

VOL. 3

NO. 3

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
Wednesday, March 14, 1984

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) made a fairly serious personal attack upon one of the members of the ministry. I would like to read the following statement: To the hon. Brian Peckford, Premier, St. John's, Newfoundland. "Dear Sir: With regard to the recent personal attack on the character of the hon. James Morgan, your Minister of Fisheries, pertaining to his negotiations with me on the restructuring of the fishing industry, I would like to make the following quite clear. First of all, it is a silly and unfounded charge that Mr. Morgan, during negotiations, broke down and cried."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: "It has absolutely no foundation.

"Secondly, the charge is in no way connected with my office or my department. Mr. Morgan during these negotiations handled himself as a hard-nosed bargainer and negotiator for his Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: -"and the fishing industry, and handled himself in such a manner in which you, Mr. Premier, should be proud of him as your Minister of Fisheries.

"I am convinced as a result of the negotiation process, that both Mr. Morgan and myself have

PREMIER PECKFORD: "gained a mutual respect for each other and I look forward to working in co-operation -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: -"for the benefit of the fishing industry of your Province. Best regards, Pierre De Bane, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

Before we continue, I would like to welcome to the galleries today, Mr. John Yoss, who is the President-Elect of the Canadian Parks and Recreation Association, who is accompanied by Mr. Vic Janes, the Newfoundland Director of the Canadian Parks and Recreation Association.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, this government attaches a high priority to school construction. Since 1971 - 72 government has funded most of the cost of over \$300 million worth of construction of primary, elementary and high schools across Newfoundland and Labrador. We now have more and better schools to house a smaller number of students. By the way, 1971 - 72, a historic year for many reasons, was also the year school enrollment across our Province peaked at 163,000. Even since then enrollment has been declining steadily and now there are 10 per cent fewer students, even with Grade XII. Today I am happy to announce another government measure for funding school construction. Government will directly assume all the debt for previous school construction of the Denominational Education Councils, some \$92 million -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE: - and, Mr. Speaker, this will leave the DECs debt free. Government will refinance the debt at an interest rate well below that being charged now to the DECs. The new arrangement will result in savings to government in 1984 - 85 of about \$1 million on current account. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the general public who may not be thoroughly familiar with our education system, the DECs are the agencies of the churches participating in our denominational education system. The DECs discharge the churches' constitutional powers and responsibilities in education. In particular, they allocate or distribute government funds for school construction. Government gives the DECs block grants, proportional to each DEC's share of the total provincial population, and then the DECs have the sole say about how the money is spent. The DECs alone decide

MS. VERGE:

school construction priorities.

In 1980 government changed the method of providing financing to the DECs. Interest rates had soared and the DECs were finding it difficult to absorb the unprecedented carrying charges on the \$114 million debt then on their books. In 1980 government assisted with the consolidation and refinancing of that \$114 million debt, providing affordable repayment terms to the DECs. From then until now, government saved about \$8 million on our current account.

MS. VERGE: Since 1980 and up to the time of the repayment that will occur later this month, government will have paid to the DECs \$82.9 million to meet principal and interest requirements on this debt. During the same period government provided a further \$63.5 million to school boards, through the DECs, for new school construction for a total payment to the DECs during the four years of \$146.4 million.

Mr. Speaker, clearly, government has demonstrated our keen appreciation of the importance of education to the people of this Province by our budgetary measures.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that as I understand the minister's statement, what was an indirect debt to the Province is now a direct debt to the Province. And I would like to ask the minister whether or not - and I should point out as well that there is no new money here, it is a transfer of a debt - I would like to ask the minister whether this means that there will be no other school financing this year. We still have schools throughout the Province that are in deplorable condition. Even though there are declining enrollments, we still have schools that need many new facilities, particularly with the expanded high school programme. And because of the new expanded high school programme, monies have not been placed in the primary and elementary schools. So there is a great need for funding as well as school construction throughout the Province. The minister has perhaps lightened the burden somewhat for the DECs and the various committees, but it is a transfer of an indirect debt to the Province, which the DECs held, and it

MR. HODDER: is now a direct debt of the Province. But I would also point out that this document states the amount of money for construction that has gone in in the past, I would remind the minister that there is much money needed this year as school boards are crying for new construction. Even with the declining enrollments, they are crying for new facilities. Emphasis has been put on the expanded high school curriculum, but there is needed added interest to be placed on the elementary and primary grades in this Province which have been suffering because government has not adequately funded the expanded high school programme.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Are there any other Ministerial Statements?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: 'Mr. Morgan, during these negotiations'- I am sorry, it is the wrong Ministerial Statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I wish to inform the hon. members of two orders issued recently in two separate cases pursuant to the Newfoundland Human Rights Code. Each of the two cases arose from complaints to the Human Rights Commission involving allegations of discrimination based on sex in employment. In both cases settlement by negotiation, as encouraged by the Newfoundland Human Rights Code, was unsuccessful and, following the recommendations of the Chairman of the Human Rights Commission, that is Mr. Schwartz, I referred each complaint to a Commission of Inquiry. So this deals with the reports of two Commissions of Inquiry.

In due course, both commissions submitted their reports and recommendations, and copies of both reports will be tabled.

The first case involves an allegation by Ms. Sharon Curtis that Coastal Shipping Limited had discriminated against her because of her sex in refusing her employment in the engine room of M.S. Astron. A hearing in this matter was held at Elizabeth Towers, in St. John's, on November 2, 1983, before a Commission of Inquiry consisting of Mrs. Beatrice Watts, the member of the Human Rights Commission, and Mr. Herbert Buckingham, a member of the commission. The Commissioners held that Ms. Curtis had been discriminated against because of her sex in being refused employment by Coastal Shipping Limited. On January 10th. of this year, I signed an order requiring that corrective measures be taken by Coastal Shipping Limited, and that order was to the following

MR. OTTENHEIMER: effect: (1) That on service of this order, Coastal Shipping Limited make personal contact with Ms. Sharon Curtis and assure her that she will be offered the first available position on any ship of Coastal Shipping Limited for which she is qualified or for which no form of certification is necessary. Secondly, that should Ms. Curtis accept a position with Coastal Shipping Limited for which no form of certification is necessary and an engine room position for which she is qualified subsequently comes open, she be offered that position. Thirdly, that should Ms. Curtis decline an offer of a position with Coastal Shipping Limited for which no form of certification is necessary that she be offered the first engine room position that comes open for which she is qualified. And fourthly, that Coastal Shipping Limited confirm its intention to offer an offer of employment to Ms. Curtis by letter copied to the Executive Director of the Newfoundland Human Rights Commission. And fifthly, that Coastal Shipping become familiar with the provisions of the Newfoundland Human Rights Code and within thirty days of receipt of said order write a letter to the Executive Director of the Newfoundland Human Rights Commission stating that in future the company will provide equal opportunities for employment for both men and women and that advertisements of the company will reflect such positions. That deals with the first matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now, the second case involved allegations by Ms. Mildred Goose and Ms. Regina Clarke that the Town Council of Tilton had discriminated against them because of their sex and in the case of Ms. Clarke, because of her marital status, in not properly considering them for employment in a programme sponsored by Canada Manpower.

A commission of enquiry consisting of Mrs. Irene McGinn conducted a hearing in this case at the Spaniard's Bay Fire Hall February 14 of this year. The commission held that Ms. Goose had been discriminated against on the basis of sex and that Ms. Clarke had been discriminated against on the basis of sex and marital status in not being properly considered for employment under the hiring practice adopted for this particular Canada Manpower project.

On March 12, 1984, I signed an order requiring that corrective measures be taken by the Tilton Town Council to the effect that, firstly, the town council become familiar with the provisions of the Newfoundland Human Rights Code and within thirty days of the receipt of the order write a letter to the Executive Director of the Newfoundland Human Rights Commission stating that in future the council will provide equal opportunity for employment for both men and women and that advertisements of the council will reflect that position.

Secondly, that a financial settlement in the amount of \$50 be made by the Tilton Town Council to each of the complainants within thirty days of receipt of the order to cover costs of expenses incurred by those complainants.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Thirdly, that a letter of apology be sent within thirty days of receipt of this order to both the complainants from the Tilton Town Council clearly stating that whether the act was committed with or without intent, discriminatory actions had taken place with respect to the hiring procedures on the community centre project against Regina Clarke and Mildred Goose. The letter shall also state that in future council will provide equal opportunity of employment for both men and women and any public advertisements will so indicate. A copy of this letter shall be sent to the Executive Director of the Human Rights Commission, that is Mr. Fred Coates.

Fourthly, that the Department of Municipal Affairs be advised that the Tilton Town Council has allowed the Town Clerk to vote on a council matter at a council meeting contrary to the provisions of the Municipalities Act.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: These were the matters in the order. I think the reports made in these cases are very significant in that they emphasize the clear right of all women in our society to be afforded equal consideration for employment opportunities without discrimination based on sex or marital status. They also demonstrate the importance of the Human Rights Commission in protecting the rights of our citizens guaranteed under the Newfoundland Human Rights Code. And since only last week International Women's Day was observed, I think it is fitting that we as a House of Assembly pay particular attention to these two important cases. I wish to commend the Commissions of Enquiry for the excellent work they did, and I think it is incumbent upon all of us on both sides of the House, in various capacities, to assure that the principle of equality in employment and other opportunities with respect to sexes be observed. And very frequently, I think, very frequently discrimination occurs perhaps not intentionally but through ignorance or through force of habit or through a lack of sensitivity, not necessarily intentionally. I imagine there are intentional aspects as well. I think it is incumbent upon all of us as members of this legislature to be conscious of that principle which indeed is a principle of law, and to do what we can to make people aware of the necessity for observing that principle of equality.

I have copies here for hon. members and the press.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Opposition.

The hon. Leader of the

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just have a few brief comments to make on the so-called Ministerial Statement just issued by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). I am not sure now if, Mr. Speaker, we are creating a precedent here for all cases that come before the Human Rights Commission. Will the results be announced in the House through a Ministerial Statement?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: All will, as a matter of principle.

MR. NEARY: All will as a matter of principle. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a good principle and I commend the minister, by the way, for taking swift action in these two cases and in establishing the Commission. It just goes to show, Mr. Speaker, how wise the Liberal administration was in this Province when they brought in a Human Rights Code and set up a Human Rights Commissioner and made provision for a Human Rights Commission in this Province. How wise we were, Mr. Speaker, thirteen or fourteen years ago when we introduced in

MR. NEARY:

this House legislation that would provide an avenue, a mechanism whereby people would be able to fight for their rights through the human rights legislation in this Province. It was indeed an excellent concept, Mr. Speaker, and we are proud on this side of the House to see that the mechanism that we have provided is now working, and, Mr. Speaker, especially in the area of women's rights. As hon. members know, there has been quite a storm of controversy about whether or not females should work offshore on oil rigs and so forth and so on. Women have now taken an interest in employment opportunities that previously were considered to be the domain of the males. So we are likely to see many examples of where women are being discriminated against in the work force. So we think it is a good thing, I commend the minister for it, and I congratulate the commission for carrying out their work swiftly and for producing good results. Mr. Speaker, we look forward in future to seeing that this great avenue of recourse, of giving people who have grievances and complaints recourse to seeing that justice is carried out. We are rather proud of that, Mr. Speaker, It is a great Liberal concept and we commend the minister for bringing this report before the House today.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Scio.

The hon. the member for Mount

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. I would like to ask the Premier whether, in light of the special, personal relationship which has been formed between the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) and the Newfoundland Minister (Mr. Morgan),

MR. BARRY:

on the Northern cod allocations which are presently unavailable to the fishermen of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, the hon. member has left a party which has advocated that the Northern cod stocks should be reserved for the benefit of fishermen of this Province for a long time, he has left the party that advocates that, and gone with a party which has been wishy-washy over the issue, and he now supports a party in Ottawa which has not seen fit to this point in time to put in place an allocation plan which is consistent with the objectives of the Government of Newfoundland.

