel and callous tax increases. Now, would the hon. gentleman tell the House if he is satisfied that other cuts could not have been made and other sources of revenue could not have been found? For instance, let me give the hon. gentleman an example: Could the hon. gentleman not have cut his Cabinet? He has the biggest Cabinet in the whole of Canada, the biggest Cabinet in Newfoundland since Confederation. Could the hon. gentleman not have cut the Cabinet and thereby saved several hundreds of thousands of dollars, reduce the number of ministers in the Cabinet? What I am asking the hon. gentleman - I am just using that as an illustration - is the hon. gentleman convinced that there could not have been further cuts in

MR. S. NEARY: expenditure of unnecessary, nonessential items, extravagance and waste under that heading? And could the hon. gentleman also tell the House if he is satisfied that other sources of revenue could not have been found?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary), like some other people in the community at large, from time to time makes erroneous statements.

If the Leader of the Opposition wants to ask a question about the question of the economic statement, why does he not ask it without prefacing his question with things which are untrue. Number one, the Leader of the Opposition said that it was the largest Cabinet in Canada. That is untrue. The Leader of the Opposition said that we have the largest Cabinet in Canada. Now the Leader of the Opposition is wrong. Now, how can I respond to the core and substance of a question from the Leader of the Opposition if he is going to preface his question with things that are untrue? It dilutes, it makes the question that the Leader of the Opposition was going to ask lack credibility. And then the largest Cabinet since Confederation, that is untrue. So if the Leader of the Opposition wants to get at the core of the economic statement given last week, let him ask the question straight out without trying to preface his question with a whole bunch of untruths.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: So after dealing with those two untruths, let me just say to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) on the question of the size of the Cabinet, I had contemplated and considered that. And given the duties and the responsibilities that the Cabinet ministers are now carrying, I did not see -

MR. HISCOCK: What about Intergovernmental Affairs?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Intergovernmental Affairs comes under my aegis.

MR. HISCOCK: Exactly.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So I could appoint another minister, is that what you mean? Enlarge the Cabinet?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Enlarge the Cabinet.

MR. NEARY: No, no

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it really is not a viable option at this point in time. Most of the ministers are extremely busy in their portfolios and there is a lot of work to be done. And I do not think that that was a place where you could save a lot of money. Somebody else would have to pick up a lot of the responsibilities and I do not think that was a viable option at all, in my view. The ministers are busy about their work and I did not consider it to be a viable option.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). I am wondering if in view of the fact that the President of the University was consulted re the government's decision to cut back on the monies allocated to the University, so in view of that fact, Sir, and in view of the severe financial bind with

MR. LUSH: school boards are in and have been in for sometime throughout the Province, I am wondering whether the Minister can indicate to the House whether or not school boards were consulted, that is, the school boards individually or through their collective body, the Federation of School Boards, whether they were consulted in this matter with respect to reducing their grants by \$150,000? I wonder if the minister can indicate whether or not this was done? Whether school boards were consulted either individually or through their main body, the Federation of School Boards, re this cut of \$150,000?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. member that I personally did not consult with the school boards. The main method by which government communicates with school boards, of course, is through the Department of Education. We also use the media because the media is a useful mechanism for communicating with the public. I hope we never lose the media. I hope the media always will be with us because this is a useful method to get word out to the public.

MR. CALLAN: By George, he's got it.

DR. COLLINS: The public seldom listens to pronouncements by the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), for instance, but if government wants to put something in the media often the public become aware of it.

So I hope I have answered the hon. member's question, and if he wishes to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) for details as to her conversations with the school boards, I am sure she will be glad to elaborate.

MR. LUSH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: To the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), In view of the fact, as I understand his answer, that it was done through the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) if it were indeed done, which government agency then contacted the President of the University? Was it the Minister of Finance in his capacity as President of the Treasury Board? Can he answer me that part, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in the statement it was indicated that the departments of government and the Crown agencies and other agencies and the university were approached by the government, and mainly through the mechanism of Treasury Board, to put in certain restraint measures. And the restraint measures that were asked of the Crown corporations were very much in line with the restraint measures that were requested of the departments of government itself.

MR. LUSH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Well, I will direct my question then, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education. The preamble remains the same, that in view of the fact that the President of the University was consulted, and in view of the severe financial bind that school boards find themselves in, were the school boards consulted re this reduction in their grant structure of \$150,000 or was, as I am gathering from the Minister of Finance, this decision made unilaterally by the government to carry out this rather extreme measure to school boards?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, over the past year I personally, as Minister of Education for this government, have had extensive contact and consultation with school boards about financing education. I have had meetings and correspondence with the Federation of School Boards at their annual meeting and I dealt with their executive. I have also had a lot of contact with individual school boards, chairpeople and superintendents of a variety of the thirty-five school boards across the Province. It was about a year ago that the Federation of School Boards presented to government a major report on the financing of education and that report prompted extra work on the part of government in examining the method of financing education. As a result of the recommendations in that report, Mr. Speaker, there were substantial increases in operating grants from the provincial government to the school boards in the budget brought down last Spring.

MS. VERGE: The most significant increase was the \$2.5 million fund which was given to those boards most in need. And, Mr. Speaker, one particular school board which had been in serious trouble previously got a 40 per cent increase from government in our operating grant this year compared to what they got in earlier years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, on Thursday past, immediately before the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) delivered his statement to this hon. House, I and my senior officials spent two hours meeting with the executive of the Federation of School Boards, and, Mr. Speaker, the reduction in operating grants to school boards that was announced is only \$1 per pupil, a total of \$150,000 across the Province.

MR. NEARY: Were they told about it?

MR. TULK: That means a lot to a classroom that has no paper this year.

MS. VERGE: And, Mr. Speaker, I submit that that is not a significant reduction, and that is not going to seriously hurt any of the school boards.

MR. NEARY: That is your opinion.

MS. VERGE: And it is only their due share of the reductions that are necessary right across government departments and agencies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Well, I take it then, Mr. Speaker, from the minister's response that there was extensive consultation with educators throughout the Province, with the Federation of School Boards, and with other groups with

MR. LUSH: superintendents. So I take it then that all of these bodies agree with this reduction of \$150,000. I take it that the Federation of School Boards and that all of the other bodies and agencies that the minister consulted with, I take it then that they agreed with this \$150,000 reduction. Am I right assuming that, that all of these bodies agreed with this reduction?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose that any people associated with school boards like having to sacrifice anything from their budget anymore than people working in the Department of Education or any other government agency. But, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary for every part of the public service, including school boards and hospital boards and municipalities, to sacrifice something for the common good and demonstrate leadership to all the people in the Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as every hon. member knows, school boards in this Province have been on the verge of bankruptcy, that has been a favourite expression of theirs, and to hear the minister say that \$150,000 is not going to hurt, substantially hurt the educational programmes throughout this Province is surprising to say the least. A further supplementary to the minister, Can the minister indicate as to what areas will be affected? I think the Federation of School Boards was quoted as saying, Sir, that this was going to draw blood because there is no fat in Education, there is no excess monies at all, and this measure was certainly going to draw blood, So could the minister indicate what areas because I am sure there are hon. members who do not know where this

Mr. LUSH: money is coming from, what this \$150,000 is designated for. Could the minister identify precisely what areas of education will be affected by this reduction of \$150,000?

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, words like bankruptcy and blood are inflammatory, and, I think, are based on irresponsible reactions to the budgetary decisions that were taken .

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MS VERGE: - anyone with a grain of common sense is going to assess the impact of \$1 per pupil.

MR.NEARY: And that is a lot of money.

MS VERGE: Now, Mr. Speaker, \$1 per pupil taken away from school board operating grants is not going to seriously affect the quality of education in this Province. School boards will be able to tighten their belts and trim travel costs, overtime spending, non-teaching staff salaries, the same as all government departments. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not going to be very hard for the school boards in this Province to trim only one dollar per pupil.

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR.LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it is fantastic to hear somebody say that a \$1 reduction per pupil is not going to hurt the school boards of this Province when everybody knows the financial straits which school boards have found themselves in in this Province for the last number of years and the government having to bail some of them out to keep them from bankruptcy. It is absolutely amazing. So, Mr. Speaker, the question is how can people do some belt tightening when they

MR. LUSH: have no money to meet their ongoing needs? This is what this money is doing. Again I ask the minister will this result in any layoffs with school boards in terms of support staff? Will it mean not being able to purchase any - not extra, Mr. Speaker, will it mean not being able to purchase paper to carry on the ordinary routine maintenance, the day-to-day maintenance in schools? So what kind of a bind is this going to put school boards in from the point of view of being able to run their schools on a daily basis and will it result in the layoff of support staff that school boards have precious little of anyways?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, \$1 per pupil subtracted from school board operating expenses is a miniscule fraction of the total outlay from government to the school boards. And do not forget,

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, that school boards also get revenue from local school taxation.

MR. LUSH: Oh, yes,

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the per pupil grant from government is just part of what government gives school boards.

MR. LUSH: Yes, yes, they will increase the taxes, pass the buck.

MS VERGE: This year, Mr. Speaker, we are giving each school board something like \$203 a pupil - I may be a couple of dollars out. We are subtracting only \$1 a pupil from that amount. But over and above that, Mr. Speaker, government is giving extra money for those school districts with above average declining enrolments, with above average heat and light costs, with above average transportation costs, extra money for school boards operating in Labrador, a \$2.5 million fund distributed to those boards most in need with debt resulting from previous school construction and, Mr. Speaker, a \$400,000 grant to help purchase equipment for the reorganized high school programme. Mr. Speaker, \$1 a pupil is not going to seriously hurt school boards.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) - she has been talking about a figure of \$150,000 to school boards, but I want to talk about a figure of \$173,000 which has been cut from the Bay St. George Community College budget. I would like to ask the minister why it is that in proportion to the overall annual budget of that college it has been cut back more than any other institution in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the reduction in the budget for the Bay St. George Community College was arrived at with reference to the needs of the college, the amount provided in the Spring budget and the overall amount is determined to be reasonable. Proportionately similar reductions were made in the grants to the other colleges and again, in consultation with those institutions, and the university, Mr. Speaker, has had a substantial reduction made in its budget. All of those amounts were calculated with reference to the needs of the institutions, the programmes that are now being operated and after dialogue with the administration of those institutions.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I heard the minister say, in relationship with the needs of the college. Well, I do not know what the college needs, Mr. Speaker, but for the past two weeks they have not had the heat on there and the lights are all off in the college, if that is in relation to their needs. But I would ask the minister why it was in proportion to their total budget in the

MR. HODDER: provincial budget, looking at the figures in the budget last year, why is it the college has been cut 6.6 per cent while, say, the College of Fisheries, in relation to its total budget, was only cut back 2.1 per cent - I am not saying that any of these figures are good figures - and the university 5 per cent? For instance, does this mean that the minister feels that the college is not as important as some of these other institutions? Is this a lack of commitment by the government to that institution?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the individual circumstances of each of the post-secondary education institutions was examined. Each of the institutions has had a reduction made in its operating budget. In the case of the Bay St. George Community College, the amount was calculated, as I said before, with reference to what was provided initially, the programmes which are being conducted, and the needs, and after consultation with the administration of the college.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port, a supplementary.

MR. HODDER: My understanding is that the college voluntarily decided they would cut back \$140,000, but the minister then slapped \$177,000 on them. I mean, does the minister feel, when she talks about in relation to needs, that these colleges do not need heat and light any more? I mean, there must be rationale. You certainly have not given me any reason why you would cut down. I mean, needs are only words. There must be a reason.

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

MS VERGE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the reason for the reduction is obvious; the economy is in trouble and the

MS VERGE: federal government did not supply as much money to the provincial government as they told us they were going to. The pulp and paper mills, and the mining industry and the fishing industry in our province are in trouble, that is why we have to make reductions everywhere, including the Bay St. George Community College.

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

MR. HISCOCK: My question is to the Minister of Finance(Dr. Collins) in the absence of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Did the Minister of Finance along with the Minister of Municipal Affairs contact the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities with regard to the cutback in their budget?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I presume there is a pattern to these questions. I presume we will go down through every item and finally we will get down and ask, Did the Minister of Finance consult with the Minister of Finance before he cut back his department, you know, and that sort of thing.

The point about a budget is that it is not a popularity contest. You do not go out and say all those who would like a tax cutback, or a grant cutback or whatever, tax increase or a grant cut, would they step forward and, please, the line forms on the left. A budget is a responsibility of government. It takes this responsibility seriously. It looks where its needs are, it looks where capabilities are of cutting back, if a cutback is required, and then it makes its decisions. And many of these decisions have to be kept in relative if not absolute secrecy -

MR. HISCOCK: Why?

DR. COLLINS: - until the statement comes
down.

MR. HISCOCK: Why is that?

DR. COLLINS: Because all these matters,
the economic statements and so on and so forth, are very
much related

DR. COLLINS: to the government budgetary position and the budgetary position should first be presented to this hon. House. It should not be presented to outside people and then as an afterthought be presented to this hon. House. Wherever possible the final details should be brought into this hon. House first.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: The minister has just said that with regard to the economic statement and that some of it had to be kept secret. The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) ended up saying it was not the case and it would be only a Ministerial Statement. If it is a budget statement we should be debating this now and not only have one Question Period for it.