We are continuing, and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is continuing his efforts in that regard with the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bane) in Ottawa, and I am continuing it as well, as minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs, in meetings that I have had with our federal representative in the Cabinet of Canada. And we would request that the members of the Opposition also clearly support the longstanding position of the Minister of Fisheries in Newfoundland and of the Government of Newfoundland in ensuring that the Northern cod stock is used, first and foremost, for the fishermen of this Province and then if there is any surplus to be used for other Canadians. To this point in time we do not have an agreement in place which would see all the Northern cod being used for the fishermen of this Province, but we will continue to try to get changes to that management plan to reflect the objectives of this government.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Mount Scio, a supplementary.

MR. BARRY: As the Premier knows, the party on this side of the House supports and encourages that the Northern cod be utilized for the benefit, first and foremost, of the fishermen of Newfoundland and that has never been any different. Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that despite this special personal relationship, a very close personal relationship between the Newfoundland Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane), has the Premier made any inquiries or done any investigation to determine whether that special relationship does not exist because the Newfoundland Minister of Fisheries has sold out the Newfoundland fishermen on that point?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, now I know the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is smarting, I know he is hurting, that yesterday he made an allegation and a personal attack against the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and he has lost badly. On his first day in the House he has lost badly and he is smarting, but he does not have to get childish and boyish about it, Mr. Speaker. I mean, the schoolboy debater over there does not have to get upset. Take it on the chin and grow up, Mr. Speaker, that is what the member for Mount Scio should do.

Obviously, we will continue as we have done in the past. We have a restructuring agreement in place now which is significantly different from the unilateral proposal put on the table by the federal government. We bargained hard, we negotiated hard, the Minister of Fisheries and myself and other officials of the Government of Newfoundland. And we will continue to bargain hard as it relates to the fishery of this Province. Every Newfoundlander and Labradorian knows that the Progressive Conservative Government, this administration and the party, have advocated a very strong position on the Northern cod. A few years ago, when we first advocated that position, there was a lot of silence around Newfoundland, even among the fishermen and among the union and among the Opposition party here. They were very quiet and half sat on the fence about it. We were being anti-Canadian, we were being separatists, we were being confrontationists because we were standing up for the inshore fishermen and trying to see that the fish that was caught from 1497 to 1976 continued to be caught by the fishermen of this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are very proud that, even though the hon. the member for Mount Scio

PREMIER PECKFORD: crossed the House, he now supports the policy on Northern cod and has persuaded some of the members opposite to do likewise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. As the Premier knows, and as I hope all hon. members of this House know, to question the confidence of a minister of government, to question the confidence of a department of government, despite what the Newfoundland Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) might believe, is hardly a personal attack. To say that a minister is incompetent is the very essence, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

 The Question Period, of course, as I stated yesterday, is to give hon. members to my right the opportunity to ask as many questions as possible and thus to receive as many answers as possible, and certainly there should not be any long preambles nor any debate. I feel that the hon. the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) has now entered into the realm of debate and I would ask him to pose a direct question.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, your point is well taken. I would ask the Premier whether he has taken or is prepared to take any inquiries or investigations and report back to this House whether the reason for the lovey-dovey relationship between the Newfoundland minister (Mr. Morgan) and the federal minister (Mr. De Bane) arises because the federal minister knows that he has a good thing going for him and knows that he is going to get the best of any future deal as long as he is dealing with, Mr. Speaker, an incompetent lightweight such as he is now dealing with? Will the Premier take investigation, make inquiries, into this point? Is he prepared to relinquish to the federal minister the question of the allocation of Northern cod in order to keep and preserve that special lovey-dovey relationship between the Newfoundland minister and the federal minister? Will he at least determine whether in future deals the best interests of the Province of Newfoundland will be sacrificed because the federal Minister of Fisheries knows that he has a good thing going and can totally dominate the Newfoundland minister at any time?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that is not really worthy of a detailed answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Eagle River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: My question is to the Premier

MR. HISCOCK: concerning the Northern cod. I have just travelled extensively down the lower part of the district, the Eastern part, and the fishermen there are extremely concerned and upset and very anxious that the Northern Development Corporation is not in place. Most of the fishermen last year had a disastrous salmon fishery and inshore cod fishery. They have now got all the salmon that is ready and they do not know if there is going to be a buyer this year. The private companies do not know if they are going to go in and take over their plants again this year. There was a proposal made last October to the MP for that area, Mr. William Rompkey, to make an amendment to the reorganization of the fishery so that the Saltfish Corporation could take over the responsibility of this corporation. This has been on the table and been referred to the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) since last October. If I am correct in my correspondence with Ottawa, when the Premier was in Ottawa for the conference on Natives rights and the Constitution -

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

The hon. member is attempting to make a speech and I would ask him to pose a question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR.HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I am not making a speech but it is a rather complicated issue. It is concerning all the fishermen and if they do not get buyers and they do not get allocations in that area -

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.HISCOCK: If the Minister of Fisheries (Mr.Morgan) would be more concerned about looking after the fishermen in Labrador than he is in interrupting the minister then something would be done down there.

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

I would request the hon. member to pose a direct question or the Chair shall have to recognize somebody else.

MR.HISCOCK: The direct question is to the Premier. Can the Premier table information in this House that the negotiations are going on and that there will be in place buyers and that the Northern Development Corporation will come under the arm of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation within the next month or two?

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, in the preamble to the hon. member's question he commented again upon the Northern cod stock. I ask to be corrected if I am wrong on this but we have a constitutional position which we are still advancing with the federal government whereby there should be concurrent jurisdiction in the fishery which would therefore give us more say over allocation of fish stocks and that has not been supported by the Liberal Opposition. So when the member for Mount Scio (Mr.Barry) and now the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) talk about us getting greater access to the Northern cod stocks, the best way that that can be

PREMIER PECKFORD: achieved is through concurrent jurisdiction in the fisheries. In other words, to give us more say and control over the fisheries. So if the Liberal Opposition are really serious on the Northern cod, could I expect to hear from them in the next couple of days that they support our constitutional position. Because then we will get the Northern cod the way that the Liberal Opposition say they want it.

MR. CALLAN: You are wrong there.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Secondly, I will listen very carefully in the next -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - day or two to hear whether there has been a policy change by the members of the Opposition and they now support concurrent jurisdiction in the fishery, which would give us greater access to the Northern Cod. I will listen very carefully for that, Mr. Speaker.

Now to deal directly with the question asked by the hon. member, I appreciate the concern that the hon. member has for his constituents, since most of the fishermen in his area will find themselves dealing in some way or manner with the fishery and with the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation. Now, under the restructuring agreement, there was a provision which described how the two governments were going to deal with the problem of the St. Anthony plant and all the plants on the Labrador Coast. That provision states that there would be established

PREMIER PECKFORD:

a Northern Fisheries Development Corporation which would include the St. Anthony plant and those plants. Now that is what the provision in the agreement said. Since that time, as the hon. member knows, a number of politicians, and other people in the fishing industry, have advocated that that Northern Fisheries Development Corporation should be an arm of the Saltfish Corporation, but the provision in the agreement says that there will be established a Northern Fisheries Development Corporation. It has yet to be decided whether in fact it will be an arm of the Saltfish Corporation or whether it will be just umbrellaed into the Saltfish Corporation.

Finally, thirdly, we have, as the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, in the last three or four weeks, through our Executive Council, through Cabinet, passed a proposal, which has now been submitted to the federal government, and that proposal deals with the establishment of a Northern Fisheries Development Corporation. It advances the views as to how we, the Government of Newfoundland, think this Northern Fisheries Development Corporation should be set up. So negotiations are now ongoing between the Province and the federal government for the establishment of that Northern Fisheries Development Corporation. We have taken the initiative, as the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, in putting a definitive proposal on the table so we have something to negotiate from and to indicate to the federal government our thinking on it. It is now March 14, and it is our hope that within the next six or eight weeks - it is difficult to say because it takes two to tango, but hopefully within the next two months - as the hon. member said, we will be in a position to put in place that Northern Fisheries

March 14, 1984

Tape No. 85

MJ - 2

PREMIER PECKFORD: Development Corporation so it
can operate in the coming fishing season in the hon.member's
district.

MR. SIMMS: Good answer.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: I thank the Premier for taking time on the answer, but, as the Premier knows, the Province owns all the plants along Eastern Labrador and that last year these plants had to be closed because of the restructuring of the fishery - Williams Harbour and Black Tickle. They are rather concerned now. So I am going on the assumption that what the Premier is saying is that he can assure the people in Eastern and Southern Labrador that there will be buyers in that area and, if there are not buyers in that area, that the Province itself will be responsible for buying salmon and look after operating these plants.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, you know, I do not know how far we can go. I will have to check with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) on that question. Perhaps the Minister of Fisheries will have something to say. I mean, we will use our best efforts and do everything we can, and hopefully the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation will be in place. I do not know if the Minister of Fisheries wants to add something more to that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to add to the information supplied to the hon. gentleman who asked the question -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. member for Port au Port on a point of order.

MR. HODDER: The question was directed to the Premier but we have got to follow parliamentary procedure here. Can a Minister of the Crown, if the question is asked of him,

MR. HODDER: pass it over? I have never seen anything in the rules to allow them to do that.

MR. NEARY: If we wanted to ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), we would have asked him.

MR. HODDER: Show me the rule that does that when he gets up there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, once again I have to say how puerile can the members of the Opposition be. I would say the government is interested here in giving information. I would feel that if they are not interested in receiving it, well, that is their concern.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! To that point of order raised by the hon. member for Port au Port, there have been occasions, certainly precedents in this House when an hon. minister has requested and asked another minister to answer and provide more information to a question that has been asked.

I am prepared to recognize the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in supplying further information to a question which is of concern to the member who asked the question -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Your Honour made a ruling a moment ago and I heard quite distinctly, and I am sure Your Honour and all members of the House heard the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) say words to the effect that you can ask a question, anyone can get up. That is a good ruling. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is here in the book, I do not need to quote the book.

MR. HODDER: Show it to us. Show it to us.

MR. MARSHALL: I will show it to you. The hon. gentleman wants it to be shown to him. The situation is, page 38 of Beauchesne, "Mr. Speaker as Presiding Officer," paragraph 117, "The chief characteristics attached to the office of Speaker in the House of Commons are authority and impartiality." "When he rises to preserve order and give a ruling he must always be heard in silence. No Member may rise when the Speaker is standing. Reflections upon the character or actions of the Speaker may be punished as breaches of privilege."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants more authority, he can look to Erskine May on page 441.

MR. NEARY: What is the point?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, the point is this, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Speaker happens to be, in this House, the representation of authority of the people of Newfoundland in this Assembly. If this Assembly is to work in the way that it is suppose to work, if it is worthy of the respect and dignity which it should have in order to conduct the people's business, the Speaker, of all people in this House, is to be respected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And when any member of this hon. House makes allegations and statements like the hon. gentleman made, they call for an immediate and complete and unequivocal retraction. I call upon the hon. gentleman to make that retraction now to the Speaker.

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

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, made a ruling on which I have seen nothing - and I have read about it - whatever I have been able to get my hands on, I have never seen anything in the section on questioning of ministers which allowed ministers to pass it along. And my comment was does this mean now that a question can be asked the Premier, he can pass it on to the Minister without Portfolio, who then passes it along to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer)? And all I am asking is for some justice for us in this House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is not going to weasel out of it. The hon. gentleman has cast an aspersion on the authority not of the Speaker as a person, but

MR. MARSHALL: on the Chair of this House.

And the hon. gentleman is required under parliamentary practice to withdrew these remarks, and apologize to the Chair for what he has done. Because if that type of thing is allowed to go on in this House, Mr. Speaker, it is going to disintergrate into chaos.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, yesterday we saw a typical example in this House of the arrogance of the gentlemen there opposite when they took the House on their backs yesterday and would not allow my colleague to make his speech, Now the hon. gentleman is trying to dictate to the Chair, trying to influence the Chair, trying to badger Your Honour in doing something Your Honour is quite capable of doing himself if he thought there were any rules broken. Your Honour could take the initiative if he thought there was anybody cast aspersions on Your Honour or on the Chair. In actual fact, no aspersions have been cast on the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the hon. gentleman that this is not a hockey game we are playing. In a hockey game, you can get an assist for scoring a goal, but in this House, if we ask the Premier a question_ we could have asked the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan); we did not want to ask the Minister of Fisheries - but we wanted to ask the Premier because he is the head of the administration, and you just cannot pass it over and then have him

MR. NEARY:

pass it on to somebody else like you do in a hockey game where somebody gets an assist on scoring a goal. That is not the way it works in this House, Mr. Speaker. And my hon. colleague merely asked the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) an innocent question. He did not cast any aspersions on Your Honour -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, no! Never.