With regard to the part that I would like to ask is that last year when the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) brought in this act, it was a landmark on reform. And one of the cornerstones of that was the tax incentive to have communities in this Province impose property tax with the idea the more property tax you collect from your residents in your municipalities the government will match that. Now after only a year it is slashed altogether. Can the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) inform this hon. House how will the municipalities make up for this loss of revenue? Will they have to raise taxes: Will they have to cut back services? Is this not another form of indirect taxation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, just to put this in a proper context, I think it might be well to make a few figures known. In 1979-80 the total amount of grants to municipalities was \$28.5 million.

MR. CALLAN: That was an election year.

DR. COLLINS: Now that was in 1979-80. In 1982-83, that is just over a three year period, that amount had gone up to \$51.9 million, or an 82 per cent increase in just three years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

DR. COLLINS: So during the term that the Peckford administration has been responsible for the affairs of this Province, the grants to municipalities have gone up by 82 per cent, which I think is a very sharp increase and I am sure that we would wish it were more. And when the new act was brought in, there was no suggestion that this severe recession was on the horizon, a recession in no small measure brought on in Canada anyway by the -

PREMIER PECKFORD: How much was it going back to '61? It was only about \$700,000.

DR. COLLINS: We are going back by a miniscule amount, to use the word that the hon. Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) used previously, we are going back a miniscule amount from that \$51.9 million. And when that new act was brought in, of course, the recession was not upon us. The recession is upon us and we have asked the municipalities to take a very small cut and we hope that they will do it, and we expect they will be able to do it by a belt tightening measure rather than reducing services.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Time for the Question Period has expired.

Before we proceed I would like to welcome to the galleries today Mr. Peter Lush, a Councillor from the Gambo Town Council in the district of Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the Financial Administration Act, I would like to table copies of special warrants for the Department of Social Services and the Departments of Mines and Energy. Mr. Speaker, also whilst I am on my feet, I would like to table the report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services Limited for 1981-82.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Motion 5, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion, the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Wild Life Act," carried. (No. 70).

On motion, Bill No. 70 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow by leave.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Libraries Act, 1975," carried. (No. 62)

On motion, Bill No. 62 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow by leave.

Motion, the hon. the President of the Council to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Leaseholds In St. John's Act," carried. (No. 71).

On motion, Bill No. 71 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow by leave.

November 22, 1982

Tape No. 2530

MJ - 2

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Companies Act," carried. (No. 75)

On motion, Bill No. 75 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow by leave.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Bay St. George Community College Act," (Bill No. 8).

MS. L. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I just have a few brief remarks to make about this bill.

MS. VERGE: The bill deals with a number of matters which could be termed of a housekeeping nature, Mr. Speaker, to actually give legal accord to some of the administrative arrangements that have been operative at the Bay St. George Community College for the last couple of years.

Mr. Speaker, I am now looking at the explanatory notes printed with the bill to refresh my memory. One of the provisions of this bill, Mr. Speaker, deals with the composition of the Board of the College and it does provide for a student representative. And as I say, Mr. Speaker, in fact over the last couple of years there has been a student member of the Council, a student chosen by those attending the College, and I believe that a new student was just named for the present academic year.

Another of the members of the Board formally provided for in this bill is a representation of the faculty and again there has been faculty representation in fact over the last couple of years. And finally the bill provides for, in a formal way, representation of the Department of Education, and again that has been the case for the last couple of years. The Department's representative on the Board is our Assistant Deputy Minister responsible for advanced and continuing education.

Mr. Speaker, another of the provisions of the bill removes the requirement that members of the Board of Governors be bonded. And, Mr. Speaker, this is consistent with legislation governing the other post-secondary institutions in the Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, this bill, to sum up, simply brings the governing body for the Bay St. George Community College into line with those of the other colleges and, in terms of the composition of the membership of the Board, gives effect to what has actually been the case for the last few years.

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to use the opportunity afforded by the presentation of this bill to this hon. House to make a few general remarks about the success of the Bay St. George Community College. The institution is a model in our Province. It is the only one of its kind, established as a result of special circumstances in Stephenville and ,

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the institution has flourished since it was founded. It got off to a very good start under the chairmanship of an individual who is now present in this hon. House, the member for the district of Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), and over the years, Mr. Speaker, the college has improved in terms of the number and variety and quality of the programmes that are offered to students. There have been new courses added over the last few years and they are popular. The feedback from students and people living in the area has been extremely positive.

Another major improvement, Mr. Speaker, has been the physical facilities. The college, until last year, was spread among a number of buildings left over from the Americans on the old Harmon Air Force Base in Stephenville, as well as facilities in Stephenville Crossing. But, Mr. Speaker, government funded the refurbishing of one large building on the old Harmon Complex known as building 360 and most of the Stephenville operations of the college were consolidated in building 360 last year. Building 360 now houses the student residence as well as the administration offices and several classrooms. That building has been very attractively furnished and decorated and I think has greatly improved the image of the college in the community.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, the Bay St. George Community College is doing excellent work in providing education and training programmes to students, students from the immediate Bay St. George area but also from other parts of our Province. And, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to continuing good work in that institution. I think it will continue to equip our people, young and old, for jobs that will be developed and offered in the Province.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation, as the minister says, is housekeeping legislation. I understand that section 71 is in effect now and this has just been passed to make the situation legal.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to as well associate myself with the minister's remarks when she praised the college and the teachers and the programmes which the college have instituted over the past years.

MR. HODDER: I think I should say, though, that the college has had a vacancy on its board of directors for quite a long time; as a matter of fact, it was the subject of an editorial in the daily paper on the West Coast, the Western Star recently, where they called on the minister to appoint a chairman of the board of directors of the college and to appoint six members, because there are six vacancies on the board of directors at the present time and the college cannot function as a college with half a board of directors; because they are, Mr. Speaker, at the present time, the same as the College of Fisheries of Memorial University.

I would like to ask the minister when she speaks finally on this bill to explain why has she not appointed the board of directors. It is my understanding that the staff at the college are very desirous that the board of directors be appointed.

I would also like to come back to what I was asking the minister in Question Period. Last year's budget for the Bay St. George Community College was \$2,831,500. I would like for the minister to explain why it was that they were cut back nearly 7 per cent, because the college is a fledgling institution, they are trying to develop new programmes. And I should say this for the benefit of members opposite: Many people have a feeling that the Bay St. George Community College is a college which handles student just from the Bay St. George area and that is not true, Mr. Speaker, because some of the courses being offered at the college now have no students from the Bay St. George area. It is a provincial institution. It is not a Bay St. George institution, it is a provincial institution in every sense of the word. And that makes me wonder why it is that they are receiving

MR. HODDER: such shoddy treatment, particularly in the fact that they did not even have a board of directors, when these cuts were coming, to fight their battles for them, and why it is the minister has been dragging her feet on that; and I would ask why it is that this institution, which is struggling to develop new courses - and by its name, Bay St. George Community College, one of the things that the college does for the community - many of the courses are province-wide - but they do have night programmes and night classes, which have been cut out, and they are cutting out their literacy programme, which is a night course, which is something, I think, since Newfoundland has one of the highest proportions per population of illiterate people, why the college would be forced into this particular situation where the academic upgrading and the literacy courses have been cancelled because of the vicious cutbacks by the department.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, the minister when she answered my question said that she had cut back according to need in looking at the programmes. However, I would ask the minister if she would look at that institution again because I do not think it is going to do much for the image of that college. They have been pushed into a corner where the teachers now have little lamps on their desks, and have had for the last couple of weeks, and they have the heat down to somewhere around sixty-five while they are trying to save on their energy bill. They have been forced into those particular circumstances. Mr. Speaker, while I should be here urging and encouraging the minister to try to develop some of the programmes - at the present time the college is looking at bringing in environmental technology courses, construction technology, and computer technology - these courses have not been implemented because they cannot find the money from the provincial government to enable them to bring these courses to the college. They have some very advanced courses in mineral technology and drafting technology, but they would like to expand their courses. I find myself standing and instead of trying to ask the minister to continue support I must ask her why it is that she started to not support the college? What is the priority of this college? I mean, is the government saying that the college is there but we are just going to let it die a slow death or are they really committed to community education in the Province? It is my belief that this institution can be a model institution in Canada, not only in the Province. I think it has been very successful in what it set out to do. But the

MR. HODDER:

We take students from all across the Province. We are very proud of our institution and yet the minister has just in my estimation, taken a blanket slash at this particular institution.

Now, I would urge the minister to reconsider what she has done, and to perhaps take another look at this situation.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Bay St. George Community College Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 8).

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 39, Bill No. 10.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority Act". (Bill No. 10).

MR. SPEAKER(Aylward):

The hon. the Minister of

Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, this bill is merely to take the powers, the functions and duties, the assets and liabilities which were held by the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority - that old Authority, of course, has been defunct for the last number of years. It was in action and in use back in the early part of the seventies and the late sixties. It is no longer an active organization. There are presently no assets. The assets which were held by the Authority were passed over to the Facilities and Services Division of the Department. The functions which were carried out by the authority were also passed over to the department, in regard to the promotion and activity in the development division, and it is now to make it official through legislation to pass all assets, liabilities, functions and duties over to the Department of Fisheries.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of
Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is asking to have Chapter 259, "An
Act To Establish The Newfoundland Fisheries Development
Authority" repealed, and nothing substituted in its place.
The hon. gentleman is asking the House to repeal this
piece of legislation and give the authority, the
exclusive authority for all fisheries matters, to the
minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: To the department.

MR. NEARY: To the minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: To the department.

MR. NEARY: No, he is asking to put the
authority, the rights that were heretofore previously in
this Act, to put the authority in the hands of the minister.

MR. MORGAN: The department is in the
hands of the minister.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a time in Newfoundland's history -

MR. MORGAN: Here we go! Here we go!

MR. NEARY: - if there was ever a time when we needed a fisheries development authority it is now.

MR. TULK: A Fisheries Minister too.

MR. MORGAN: What for?

MR. NEARY: What for? To try to motivate the minister, if nothing else. To try to steer the minister in the right direction. To try to give the minister ideas; to make proposals, and suggestions, and give ideas to the minister because he does not have an original idea of his own, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is presiding over the demise of the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery.

MR. MORGAN: Not so.

MR. NEARY: That is so.

And if the hon. gentleman had any sense, instead of repealing this act what he would ask the House to do would be to beef it up, get it to become active so that it could advise the minister on how to cope with all the problems, the major problems that we have in the fishery at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, as hon. members know, and as the people of Newfoundland and Labrador know, this government with oil on its brain, the Premier with oil on his brain, have totalled neglected the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery. The fishery, which was the backbone of this Province, our most basic industry, Mr. Speaker, has been totally neglected by this administration. Fisheries have been pushed into the background, and in the last several years the fishery had deteriorated to the extent in this Province that all the major fish plants are presently on the brink of bankruptcy. Everybody knows that. Editorials are written about it. The administration

MR. NEARY: which would mean that they would not be able to meet their payrolls. And members do not have to use very much of an imagination to know the company I am talking about. It is the largest single fish company in this Province. It is not Nickerson's. Nickerson's can close down the plants they have in Newfoundland and they would not be missed. Everybody thinks that Nickerson's is a big processor in Newfoundland. They only have a handful of plants scattered around Newfoundland, and most of them are closed. If Nickerson's went belly up tomorrow, if Nickerson's went into receivership or bankruptcy tomorrow they would not be missed in this Province. Maybe National Sea would be missed, but National Sea we are told, is not in trouble. Nickerson's, we are told, owes the Bank of Nova Scotia \$100 million, and the Nova Scotia Government another \$17 million or \$20 million.

So in the main their operation is in the Maritimes, in Nova Scotia, but not in Newfoundland. They built a plant down in Jackson's Arm and I do not know if hon. gentlemen have had an opportunity to see that plant but it would be worth their while to drive down over that rough road down to Jackson's Arm and take a look and see where they put the plant in Jackson's Arm. It was doomed from the day it started and it will never operate.

So Nickerson's are not all that big in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: Let them go.

MR. NEARY: I would say let them go.

MR. TULK: We will start anew.

MR. NEARY:

Pick up the pieces.

The Lakes are big. The Lakes affect a large number of communities and of course the other big fish processor is Fishery Products. If Fishery Products went under for some reason, if the banks cut their credit off, no doubt there would be serious repercussions in a large number of communities throughout this Province. There would be repercussions.

But, Mr. Speaker, the question arises again, how long can this government - and it is a provincial responsibility, I hope that no member of this House is sitting back on his haunches and waiting for the Kirby Task Force -

MR. TULK:

Or the media.

MR. NEARY:

Pardon?

MR. TULK:

Or the media.

MR. NEARY:

- or the media for that matter -

I hope they understand that fish processing is a provincial responsibility and I hope that nobody is saying, "Well", pointing the finger and looking to the Kirby Task Force to step into provincial jurisdiction unless they are invited or unless the Minister of Fisheries is going to abdicate his responsibility and

MR. NEARY: turn the processing over to the Government of Canada. Unless that is going to happen, it is up to this administration to determine what happens to the processors in this Province. And how long more, Mr. Speaker, can we keep pumping money into these fish processing companies? I am not talking about the little fellow, it will only cost \$100,000 or \$150,000 to keep him going. That is not the problem at the moment. I think the Province could manage that.

MR. TOBIN: The tragedy of the whole thing is that not one cent that we pump in gets back to the fishermen.

MR. NEARY: Not a cent, that is right. No matter how much you pump into it, whether the companies are big, medium or small, no matter how much money you put in it never seems to filter down to the fishermen.

But the question is, Mr. Speaker, can we afford, and should we - this is the question the minister has to address himself to, and that is why he needs a group like the Fisheries Development Authority to advise him, how long more should we keep pumping money into these fish processing companies?

MR. TULK: He needs an umbrella.
(inaudible).

MR. NEARY: He needs what?

MR. TULK: An umbrella.

MR. NEARY: Yes, he needs an umbrella, as my hon. friend says.

But how long more can we keep throwing good money after bad? And will it do any good, Mr. Speaker, at this point in time to merely keep these fish processors afloat? They will be back again next year looking for another handout, and the year after

MR. NEARY: they will be back again.

The minister is faced with a very crucial decision and it is this, Mr. Speaker, Should he hang on or should he let go? He has a tiger by the tail. Should he put more money into the fish processors to try to save them from receivership and bankruptcy, or should he let them go and pick up the pieces afterwards -

MR. TULK: And restructure -

MR. NEARY: - and restructure the fishery?

MR. TULK: The biggest question of all.

MR. NEARY: Now that is the question.

That is a very important question, Mr. Speaker, a very important question. Should the minister, if he can find the money - and it is a provincial responsibility - should he step in with more money for the fish processors just to keep them afloat, just to keep them limping along as they are going now? Should he do that or should he let them collapse and then expropriate the plants and restructure the fishery? Now, Mr. Speaker, it would take a lot of courage to do the latter. It would take an awful nerve and a lot of courage on the part of the administration.

MR. S. NEARY: I would rule that out right off the bat because I do not think they have the courage. I do not think they have the nerve to let a company like Lake or Fishery Products go into receivership or go into bankruptcy, the argument being it would affect too many plant workers and fishermen and communities. So I would have to eliminate that right off the bat, although it is something that the minister should address himself to. Would it be less costly on the taxpayers and more beneficial in the long run to the fisherment and to the plant workers to let these companies go? They have themselves boxed into a corner. They have themselves into the jam through their own mismanagement and putting fish plants in communities and in regions that they knew were uneconomical, where they knew they were doomed from the start. They knew that, Mr. Speaker. So should the government keep bailing them out? And, Mr. Speaker, if so perhaps the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) can tell us whether a financial assessment is being done on these companies. I am told that some of these companies that I just referred to - the three biggies - still have their \$200,000 a year directors in the United States. They have their offshore companies. They have susidiaries on the Mainland and in the United States that are feeding off the parent company.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I hope hon. gentlemen are listening to what I am saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, we are not.

MR. NEARY: Well, I will just repeat it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. TOBIN: Oh, I am sorry. We were listening.

MR. NEARY: I am asking the Minister of Fisheries to tell this House before he puts one more dollar into these

MR. S. NEARY: companies, has he sent in an auditing firm to have the financial status of these companies assessed. I know the Kirby Task Force is doing it right now and it is going to take them another two or three months before they finish their assessment, but has the minister done it? because this is a provincial responsibility. And if so, will the minister tell us if these reports and rumours that we are hearing about these companies having offshore companies and subsidiaries that are fattening and thriving and leeching off the parent company, do they have their \$200,000 a year men down in the United States who fly in, jet into Newfoundland once a year and hang around the office for a few hours and then go on again to justify their \$200,000 a year?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker,
is it not about time that the minister told us what is happening regarding the fish processing part of the fishery -

MR. TULK: Especially Fishery Products.

MR. NEARY: - in this Province, especially the status of Fishery Products and Lakes. Nickerson's I do not even bother about, They have so few plants in this Province they are hardly worth bothering about, although the hon. gentleman somehow or other seems to lay great emphasis and great stress on Nickerson's. If Nickerson's left Newfoundland tomorrow they would not be missed.

MR. TULK: It sounds good anyway.

MR. NEARY: So we are really talking about two companies. I hope, Mr. Speaker, I put that to rest, about the Nickerson empire -

MR. STAGG: The myth.

MR. NEARY: - the myth about the Nickerson empire in this Province. Take out National Sea which is a separate company who seem to be doing all right at the moment and just talk about Nickerson's. If they were eliminated from the Newfoundland scene altogether, they would not be missed. So let us hear no more about that. So we are really talking about two fish companies, we are talking about Fishery Products and we are talking about the Lake Group of companies. And it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that we are talking about a problem of gigantic proportions. The minister himself admitted it will cost \$150 million just to keep these companies afloat, just to keep them in a position where they can stagger on until the next crisis arrives. That is no good, Mr. Speaker, that is not planning, that is poor planning. Should we keep sticking our finger in the dyke and bailing these companies out not knowing - Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman does it - not knowing about the offshore companies that these companies have in the West Indies, in the Bahamas, not knowing about how much they are feeding into their subsidiaries and

MR. NEARY:

United States with their estates in Florida and their estates in the Bahamas and in the West Indies. And the minister cannot stand and tell me that that is not so because it is so. They still have their big estates in the Bahamas, in the West Indies, and in Florida. And that is that what we are going to be asked to subsidize in this House?

Mr. Speaker, the first matter the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has to address himself to is whether or not we should continue to throw good money after bad, whether or not we should keep putting money into these processing companies or have we reached a point where we should say, no, you are not getting another cent.

MR. TULK: Not one red copper.

MR. NEARY: You brought about this financial situation through your own mismanagement and your poor planning and we are not going to bail you out any longer. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is either that or keep priming the pump, keep putting the money in and keep challenging Ottawa, as the hon. gentleman does in this House day in and day out, to put money into those companies. And it is not a federal jurisdiction. If the hon. gentleman is going to stand up now after I take my seat and say, Well, the Province cannot afford it, we would like to know what Ottawa is going to do. Well, Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. gentleman then would be, what plans did the hon. gentleman put up to Ottawa? Could he table any plans that he has to restructure these companies, in this House? Lay

MR. NEARY: it out on the table so we can see it, so we can make a value judgement on any plans that he might have. We have not seen any evidence of any plans yet in this House, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman tells us, stands up and makes accusations and makes irresponsible statements about what Ottawa is going to do. It is not Ottawa's jurisdiction. I would like for the minister to tell us what it is he wants Ottawa to do. Does he just want Ottawa to give him a blank cheque? Or is he prepared to abdicate his responsibilities and turn the processing sector of the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery over to the Government of Canada? Is that what he is saying?

 Mr. Speaker, that is what the hon. gentleman has to address himself to.

MR. NEARY: And I was hoping that when the hon. gentleman spoke on second reading to repeal the Fisheries Development Authority that he would get up and tell us what the minister is going to do. He is asking to have an authority eliminated, wiped out, that helped the minister plan and gave him advice on the future development of the fisheries, and helped him make regulations. The minister needs all the help he can get, Mr. Speaker. He needs all the help he can get. And one would have thought that instead of repealing this act he would have broadened it, he would have appointed Newfoundlanders of goodwill, businessmen -

MR. STAGG: Do I have to listen to this every day?

MR. NEARY: Yes, and you will have to listen to it more often. If you do not like it you can always go down to your little Parliamentary Secretary's office that was appointed since the Budget was brought down in this House.

MR. HODDER: Plus your private secretary.

MR. NEARY: With your private secretary and your telephone and all that sort of thing.

MR. STAGG: Does the hon. member for Port au Port have a private secretary?

MR. NEARY: you do not like it you can go on back down to your little Parliamentary secretary's office.

MR. TULK: How private are they?

MR. STAGG: They are not private are they?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should have, instead of repealing this act, been seeking advice. The hon. gentleman has not had an original idea in the fisheries since he took over.

MR. HODDER: No, not one.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman cannot just cope with the situation, the administration cannot cope with the

MR. NEARY: Plant workers are wondering if they are ever going to be paid and when they get their pay cheques will they be honoured by the bank? A pretty serious situation, Mr. Speaker, to have that dark cloud hanging over your head, not knowing where you are from one day to the next, from one week to the next.

They just had a big meeting down on the Burin Peninsula.

MR. TOBIN: I was there.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman was there. I do not know what kind of a contribution he made. I did not hear him outline the plans of the administration that he is supporting. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the hon. gentleman or the other hon. gentleman who was with him, I did not hear either one of them -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I have silence please?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! Order!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if we cannot have silence, could you name them?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I did not hear either one of these hon. gentlemen say to the people whom they met on the Burin Peninsula who were concerned about the fishery down there - I did not hear them say, Here is what the government plans, A, B, C, one, two three, here is what we are going to do. Because they had no plans, Mr. Speaker. They are flying by the seat of their pants and they have been for the last several years. They have no plans. The only plan they have is to keep attacking Ottawa hoping that that will distract from the real problems.

MR. NEARY: The minister hopes that if he follows the Premier's example, by attacking Ottawa, that that will distract from the real problems we have in the fishery. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this government has completely neglected the fishery. Now, the hon. gentleman will get up in a few minutes and say, 'Oh, yes, but what about - we put \$25 million or \$27 million into the fishery. We had to use this money to save the fish plants, to save the processors.' That is what he will tell us, Mr. Speaker. I ask any thinking member of this House, is that outlining plans for the future of the fishery by the minister standing and saying, 'Oh, we had to give \$25 million or \$27 million to the processors to keep them from going bankrupt or to keep them from going into receivership or to save the fish processors'? Is that a master plan for the development of the fishery, Mr. Speaker, or is that merely sticking your finger in the dyke when a crisis comes up?

MR. TOBIN: And it is going to continue like that until the federal government changes its policy.

MR. NEARY: Changes what policy?

MR. TOBIN: On foreign quota allocations.

MR. HODDER: On what?

MR. TOBIN: Quotas.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is Ramea closed because of the fish quotas?

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the problems that I am talking about have nothing to do with quotas or conservation, they have to do with mismanagement and it has to do with financial mismanagement of the plants.

MR. G. TOBIN: Mismanagement of the quota system.

MR. NEARY: I see. Mismanagement of the quota system.

Mr. Speaker, this would be a nice administration to allow to carve up the quotas. I hear hon. gentlemen over there every day saying that they should have the right to set the quotas. What kind of a jungle and what kind of a mess would we have if this hon. crowd were given the right to set quotas and Nova Scotia had the right to set a quota, New Brunswick to set a quota, Prince Edward Island to set a quota and Quebec to set a quota? What kind of a mess would we have on our hands?

Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentlemen are talking about is completely impractical. It is not workable in the first place. It is impractical, it is nonsense and it is only political rhetoric to try to embarrass the federal members and the Government of Canada. Hon. gentlemen do not mean what they say. And if they mean what they say, they certainly do not think about it.

MR. TOBIN: Then you agree that that plant should be closed while we are giving away 83,000 tons of cod.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Mr. DeBane went through that the other day. If I were the member for the Burin Peninsula, I would discuss that with the Premier. Before I would ask a question like that, I would ask the Premier about his meeting with Mr. DeBane last weekend. That is what I would

MR. S. NEARY: do, before I would ask a silly question like that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: It is so obvious, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the gentleman is like the Premier, he does not understand. He may be a nice fellow and he may be well-meaning and well-intentioned, but he does not understand.

MR. G. TOBIN: What is your stand? is what I am asking. Where do you stand on it?

MR. NEARY: On what?

MR. TOBIN: On the plants closing down because of the lack of a fish supply while the federal government is giving away 83,000 tons of cod to the foreigners. Where do you stand?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, where we stand:
The Liberal policy -

MR. TOBIN: On the fence, that is where you stand.

MR. NEARY: No, we do not sit on the fence.
Let me tell the hon. the gentleman where we stand.

Mr. Speaker, it was a Liberal government that brought in the 200 mile management zone.

MR. TOBIN: Yes. And did you go far enough. What did you do after you brought that in?

MR. NEARY: Oh, you want the nose and tail now. I see. Well let us talk about the 200 mile management zone first. It was a Liberal government that brought in this great reform and if the members on this side of the House had their own way as spelled out by our spokesman on fisheries last session, last Spring in this House, we

MR. NEARY: would not have one foreigner operating inside the 200 mile management zone. Now, has that sunk in? That is what this side stands for. But if I were the hon. gentleman I would ask the Premier what his side stands for.

MR. TOBIN: Go on and talk to your friends about it and convince them to do it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Liberal position is, always has been, ever since the day the 200 mile management zone was declared by a Liberal administration in Ottawa, that the foreigners must go. They have to leave.

MR. STAGG: Why are they not gone?

MR. NEARY: Well, I would like for the hon. gentleman to tell me that.

MR. STAGG: The federal Liberals do not believe in it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I were hon. members I would ask the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and I would ask the Premier why they are not gone. Do not ask us. You are the government and all you have to do - Mr. Speaker, I would submit that all the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier have to do is to hoist the flag. That is all they have to do. Hoist the flag and Ottawa will say, "Well, if that is what you want sobeit. Out they go. But you will have to suffer the consequence".