MR. NEARY: My colleague was not on his feet speaking, did not deliberately get up and say, 'Your Honour is wrong.' We know how to question the rulings of the Chair if we so desire. We will do it under the rules of the House. The hon. gentleman is making a mountain out of a molehill, Mr. Speaker, and all he is attempting to do is to use up the Question Period so that we will not ask the administration penetrating and embarrassing questions.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: This is absolutely ridiculous. I would like to hear more questions from the Opposition.

MR. HODDER: Who started it yesterday?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, the situation is they are only splitting hairs. If we have a Speaker who is Chairman for this Assembly, I mean, it is ludicrous for the Opposition to try to advance the argument that suddenly now, because the Premier under questioning one day when he was asked a question about fisheries, answered it and then assumed or figured that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) might have more detailed information to give to the hon. member - I was just trying to help the members of the Opposition.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am sure -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Let me finish. Let me finish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Speaker is in the Chair and I am sure the Speaker is not going to allow, because I passed it over to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) today to help give more information to a member of the Opposition, that in future that becomes a precedent so that we can start with the Minister of Finance and then the Speaker will allow it to go to the Minister of Justice, allow it to go to the President of the Council, allow it to go to the Premier. The Speaker is in the Chair to ensure that fairness and equity happens on those kinds of things where there is mostly custom and not rules. And no Speaker is going to allow this little incident to become of such precedent-making nature that tomorrow you are going to see a line right up on the front benches here from one minister to another in answer to a question. That is ludicrous and foolish! The members of the Opposition are wasting the time of the House when they could be asking penetrating questions. Do you know why they are wasting the time of the House and having points of order? They do not have any questions because they have been embarrassed again today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

The Chair has heard enough argument on this point. The question was asked of the Premier. The Premier felt that the hon. the Minister of Fisheries might be able to supply other information and the Chair recognized the hon. the Minister of Fisheries,

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): a precedent which the Chair ruled had taken place several other times in this Legislature. There was then an allegation made that the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) had made some comments casting aspersions upon the Speaker or the Chair, and sufficient argument, I think, has been heard. I shall reserve any judgement on that point. I would certainly like to listen to the tapes and hear what Hansard has to say about any remarks that have been made by any hon. member. Certainly, however, I would like to say that whether or not a member has been recognized his comments certainly can violate the rules of this House, I would caution all hon. members that they should reflect upon interruptions and comments that might be made in the heat of debate.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MORGAN: Further to the information required by the gentleman who asked the question in a very sincere way, because the Labrador Coast is indeed a very important part of our Province -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - and there is very important fishing in that part of the Province -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port on a point of order.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne, page 131, says what there is to be said about answers to questions. There is a lot to be said about questions but very little about answers, which leads me to believe that, whoever wrote this book, it was done by a governing party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, it simply says, Section 358
(2) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, can I have some quiet here?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: It says, "Answers to questions should be brief as possible, should deal with the matter raised, and should not provoke debate". The rest is silent. Now, Mr. Speaker, precedent may dictate in this House, but I have been here since 1975 and I have not seen - except when leave has been given from the House - I have not seen that precedent take place, and that is why I rise on this point of order. I would like Mr. Speaker to take that under advisement because, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a taking away

MR. HODDER: of the powers of the Opposition in Question Period, which is happening everyday anyhow.

MR. MARSHALL: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To the point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is questioning your ruling again now. I suggest he get a crash course on Beauchesne. We have a new one now - Jimchesne we will call it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: But look! It says: 'In putting a question a member must confine himself to the narrowest limits.' It goes on to say it may not 'deal with an action of a Minister for which he is not responsible to Parliament'. Now the question was asked, so the hon. gentleman obviously wished to have the answer because it was germane and pertinent to his district, of the hon. the Premier, who is the Chief Minister in the government, and he responds and he says perhaps some more details may be known - by whom? - by the minister who is responsible to Parliament. So, you know, it is a crack of nonsense - I am constrained from saying what I really think it is. All the hon. Premier did was give it to the minister responsible. So there is no possibility in this House of every minister

MR. MARSHALL: in this House of every minister getting up and answering a question along this nature. Now what the hon. gentleman is doing here, first of all, is challenging Your Honour's ruling. When Your Honour says he is going to take it under advisement, then the gentleman gets up in this House and says that is not satisfactory that Your Honour take it under advisement. That is in effect what he is doing. Now I would say if the hon. gentleman cannot abide by the established rules of this House, which are the established rules of British Parliamentary practise, the obvious proceedings would have to be taken against him.

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

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

MR. HODDER: I do not know what the minister is reading from. He seemed to be making up the rules as he was speaking there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: You do not own the House, you know.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: Replies to Questions, 363. (1).
"A Minister may decline to answer a question without stating the reason for this refusal," -that is one thing a minister may do and very often ministers on that side should take that course- "and insistence on an answer is out of order," - we all realize that, Mr. Speaker - "with no debate being allowed." There is nothing, the rules are silent I say, Mr. Speaker, and I hope this is not a reflection on the Chair - I hope it is not because I do not intend it to be - but I have been here for some ten years and I have not seen this as being a precedent, so I had to raise it as a point of order because I feel that this would become a precedent after this particular time, which would mean that then ministers could take advantage

MR. HODDER: of it. And I find this, Mr. Speaker, to be totally objectionable. I would not put anything beyond those ministers over there if they decided they wanted to play a few games on a day when we had some questions that they might not want to hear. So, Mr. Speaker, we do have rights and privileges in this House, which were given us through the Crown and by parliamentary law, which, through the centuries, has been added to and subtracted from, but for the time being we are working by our own Standing Orders and we work by Beauchesne and any precedents that have been set before. Now I know of no precedents in this House in the last ten years, and I sit here all the time - I am not gone and back, I am here and I try to do the best job I can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: But I am here to try to make sure that, when we have a Question Period, we have a fair chance at asking questions, which is not what we have been getting lately.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: This has really gone down to a new low. I mean, here is the member opposite trying to again challenge a ruling by the Chair. The ruling by the Chair has been made. It has tried to be challenged while the hon. member was sitting down. It makes no difference if he is sitting down or standing up; there are still certain privileges in this House and certain rules that have to be abided by whether you are standing up or sitting down. But, okay, it has been ruled upon. Now the hon member is getting up under another point of order and, through the back door, challenging the Speaker's ruling. Now talk about rules of the House! I mean, we are setting new precedents 'alright! We are setting new precedents that, once the Chair rules on a given issue it is supposed to be finished and done with and we get on with our work, and not that a member get up again, in the guise of another point of order, and try to challenge the Speaker's ruling. That is the new precedent that is being set here. We are having the rules of the House being flaunted by the hon. member because he does not understand the rules.

MR. HODDER: Yes, he does understand the rules.
Take the book home tonight and read it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
I recognize the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, regretfully again I find myself in the position where I have to comment on some of the remarks that have been made by the Premier, who obviously does not understand the

MR. NEARY: rules, the ordinary simple rules of this House, Mr. Speaker. My hon. colleague was not challenging Your Honour's ruling through the back door. My colleague was raising a different point of order on a different section of Beauchesne where an hon. gentleman has to be brief, any hon. minister has to be brief in his answer, Mr. Speaker, and not provoke debate. That was the point that my colleague argued, so they have gone off on a completely different direction, Mr. Speaker. And again they are trying to bully and badger the Chair, as they have been trying to do last session and this session. The fact of the matter is that my colleague who asked the question does not want the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to answer the question. He wants the Premier to answer it.

MR. SIMMS: He went to him because you just told him.

MR. NEARY: No, I did not tell him,
Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: You told the Minister for
Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not so.
The former Speaker of the House should be well aware that
that kind of statement that he just made, I cannot say it
is unparliamentary, but it is the type of statement that
lowers the decorum of this House and the hon. gentleman
should have better sense.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to see
a repeat from the other side as to what happened yesterday.
Mr. Speaker, I like a stormy session, I like hard debate
and I like banter back and forth, but what we saw yesterday,
the shouting and the bawling and the roaring from the
doorways and the corridors, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: And the lies.

MR. NEARY: I hope that does not start again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope,
and I know that Your Honour is going to be fair about this
and take it under advisement, as Your Honour said he would.
Because, Mr. Speaker, we do not want to get the impression
on this side that hon. gentlemen over there opposite are
up trying to bully and badger the Chair. We hope that
will never happen, Mr. Speaker, because that could really
put the House in turmoil and I hope Your Honour does not
allow that to happen. But that is what they are attempting
to do. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. colleague was
right in raising his point of order and I hope that
Your Honour will rule that there was a valid point of order,

MR. NEARY: that questions should be brief, supplementary questions should be brief and answers from the Premier and ministers should be brief.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I cannot allow the time to pass now. The hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) can get up and say what his point of order was but he ranged all over the place and went back to the previous decision that was made. Now, if the hon. the member for Port au Port is saying that his point of order is that the minister has to be brief in his answers, was that the point of order?

MR. CALLAN: (Inaudible) first of all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, now, Mr. Speaker, we have the member for Port au Port saying that his point of order was not about the minister's answer being brief, and we have the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) saying that the member for Port au Port's point of order is about the minister's answer being brief.

MR. SIMMS: That is right.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The member for Port au Port just shook his head 'no'. He said his point of order had nothing to do with the minister's answer being brief and the Leader of the Opposition just got up in his place and said the point of order was about the minister's answer being brief. Now, neither one of them over there knows what the point of order is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The Chair has heard some debate, argument, points of order raised and, as I mentioned earlier, will take the whole matter under advisement and reserve any judgement about asking any members to withdraw any statements made if they indeed turn out to be unparliamentary.

The time for Question Period has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Subsection 2 of Section 28 of The Financial Administration Act I wish to table the Lieutenant-Governor's warrants. I think there are twelve or thirteen in all.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present the following petition, signed by forty-three residents of the town of Makkovik. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is as follows: "We, who have signed below, would like to have Dr. Millicent Loder appointed as Chairman of the Grenfell Regional Health Services Board of Governors. Dr. Loder has been a member of this Board since its foundation. She has worked as a nurse with the International Grenfell Association at St. Anthony, Mary's Harbour, Charlottetown, Black Tickle, North West River, Rigolet, and Nain, between the years of 1940 and 1980. Having lived most of her life in the Northern Newfoundland and Labrador, she has a good knowledge and understanding of the health services and the general problems of the area."

Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition I wish to say that I have known Dr. Millicent Loder since 1965, when I first went into Labrador. In fact, I knew her late husband, Sid Loder, who was a very hard working gentleman with the Department of Social Services years ago. And Mrs. Loder has spent many hard working years associated with the

MR. WARREN: International Grenfell Association
in Northern Labrador and Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker,
not casting any reflection at all on the present Chairman of the
Board, I wish to state that the present Chairman of the Board has
been there for a period of time, at the Minister of Health's
(Mr. House) discretion. However, I hope that the Minister
of Health would seriously consider, if and when he decides that
the present Chairman is no longer needed to be Chairman of that
Board, he would seriously consider Dr. Loder's qualifications
and her knowledge and her interest and her concern for Labrador.
Mr. Speaker, if and when the minister decides
that this position could become vacant, I would strongly
recommend on behalf of the people in Makkovik, who signed this
petition, that he would give every consideration to the appointment
of Dr. Loder to the worthwhile position of Chairman of the
Board of the International Grenfell Services.

PREMIER PECKFORD: How many names do you have on the list?

MR. WARREN: I said forty-three, I will just
check them again. It is from Makkovik.

PREMIER PECKFORD: There are 180 voters
in Makkovik.

MR. WARREN: I have 43 names here.
Are you questioning the petition?

PREMIER PECKFORD: No. No. I am just saying
that I did not know how many names were on it.

MR. WARREN: You will see the petition
when it goes through.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, but there are 180 voters
in Makkovik and there are only 43 on that and I figured
that it seemed like an awfully small number of names.