MR. TOBIN: I know why they are not gone.

MR. NEARY: Yes, and I know why they are not gone.

MR. TOBIN: Because of the trade-offs.

MR. NEARY: I know why they are not gone, it is because of the weak-kneed attitude of the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries and the administration in this Province. That is why they are not gone.

MR. TOBIN: It is the trade-offs too.

MR. TOBIN: Norway is in there at 4 per cent, I think it is tarrif, Iceland is in there with nothing.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, we have not heard that kind of philosophy, that kind of policy -

MR. SIMMS: You do not listen.

MR. NEARY: - come out of ministers, the mouths of ministers on the other side. They are not facing up to the situation, Mr. Speaker. They are not facing it. They are slinging and welshing on their responsibilities and they are abdicating their responsibilities and they are trying to slough it off on Ottawa and the Government of Canada.

MR. TOBIN: It is nobody else's fault.

MR. NEARY: I am sure the Government of Canada would be glad to kick out the foreigners tomorrow if the Premier of this Province would get up and say yes, kick them out. They have to go.

MR. RIDDEOUT: What would happen to the trade-offs then?

MR. NEARY: Oh! Ask the Premier. Do not ask me, I am not the Premier.

MR. TOBIN: It is not the Premier it is your Prime Minister, your idol.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, we need more than just rhetoric in this House by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), we need more than that to the Government of Canada to say that the foreigners must go. The hon. gentleman can get up and make all the cheap politics he likes out of it, the foreigners must go. It is up to the Government of Canada to kick them out. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to lay on the table of this House communications that he has had on this particular matter.

MR. TOBIN: What is your stand on the Nose and Tail Bank and the Flemish Cap?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is another question.

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible) what we are saying, what they are saying and what the foreigners are saying.

MR. NEARY: Now, you just asked us about the foreigners. We gave you the answer. That is our policy, that is our philosophy. It is just like the oil, Mr. Speaker, we tell the hon. gentlemen that we think we own the oil. We think there should be an negotiated settlement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Then you would think you would do something.

MR. NEARY: Because they grabbed the ball away from the Liberals a few years back and have been carrying it ever since they think it is their issue.

MR. DINN: Sign the Nova Scotia agreement for the oil.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you do not have to sign anything.

MR. DINN: Give it away.

MR. NEARY: You do not have to sign anything unless you have a vicious mind like the Premier who thinks that everybody is an enemy. Somehow or other he has got the idea in his mind that somebody is trying to force him to sign something. Who is trying to force him? Who is trying to force the Premier to sign something? I say to the Premier -

MR. BAIRD: You and Chretien.

MR. NEARY: Is that so?

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): A point of order?

MR. MORGAN: A point of order.

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

Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: It is a fisheries matter, and it is passing over authority from an Authority, appointed years ago by the Liberal Administration, back to the Department of Fisheries. We are not talking about the present negotiations or lack of negotiations on the agreement on the offshore, we are talking about a fisheries matter. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the person now speaking in the debate be asked to be relevant to the debate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order?

MR. NEARY: - may have gotten sidetracked off on the oil there, but one of the members was interrupting. So I will get back on target again, Sir, if you do not mind, and talk about the fishery.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the fisheries, the hon. gentleman must accept full responsibility for the mess that the processing sector of the fisheries is in today. The hon. gentleman was warned about issuing processing licences helter-skelter all over the place.

MR. WARREN: Too many licences, too many fishermen.

MR. NEARY: There are too many licences, the hon. gentleman knows that. There are too many processing licences. And that is a provincial responsibility, Mr. Speaker. There is no way - I hope I never have to say this again, but it seems to me that you have to say it every day, processing of fish, quality control, marketing is a provincial responsibility. Harvesting of the fish, conservation is a federal responsibility. When we talk about shared jurisdiction, there is where your shared jurisdiction comes in, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) can stand in his place all he wants and say, Well, perhaps my hon. friends on the opposite side can tell us how much money Ottawa is going to put into the processing sector. Poor old Newfoundland does not have the money, we will just have to up the taxes, we want it from Ottawa. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is like the hon. gentleman saying, I am going down to the bank manager to borrow money but before I go down I am going to insult the bank manager, I am going to ridicule him, I am going to slander the bank manager, I am going to libel him and then I am going to go down and ask him for a loan. That is what the hon. gentleman is saying about Ottawa. He slanders Ottawa, he slams them every chance he gets, he ridicules them, he lets go vicious attacks, personal attacks sometimes on Newfoundland's minister in the Government of Canada, and then he goes and says, Now, can we have a few dollars for the processing sector?

MR. TULK: And he says, De Bane, I want to be friends with you.

MR. NEARY: And I want to be friends with you. Now, you understand that, but when I get in the House I am going to give it to you, I am going to give you a bolt of lightning right where you least expect it. That is the kind of a policy they have, Mr. Speaker. That is the kind of a policy they have.

And the minister could use all the advice and all the counselling that he could get. Because as I said a few minutes ago, this administration is presiding over the demise of the Newfoundland fisheries, and, Mr. Speaker, it is shameful. It is shameful! Because it is our most basic industry, it is the one industry that has kept Newfoundland going for the last 500 years.

MR. NEARY: And what have they substituted in its place? Oil. They have oil on the brain. The Premier has oil on the brain. He dreams about it and he eats it. All he can think about is oil. Forget the fishery. The only time they worry about the fishery is when one of the processors comes in and says, 'Look, if we do not have a few dollars by next week we are going bankrupt.' Oil on the brain. I know there are people who will question whether or not that gray matter is there, but I suppose some of it is there. Oil on the brain, Mr. Speaker. They have neglected the fishery. And I can now see the wheels turning with the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall). He is going to get up and say, we spent \$27 million, we had to bail these fish companies out, we had to save these jobs and we had to keep these communities going. Is that planning for the future of the fishery. Is that restructuring the fishery? Is that revitalizing the fishery? No, Mr. Speaker, that is like the little fellow in the dyke, sticking his finger in the dyke. The fact of the matter is that it is criminal the way this administration has neglected the Newfoundland fishery. I would say it is third or fourth on their list of priorities. The fishery should be number one. It should always be uppermost in our minds. They should have a master plan for the development of the fisheries. They should tell us man fashion if they have courage and if they have enough intestinal fortitude to do something about the marketing of the fresh fish and the fresh frozen fish in this Province. We have gone on record over here on this side of the House as advocating, Mr. Speaker, an extension of the terms of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation

MR. NEARY: or alternatively to set up a new corporation or co-op to market all the produce of the sea. That is a part of the conventional wisdom of this side of the House, that is a part of our ideology, Liberal philosophy. It was a Liberal government that set up the Canadian Saltfish Corporation in the first place, which is one of the success stories of Confederation. A real success story. And, Mr. Speaker, the initiative to expand the terms of reference of that corporation or to set up a new marketing board rests with

MR. NEARY: this House, with this administration. Ottawa cannot do it unless the Province takes the initiative, Mr. Speaker. Are you aware of that? And they totally ignored it and neglected it. I do not know if they are being stubborn because it is a Liberal idea, because it is a Liberal policy, because it is a part of our platform. Is that why they are being stubborn about it?

MR. TULK: It is not far enough to the right.

MR. NEARY: Maybe my hon. friend is right, it is not far enough to the right. It does not put enough dollars in the coffers of their buddies, their wealthy buddies and their rich friends. And they would not give their lawyer buddies anything, it would be too much of a challenge. It is a little bit to the left, not enough to the right. It would not follow enough consulting fees and legal fees. And they would not be able to make enough political appointments, Mr. Speaker, that is why. And the other thing is it is a Liberal idea so, therefore, they have to be against it. They do not want the Liberals to get a little bit of credit. It is our idea. We do not mind the government if they steal it on us.

MR. TULK: He almost destroyed it a couple of weeks ago.

MR. NEARY: That is right. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) went as far a few months ago as to attack the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, tried to destroy it and tear it down.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I am speaking so long on this bill is it is shameful and irritating and it would almost make one cry, it would certainly make us sad when we see the way that this administration has treated the fishermen and the plant workers in this Province. Everything is oil, oil, oil, forget the fishery. Our only real basic natural resource, renewable resource, let it go down the tube for oil. And then the Premier has the face to

MR. NEARY: tell us that if we get oil, oil will pay for everything, oil will pay for the fishery, oil will pay for education, oil will pay for hospital services, health services.

MR. TULK: Are you sure he said that?

MR. NEARY: No, he did say it.

MR. TULK: He might have changed his mind?
He might have changed his mind?

MR. NEARY: If he changed his mind it is only since I started speaking here this afternoon. It is time now that somebody stood in this House and put the administration in their place, put them in the pew as far as their treatment of the fishery is concerned. And, Mr. Speaker, let us hear no more, when they are responding to what I am saying, let us hear no more of these attacks on Ottawa, let them stand in this House and tell this House what their plans are to deal with the problems of the fishery. But they will not do that, they will not do it because the only defence they think they have is to distract from what I am saying,

MR. NEARY: the charges that I am making, and they are pretty strong, charges that this government is neglecting the fishery, and they cannot slough it off or weasel out from under it by saying, Well, what is Ottawa going to do? What is the Kirby Task Force going to do?

MR. TULK: What about the licencing policy?

MR. NEARY: The Premier's licencing policy is he would like to see everybody into the fishery earning \$1,000 or \$1,500 a year.

MR. TULK: He would sooner have 10,000 fishermen making \$5,000 a year.

MR. NEARY: That is right. He would sooner have 10,000 fishermen -

MR. TULK: Making \$5,000 than have 5,000 fishermen making \$10,000 a year.

MR. NEARY: Yes, making \$5,000 and 20,000 making \$2,500. That is his philosophy. Put them in the boats and let them starve, that is his philosophy.

MR. TULK: And he says, 'The bad ones, they will fall out.'

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, let them go rabbit hunting, let them go down and catch a few partridge, a few blueberries and a few bakeapples and a few partridgeberries. That is the Tory philosophy. That is the Tory codology, I can guarantee you.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my few remarks on this bill will motivate the administration into laying out their plans in this House today. We cannot wait much longer, time is running out, the clock is ticking. Fish plant workers never know when they go the bank with their cheques if they are going to be honoured. The people down in St. Lawrence do not know if their plant is going to ever reopen. The people down in Trepassey

MR. NEARY: do not know if their plant is ever going to reopen again. We hear a few weasely words from the member when he speaks in the House, we hear nothing from the administration, no guarantee. Weasel words are not good enough, we want a commitment from this administration that that plant is going to reopen. What about Fermeuse? What about Harbour Breton, Mr. Speaker, and what about all the other plants that are shut down because of financial problems? What about them? They have been swept under the rug now for the last several weeks. This is our third week in this House. We have not heard a statement on the economy, we have not heard a statement on the fishery.

MR. CARTER: Sure you did.

MR. NEARY: No, we have not heard a statement; we heard a statement on fiscal matters, we saw the administration tax Christmas presents and hot dogs and donuts and footwear and insurance and clothing and that sort of thing. We have heard all of that but we have not seen a statement of what this administration plans to do on matters that fall under provincial jurisdiction either in the fishery or in the economy of this Province. They stand

MR. NEARY:

over there day in and day out and outside of the House, they bring in resolutions that they hope will embarrass somebody. They play little political tricks and little games and they attack Ottawa, and they attack Nova Scotia, and they attack this one. Everybody is their enemy. But, Mr. Speaker, the people want to know now what is this administration going to do on matters that come under provincial jurisdiction? That is what they want to know, what plans the administration have to cope with the problems of the fishery. And I do not think the old landlubber from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is the one to stand up and tell us. He would not know one end of a sculpin from the other.

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible) to you, in that case.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we want the Premier of this Province who has oil on the brain, the man who has abandoned rural Newfoundland, who is now a city slicker, turned his back and betrayed the people who elected him and voted for him - we saw an example of that last Thursday, how he betrayed the people who supported him and let them down and turned his back on them. We have seen that, Mr. Speaker.

So let us have no more political game playing, no more political trickery, no more resolutions that are only meant to embarrass and not to accomplish anything, no more vicious attacks on the Government of Canada, whom this administration have to work closely with in order to revitalize the fishery, Mr. Speaker, no more of that. Let them stand up, Mr. Speaker, man fashion and start to govern this Province for a change, something they have not done since they moved over there.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I had my way the foreigners would be gone. Okay? The foreigners would be gone. And if I was the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in this Province I would not be looking to Europe, I would not be looking to Europe for new markets.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would not hang my hat, on the future of the fishery in Newfoundland, on finding markets in Europe. I would look to the United States, to the Americas, and I would look to the West Indies, and I would look to Japan. I would look to the Pacific. I would not look to Europe.

MR. TOBIN: Why?

MR. NEARY: Why? Well, I do not have to go into it now but to give the hon. gentleman a brief answer, they are always looking inward and not outward. They do not want -

MR. TOBIN: Because Iceland are in there with no tariffs and we are in there roughly with 15 per cent. No fishing inside the 200 mile limit.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would look to the Americas, mainly the United States, I would look to the Pacific, and I would look to the West Indies. I would not be looking to Europe. Well, I would take markets if I could get them there, yes, but I would not go with hat in hand on my hands and knees to get markets in Europe. And I think the administration is making a mistake.

MR. S. NEARY: Do they realize, Mr. Speaker, they are the government, they have to govern? It is something they have not done yet. They cannot keep attacking and blaming things on somebody else. Let us see the colour of their money. Let us see their plans.

AN HON. MEMBER: This is a poor waste of time.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is a poor waste of time allright. It is a poor waste of time to talk about the fisheries. That is what hon. members think. Oil is all they ever want to talk about. They are so preoccupied with oil they can think of nothing else.

MR. G. TOBIN: If that is an order, you have (inaudible). You will soon lose your government (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is about that we had a good debate in this House on the fishery. It is about time, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad that this bill was brought in today to trigger a debate, because I am sure that is what it will do when I sit down. Forget the attacks. I beg members on the opposite side for a change to forget the attacks. Let the Premier stand in his place and say, 'Here is what we intend to do to revitalize the Newfoundland fishery: Number one, we are going to set up a marketing board or expand the terms of reference of the Canadian Salfish Corporation. Number two, we are going to do a financial assessment on the processing sector and we are going to take a look at whether or not we should follow the same old policy of throwing good money after bad, taxpayer money into these companies where it is not warranted. We are going to take a look at that. And we are going to work with the Government of Canada on conservation and management of the stock, and where new wharves and slipways and bait depots, all of that sort of thing, where all of these things should

MR. S. NEARY: go. Here is our master plan.'
That is what I want the Premier to stand up and show me.
'Here is our master plan for the development of the fishery.'
Never mind picking out a little bit here and a little bit there
and because they put a few dollars into this company and that
company, that is the plan. That is not a plan, Mr. Speaker,
that is merely dealing with crises, one crisis after the other.
That is merely dealing with situations that occur on the
spur of the moment, that crop-up. We cannot, Mr. Speaker,
carry on that way, with the Premier and his minister flying
by the seats of their pants all of the time as far as the
fisheries are concerned, no plans. Oil, oil, oil.
All they ever think about is oil, much to the dismay of the
fishing industry of this Province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you know, this House is here to debate, this House is here to scrutinize and examine plans and estimates. But, Mr. Speaker, day in and day out we just seem to be drifting in this House. There is never anything definite put before the House to discuss and debate. We can never get a handle on anything to decide, to determine whether or not we should vote for this proposal or that proposal because there is never any concrete, positive suggestions or policy or plans put before the House. Let the government bring in a piece of legislation to change the marketing which has been one of the big problems in the Newfoundland fishery for 500 years. Let them bring in a major reform in that regard and see how quick the Liberal Opposition will support it and praise the government for doing it.

MR. TOBIN: I was just looking at the hospital programme the other day.

MR. NEARY: What hospital programme?

AN HON. MEMBER: The member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) got up and said cancel the hospitals. I (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Cancel what hospitals?

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I hope the hon. gentleman who is in his first year, not even a year old yet, will not be politically or intellectually dishonest with his constituents. I hope if the hon. gentleman is going to quote my hon. friend that he will quote him accurately.

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: And not do like the Premier does twist every little thing -

AN HON. MEMBER: I did not say that.

MR. NEARY: - play with words and twist and turn and try to embarrass everybody and try to put people on the defensive. Mr. Speaker, can Your Honour tell me what that accomplishes? Is it getting us anywhere? Is that kind of

MR. NEARY: policy that kind of strategy the Premier uses, is that getting us anywhere in the Province or is it getting us in deeper and deeper all the time?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) cancel the hospital in Clarendville.

MR. WARREN: You are more interested in the rabbit season, boy. You are more interested in the rabbit season.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Kirby Task Force no doubt will address itself to matters that come under federal jurisdiction, namely, management of the resource, conservation of the stock, research and so on. No doubt the federal government will address itself to any problems within their own jurisdiction. They do not have to address themselves to problems under provincial jurisdiction, although I understand they are having an assessment made of the major fish processors in this Province that they are having great difficult with. They are having a problem getting a handle on it. That is provincial jurisdiction. And I hope the minister and the Premier do not look to the Kirby Task Force to resolve the problems in the areas that come under provincial jurisdiction

MR. NEARY: unless, Mr. Speaker, they are prepared to give the jurisdiction to the Government of Canada as happened in the case of St. Anthony. St. Anthony is a good example of what we saw happen when two governments cannot agree on jurisdiction. You had the Government of Canada prepared to reactivate the St. Anthony fish plant and you had the Premier of this Province saying, No, it is our jurisdiction and if you intrude on our jurisdiction we are not going to give them a license, we are going to cancel their license. And the Government of Canada had to take the position we are going to go ahead anyway whether you like it or not and you can challenge our jurisdiction in the courts if you want to. If it is a constitutional matter, challenge it in the courts. I hope it will not have to come to that again. But pretty soon, Mr. Speaker, probably before this week is over, the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Premier are going to have to ask themselves, will we pour more money into Fishery Products, and Lakes, especially, to try to keep them afloat or will we outline a plan whereby the federal government can participate and jointly we will keep these plants afloat? And if we are going to do it jointly this House should know what plans they have. Never mind screaming to the press, we want \$150 million. The hon. gentleman has not told this House how much he thinks should come from the Province and how much he thinks should come from Ottawa. Should it be 90/10, 50/50, 75/25 or should the minister take the position, we have cuddled up now and we have babied you long enough, you are not getting another cent. That is what the hon. gentleman and the Premier have to

MR. NEARY: address themselves to, that is the question.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Your time is up.

MR. NEARY: Yes. I wish I had another hour or two so I could rivet this message home. This government, Mr. Speaker, have grossly neglected the Newfoundland fishery and they have done it in favour of oil and gas. And I would say, so far, that we have seen more gas than we have seen oil.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, try as they will, keep on trying, to leave the impression that this government is not concerned about the most important industry we have, the fishing industry, they are not going to succeed. The people of this Province know differently, the people around the Province know quite differently. The fishermen, the plant workers, the companies, all concerned, all connected with the fishing industry are quite aware of this government's devotion to making the fishing industry a vibrant industry for the future.

MR. MORGAN: And, Mr. Speaker, they can go on also and try to pretend that we do not have any policies on the fishing industry, because the fact is that we put forward, I guess, the most comprehensive policy position on the fishing industry ever developed in this Province, in fact, ever developed in the Atlantic region of Canada, when we sat down and put forward to the Kirby Task Force a few months ago a comprehensive, detailed policy statement clearly outlining what this government stands for as it pertains to the fishing industry, clearly outlining it.

MR. NEARY: Why did they not (inaudible) that policy?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has not read that document. He wants to ignore the document and still leave the impression we have no policy. If there is any part of that policy document he disagrees with, let it be said what he disagrees with in the policy statement. I have yet to hear any comment from the Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition or otherwise, as to what they disagree with; as to what we are doing in the fishing industry, I have yet to hear any constructive criticism.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is this government is doing lots for the fishing industry. I am just saying first-hand this evening - unfortunately I know that what I am going to say in the next half hour is not, again, going to be carried out to the people of our Province. Last Wednesday, on Private Members' Day, a resolution was brought forward by my friend from St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn), an excellent resolution, excellent debate from both sides of the House. I think there were no more than two or three paragraphs carried in both print medias and two or three sentences carried on the electronic media. Why is it, I wonder? Why is it?

MR. MORGAN: But for the record, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, carried by the media or not, I want to make quite clear to this House of Assembly the kinds of things that we are doing for the fishing industry.

Mr. Speaker, why are we developing facilities as we are doing around the Province? Many of my colleagues on this side of the House, a few on that side of the House of Assembly, they are aware of what we are doing to develop facilities. Talking about responsibilities in the fishing industry they keep on saying the processing sector is the Newfoundland Government's jurisdiction and responsibility. Well, how about the supplying of facilities for fishermen? All of the harvesting in the fishing industry is under the

MR. MORGAN: control of and jurisdiction of the federal level of government. If we said, "Yes, Mr. Ottawa, because you have jurisdiction over the harvesting sector of the fishing industry we are going to stay away from it. We will not touch it, Mr. Speaker. We will not build baited trawl holding units, we will not build slipways for fishermen, we will not give loans to fishermen, we will help get fishermen new gear." Do we do that? No, Mr. Speaker, we do not do that because we realize that it is so very important for both governments to work together for the sake of the fishing industry, And we get involved in building facilities. This past year we spent more than \$3 million in building facilities which should have been built by the federal level of government. We do not say "No, you must build all the facilities" and us do nothing in that regard.

Do we say to the fishermen "If you want to do research work on developing new techniques and new technologies and new types of fishing gear that you must go to Ottawa to understand what you should be doing in the fishing industry"? No, Mr. Speaker. It is their responsibility, it is their jurisdiction. They should show the fishermen how to become more diversified. They should show the fishermen how to improve upon their catching and harvesting techniques. They should show the fishermen how to improve their harvesting and total catch with better boats, etc., but they do not do it. It is the Newfoundland Government who is out there on a daily basis working with fishermen's committees and fishermen to help them to become more diversified and more modern in today's harvesting techniques.

Mr. Speaker, you talk about markets. It seems that we, the Newfoundland Government, has to be of total responsibility again here in the marketing of fish. The processing of fish, the Opposition wants to believe,

MR. MORGAN: is totally the Newfoundland's Government responsibility.

MR. NEARY: So it is.

MR. MORGAN: It is clearly obvious why. A few months ago, when this government was helping out the processing sector of the fishing industry, we were criticized for it, for putting money into companies to help them keep going to provide jobs in fish plants. In fact, all of the companies we helped and assisted we did it on some very strict criteria and we set down some very firm conditions and these conditions have been met in most all cases and most all of the companies assisted are now on a viable footing for future years. So they want us to believe and the people to believe that because the processing sector is totally under Provincial jurisdiction, that Ottawa should not assist us at all. As I said earlier, if we took the same attitude in the harvesting sector and did not assist the fishermen that would be wrong for the fishing industry. We are helping out in their jurisdiction surely they can help out in ours.

Now we did help out the processing sector of the fishing industry through financial assistance. Not only that, that has been said over and over again, but what else have we been doing, Mr. Speaker? Have we been

MR. MORGAN: sitting idly by down in the Department of Fisheries in Atlantic Place, have not done anything to help the fishermen with regard to new equipment, have done nothing at all to help the companies with regard to improving their processing efficiency? I wonder which government it is that makes loans available for secondary processing and goes out there and gives them interest-free loans for two years? For what purpose? To get more jobs in the fishing industry, to take a product and then go into further processing so the end product leaving our plant is going where? Directly to the consumer in the market place. Now, who is doing that, Mr. Speaker? Which government, I wonder, is doing that? Who is out there working with the fishing industry today trying to develop more species, different types of products and different species? The federal government? No, Mr. Speaker. Who is out there gathering information on a daily basis in the market place? Who is doing that? Development of different species -

MR. ANDREWS: The scallop fishery.

MR. MORGAN: Scallops is a prime example, the eels and other species, dogfish. But who is out there gathering information in the market place? Who is working hand in hand with the fishing companies and finding markets? What is the federal government doing? They have been doing things that we are not too pleased with and that is using fish to trade for fish markets; that is about all they have done with the exception of a few little efforts on behalf of the Industry, Trade and Commerce Trade Division over the last number of years.

MR. STAGG: Carrying coals to Newcastle.

MR. MORGAN: So we are out there working hand in hand on promotions with the fish companies. We are doing it on a monthly basis. We get criticized for that. We get criticized for being out in the market place working with the fish companies. If someone from the Department of Fisheries is out there travelling with the fish companies trying to find markets, we are criticized for doing that. What else are we doing in the market place? Not only promotions, we are also doing research work. We use the Fishing Industry Advisory Board - is that a federal board? No, it is a Newfoundland Government board - to gather all the information and, again, to assist the companies in furthering markets not only in Europe, as mentioned earlier, but other locations, alternate markets in the Far East and the East Bloc countries and in other parts of the U.S. we have yet to capitalize on in the U.S. market place.

Now, what else are we doing? Is there anything else that we are doing? Oh, there are a few other things we are doing as well. I wonder which government is sponsoring and paying for the subsidies on the Quality Control programme?

AN HON. MEMBER: What? Quality Control programme?