MR. WARREN: Are you upset? If you are
upset, tough luck.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I support
Dr. Loder, I support the people of Makkovik and I am sure
the Premier does too. He has a chance now to get up and
respond. Why does he not get up and respond and let the
people of Labrador know what he stands for. I support
this petition, Mr. Speaker, and ask that it be placed on
the table.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
This being Private Members' Day, Standing Order 53(4) says
that ordinary routine business must end by four o'clock and
private members' resolutions must start at four o'clock.
I suppose if we have leave of the House we could carry on and
finish up this particular petition if members want to speak
to it.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, go on with private members'
day.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

We do not have leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Before we get into private members' resolutions, I reserved a ruling yesterday on a couple of points of privilege that were raised. I would like to refer to the first one that was raised by the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) when he said that the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) threatened the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). I have looked at the transcript from Hansard and I have read very carefully section 71 in Beauchesne, page 23, and the first sentence of that section reads, "Direct threats which attempt to influence Members' actions in the House are undoubtedly breaches of privilege." Having looked at the transcript, I certainly do not see comments made by the hon. Minister of Fisheries which would influence the actions of the hon. member for Mount Scio. There was nothing there that indicated physical violence or threats on his life or anything of that nature.

Also, I would like to say that matters of privilege should really be raised and when they are raised they should be accompanied by a motion to bring forward some action. There was certainly not any motion made on raising this point of privilege, so there was not a prima facie case established.

Secondly, the hon. member for Mount Scio, near the end of yesterday's sitting, raised a point of privilege pertaining to the hon. Minister of Fisheries about a certain meeting which allegedly did or did not take place. And again I refer to Beauchesne, page 12, Section 19, which says, "A dispute arising between two Members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege."

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Having read the transcript, the quotation here by the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) where he says, "Now suddenly that came out of a meeting that took place down 'in a Newfoundland Hotel.'" Later on the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), rising on his point of privilege, said, "First of all I did not have a meeting with Mr. Harris 'in the Newfoundland Hotel.'" So there is obviously a difference of opinion as to where and when and if a meeting took place and certainly a question of a difference of opinion between two hon. members. Again there was no motion made to point out any action to be taken, and certainly no prima facie case has been established.

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members' Day we shall proceed with Motion 1 to be moved by the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to start off this debate on this private member's resolution by noting first of all to the House that it has become a tradition thing, perhaps, for the Party on this side to put our first resolution down on the fisheries of the Province.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear.

MR. TULK: I think it shows, Mr. Speaker, the kind of feeling that we have about the fishery and the kind of importance that we put on fisheries' matters in this Province. It shows, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador believes, unlike some people on the other side, believes that the fishery is the most important industry that we have. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is the very basis of Newfoundland society, that it is the reason we came here, and it is the reason we are going to stay here. It is more important, Mr. Speaker, than the offshore, it is more important than any other component of our economy, because without the fishery Newfoundland is nothing. Mr. Speaker, I do not mean in this debate, in the few minutes that I have, to put down the other sectors of the economy, obviously not. They are very important. Forestry is important in this Province, mining is important, so are the service industries in the Province as well. I think it needs to be said and I think we should say it, that the fishery reaches across every segment and reaches into practically every home and into every person's house in this Province, it reaches across every segment of our society.

Mr. Speaker, there is nobody, absolutely nobody in this House who will disagree with that statement. There is nobody in this House, I know, who will

MR. HODDER: disagree with that statement.

At least the people on the other side pay lip service to that kind of statement and that kind of feeling, that the fishery is the most important industry in Newfoundland. They pay lip service to it.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the actions, and I am afraid I am a believer that your actions speak louder than your words, if you look at the actions of the government of this Province, if you look at the actions of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), look at the actions of the Premier and look at the actions of the government as a whole, then you will see, it is very easy to see, that really what the other side of this House is doing is paying lip service to the fishery. That is exactly what they are doing. For example, Mr. Speaker, and I suppose it is a good indicator of just what the priority of the government is on fisheries, look at how much they put in their budget, how much of their total budget is allocated to the fishery. Last year, if you combine current and capital account in this Province, the total budget for Newfoundland was \$1.863 billion. Mr. Speaker, that is a fair chunk of cash, and you would have expected that the biggest priority in that budget would have been in fisheries. But, Mr. Speaker, what did we see? The total amount spent in this Province last year on fisheries - now remember the budget is \$1.863 billion - what did we see in the fisheries budget? - \$17,396,000, Less than 1 per cent of the provincial budget was spent on fisheries by the provincial government. Yet, the Premier stands in his place day after day and proclaims the

MR. TULK:

of the fishery, how important it is. While on the one hand he is talking about oil, still he is trying to paint a picture that the fishery is very important to him. He talks about the importance of the Northern Cod. We had a prime example, Mr. Speaker, of exactly what the Premier tries to do with motherhood issues again today when he attacked the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). He tried to attack the member for Mount Scio on the basis that this side of the House did not support the concept that Northern Cod belongs to our inshore fishermen and indeed belongs generally to the fishermen of Newfoundland. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a red herring. This side has supported for years the idea that the Northern Cod stock belongs to Newfoundland regardless of the type of government that is in Ottawa or the type of government that is in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, the Premier is now off on another kick. He gave us an indication today that he is going to try to get concurrent jurisdiction through constitutional change. Now, those are high sounding words. Those are high sounding words, yet the same Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), when they signed the restructuring agreement last year, gave away much of the jurisdiction that they had themselves in this Province. You cannot deny that, nobody can deny that. Is it any wonder that the member for Mount Scio would stand in this House yesterday, being the knowledgeable man that he is, and call the minister, not Jim Morgan, the minister, incompetent, weak? Is it any wonder? Absolutely none. It is time for this government and this Minister of Fisheries to put their money where their

MR. TULK: mouths are, Mr. Speaker. They have not done it. It is time for them to develop some policy for the fisheries in this Province and, Mr. Speaker, they have not done it. They have fudged every issue that there has been. They tried to find motherhood issues so that they could gain a few votes off some people by looking good, and ended up, Mr. Speaker, with the worst crisis in the Newfoundland fishery that we have seen, I would say, since the 1930s, in Newfoundland. We are faced with a situation this Summer of absolute chaos in the fishery unless somebody steps in and does something to stop what is happening. We are faced, perhaps, with fish plants closing in the Province, we are faced with perhaps hundreds of people off work, and our fishermen in particular are faced with the prospects of bankruptcy, absolute and total bankruptcy. There are two gentlemen today in the gallery from Musgrave Harbour and I would say that they can say to you - they have lived there all their lives, and they could say, Mr. Speaker, and inform this House and inform the rest of us that last Fall in that community as well as other communities along our East Coast, they saw more for sale signs, those black and red for sale signs in the windows of fishing boats than they have ever seen in their lives before. Now, Mr. Speaker, that says something to us. It says that this industry is in trouble and it tells us that somebody, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), whoever he is, whatever body he happens to occupy is responsible for the mess that is here. Now, Mr. Speaker, we believe on this side of the House, and we have no hesitation in saying that, that the people of this Province - you can call it socialist or you can call it what you wish, I call

MR. TULK: If members on the other side do not understand that, it means quite simply the amount of purchasing power, the ability of a fisherman to buy goods, the ability of a fisherman to have a decent standard of living has gone down. They will dispute that on the other side, but let me point out a few facts to them, let me give them a few facts, let me give them a few indications of what has gone on, and I would like for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to take this down if he can dispute it, but he cannot. In 1978 one grade of codfish in this Province was purchased at 16.75 cents per pound plus a two cent subsidy by the federal government and .5 cent subsidy by the Province for a total of 19.25 cents per pound. Now, I can take him on down through the figures and tell him that in 1979 it was 18.5 cents because the federal subsidy had been dropped and the .5 cent per pound subsidy by the Province had been dropped. I can also tell him that in 1980 it was down to 19 cents, in 1981 it was 20 cents, in 1982 and 1983 it was unchanged. So, Mr. Speaker, if you take off the federal subsidy and the provincial subsidy, what you see happening to the fishermen of this Province is that from 1978 to 1979, on cod alone, they had a loss of 2.5 cents per pound. Now, Mr. Speaker, they had a loss of 2.5 cents per pound in subsidy and, if you total it all up, what it really means is that the price of fish in Newfoundland, the price of cod in Newfoundland has risen from 19.25 cents, in 1978, to 20 cents today, for an increase of .75 cents per pound. Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the minister will say they had an increase but the truth is, as I said before, that the real income has gone down. The amount of money available after expenses, and the amount of money to maintain ones gear is less. For example, Mr. Speaker, let us take the example of the increase in the cost that fishermen have had

MR. TULK: to suffer. The cost of nets and gear has tripled in the last five years. A fellow the other day, Earl Small - where is he from, Steve? -

MR. NEARY: White Bay.

MR. TULK: - from down in White Bay somewhere, gave me an example of where his insurance, in 1982, jumped from \$6,800 up to something like \$9,900, an increase of 50 per cent. The cost of living has tripled, the cost of fuel since 1978 has gone from 85 cents per gallon to \$1.85 per gallon, the price of licences have risen. The minister, I suppose, will say, yes, that is federal. He may find that little out, it is federal. But, Mr. Speaker, the truth is that while costs have increased the price of fish has stayed virtually the same. To add insult to injury, those people are asked to produce a quality product, to do certain things, to ice fish, to cut throats at sea and so on, to ice it down and to have it graded and to increase quality. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is nobody in this House, there is nobody in Newfoundland who will say that we should not have a quality product, absolutely nobody. The truth is that those people are being asked to do it, to cut down on the amount of time that they have available for fishing, to raise the number of times that they have to haul gear, to raise their expenses without any compensation for doing so. Mr. Speaker, there has to be compensation for those fishermen. Mr. Speaker, given that situation, given the incompetence, as pointed out yesterday by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), is there any wonder, is there anybody in this House that would wonder - the member from Twillingate (Mrs. Reid) I am sure will not wonder - why Unity '84 is taking place? She will not wonder about that, she is too good a member to wonder about that. She knows exactly why that is happening. She knows that our fishermen today are fishing for less than they fished for in 1978 and she would not deny that. They are fishing for less.

March 14, 1984

Tape No. 97

MJ - 3

MR. TULK: Is there any wonder that we see that Fishermen's Union then, out of desperation - I suggest to you that Unity '84 was born out of desperation - is it any wonder that we

MR. TULK: see that union through that political movement that they have put together called Unity '84, holding public meetings, attacking the government, and threatening to take over politics themselves because they say that the people in this House are not doing the job that they should? Mr. Speaker, I have to confess to you that I am surprised that we do not see fishermen in the streets in Newfoundland, I am surprised that we do not.

DR. COLLINS: They have too much sense.

MR. TULK: Pardon?

DR. COLLINS: They have too much sense.

MR. TULK: They have too much sense? No, they are a too civilized a people to do that. But if you saw the frustration that we saw in that meeting we had with the Executive Board of the Union the other day — something that your government will not do, by the way, sit down with the Executive Board of that Union—if you saw the frustration that those people are going through, then you would yourself wonder how civilized are they that they are not in the streets already.

MR. NEARY: They are an awfully quiet people.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I suppose the government can say, 'Well, it happened and we were not warned about it.' Well, we have to ask ourselves the question, has the government been warned what was happening in the Newfoundland fishery? Did anyone try to persuade them to take action? Did anyone point out to them some of the things that they should do before this crisis that we are now in happened? Yes, Mr. Speaker, indeed they have. As a matter of fact, it has come from this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, there are times when I believe, over the last two years, the caucus on this side of the House are prophets, I believe we are prophets because we have told the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), we told Dr. Kirby, we have told the friend and colleague of the Minister of Fisheries over there, the man who bails

MR. TULK: him out , Mr. De Bane we have told him on numerous occasions what is happening in the Newfoundland fishery.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the last time that we told the government of this Province where the real issues were in the Newfoundland fishery and the problem with fishermen's income in this Province was in the debate on the restructuring agreement last Fall. Just to refresh the minister's memory over there, just to try to get him so that he is thinking, so that he knows what to do , I want to say this to him , I want to repeat what I said then, and I will quote from Hansard. 'We have been bringing this issue to the House for years ,on this side of the House. We have pointed out that costs have increased and prices have decreased substantially. Fishermen's incomes in this Province are practically the same today in real terms, or perhaps even lower, than they were in 1977. And yet the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in this Province has refused to act.'

MR. HISCOCK: You have five minutes left.

MR. TULK: Five minutes. The time is gone already. The Minister of Fisheries 'has refused to act. Instead, the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries, in the restructuring agreement, shoved in something called a social compact. They were going to establish a social compact, 'The Premier is fond of glorious sounding words. He is fond of them. And of course the Minister of Fisheries, not knowing any better, goes along with it anyway.

Now that is great stuff. It sounds good. Mr. Speaker, where is the substance? Where is the substance of the social compact? Where have we seen any negotiations going on with the Fishermen's Union? I will ask the minister a question, the question that I asked the executive , the other day, of the

MR. TULK: Fishermen's Union, and I could not believe the answer, and I expect the minister to supply an answer when he gets up: Has there been any meeting of publicly elected officials with the Fishermen's Union in this Province on that so-called social compact? Which is really the same wage restraint programme, in the Premier's mind, that he announced the other night. The same thing. Basically what he is telling the fishermen, like he told them down to Rotary the other day is that, 'You are not going to get any more. You have to make sacrifices'. I believe it was yesterday the Premier in this House (made this statement - I made a note of it - made this statement:

MR. TULK:

The fishermen of this Province, he said, have to share the burden of the restructuring and of the crises that we now have in the fishery. Well, Mr. Speaker, how can you share any more of the burden if you are bankrupt? And there are hundreds of fishermen around this Province today who, if they were in any other business, would have had to declare bankruptcy for long ago. So how can you share any more of the burden? I would like for the minister to tell me how he expects the fishermen of this Province to share any more of the burden than they are now sharing when they are unable to pay their loans, when in desperation this Fall there was what was billed as a 'boat owners conference' in this Province; and we had fishermen who have since said to me, said to me in an executive board meeting, again the other evening - 'You know, it was the worst thing that ever I did in my life,' this fellow said to me. 'I had to go in and stand up in front of television cameras, in front of the media of this Province, and announce that I was broke.' For a proud man of Newfoundland that is not an easy thing to do and yet, that same person today, that same fisherman, is being asked by this minister and this government to share the burden, to share the burden of putting the fishing industry back on its feet.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about one other point either, that the fishermen of this Province are not saying that the independents or the super company in this Province can afford to pay any more. They are not saying that. They know the kinds of conditions that are existing.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave. The hon. member may continue.

MR. NEARY: You have half an hour.

MR. SPEAKER: No, twenty minutes. Twenty minutes to open and twenty minutes to close.

MR. TULK: As I said to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and as I say to this government, is there any wonder why we have Unity '84? Can you expect our fishermen to bear any more of the burden? I do not know where the Premier of this Province got the gall to walk into this House yesterday evening and say, 'Well, we have spent \$100 million in the fishing industry,' And, Mr. Speaker, we know that half of that was converting debt into equity, we know all that nonsense, and then to go on and say that the fishermen of this Province have to bear part of the burden. The burden for what?

MR. NEARY: For their blundering.

MR. TULK: For their blundering, yes. I am going to say this - I have said it before in this House and I will say it again - for the blundering of both the federal government of 1977 and the provincial government of 1977 and since. Because what we did in this Province in 1977 is barely short of criminal, when we said to our fishermen, to our people - we drew this line on the map. We had an agreement, which was a good agreement. It was a good agreement. And if we had waited for the stocks to build, then perhaps we could have increased the effort in the fishing industry. Hopefully, we can. But what we said to our fishermen and to our people was simply this: 'Get in a boat' - the Premier has been at it for years - 'Get in a boat.'

MR. NEARY:

Walter Carter said it too.

MR. TULK:

Walter Carter: 'Get in a boat,'

Romeo LeBlanc: 'Get in a boat' - 'You are all going to be rich in the fishing industry.' Well, now we see the riches. We went out there to catch fish but, as Romeo LeBlanc later said, it just was not there. And, on top of that, of course, we gave away species that we should never have given away and the minister is now, in his new love relationship with the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane), starting to agree to trade fish for fish, and he cannot deny it. It was only yesterday. It was shameful, but yesterday morning, after this House had gone on record as saying quite clearly that we unani- mously agree that we should not be trading fish for fish, it was disgraceful yesterday morning to see the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) agreeing with the federal minister that indeed he had struck a good deal in Japan, even though he gave away some fish.

MR. HODDER:

And to think that he has spend half of his life against that.

MR. TULK:

Well, sure he has. This whole House has been against it because it is not good for Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me come back to the social compact.

MR. HODDER:

That is their policy, as flexible as an hour is long.

MR. TULK:

As flexible as the hour that is there, that is their policy.

Let me ask the Minister of Fisheries: Last Fall, in September, there was this great press conference upstairs in which it was announced that there was going to be a social compact with the

March 14, 1984

Tape 99

EC - 4

MR. TULK: union that represents our
provincial fishermen. I want to ask him, and I want
him to answer the

MR. TULK:

question: Has he met with that union to discuss that social compact or was that just another dash of rhetoric that blew out of the Premier's mouth? And I will give him an answer, Mr. Speaker: The answer is that there has been one meeting with Cabot Martin and one meeting with a federal official.

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

MR. TULK:

There has been no publicly elected official in this Province who has met to discuss that idea of a social compact with the Fishermen's Union. Now the minister is probably going to stand up as well and say, 'Well, we cannot do anything about the collective bargaining process in Newfoundland'. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell the minister, in relation to that social compact, the Premier has been requested to hold a meeting; the letters are here where he has been requested to hold them. On collective bargaining, that is what our fishermen are now asking for. They want to go through a process of collective bargaining, I think that would sum up what was said in that meeting the other evening. They want to go through a process of collective bargaining.

MR. NEARY:

Last Friday we had a meeting.

MR. TULK:

Last Friday afternoon we spent three hours. That is more than the provincial government spent with the Fishermen's Union -

MR. NEARY:

In ten years.

MR. TULK:

- no, I will not be as bad as that I will say five, I have been here five, I know five - on wage problems. Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this Province is famous: The Premier of this Province is famous for talking about reasonable proposals. He stands up over there, 'Our's is a reasonable proposal.' Now I have to ask a question. As

MR. TULK: a member of this House and as a citizen of Newfoundland I have to ask a question: Is what the Fishermen's Union and the fishermen of this Province asking for today unreasonable? Do they say they do not want a restructured company in this Province? Do they say that they do not want the Newfoundland fishery to be commercially viable, as Mr. Kirby says? Do they say that? Do they say they want something for nothing? Absolutely not! As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Fishermen's Union in this Province today are operating quite the opposite. They have to be the best union, the best set of people that ever sat down to a table to do collective bargaining.

MR. NEARY: The most civilized.

MR. TULK: They must be because, they not only are coming to the fish companies and to government and saying, 'Look, we want an increase in the price of fish', not only are they doing that - and that is the normal way that unions operate, they come and they say they want more. But this union is not normal, no, because what do they do? They say, 'Yes, we need more,' but then they say to the government of the Province, 'Here is the way we think you can do it, here is the way we think that you can solve the problem and increase the amount of money coming into the independent processors, increase the amount of money coming into the super company and increase the amount of money coming to fish plant workers and increase the amount of money coming into the fishermen, the first producers'. They are a unique group. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) would do well to stay out of this House, in the way he has been acting the last couple of days, he would do well to spend his time trying to get some sort of meetings with them and get some of the problems that our fishermen have straightened out. He would do well to do that.

MR. MORGAN: We gave you leave for half an hour.

MR. TULK: with the submission that we made to the Kirby Task Force? Not an iota of difference in principle. The same things that we said to Mr. Kirby, and the same things that we said when we said Mr. Kirby should be put on the shelf, and the same thing that we said - except the debate for social reasons on the South Coast in this House last Fall - we are now saying to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and indeed that is what the union is saying to them. All they are saying is, "Consolidate your marketing. Give in the same fashion that the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, recognize that you are dealing with a commodity and give that organization that you put together a line of credit such that they can hold fish and sell when market prices increase. In that way we believe you can up our income and stabilize our income."

But no action, no movement. I am going to sum up by saying this, because I get another kick at the cat from twenty minutes to six on next Wednesday, all we get in this province is a Minister of Fisheries, who one day will row with the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) if it suits his political purpose, the next day they are dancing all over Asia and Europe and then the next day -

MR. NEARY: Up Your Minister Week.

MR. TULK: It is Up Your Minister Week, and the next -

MR. MORGAN: "I'll go waltzing 'round Asia with you."

MR. TULK: There you go. There you go. Mr. Speaker, I am going to close on that note, because that just represents what the Minister of Fisheries will put in the fisheries in this Province.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am going to be in a very different mood from yesterday, because the mood I was in yesterday, in dealing with the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), I will carry on tomorrow when I speak in that debate. So today I am going to speak in a completely different mood, because the hon. gentleman who just sat down, I am going to respond to him in the same manner in which he made his speech, a very sincere manner. He is speaking on behalf of the fishermen, the fishing industry and the problems in the industry, and he made some good comments, and, therefore, in that light I am going to respond accordingly. I think that when debate takes place in the House and the members of the Opposition speak in a certain tone, they can expect to be responded to in a tone accordingly. And I will deal with the member for Mount Scio tomorrow in my further addition to the debate I commenced yesterday. So I will not comment today on the member for Mount Scio's comments on the fisheries, that will wait until tomorrow.

Now the hon. gentleman who just sat down is leaving the impression that we as a government here suddenly changed our policies on the fishing industry. Yet no longer than two days ago they were saying we had no policies in the fishing industry. Now the fact is we have had a policy on the fishing industry firmly established, Mr. Speaker, made public, sent around the Province, sent across the country, in fact, to other provinces, fishing provinces; it was established in June of '82 and I have been minister now since 1980, I guess it was '79 - '80 - developed in conjunction with the senior officials of a number

MR. MORGAN: of government departments, and the Cabinet and Planning and Priorities and the caucus and all concerned. That is a policy which clearly outlines what we see for the future of the fishing industry. And do not let it ever be said again by anybody in the Opposition, or the Fishermen's Union or anybody else, that the Peckford Administration has no policies on the fishing industry. We have firmly developed our policies. They are all in this document for anybody to read. Now if the Opposition members do not want to take the time to read the document and understand what we are saying and why we are saying it, that is entirely up to them. But the fact is we do have a firmly established policy and we are quite proud of our policy.

Now to suddenly say, first of all, that we changed our policy on the Northern cod, that is absolute rubbish. Our position on the constitution referred to today by the Premier is the same now as it was then. We could not get constitutional change during the debate on the constitution for the fishing industry. We could not get concurrent jurisdiction, we to have a say over one part of the fishery and they the other, but also to work together in a joint way concurrently. We could not get that then, but we did get it. We did get it in the most significant agreement ever signed in this Province on fisheries. In fact, I would say it is the most significant federal/provincial agreement ever signed. Why? Because it involves so many thousands of Newfoundlanders, thousands of fishermen, thousands of plant workers. And how often have I heard that agreement condemned! It seems if we cannot get an agreement, as it is now on the offshore, we are condemned for that. And suddenly, if we get an agreement, a good one, we are condemned for that.

MR. MORGAN:

If it is too good, we get condemned for it by the Opposition. Because, Mr. Speaker, nobody can tell me that that agreement is not good for Newfoundland. Let us listen to some facts about that agreement.

Well, first of all, what are the results of the agreement? Well, Mr. Speaker, today in our Province we have every deep-sea plant open and operating.

MR. MORGAN:

We have today, for example, in our Province, we have right now employed, 4,570 plant workers. Are they working for National Sea in Nova Scotia? No. Working for Nickersons? No. Fishery Products? No. The Lake Group? No. John Penny and Sons? No. They are working for a new deep-sea company as a result of the restructuring agreement. They would not have their jobs today, Mr. Speaker, if it was not for the agreement signed by the two levels of government and the Bank of Nova Scotia, our putting in \$31 million and \$75 million from Ottawa. And the Opposition is condemning us for doing that, for saving 4,570 jobs. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have every plant open with the exception of one, Burgeo, and Burgeo will reopen April 2, in a couple or three weeks time. The other one not open yet is in the district of Fortune - Hermitage, the community of Gaultois, the plant in Gaultois, an isolated community on the South coast. That plant is being upgraded and renovated, modernized if you want to call it that. That plant will reopen in the month of April. And we have a further 820 trawlermen working right now, working. They are not on welfare, they are not sitting at home, they are working as a result of this new agreement that has been put in place.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How many?