MR. MORGAN: Quality Control programme. It was this administration under the present Premier which initiated a quality programme in this Province for the first time, to do what? Fortunately, we had the co-operation of the Fishermen's Union. We worked hand in hand again with the Fishermen's Union and we developed pilot projects for quality control. What for? Because we are convinced that the answer in the future is to put in the market place good quality

MR. MORGAN: fish. It has to be consistent,
not one year good quality and the next year reasonably
bad or reasonably good, but a consistent good quality
fish for

MR. MORGAN:

the market place in future years. That is a must. So where does the -

MR. NEARY: You are talking to the gallery.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking to the galleries. The Opposition Leader, continuously, stands in the House to debate, both talk to the galleries, to two or three of his friends, Mr. Speaker, I am talking in debate for the record of this House of Assembly, that the fact is that in working on developing market it ties into quality, and this government is determined to ensure that down the road, if everything goes well no later than '85 or '86, that we will have a quality control programme throughout this Province, throughout the Province whereby the quality will be recognized at the level of the fishermen, in other words, the man catching the fish, the people who are handling the fish, the transportation companies, the companies who do the processing in their plants, and out to the final brokers who are going to market the product. It is recognized by all concerned that fish is food and has to be handled and dealt with and processed accordingly. And if we can see the day when fishermen believe in that - for example, the Bonavista Peninsula, where product has been ongoing for the last two years, again in co-ordination with the Fishermen's Union and with the companies concerned, and they are coming to realize that they must, the day is coming when they are going to have to, when the fish is caught, the fish must be bled, gutted and washed and iced at sea. That is one part of the Province, but the day is going to come when we are going to see that kind of a regulation - or hopefully not a regulation, hopefully on a volunteer basis by all the fishermen, through their union,

MR. MORGAN: in working with government, see the day when that kind of a process is carried out throughout the Province for the sake of quality.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we heard talk about the Kirby Task Force. I just have one question on it to pose to the House of Assembly and to pose to all Newfoundlanders; When the Kirby Task Force was appointed, was it appointed because everything was fine in the fishing industry? Was it appointed because there were no problems in the fishing industry? Was it appointed just for the sake of doing a study to look at what could be done down the road a number of years from now? Mr. Speaker, it was appointed -

MR. TULK: Was this a royal commission?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman asked again a stupid question. Obviously he does not know what is going on in the Province. The royal commission report, its recommendations, practically all the recommendations of the Inshore Royal Commission under this government's jurisdiction has been acted upon to date, practically all of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: But the federal government again refused to deal with them. Maybe they are awaiting the Kirby Task Force. I am not going to. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) keeps on saying I am attacking Ottawa again. Nobody is attacking Ottawa. We are merely putting forward policies which we think are the right policies for the fishing industry of our Province. It is as simple as that.

MR. J. MORGAN: And we are hoping that Mr. Kirby and his task force would indeed understand these problems as presented because there is a very definite role, other than the Newfoundland Government's with regards to improvements in the fishing industry. I do not think anybody - the Opposition Leader (Mr. S. Neary) can try - can accuse us of not co-operating with the Kirby Task Force and its work. We co-operated fully, extensively, because we felt that the Task Force is indeed an important study which we feel and hope will bring in certain recommendations. But why was it appointed? It was because there were financial difficulties in the fishing industry, severe financial difficulties. At the time they appointed, one or two large companies were on the verge of bankruptcy. It was made known they were on the verge of bankruptcy. For example, the Newfoundland Government had to find an amount of approximately, in this case, \$5 million. We found \$5 million to put into an investment in the fishing industry to help the Lake Group survive, and in this case we worked it out with the federal government. I recall numerous meetings, and finally the last meeting resulted in a number of the departments of government from Newfoundland - Finance, Fisheries and Development - sitting down in a board room in Toronto with the bankers, the companies, the federal authorities, and we finally worked out a deal where we could save that company. But it was only a temporary measure, a very temporary measure. The problems that were there when Mr. Kirby was appointed are still there. Now, the Opposition in their loyalty to the Liberal Party can make believe that we are abdicating our responsibilities, etc., and the federal government has to step in the processing end of the fishing industry and take control and do things there. Nobody, not even the federal level, to date has indicated

MR. J. MORGAN: that. They have indicated that they want to work in co-operation and we believe them because after all it is the most important industry in Atlantic Canada- not just in Newfoundland, in Atlantic Canada. And surely with such an important resource industry in Atlantic Canada, the federal government is not going to ignore it. Now when the Lake Group was assisted, it resulted in the reopening of a number plants, as members of the House of Assembly are quite aware, some in their own respective districts. We said then in discussions with the Kirby Task Force that the Lake Group was not the only company that was having financial difficulties, but the other companies, Nickersons of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia at that time was one all one big company, then there was the other one Fishery Products.

MR. MORGAN: Of course, we thought with the input of funds from the Canadian Development Corporation in the amount of approximately \$34 million, taking a 40 per cent interest in the company, that that would help Fishery Products' financial difficulties which they had at that time. So these same problems that were the reasons for the appointment of the Kirby Task Force are still out there, they still have not been resolved. And suddenly some of the media leave the impression - I do not know whether it is intentionally, hopefully it is not; maybe it is because of the lack of having the facts - but they leave the impression that suddenly there is a new problem in the fishing industry, that it all came up this Fall. Well, the problem we had in the fishing industry with the small and medium sized companies, that problem is resolved, it is no longer there. Most all the medium sized companies are today, I would say, as I mentioned at the beginning of the debate, on a reasonably firm footing for the future. But the problems of the large companies have still not been touched, are still there. So there is no point in trying to leave the impression that this is a new problem, something that just came to light. It is a problem that was, as I said earlier, addressed extensively by the Kirby Task Force. Now surely the Opposition is not going to complain about the fact that we cannot find approximately \$100 million to \$150 million for the processing sector of the fishing industry. Well, we cannot find it. You cannot get blood from a turnip, as the old fisherman would say, so what is the alternative?

MR. NEARY: What are you going to do?

MR. MORGAN: If we cannot find the monies - and we found so far \$29 million, and so far the federal government has not put in any money with the exception of \$13 million and a government guarantee in the Lake Group - I am convinced that common sense will prevail in Ottawa -

MR. MORGAN: common sense with the Kirby Task Force, common sense with the ministers - and they will recognize the need for this kind of restructuring. And how can a Province with 500,000 people, with limited revenue - and we do not have the revenue base, the resource base or otherwise - get that revenue at the present time? How can we afford to find, and where could we find - goodness gracious, if we had the oil and gas revenues coming in I say we could find it. I say if we were getting a fair deal from Ottawa and had that development going we could possibly find it. At the present time, because we cannot find the money the Opposition wants to glory in the idea, 'Oh, they cannot find the money, they cannot find the money and they got to go to look to Ottawa for assistance'. Well, are we not as good Canadians in Newfoundland as they are in other parts of the country?

Surely we must be just as good Canadians, you know, working in Trepassey and Marystown and Burin, Harbour Breton and St. Lawrence and Twillingate and Bonavista and Charleston and Tizzard's Harbour and Morton's Harbour, Bridgeport, any place along the coast. Surely these Newfoundlanders working in these plants are just as important and need jobs to carry on with their occupation in this industry, just as important

MR. MORGAN: as other Canadians. So all we are saying is the task force was appointed to address that major problem.

MR. NEARY: No, it was not.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it was appointed because there were financial difficulties in the large companies. They did not address the other companies. Let me give you a prime example, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: How do you know?

MR. MORGAN: Plants were closing down in the following places last Spring, in Newfoundland: They were closing down in Charleston, they were closing down in Dildo, they were closing down in Gooseberry Cove, Tizzard's Harbour, Bridgeport, Morton's Harbour, Black Tickle, Williams Harbour, Triton Seafoods in Triton. All these plants were going to close. Now, why were they going to close? Because they were part of a large company and that large company found itself in financial difficulty. And they came looking for money. Where did they come? They came to both governments. One government said, I am sorry, we do not believe that you should be assisted, you have overexpanded in some areas of Atlantic Canada and we are not going to put any money up. Our choice is let your company go into receivership or bankruptcy.

MR. TULK: Do you agree with that?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, that would have meant jobs lost in all of these plants along the Northeast coast of the Province. Now I am asking a very straightforward question to the members of the House of Assembly: Can we as Newfoundlanders, as leaders in this House of Assembly, afford to see all of these people, thousands of them, lose their jobs and go on unemployment insurance for - what? - ten months or twelve months and then go where? To the social assistance roles. We could not afford to do that, Mr. Speaker. But in this case one government took the

MR. MORGAN: attitude yes, we can afford it, let the chips fall where they may, and let those plants close. Now, that was part of a large company. So we decided to look at it in a very serious way and we did. We had chartered accountants look at it, we had lawyers look at it extensively and very thoroughly. Then we decided that we could not afford to let these plants close. So what happened? We called in Mr. Kirby's Task Force, we sat down in two long meetings, we said, Here is the major problem, will you assist or will you not assist? The federal government chose not to assist, they chose not to assist the people living in Triton, not to assist those living in Charleston and Dildo, and Gooseberry Cove and Tizzard's Harbour and Bridgeport and Morton's Harbour and Black Tickle and Williams Harbour.

I said then and I say now that surely the people living in these locations around our Province should have been recognized as good Canadian citizens who want to do a job in the processing plants and to help keep a major part of our fishing industry alive,

MR. MORGAN: but they were rejected at the time. And I today am a worried man because I am worried about the fact that the same kind of attitude may again prevail in Ottawa.

MR. TULK: Not a bad idea (inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman thinks this is funny. I am not worried for me, I have a job.

MR. TULK: No, I do not! No, I do not!

MR. MORGAN: But those on the Northeast Coast who will lose those jobs in those plants will have no job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to carry on without being interrupted.

The fact is I am worried because the last meeting I had with Mr. Kirby and his Task Force, and with the bankers, and with the companies senior officials and owners, the Nickerson family, the Lake Group senior people, Fisheries Products senior people, that was months ago after having a series of about thirteen, fourteen meetings in Board Rooms in Toronto and Montreal, Ottawa, and here, and Halifax. Why were these meetings being held? To try to find a way to restructure the fishing industry, to save the major companies. Because unless there is going to be - there has to be, there must be - unless there is we are going to see some very, very serious repercussions, there is going to have to be a restructuring of the debt to equity ratio in these companies. Their debts are just too large, they cannot carry it. The high interest rates hurt them substantially in the last year and a half, hurt them to the point where they brought them to the brink of bankruptcy. At least we know that of one company last year, we had to come in and save it and keep it going. So unless that question is going to be addressed, the whole purpose of the Kirby Task Force, all the work it did over the past number of months, it will mean that the fishing industry will still be left in a very, very serious financial problem

MR. MORGAN: with the large companies. And why would we not welcome - I do not think any member here would not welcome - I do not care where the funds come from right now; if someone walked into my office tomorrow morning, Mr. Speaker, and said, 'I am from Tokyo', and he spoke with an accent, and said he had \$100 million to invest in the fishing industry in Newfoundland, we would welcome him in. The Foreign Investment Review Industry might not do it. They would have their scurtiny and regulations to the point where they would probably discourage any investment of that nature.

Then, Mr. Speaker, if someone came from West Germany and said, 'We have x millions of dollars to invest in the fishing industry', would we say no? No, Mr. Speaker, we would not say no. We would welcome them with open arms to invest their money. Again the Foreign Investment Review Agency would be discouraging that kind of investment.

Mr. Speaker, I thought I had unlimited time in closing this debate, Mr. Speaker. Maybe I am wrong.

MR. TULK: You are wrong.

MR. CARTER: Unlimited time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

MR. NEARY: No, not by leave! You would not give it to me.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we know the time is gone

MR. MORGAN:

for us to blame the companies, the companies to blame the government, for us to blame the federal government and the federal government to blame us. We know that the federal government has fallen down on controlling the indiscriminate fishing on the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks whereby last week there were fifty-eight foreign vessels fishing on the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks just outside the 200 mile economic zone. Doing what? Over-fishing and having a drastic effect on the stocks on the Grand Banks which supply fish to these plants along the South Coast. We know, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government gave away to the foreigners last year 160,000 metric tons of fish. Not all of it was species normally caught by Canadians, not all of it, but many, many tons of it; for example, 15,000 tons of Northern Cod alone which is our main species. We know they have made many mistakes. We know, Mr. Speaker, the policies should be changed and reviewed, we know there may be some over-expansion in the processing sector of the fishing industry in the past because of the monies so freely available from DREE. Mr. Speaker, I will clear the air; there was not one new plant built in the last seven years, one new modern new plant built in the seven years with new licenses. It was all existing licenses and in came a large company, bought the small company, went to Ottawa, got the funds and expanded.

MR. NEARY: Who did that?

MR. BARRETT: Nickerson's.

MR. MORGAN: We did not give the licenses, they were there a long time ago. It was over expansion. We know there is need to co-ordinate the market, we know, Mr. Speaker, the need for consolidation in the

MR. MORGAN: market place. To do what? to go out in an effort of consolidation, the joining together of all companies either voluntary or otherwise in the market place. To do what? To market the top quality fish we are hoping to produce through a quality controlled programme throughout the Province. And we know that the large companies in fact are the mainstay of the deep sea fishery in Newfoundland, two large companies, Fishery Products and the Lake Group, and we know these problems have to be addressed, these problems, Mr. Speaker, and others I have not got time to get into because of my limited time in debate. But I will say again, Mr. Speaker, this government over the past three years, under the present leadership of our Premier, nobody across this Province,

MR. MORGAN:

and I have travelled extensively, I sit down with fishermen's committees, I sit down with the union and the companies and the independents and the salt fish producers and all of them, even the boat builders, and there is not one of them, Mr. Speaker, one organization or one group but will stand up and say, 'We know one thing, if the federal government gave the same kind of attention to the fishing industry as you are giving to it,' Mr. Speaker, 'it would be a much better industry for the future.'