MR. MORGAN:

Eight hundred and twenty deep-sea trawlermen.

Now further to that, what else did the restructuring agreement say and what is it doing? It is putting in place a mechanism whereby all the small and medium sized companies around the Province will be able to market their product. Through the new marketing organization of this new deep-sea company the independent small companies can go to the marketing arm and market their product and be given access to international markets, not just the USA,

MR. MORGAN: Europe and other parts of the world. We are going to have a study of the utilization of the resource. We are going to have a Burin Peninsula Development Fund to help reaffirm the economy of that part of the Province. We are going to have a new Northern Fisheries Development Corporation to go into the Labrador Coast and the Great Northern Peninsula and firmly establish in that part of the Province the economy through the fishing industry, which is the main and only industry in the area. That is what the restructuring agreement is doing. Now over and above that what is happening now in Newfoundland? I hear these comments day in and day out that the fishing industry is in total chaos, nothing is going on in the fishing industry, everything is in a chaotic state. Well, I just mentioned these employees, what else is happening today, in the middle of the Winter, in Newfoundland? Well, Mr. Speaker, we have today 1,000 plant workers working in plants that were never open before in the Wintertime. Now why is that? Now, why is it that suddenly in the middle of the Winter in Newfoundland we got 1,000 more jobs than we ever had before in inshore plants that normally would not reopen until the middle of May or the early part of June when the caplin scull comes ashore? We have them working as a result of a federal/provincial agreement on the resource-short plant programme. Now someone says, 'Well, what is the big deal, Mr. Morgan and Mr. De Bane getting so cosy and co-operative? Well, if we are so cosy and co-operative, what are the results of it? Let me mention a few: The resource-short plant programme is one. If I had been fighting with De Bane like I was fighting with LeBlanc, for two years, we would not have the resource-short plant programme in place today. As a result of that co-operation, we have got 1,000 more jobs this Winter. We would not have

MR. MORGAN: the 25 per cent subsidy on the boats for fishermen that has been brought back. LeBlanc cancelled it. Do you think that by fighting with Ottawa on behalf of the fishermen instead of co-operating with them we would have got that 25 per cent subsidy back? We would never have gotten it back. Do you think we would have got the subsidy for the sealers, that is now being paid to every sealer in the Province, if it was not for Mr. De Bane and myself working together? Do you think we would have got the new ice making programme coming into place this Summer? We are going to have new ice making facilities all along the coast of Newfoundland, they are going to spend close to \$6 million this Summer, the federal government. Do you think we would have the upgrading of all the marine service centers? They are going to build new ones along the coast, one starting this Summer in Green Bay, in fact, cost shared.

MR. TULK: Green Bay.

MR. MORGAN: These things would not be done if it was not for the federal government and myself working in co-operation. The ironic part of all this is that my colleague for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is getting condemned left and right by the Opposition because he cannot get along with his colleague or counterpart in Ottawa. He gets condemned for that. And now suddenly I am getting along with my colleague in Ottawa - the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa is on the opposite side of the fence from me politically - we are getting along, we are getting things done and we get condemned for that. So the Opposition just do not know where they are going and what they stand for. It is as simple as that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I will speak to the resolution because it was presented, as I say, with sincerity. I sat and listened to the hon. gentleman. I had the courtesy to sit here, although I had other meetings pending downstairs. I sat and listened to his speech. I did not have to, I did him that courtesy. Now, unfortunately, you see the way he treats things in the House, he gets up and makes a bit of a half decent speech, I sit and listen, the government ministers sit and listen, but when the time comes for him to hear what we are talking about in policies, and when we try to explain our policies to him, Mr. Speaker, he is gone from the House. That is the reason why they keep saying we have no policies. They do not want to hear our policies.

MR. NEARY: He is on urgent public business.

MR. MORGAN: Urgent business, Mr. Speaker?
The hon. gentleman has no more urgent business than I have, I am sure of that, with the problems we have today in the

MR. MORGAN: Province's most important industry, and they are being worked on on a daily basis , almost on hourly basis, night and day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I find it, I guess, coincidental, not any more than a coincidence, that what Mr. Cashin is doing in his Unity '84 campaign is asking the government to interfere in labour relations as it pertains to the fishing industry. Nobody can deny, no member of this House, on either side of the House can deny that there is a problem with certain sectors of the fishery as it pertains to the fishermen. Now, not all fishermen are bankrupt. There are many fishermen who made much more than any minister of the Crown last year, or any member of the House last year, many fishermen, but there are others who are below the poverty line. So there is a problem and that problem has to be addressed.

But there is no point in suddenly saying that the new deep-sea restructured company is going to solve the problems of the inshore fishermen, and nobody has ever said, the Premier included, that the new deep-sea company is only going to work on the backs - the term used - of the inshore fishermen. How ridiculous, the Premier coming from a fishing area of the Province, a rural area, myself growing up the son of a fisherman, to get on with the nonsense that we are going to have this new company work on the backs of the fishermen.

But the fact is , Mr. Speaker, that less than 50 per cent of the fishermen in our Province will be selling their fish to this new deep-sea company. Why? As I mentioned, it is a deep-sea company: it operates from deep-sea trawlers going off shore harvesting thousands of metric tons of fish for processing in these plants. It only buys from a very small portion of the inshore fishermen. The Northeast Coast, is a good example, where there are inshore fishermen operating longliners.

MR. MORGAN: So to suddenly say, as the resolution is saying, that we have to interfere in the labour relations, does this mean, Mr. Speaker, that this government here through my colleague, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), is going to have to go out and tell E.P. Janes and Sons how much to pay for fish, and tell Ocean Harvesters, in Harbour Grace, how much to pay for fish, and tell Mr. Boyd Way over in Beothuck Fisheries - some friends of mine are here, I think, in the galleries from Musgrave Harbour, out on the Northeast Coast, in the hon. member's district who just spoke - and tell him, Mr. Boyd Way in Wesleyville, how much to pay the people of Musgrave Harbour for fish? Nobody, surely, in their own logic and reasoning is saying to government you must go out and tell the companies how much they are going to pay the fishermen for their fish this year. Now, we are not going to

MR.MORGAN:

do that and more than half the total fishermen in our Province sell to these independent, private sector companies. Some of them got assistance from us. People are always saying what are we doing for the fishing industry. Well, everybody knows all the money we have put into those independent processing companies over the past two years, over \$30 million in government guaranteed loans. But we did more than that as well and I will elaborate further on that later on. But I want to say now nobody is going to deny on this side of the House - at least I am sure if he is in a clear mind he is not going to do it, he or she - that fishermen do deserve more return for their effort. But it is not for us to use the taxpayers' dollars. We just took \$31 million from the taxpayers of Newfoundland, Mr. De Bane took \$75 million from the taxpayers across Canada and put it into the fishing industry in Newfoundland. Now suddenly we are going to dictate the price of fish? No, Mr. Speaker, There is a proper collective bargaining process in place and that collective bargaining process must be carried through. The union on behalf of the fishermen and the fish plant workers must sit down with these individual private sector companies, number one, and work out a price and a wage agreement. And they must sit down with the new deep-sea restructured company and work it out with them. Now I get the impression that what people are saying today in the Province of Newfoundland, including the Opposition now, is that because we are a shareholder, a minority shareholder of the large deep-sea company, that because we are a shareholder we are going to have to put more

MR.MORGAN: money up to pay better prices to the fishermen and more increases for the plant workers. But how could we do that? How could we justify putting up more money as shareholders through the deep-sea company, because we are shareholders in that company, and get the new company to pay less than half the fishermen of our Province better prices and better returns and leave the other 60 per cent, who sell to these small independent companies, still on low prices? No, Mr. Speaker, the argument from the Opposition is not making any sense, it is not logical. And what I am saying is the same thing that Mr. DeBane is saying. We are on side on many issues. He is a man of principle and he showed that today quite clearly on an issue brought before the House yesterday, a man of principle.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, he is-

AN HON.MEMBER: He should run for the leadership.

MR.MORGAN: Yes, if he ran for the Liberal leadership I might support him. I just might support Mr. De Bane if he ran for the Liberal leadership, although I am a Conservative. He is a man of principle. But I should not commit myself too far now, Mr. Mulroney would not like that.

MR. NEARY: How about Mr. Marshall?

MR.MORGAN: Or my colleague in St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) would not like that. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am saying I am responding in a positive, sincere way because the questions posed were genuine and sincere. They are saying, 'Why can you not do more than what you are doing? What are we doing? Last year we put in

MR. MORGAN:

\$12.5 million. In companies?

No, not the companies. The restructured company? No. Where did it go? Into the hands of the fishermen. It went into the hands of the fishermen, \$12.5 million. How did it go in the hands of the fishermen? It went through loans through our Loan Board, subsidized by the government of this Province, subsidized to the tune of 3 per cent less than the bank rate. If I go tomorrow morning to get a loan for a car, I do not get subsidized. To get a loan for a car to use back and forth to work I do not get subsidized. If a trucker gets a loan to buy a truck, he does not get subsidized. If a logger gets a loan to buy new logging equipment, he is not going to be subsidized. So, Mr. Speaker, we are subsidizing them, we are doing our utmost as a Province to help the fishermen. Do not let it ever be said anywhere around this Province that this government, and the Premier of this administration in this Province has not done everything possible to help the fishermen of our Province. We have done everything possible, and furthermore we are not going to give up doing more. Why? Because without the fishing industry, with all respect to the urban centres like St. John's and Corner Brook and Grand Falls and Gander and maybe Bishop Falls and Botwood and some of them, but outside of these areas the fishing industry is the mainstay of our economy.

In Labrador West there is not much of a fishery either. Without the fishing industry we are not going to have any kind of stable economy in rural Newfoundland. So that is the reason why we are so committed to doing something for the fishing industry every day of the week. And the

MR.MORGAN: hon.gentlemen can try to leave the impression we are not doing anything, we are not concerned, but we are, Mr. Speaker. We are concerned and we are working hand in hand, cheek to cheek, as John Crosbie would say to the ministers, cheek to cheek on issues. We have disagreed on the Northern cod. We have fought hard, we have fought gentlemanly, on the Northern cod.

MR. MORGAN: I recall fighting and pounding desks in meetings with the federal minister and saying, 'No, you are wrong, you are giving away our Northern cod'. But the Opposition did not take a stand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Oh, the Opposition was weak-kneed, they did not take a stand. We fought giving fish to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and Quebec and others. We fought the fish going overseas to the foreign countries. We fought it, but the Opposition was weak-kneed. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, it came down to the point that we as gentlemen agreed to disagree. It was a policy issue. Their policy is wrong, we said; we say today it is wrong, but we agreed, as gentlemen, to disagree and we said, 'Okay, let us carry on and work on the other issues, let us work together on other issues, let us resolve other problems'. And I am convinced that when the new management of the new company -

MR. TULK: Ha!

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is of the opinion, and he is keeping his fingers crossed, that there is not going to be a new company put in place.

MR. TULK: No, I am not.

MR. MORGAN: He is hoping now that there will be no new Board of Directors, no Chief Executive Officer, and suddenly we will have chaos and we will have all of these plants closed down and have major chaos in the fishing industry. Because there is not now, it is working well.

And I have to applaud, Mr. Speaker, those people who are doing the interim management operations today of that new company. They are doing a comendable job getting all of those plants opened, and now working on getting Twillingate open; they are going to get Charleston open and Bonavista open, they are going to get St. Lawrence open -

MR. MORGAN: - St. Lawrence is going to re-open after being closed for three years - and they are going to get all these inshore plants opened. Mr. Speaker, when that new management team is in place and a new Chief Executive Officer then the red carpet is laid out for Mr. Cashin. I told him so in a meeting no longer than two weeks ago, Mr. De Bane and myself sat down with him and I said, 'Mr. Cashin, you know it'.

MR. NEARY: Give us a date.

MR. MORGAN: It was the same weekend of that mysterious meeting that Mr. Barry was involved in, in fact.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: And I will tell you more tomorrow on that one, I will tell you more tomorrow on that one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I recall saying to Mr. Cashin, 'Mr. Cashin, you know what I would like to see you do from here on in? I would like to see you, Mr. Cashin, sit in on the -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: By leave for half an hour, the same we we gave the gentleman from the Opposition. Fair is fair.