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 10).

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 21, Bill No. 12.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Geographical Names Board Act, 1974," (Bill No. 12).

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, this is merely a bill where there is a slight conflict in the Municipalities Act and the Newfoundland Geographical Names Board Act. Under the Municipalities Act, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council is empowered to change the name of towns; under the Geographical Names Board Act, the minister may approve changes in name of geographical - may recommend to the board for a geographical feature and cause notice of approval to be put in the Newfoundland Gazette. So there is a possibility of a conflict, and what this bill does

MR. MARSHALL: is it says, subject to the Municipalities Act, the minister may recommend it.

I move second reading.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I would not venture to take up the time of this House when there are so many people unemployed in this Province to talk about such a foolish thing.

MR. NEARY: A trivial matter.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Geographical Names Board Act, 1974," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Order 18, Bill No. 20.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
The Chair is having some difficulty hearing what Order is being called.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department of Labour And Manpower Act," (Bill No. 20).

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, this is basically a housekeeping bill. There is not much too it. Basically, what we are doing in the Department of Labour and Manpower is adding an assistant deputy minister who will be responsible for Occupational Health and Safety. It has already been done and basically what we are doing in this bill is inserting three assistant deputy ministers for the Department of Labour and Manpower, one of whom will be

MR. DINN: responsible for Occupational Health and Safety, the other for Manpower and the other for Labour. So, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there should be too long a debate on this particular bill.

I spoke, by the way, to the Labour and Manpower critic on the Opposition side and he said that he did not see much need for a long debate on this and that it was a matter of -

MR. SIMMS: It was already done anyway.

MR. NEARY: My colleague said it for me.

MR. SIMMS: Oh, yes.

MR. DINN: So I move second reading if there are no speakers on it.

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

MR. HISCOCK: I would just like to comment upon this and I am glad, as most members, that we now have a deputy minister to look after occupational health and safety. But with regard to that, Mr. Speaker, it is an ongoing thing that we need continually in this Province, with regard to the history of the mines in St. Lawrence where there was no occupational health and safety legislation, they just went down in the mines and we found out later the end result. We also have the dust report in Labrador City and then, of course, we have working conditions, as pointed out by the draggers. We also have industry.

I think one of the complaints all the time is brought up with the Department of Transportation, the ploughs, for example; in these ploughs there are no safety bar on some of these snow clearing ploughs and that as a result the reason was given by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), if we have to do these many of these older vehicles they would have to be replaced.

MR. HISCOCK: I think one thing is that, again as I said in the committee, that with regard to occupational health and safety, we need more courses like this in our Grade XI curriculum, we need more speaking tours by various officials in his department, and we need more encouragement in particular by the people in the work force to complain to the minister directly, to the Ombudsman, and to have some system in place where a person can complain without finding that he or she is being discriminated against with regard to the job and job security. So I am glad to see that we finally have an assistant deputy minister. Unfortunately it may have come a little bit late because what I think this government has done, this government has been very strong on rhetoric of protecting the workers, but with regard to the main thing is that once our Newfoundland quota, x number of other things with the offshore, the attitude has also been by people who have worked on the offshore is that once we have been there, once we got on the offshore then we are forgotten about.

MR. DINN: It has been there a year and a half.

MR. HISCOCK: Of course it has been there a year and a half but still the Royal Commission is now pointing out what was actually done with safety was that we put the people on the rigs and we forgot about them. So, by having the Assistant Deputy Minister does not necessarily mean that we are going to have the legislation reinforced and enacted. And I would like to see that we not only have an Assistant Deputy Minister but that we have some bite into this legislation and some fines to the companies to make sure that if we are going to bring in legislation, it is not cosmetic legislation but in actual fact it is protecting the workers of this Province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN: I defer to the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: I will not be long actually.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the words of my hon. colleague but I expect that he said that we were supporting this particular measure.

MR. TULK: That is exactly what he said.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, certainly we will support any measure that is going to improve and enhance the work place for the workers of this Province, any bill, Mr. Speaker, that is going to try and make the work place safe, any bill that is going to minimize the chances of our workers catching some sort of occupational disease. We know, of course, that this is a measure that has been worked for for a long time in the work place, particularly in the mines, Mr. Speaker, the Labrador City-Wabush mines and of course the Baie Verte mines. These have been the three that come to mind. And the workers and the unions and

MR. LUSH: the people in these areas for a long time have been enunciating and articulating their concerns in these matters for a number of years. Some months ago the government acted and we know that the body, the agency, that was to enforce the rules and regulations and the recommendations made by the study was to be placed under the minister's department of Labour and Manpower. At that time we questioned, I recall, as to why it was Labour and Manpower, because maybe we thought the Department of Health might have been the logical place for this division, this particular division. But at that time the minister had indicated that officials in his department, of course, were close to the situation, close to the scene and that they had been working hand in hand with the unions and the study initiated and that, as a result, they had a lot of expertise within the department. So therefore the department was going to be placed under - or the division, whatever we call it,

MR. LUSH: the body that was going to carry out these particular tasks and these specific responsibilities - was going to be placed under the Department of Labour and Manpower.

So, Mr. Speaker, first of all we certainly welcome any legislation that has to do with occupational health and safety, naturally, and we certainly hope that whatever department it is placed under that it is going to do the job effectively and efficiently.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is already done.

MR. LUSH: Yes, we know, but all I am saying is we were not so concerned about the particular division, the particular department as long as the division was going to operate effectively and efficiently to ensure, Mr. Speaker, that all of the precautions, all of the measures that had to be taken to reduce the incidents of occupational disease were certainly going to be taken, that every initiative was going to be taken by the government.

The only concern that we have Mr. Speaker - and I just raise it as a concern - we wonder whether or not we had to set up another Assistant Deputy Minister, particularly in this time of inflation and this time of restraint, whether or not that was really necessary because one would have assumed that it could fall into the department without having to set up any extra people or an extra division requiring an Assistant Deputy Minister. So that would be our only concern, Mr. Speaker, that particular one, whether during this time of restraint, whether we need to set up that kind of structure and whether it is indeed necessary for an Assistant Deputy Minister or other administrators or directors, whatever the case might be.

But in principle, Mr. Speaker, we certainly support the measures the government have taken with respect to establishing this division, with respect to taking all the steps they can to ensure that the work

MR. LUSH: place, particularly in the places that were mentioned, and in future developments, that we will make these places of work, the work places safe for all workers, free from industrial disease and taking all of the measures that we can to ensure that once we set up industrial areas that all measures are taken to make it a safe place to work. So, Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH: we certainly welcome any of those steps and we will certainly endorse this particular amendment.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): If the hon. the minister now speaks he will close debate.

The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members opposite for participating in the debate. And the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), just to address some of the points he made, talked about roll over protection on old equipment in the Department of Transportation, the roll over protective structures, for the hon. member's knowledge - hence, from now on he will never bring it up again - have been looked after by the Department of Transportation in every area that roll over protectors are required.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Now, there are some machines that do not have the capability of being fitted with roll over protectors. They are not suited, or cannot be fitted, and the Department of Transportation have not done it, you know, with our recommendation, as a matter of fact, because it is more dangerous to have them on than not to have them on and those machines are not to be operated in dangerous areas. So, Mr. Speaker, besides the fact that that particular point has nothing to do with the bill itself - the bill addresses itself to one item - or two items actually only. One is the assistant deputy minister. Adding an assistant deputy minister has already been done under the Occupational Health and Safety Act and one of those assistant deputy ministers in the department will be responsible for Occupational Health and Safety.

MR. DINN: The other thing is the definition of the director who will be now known as the Director of Administration. He is already in place. We are not doing anything here outside of that.

To get to one or two other points, because the hon. member did not quite read the bill or did not understand what the bill was all about, the Occupational Health and Safety legislation that we have in this Province is the best piece of legislation on Occupational Health and Safety in North America, bar none.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: And that is recognized by just about every jurisdiction in Canada for sure and is becoming recognized in other areas. It is an excellent piece of legislation.

The hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) brought up the point that people should have more input. Well, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. member's information - because it really does not have much to do with the legislation we are talking about here today - but for his information, we have now over 800 health and safety committees in the work place right now in all areas of the work place, in the mines in Western Labrador, Baie Verte mines, Bowaters, Abitibi-Price, the big operations and the small operations. And in the small operations even with less than ten employees, they have a representative there who is designated to look after the health and safety conditions in that area.

MR. HISCOCK: We are losing more fingers on more hands.

MR. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is now waxing eloquently about workers' compensation and how we are losing more fingers and having more accidents and so on in the work place. Mr. Speaker,

November 22, 1982

Tape No. 2568

IB-3

MR. DINN: the fact of the matter is
that is not true and that is actually going down. The
accident rate in the Province over the past

MR. DINN:

year has gone now, Mr. Speaker, and if the hon. member had looked at the report of the Workers' Compensation Board that was tabled here in the House in the past year he would know what the situation was in that area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to get up and talk about a piece of legislation that is on the Order Paper, but the hon. member should read the legislation before he gets up and comments on the legislation that is before the House.

I do acknowledge the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). I believe he knew what the bill was all about. He certainly talked about the fact that there was a need and he did agree with the legislation and that we did need an Assistant Deputy Minister of Occupational Health and Safety. The Occupational Health and Safety Division was over the past four or five years brought together in one area in the Department of Labour and Manpower, and I believe the bringing together of all of these groups under one assistant deputy minister and in the Department of Labour was a very wise move on behalf of government, a very courageous step. It is a thing that, for example, bureaucracies do not normally like when you take the electrical section away from Hydro, and some other sections from the Workers' Compensation Board and the Department of Health and bring them together as one, they do not like to see their bureaucracies tumble but for better efficiency and for better operation of a division such as Occupational Health and Safety, in a department where we have communications on a daily basis with labour and management I think it was a very wise move, a very courageous step on behalf of government, and

MR. DINN: it is working, Mr. Speaker. So I move second reading of the bill and I acknowledge the concerns of the hon. member for Eagle River. Perhaps if we have a change to the Workers' Compensation Act we might more appropriately talk about his concerns about Workers' Compensation when that bill is presented before the House, and the other areas where he showed some concern.

So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member appeared to be confused about everything on just about everything that he spoke on since the session started. This bill adds an assistant deputy minister and a director in Occupational Health and Safety and in the Department of Labour and Manpower and this does what has been done for the past year and a half. So I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department of Labour and Manpower Act," (No. 20), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Order 19, Bill No. 30.
Motion, second reading of a bill,
"An Act To Amend The Livestock (Community Sales) Act".
Bill No. 30.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. Minister for Rural,
Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUIDE: Mr. Speaker, I will be quite
brief. This amendment which we propose to introduce is
exactly housekeeping business. And what we want to do is
to expand the definition of 'community sale' to include the
words 'from a motor vehicle or trailer having to do with
the sale of livestock' and that obviously would be to have
greater control on the prevention and control of disease
in the livestock sold throughout the Province.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat
Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised
knowing that this government is living so high on the hog
that the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern
Development (Mr. Goudie) would bring in a livestock bill.

It is surprising, Mr. Speaker,
that there three or four days ago we came
in expecting them to slash expenses in this
Province by cutting off different departments and now we
are coming in with a livestock bill.

I would like to ask the minister
does this coincide with community pastures. And the meaning
of trailer, does it mean any kind of a trailer. I think
the term trailer is fairly broad. Does it mean flatbeds?
I think the minister is using the term 'trailer' - this is a
housekeeping amendment but next year the minister will probably
want another housekeeping amendment to it. So, could the minister
just before he closes the bill elaborate on whether
these are community pastures, only concerning

November 22, 1982

Tape No. 2570

IB-2

MR. WARREN: community pastures and what is his
definition of a trailer? Then I could go further and ask
him some other questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): If the hon. minister speaks now he will close the debate.

The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: As I mentioned, the sole intent of this amendment is to regulate the sale of livestock in such a manner that will prevent and control the spread of disease in the Province has nothing to do with community pastures at all, at least in the context in which the hon. gentleman mentioned it.

The words 'from a motor vehicle or trailer' had been added to the definition and I will read the definition, so it is clear. Community sales means 'the sale or offering for sale of livestock at a railway depot, siding, or car or at dockside or from a vessel thereat whether by means of a public auction or private arrangement.'

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. GOUDIE: I am not suggesting this is heavy legislation, Mr. Speaker, I am just trying to explain what the definition of a trailer is. And the reason we are bringing this in is that, hon. members from -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. GOUDIE: Well, I am just trying to answer the gentleman's question, that is all.

MR. WARREN: Be quiet! Be quiet!

MR. GOUDIE: Hon. members from around the Province -

MR. MORGAN: Have respect for your colleague's question.

MR. GOUDIE: - want people involved in agriculture selling produce from trucks and so on and some people have attempted to do the same thing with chickens, with

MR. GOUDIE: hogs and so on. There is a possibility of spreading disease. We have a disease-free hog programme in the Province and we want to regulate that type of thing. So it is the back of a pickup truck, on a trailer that can be towed by a truck or a car, just that type of vehicle that is all.