MR. NEARY: We will give you half an hour.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister's time has elapsed.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is being fair on this one.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.
MR. MORGAN: We are not being partisan, we

are being pretty fair in debate. I only get partisan with those guys who are partisan on me. In this case, the debate has been pretty fair.

MR. SIMMS: So far so good.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I said to Mr. Cashin, I said, 'Mr. Cashin, if you want a better deal for the fishermen,

MR. MORGAN: if you want a better deal for those plant workers, and you say you do, better wages and better prices for their fish in dealing with the new big company, well, Mr. Cashin, the carpet is laid out for you. Come on in'.

MR. TULK: When was that meeting?

MR. MORGAN: The meeting of the weekend Mr. De Bane was here. The full executive of Mr. Cashin's union was around the table and they all witnessed what I told them. I said, 'Mr. Cashin, there is nothing I would like to see more than you, you, if necessary, Sir'- I did not call him Sir. We were were 'Rick' and 'Jim.' And I said, 'Rick, nothing I would like to see more'.

MR. TULK: Where did all this happen?

MR. MORGAN: You know, people leave the impression, as I recall two years ago, that Morgan could not get along with anybody, because I was fighting with LeBlanc. Now I am getting along with my good friend in Ottawa, now I am getting along with Rick Cashin and others and they condemn me.

MR. TULK: You cannot get along with everybody.

MR. MORGAN: Not a certain person from Mount Scio, at least.

Mr. Speaker, I said to him, 'The carpet is laid out for you by both governments, not just by Mr. Peckford, but by the Government of Canada.' To do what? To do what? 'We want you, or somebody on your behalf, to be on the Board of Directors of the new company. We have left a vacancy for the sole purpose, through the social compact so much criticized, for you to have a member on the Board of Directors to do what. So, Mr. Cashin, your union can then have a say in the day-to-day management of the company, have a say in the day-to-day operations of the company, have a say in all policy issues, have a say in the running of the company. And, Mr. Cashin, I said, 'then you could have a say on whether or not the fishermen and the plant workers get a fair deal from the

MR. MORGAN: new company.' And what better way to do it, Mr. Speaker, what better way to do it? It was the Premier's idea and it was taken up by Mr. Donald Johnston, who is now a candidate for the great Liberal Party leadership coming up in June. Mr. Johnston, he adopted the policy of, the Premier said, 'What an excellent idea having union involved in management. That is a great concept,'

MR. MORGAN:

he said, 'we fully support that.' And they did.

MR. NEARY: Do you call him God or Mister?

MR. MORGAN: I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have more friends in the Liberal Cabinet today than members of the Opposition, I will tell you that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: - I did not interrupt, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MORGAN: I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman when he spoke, so give me fair chance to finish in the next five minutes or so. Be fair! Let us be fair!

So, Mr. Speaker, the issue is quite clear. We have resolved a major part of the problems of the fishing industry, a major part with all these plants now open and working to the deep-sea side, that is now working. We have a problem over here which we have not resolved to date, and I do not want anybody to ever say that the Peckford administration is not recognizing that problem, because they are. It was identified at two sources, the Inshore Royal Commission, commissioned by this government, by the Premier in particular; it was identified by the Kirby Task Force, but unfortunately, the Kirby Task Force, identifying it, did not address how to resolve it, and that is the problem with a certain category of fishermen in our Province who are not making sufficient returns to make their operations viable. In other words, they have money invested in longliners, they have money invested in fishing gear, they have money invested in an operation and they are trying to make a

MR. MORGAN: dollar. How are they trying to make a dollar? The fisherman has only one licence with which to go fishing on the Northeast Coast. They fish for groundfish and they go out using gillnets. They have no licence for crab, they have no licence for lobster, no licence for salmon, no licence for herring, no seine licence, no draggering licence, all they have is the basic gillnet licence. And with that kind of a licence they are not making a viable return. they are not making money, in fact they are hurting. And do not ever let anybody say that our Loan Board is going around taking boats from fishermen who are making an effort. By their own efforts in trying to make a living, they are failing because of bad conditions and poor catches. We are not doing that. We have not taken one boat, we have not repossessed any boats from any fishermen who are making every effort to keep their enterprise going. And, by the way, Mr. Speaker, talk about all the bankruptcies in the fishing industry - you would not know but everything was gone into chaos again! 'Who do you think is bankrupt? All the fishermen!' In three years, a total of seven bankruptcies! How many fishermen do we have, Mr. Speaker? We have 14,000 full-time and we have 11,000 part-time. Out of all these fishermen, only seven have gone to the point of declaring bankruptcy! Now, are we going around seizing longliners every day of the week and taking all these liners from fishermen? I hear the argument that the fishermen are losing their boats, that Peckford and Morgan are taking their boats, the bank is taking their boats, they cannot go fishing anymore. In a total of three and one-half years, we have repossessed, out of a fleet of over 2,000 longliners, a total of sixty-one vessels. Now, out of the sixty-one

MR. MORGAN: vessels, Mr. Speaker - this is information that I think is important to the Opposition - out of the sixty-one vessels that were repossessed through the legal process, thirty of these vessels were abandoned by the fishermen and the fishermen said, 'We are quitting the fishery, we are giving up. We have a job somewhere. We are going away to the Mainland. Take the vessels, we are going to leave them.' So actually there were only thirty-one that went through the process of the fishermen saying, 'I cannot afford to carry on, I cannot make my payments, I am giving everything up' - in three years, out of over 2,000. So it is not all as bad as what it is made out to be. But in saying that, I am saying at the same time that there is a problem.

MR. MORGAN: There is a problem, Mr. Speaker, and a problem that Mr. De Bane and myself in travelling with Mr. McGrath, the former Minister of Fisheries for the Nation, the three of us travelled together with the Deputy Minister of Fisheries from Ottawa, Dr. Art May, a Newfoundlander as well, we travelled together for seven or eight days in the Far East looking for markets, and then we get criticized because we were doing it, we are travelling looking for markets. If we do not go travelling looking for markets we get criticized, if we go looking for markets we get criticized, so you cannot win either way. But the fact is we know what we are doing is right, because without markets we are not going to have a fishing industry. It is no good in Ocean Harvesters having a plant full of fish or Boyd Way with a plant full of fish in Musgrave Harbour or a Bonavista plant full of fish if we cannot sell it.

MR. CALLAN: Arnold's Cove.

MR. MORGAN: Arnold's Cove is working quite well, in the hon. gentleman's district. One of the best managed plants in the whole Province, the most productive plant in the whole Province. We will have to change that district next time, make it PC, I guess, because it is working so well out there. But, Mr. Speaker, we have to find markets. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we find markets, and if the market return is sufficient, if the market return is good, to get that what are they going to look for? Are they going to look for round codfish, split codfish or what are they going to look for? We are going to have to supply to the marketplace what the marketplace wants. It is no good in us supplying massive supplies of fish, or producing it, if the market does not want that fish. It would all be held in inventory, not sold. We have to go out and find what the market is demanding in the fishing industry, what the market is looking for and then produce that fish for that market. We have to do that. But add to that, Mr.

MR. MORGAN: Speaker, the important point, which is such I cannot overemphasize it when I talk to fishermen down on the local wharves or on the stages or on the boats, and I cannot overemphasize it in talking to plant workers in the plants, it has got to be quality product. It has got to be top quality product because if we do not move in with the quality product when the market is asking for it, Norway will fill the gap, Iceland will fill the gap, and other countries, but these two in particular. So when we find the market and what the market needs, we have to fill that market with top quality product. Then, Mr. Speaker, what will happen? We will have enough return coming back to those independent private companies in Newfoundland, - and my last count was over 100, 112 or 113 independent private companies involved in the fishing industry in Newfoundland besides this big new company now - we will have enough return from the marketplace in prices they get in the market to enable them to pay a better price for the fish to fishermen. So it is a vicious circle; from the market to the processor and back to the processor to the fishermen to give them a better increase in price. If not, how can we as government suddenly walk in and say, 'Here, Mr. Fishermen, we are going to give a subsidy and a price of fish. You got 27 cents last year we are going to give you 3 or 4 cents more per pound'? Well, I do not know how we could justify doing that. When I saw the results of meeting a few days ago down in Maine, in the New England States, and they called a meeting of all the fishermen in the area - what did they call a meeting for? - they did not call a meeting to meet with a politician, although some of them showed up, some of the Senators, I understand, they called to talk about stopping Canadian fish from coming into the market because the Canadian fish was being 'subsidized', in their term.

MR. MORGAN: They are still complaining about this nationalization of the fishing industry of Atlantic Canada and Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! I understand the hon. minister is speaking by leave.

MR. MORGAN: Five minutes more and I will clue up.

MR. SPEAKER: Thirty minutes have elapsed since the hon. minister started. Is there leave to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave!

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). I must say that the whole atmosphere of the House of Assembly is completely different when the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is not in here. Completely different. The hon. gentleman from LaPoile is a good debater in the House, he debates the issues, I like listening to him. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will try to clue up. On the resolution, we cannot agree to the resolution 'that the House direct the government to immediately resolve the unsatisfactory labour relations' because there is a collective bargaining process in place which we are one of the only provinces in Canada to have established on behalf of fishermen. We have given the fishermen the right to carry through collective bargaining process.

MR. NEARY: Who brought that in?

MR. MORGAN: It was brought in by the Progressive Conservative Government.

MR. NEARY: The Liberal Government.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if it was brought in by the Liberal Government it was not working very well. It was not working very well before we came in office.

MR. NEARY: We gave the fishermen collective bargains the same as we gave it to the teachers.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman was in the government at the time, I say to him I commend him because it was the right step.

MR. NEARY: And we gave them the check off.

MR. MORGAN:

So because we have the collective bargaining process in place, because it is there, it would be totally wrong for us to interfere and say to ABC companies you must pay so much for your plant workers or you must pay so much for the price of fish.

So within the next two or three days I would say - the last time I said it it was the next two or three weeks, I am saying now in the next two or three days, when the two governments announced the Board of Directors of the new Newfoundland company, and I am expecting to see within the next two or three days the announcement that -

MR. NEARY: DeBane is coming in on Friday to announce that.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if it is Friday or Saturday or Sunday, who cares? The next two or three days, as long as it is done, Mr. Speaker. People have been saying, 'Oh, now what is happening?' The Newfoundland Government cannot get along with Ottawa; they cannot agree on a Board of Directors. How foolish!

MR. NEARY: I will guarantee you that a Newfoundlander will not be the Chief Executive Officer.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I said some time ago the Premier said the same thing -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, if I only have five minutes at least be fair and give me time to speak in silence.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Premier is not advocating it has to be a Newfoundland Chief Executive Officer, the Premier is not saying they must be all Newfoundlanders on the Board of Directors. We are saying we have no disagreement with the Government of Canada on that system now in place of

MR. MORGAN: finding a Chief Executive Officer and putting in place a Board of Directors.

MR. NEARY: You have agreed to hire a Come From Away -

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is trying to leave the impression -

MR. NEARY: An outsider.

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, to be fair, I told him I would be finished in five minutes.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: He has been fair so long, so let us hear it out to the end. By the way let me clarify something. The hon. gentleman made one charge this afternoon - he is learning from his colleague for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) about making charges that he cannot back up and he will have egg on his face tomorrow - when he said the minister has changed his policy and now he is trading away fish.

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. MORGAN: Ah, ha! But think about where the fish is coming from that is going to Japan. Is it coming from Newfoundland waters? Ah, ha! It is coming from the Nova Scotia waters. All along Nova Scotia has been saying, 'yes, trade the Northern cod to EEC, we want markets.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

MR. MORGAN: Yes, sure.

MR. NEARY: I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman where we will give you leave.