MR. WARREN: How about a church sale, last year in a similar circumstance they sold a sheep. Is that allowed?

MR. GOUDIE: Well, the church in question should certainly have obtained permission to sell the animal. But, I mean, with the number of personnel we have to enforce such things it is difficult to keep track of all of that. But that is the type of intent behind this, is to try and control disease by restricting the sale of animals to designated points rather than from the back of pickup trucks and other vehicles in the Province.

MR. WARREN: But that is not on the hoof, is it? That is cured?

MR. GOUDIE: Yes. I move second reading, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Livestock (Community Sales) Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Fur Farms Act". (Bill No. 31)

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I guess on this particular bill we could get into a great dissertation about the economic ventures put forth by the former Liberal administration in the 1960s but there is no point in doing that.

MR. NEARY: I simply produce (inaudible) in Canada do you accept it or not?

MR. GOUDIE: We could get into a great dissertation is what I was going to suggest.

MR. GOUDIE: All we want to do here, Mr. Speaker, is to repeal the Fur Farms Act because it is covered under other legislation in different departments of government.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Fur Farms Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 31)

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I think we could resolve the House into Committee of the Whole and put some of these bills through the Committee stage.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON SAID BILLS:

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Conflict Of Interest Act, 1973." (Bill No. 15)

MR. MARSHALL: I have an amendment, Mr. Chairman. I move that subsection (4) of section (11) as set out in Clause 1 of this bill be amended by relettering paragraph (b) and paragraph (c) and adding immediately after paragraph (a) the following:

"A minister of the Crown includes the parliamentary assistant to the Premier, the special assistant to the Premier and the parliamentary secretaries to the ministers of the Crown". And the word 'and' then follows. Now this amendment will provide that the Premier may include in the guidelines respecting ministers of the Crown the persons named in the amendment, that is the parliamentary assistants. So it permits the Premier to expand the application of the bill. I so move.

On motion, amendment carried.

MR. MARSHALL: I believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition has another amendment.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not have it with me because I did not know we were going to do Committee of the Whole today, but I have an amendment that has to do with substituting the Auditor General wherever the Premier's name or title occurs in the bill, that it be substituted with the Auditor General. I would like to move that - I wish I had the amendment here with me.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I would like to move that anywhere where the Premier is mentioned in relation to the responsibility for him to adjudicate on these matters of Conflict of Interest

MR. NEARY: Yes. I think it is only in one place. I am not sure now. "The Premier of the Province may make such guidelines". Could that be substituted with the Auditor General, wherever 'the Premier' is used.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To that amendment, if I may.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, to that amendment.

We do not go along with that amendment at all. And the reason for it is as given when I closed the debate on the amendment in second reading, and that is that we should not or I should not put off onto somebody else what is clearly my responsibility. So, I do not want to shirk my responsibility and put it over on anybody else. This is conflict of interest guidelines as it relates to ministers and so on who are appointed by the Premier, not appointed by the Auditor General. And the Premier, in the same way as the Prime Minister of Canada, for example - the Prime Minister of Canada has a set of new guidelines, conflict of interest guidelines, that he announced in the last few years and, of course, the Prime Minister is responsible for those guidelines for the ministers who serve in his Cabinet and the executive branch of government.

So whilst it might sound awful motherhoodish on the surface, it destroys a very, very basic principle, which is, of course, the role of the First Minister, the role of the Premier or the Prime Minister, or whatever you call him within the British Parliamentary system. And that is that the Premier appoints people to the Cabinet, not the Auditor General, and therefore they must be responsible to the person who appoints them. And that is a quite clearly established rule. We checked this out when we were doing up these guidelines last year. We were not able to get the amendment last Spring like we had wanted to, but it is clearly consistent with all the guidelines that have been established by Prime Ministers and Premiers throughout

PREMIER PECKFORD: the British Commonwealth, that there is nowhere where the Auditor General comes into play on this kind of measure which is guidelines affecting conflict of interest where a minister may be sitting at the table to make a decision upon something that they have an interest in. And therefore clearly in the ongoing operation of government weekly and daily and so on, it must be the Premier or the Prime Minister. To do it any other way there would have to be some unbelievable administrative reporting system available to the Auditor General so he knew what was coming up in Cabinet every day and what was going on. What you have to do is set out the guidelines and under the guidelines then put the onus upon the ministers to report. And that onus is there and that responsibility. Any minister in this Cabinet now has to report any interest that they have in writing to the Premier which is on record then with the Clerk of the Executive Council and then I have to respond to that minister if I feel that there is a potential conflict there and say yes or no or whatever.

So that is the only way that it could be done from just a sheer administrative point of view besides the principle which is very much at stake here on that, the principle of the Premier appointing the ministers to the Cabinet and then obviously being the one responsible,

PREMIER PECKFORD: therefore, to them in any set of guidelines that must be established. Whilst it sounds good in theory in practice the whole question of the reporting system that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) proposes is one which has not been accepted by the Prime Minister of the nation and by the governments in the British Commonwealth in any case. And the administrative nightmare contained in that will be just horrendous. So I must therefore exercise my responsibilities and if, in fact, a minister breaks any of those guidelines well then the appropriate action will have to be taken by the minister, not by the Auditor General. The Auditor General should not be the one to have to take the action. It must be stimulated by the leader of the government to whom the ministers are responsible.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, first of all, in reply to this abrupt communique that the Premier has sent me, we already sent our man to see the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and the Government House Leader said he would be in touch with us when -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh, I am sorry, I did not realize that.

MR. NEARY: It has to do with the cutting off of our telephones. Our House Leader went and talked to the Government House Leader and he said he would be in touch with him.

MR. MARSHALL: You do not know when he talked to me?

MR. NEARY: The very day we got the letter we went to you and you said, 'Well, there is no hurry'.

MR. MARSHALL: What has that got to do with the amendment?

MR. NEARY: I think it was on Thursday. 'There is no hurry,' you said, 'we will be in touch with you'.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I had not heard back from your letter and I did not know.

MR. NEARY: Well that is what I was waiting for, to hear back from you.

Mr. Chairman, we do not accept that explanation given by the Premier (Mr. Peckford). We think that the whole thing will be a sham, if the Premier lays down the guidelines and then he is the one who sits in judgement, he is judge and jury of whether or not a minister or a parliamentary secretary -

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is the way it is now.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, the way it is now, members of the House, ministers, Premier, have to register their conflict of interest annually with the Auditor General.

MR. MARSHALL: You are talking to this amendment.

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. MARSHALL: Registering is not even mentioned here.

MR. NEARY: You register your form.

Every year you update your form, your conflict of interest form. You register it with the Auditor General every year, yes. And the Auditor General sends out the forms every year, in December I think it is, and we all file our conflict of interest information with the Auditor General. And we think the Auditor General or some other servant of this House is the proper one to hand out any disciplinary actions and not the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Giving away all of my responsibility.

MR. NEARY: I beg your Pardon? You are giving it away?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes. I mean, it is the responsibility on the leader of the government for guiding the Cabinet.

MR. NEARY: But we have already seen how the Premier reacts when ministers have violated, in the past, established practices and procedures

MR. NEARY: and violated acts of this House, we saw how the Premier reacted. In one instance he said it was just a genuine misunderstanding between two hon. members. And in the second instance the hon. the Premier dismissed it as just saying, "Well, in his judgement"- the hon. Premier said, "In his judgement - Mr. Chairman, the people of Port aux Basques especially in Grand Bay West want to know why all these roads were paved to Summer cottages too and why the road to Grand Bay West was not paved. Is that restraint and cut backs? Is that what the donut tax and the hot dog tax is now, to pay for these roads and country lanes down in the Codroy Valley and down in St. George's district?"

So, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that the Premier has already shown us what he will do in the way of letting ministers off the hook. And as far as we are concerned on this side of the House it will just be a farce and a sham, if the matter of discipline is not placed in the hands of an independent person, a person who is not an elected person, a person who is not a politician. Mr. Chairman, how do we know when a minister violates the Public Service Commission Act, how do we know that he does not go to the Premier and say, 'Look, I am sorry for what I did' or 'Can I do this?', and the Premier says, 'Sure, boy, you have my blessing. You have my approval to go ahead and do it'. Mr. Chairman, does that make any sense? Would it not be far better to have somebody sit in judgement who is a servant of this House, who is independent of partisan politics? What is the Premier afraid of? He is not giving up anything if that is what he thinks.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is.

MR. NEARY: No, he certainly is not. No, Mr. Chairman. This House supercedes the Premier's authority.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am not talking about the members of the House, I am talking about the members of -

MR. NEARY: Well that is what we are doing. If this House decides -

PREMIER PECKFORD: - the Cabinet.

MR. NEARY: Oh, the members of the Cabinet.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If you have a responsibility you cannot shirk it off on anybody else.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if the Premier is sincere and if the Premier wants rules and regulations controlling his ministers, governing the actions of his ministers, if he is sincere about it and he has nothing to hide or nothing to fear well then he should allow the rules and regulations to be enforced by the Auditor General or some other independent person. And that is not giving up anything.

MR. NEARY: That is not shirking one's responsibility. That is not belittling the office of the Premier. The Premier should not be the one to sit as judge and jury, to sit in judgement of the behaviour of his ministers or any senior officials in the government. If we are going to make the act meaningful at all we should give that authority to some independent person like the Auditor General. And that is why I move the amendment, Mr. Chairman. And we are disappointed that the Premier would not go along with -

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am disappointed that you would suggest it.

MR. NEARY: Why is the hon. gentleman disappointed? Because the hon. gentleman thinks we are taking something away from him?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Because I thought you understood the whole question of the role of Cabinet and the leader in the British Parliamentary tradition.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I certainly do and if the Premier understood it then he might not resist this amendment.

MR. DAWE: You should read about it because the closest you are going to get is in a book.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) has an awful lot of old lip over there. Would it not be far better for him that he went out and tried to get his Winter crews in shape so that nobody will be killed on the highways when we have our first fall of snow. Because that is what is going to happen. The moment we have glitter or snow, the very first day -

MR. DAWE: You are going to blame us.

MR. NEARY: No, I will not blame you. But I am warning him now, the signals are up now. The hon. gentleman is going to cut back on his snow clearing. It would be far better that he went out and tried to protect the motorists from being killed the first snowfall. The Minister of Finance

MR. NEARY: (Dr. Collins) announced it the other day in his - oh, he did not say we are cutting snow clearing.

MR. TOBIN: Speaker to the amendment, you are out of order.

MR. NEARY: I see.

MR. DAWE:

You just do not listen and then when you are provided with the written material you do not read it. And then you come in here and shoot off your mouth about it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is so busy trying to get all these little country lanes paved down there up to the Summer cottages, down in the Codroy Valley and down around St. Andrews -

AN HON. MEMBER: Every lane in St. Andrews.

MR. NEARY: Every lane in St. Andrews, that is right, that the taxpayers are now asked to pay for on the increase in the retail sales tax.

MR. WINDSOR: We were going to tax Liberals but there was no return.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Development wants to engage in debate I would be very happy to engage in it but it is the Minister of Transportation who is being slimy over there now. But if the Minister of Development wants to be just as slimy and just as low and just as much of a sneak and just as much of a rat, if the Minister of Development wants to be as slimy and just as much of a rattlesnake then

MR. NEARY: go down in the gutter with him. The Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) should get down in the gutter with him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where are the television cameras going to be needed?

MR. NEARY: Well we will have that Wednesday. My colleague, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) will test the administration on that subject on Wednesday and the answer again will be no because they are ashamed and afraid and they have too much to hide to allow the sessions of the House to be broadcast.

But anyway, Mr. Chairman, I got their dander up again. They are all flustered over there again now. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is, that the Premier will be giving up nothing if he agrees to allow the Auditor General to be the judge of whether or not ministers have broken the law or whether they have violated the established practices and procedures or whether they have violated any regulations or any rules that have been laid down by this House. That is a matter for an independent person, not for the Premier, because, Mr. Chairman, the Premier has already shown us that he is incapable of doing that, that he cannot discipline his ministers. We saw it happen now on three or four occasions with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). And the hon. gentleman backed away for some reason or other which makes people wonder what the hon. gentleman has on the Premier. Everybody seems to be asking the same question throughout the Province, 'What does he have on the Premier that the Premier refused on three or four occasions to discipline the hon. gentleman'? And, Mr. Chairman, how many more ministers are in that category? We know that -

MR. MARSHALL: What does the hon. member want?

Does he want to adjourn the debate or does he want to -

MR. NEARY: No, there is no such thing as adjourning the debate in Committee of the Whole, is it? But I will move the adjournment of the debate anyway.

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

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!
The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report that Bill No. 15 has been passed with amendment and that progress has been made and we ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House I would like to tell the Opposition the order of business for tomorrow. We will be going into Committee of the Whole to dispose of the bills that are on the Order Paper. The next item of business will be the Dangerous Goods Act, Transportation of Dangerous Goods, presently Order 48, Bill No. 61. Then we will be going, Mr. Speaker, to An Act To Amend The Wildlife Act, No. 2, Bill No. 70 and we will be proceeding on then with the other things.

November 22, 1982

Tape No. 2578

IB-1

MR. MARSHALL:

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

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