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

MR. NEARY: Could the hon. gentleman tell the House if the Chief Executive Officer of the new super company would be a Newfoundlander or a Come-From-Away? If so, where is the local preference policy?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, whether the new Chief Executive Officer is from Hong Kong or Tokyo or any part of East Asia or any part of Europe or any part of Canada or any part of the U.S. or any part of Newfoundland, as long as he is going to take that company and do the competent job we are going to ask him to do, to properly manage it, to make sure it survives as a company, to make sure that those jobs are going to be kept in Burin and Grand Bank and Gaultois and Fortune and all around the Province, and in Twillingate, in St. Anthony, and in other places, in Bonavista, as long as we know he is going to do the job for us, because we have with us in the same company quite a number of competent and local people who can manage the operations of it. And nobody is going to draw me into tripping up and saying, 'oh no, I am opposed to anybody who is not from Newfoundland. I am opposed to them.'

Mr. Speaker, we are going to see a Board of Directors appointed within the next two or three days, we are going to see a new Chief Executive Officer, and the interim management team is doing an excellent job, by the way, of keeping things going now and supplying all of these jobs, getting all these inshore plants ready to be reopened in the next two or three weeks, everything going full swing, Mr. Speaker, everything is going full swing in our fishery because of the interim management team. Mr. Etchegary has done a tremendous job. I have to say it today in the House, Mr. Etchegary has done one heck of a job in getting the company going. Let us hear it for Mr. Etchegary, fellows. Let us hear it for him, the job he has done as a Newfoundlander, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - a tremendous job as interim manager and getting everything going for us.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please. The hon. Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is getting partisan now, and childish and ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. I think his leave is over as of now.

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Nobody is getting partisan. I will close up my speech by saying, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: His leave is gone, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: I will close by saying that the new management and the new Board of Directors upon the instruction of the two governments will ask

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Cashin to sit down and bargain in good faith, to negotiate in good faith and to work out a satisfactory agreement to the satisfaction of all the plant workers and the fishermen.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on this resolution that my hon. colleague from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) placed on the Order Paper. I believe that this resolution is pretty well self-explanatory and it is in my estimation a resolution that does take the government to task for things that have been left undone.

And, Mr. Speaker, the past couple of days the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and my new colleague from Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) have been in some sort of a debate. Yesterday evening I think it came to a head and even today the Premier read out a telegram that supposedly came from Mr. De Bane.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Supposedly?

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I said supposedly it came from Mr. De Bane, Mr. Speaker, and I will still say that, it supposedly came from Mr. De Bane.

MR. MORGAN:

You will find out.

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Fisheries would shut up for one second, Mr. Speaker, I have a telegram here, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries on December 8 in the House of Assembly in 1983 made accusations concerning the fishery and it does tie into this motion, concerning the seal fishery, above everything else, concerning the

MR. WARREN: seal fishery, and he said there were Federal Cabinet Ministers who wanted the seal fishery to die and he made accusations about the Cabinet Ministers.

Now I have here, Mr. Speaker, and I am satisfied to table this telegram that came back from the Minister of Economic and Regional Development (Mr. Johnston) and it says, and I will quote, Mr. Speaker, the first two sentences of the telegram, and the last two sentences, all the inner part of the telegram, Mr. Speaker, shows what the federal government has done for the seal fishery. However, I think it is worth noting what Mr. Johnston had to say about the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

"Thank you for your information in your Telex of December 9, 1983 of remarks" -

AN HON. MEMBER: You sent him a Telex.

MR. WARREN: That is right. I sent him a telegram and I sent him a copy of Hansard, by the way, I sent him a copy of Hansard and a copy of a telegram and a copy of a news report of what the Minister of Fisheries said about the Cabinet Ministers in Ottawa, and here is the response that came back.

"Thank you for your information of December 9, 1983 of remarks attributed to me by the Newfoundland Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) concerning the future of the seal fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador. Parliamentary protocol prevents me from calling Morgan a liar." And on the end of it, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Johnston says, "Since I have no use whatsoever for any parliamentarian, especially a minister, who does not tell the truth, I have no intention of responding to him publicly."

MR. MORGAN: Nonsense.

I do not call him Don.

March 14, 1984

Tape No. 109

NM - 3

MR. WARREN:

Now that is the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, whom the Premier uses as his hatchet man left, right and centre.

MR. WARREN:

Now, this is the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). The Minister of Economic and Regional Development (Mr. Johnston) says, 'As a parliamentarian, unfortunately, I cannot call him a liar. I cannot call him a liar as a parliamentarian. But, Mr. Speaker, I am sure we know what Mr. Don Johnston is saying in this telegram, that the hon. Minister of Fisheries did not tell the truth in the House on December 8th.

MR. WARREN:

So, Mr. Speaker, we can gather from this telegram that the Minister of Fisheries did not tell the truth as it pertains to the seal fishery. Now I believe that there are three people responsible for the failure of the seal fishery in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador today, and one of the people that I hold responsible for the failure of the seal fishery is the hon. Minister of Fisheries. He is definitely responsible, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:

About three years ago, Mr. Speaker, there were questions from this side of the House directed to the Minister of Fisheries asking what was his involvement going to be in making sure that our seal fishery would be sustained. And the answer that the minister gave was, 'That is up to Ottawa.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that was a cowardly response for the minister to make at that time. I still believe today that the minister is now sorry for it, because we may as well forget about it, we may as well consider our seal fishery dead. Our seal fishery is dead. I was interested that the

MR. WARREN: member for Baie Verte-White Bay
(Mr. Rideout) brought in a resolution, that hopefully will be debated before this session closes, about the seal fishery in this Province. Because, Mr. Speaker, I assure you, Sir, that all those fishermen from Nain all the way down through the Northeast coast who had to depend on the seal fishery to supplement their income may as well hang up their hats. From now on, Mr. Speaker, they may as well hang up their hats. Because this government and the government in Ottawa just turned a deaf ear to the protestors, to Brian Davies and Paul Watson, whoever they were, when they were going around asking for donations throughout the world to support their protest, they just turned a deaf ear and now we can see what the results are. The same thing is happening with every other aspect of our economy. The Premier is going around blindfolding the people in the dark. On April 6th. the people were blindfolded. They gave him a mandate and he cannot deliver on that mandate.

AN HON. MEMBER: They must have blindfolded the crowd who were to vote for you.

MR. WARREN: This telegram, Mr. Speaker, as it pertains to the fishery and that the Premier read today supposedly came from De Bane, supposedly. It is interesting to note that a school boy such as the Premier would consider reading such a telegram. In fact, I would say that the person who sent the telegram and the person who read the telegram, both of them have the same kind of intelligence. That is how

March 14, 1984

Tape No. 110

ah-3

MR. WARREN: much regard I have for
the intelligence of both individuals.

MR. TULK: And you could have easily
added that the federal Minister of

MR. TULK:

Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) has nothing better to do than to send back replies to the likes of that.

MR. WARREN:

So you can see why our seal fishery is gone. The federal Minister of Fisheries has as much concern about the fishery in Newfoundland as the provincial minister.

MR. TULK:

He has got nothing better to do than to send those Telexes.

MR. WARREN:

Exactly.

Mr. Speaker, I have to chuckle sometimes when I hear the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) saying, 'I am getting along fine with De Bane.' Yes, Mr. Speaker, no wonder he should get along fine with De Bane, because we know that De Bane is crucifying the fishery in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

We know that, Mr. Speaker!

That is why he is getting along fine with De Bane, because De Bane is crucifying the fishery in Newfoundland. And why would not the Minister of Fisheries get along with a Cabinet minister in Ottawa who is definitely crucifying the fishery in Newfoundland?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries said, 'What did we do'?

MR. HODDER:

We will know more about that Telex he sent.

MR. WARREN:

As I said, that Telex supposedly came from De Bane, and I am still saying 'supposedly' until we find out more about it. Mr. Speaker, there are all kinds of tricks being played and when all the stuff comes out to be washed, when all the dirty linen comes out, we will find out where the linen came from.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to a couple of comments that the Minister of Fisheries made today. He said, 'We have given the fishermen \$12.5 million'.

MR. TULK: He did not say that?

MR. WARREN: Oh, yes. And I asked the minister verbally across the House, 'How? By what means?' He said, 'Through loans.' 'Through loans,' he said, '3 per cent below prime rate,' and now we have half of those fishermen gone bankrupt and having to pay back the loans. Well, that is what you call giving them \$12.5 million! That is what I call good business economics! That is good business economics - give the fishermen loans and let them go bankrupt, lose their houses, lose their trucks! Mr. Speaker, because of this \$12.5 million, the fishermen now are suffering.

A few days ago the Minister of Fisheries appeared on television when he went down to the Income Tax Task Force and here he was, down speaking to the P.C. Task Force which is going across Canada and saying, 'Look, you have to look after everybody's taxes but do not tax me, or do not tax anybody else, but look after everybody.' And here he was, the same minister who is giving out loans to people and saying, 'If you do not pay up, I will take your boat from you.' This is what is happening. So what can you do?

MR. TULK: Tell him about the unemployment insurance problem he has caused down your way.

MR. WARREN: Oh, that is too embarrassing. I cannot tell him that!

MR. TULK: Tell him about it.

MR. WARREN: About some 122 fishermen?

MR. TULK: Tell him the story.

MR. WARREN: No, it is too embarrassing.

In fact, it is shameful!

(Inaudible).

MR. TULK: Tell him the story.

MR. WARREN: No, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. gentleman from Placentia (Mr. Patterson)

can have twenty minutes after I am finished and he can go on and talk whatever foolishness he wants to talk about. He has not talked any sense so far.

MR. PATTERSON: I am just wondering if it is better to burn a boat or repossess it?

MR. WARREN: Well there is not much difference is there? There is not much difference when the fishermen have to suffer. At least if they burn their boats, it is the fisherman's own boat and he can do what he wants with it. But if you repossess it the fishermen still owes the money on it, which is unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, this hon. minister sent one of his sharks down to Makkovik and Nain about three years ago and said, 'Now, you show those local people how to calculate their U.I.C. contributions.'

MR. TULK: Oh, here it is!

MR. WARREN: So they went down to Makkovik and Nain and said, 'Look, this is the way you calculate U.I.C. contributions.' So naturally, here was somebody from St. John's, from the 5th Floor of Atlantic Place, gee whiz, he should know what he is doing! So naturally, the local clerk in the fish plant there followed his instructions to a 'T'. Three years later, they discovered that they were overpaid because of the information that was given by the minister's department.

MR. TULK: Because of the way it was calculated.

MR. WARREN: Because of the way it was calculated.

And the result was that there was some \$47,000 that the

March 14, 1984

Tape 111

EC - 4

MR. WARREN: fishermen were forced to pay
back. But I must admit that I brought a resolution in
here .

MR. WARREN:

last year and I shamed the minister so much that he finally agreed that they would pay back the money to the fishermen. But listen to what happened. The big story is not out yet as to what happened. The big story of what happened was instead of paying the money back -

MR. SIMMS: The big story is

MR. WARREN: Yes, that is right. Where did the money come from to pay the fishermen? They took it out of the operation of the Northern fish plants which came out of a federal/provincial agreement. That is where it came from, out of the federal/provincial agreement, out of the operations of the two Northern fish plants. Instead of coming out of the provincial coffers where it should have come from, they decided that they would take it out of the federal coffers. So this is what happened to it.

MR. SIMMS: Were the fishermen helped?

MR. WARREN: Were the fishermen helped? Yes, the fishermen were helped but only because of what I had done. done. It was not because of what the minister did.

MR. PATTERSON: There are three leaders over there now.

MR. SIMMS: That is right.

MR. TULK: We are all leaders over here.

MR. WARREN: My hon. colleague from Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) said yesterday that the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) came home crying. Now maybe there were not any tears running down his cheeks, but for a minister to go up there and come with documents with his signature on them and all of sudden be told by the Premier they are no good, even I would cry over that, and I am sure the hon. the Minister of Fisheries had to feel like it.

MR. TULK: Do you know about the telephone?
MR. WARREN: No, tell me about the telephone.
MR. TULK: Well 'Jim' was not allowed to use the telephone the last week they were in Russia.
MR. WARREN: So that would have caused a man to cry.

Let us face it, Mr. Speaker, hon. colleagues on that side, I am sure, if they wanted to would admit that the Premier has used the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). In the meantime, the Premier goes home and sits back and kills himself laughing at the kind of fool he has made of the Minister of Fisheries. This has happened on two or three occasions, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I want to speak for a few moments, before my time elapses, on the restructuring.

MR. PATTERSON: By leave.
MR. WARREN: I appreciate the hon. the member from Placentia (Mr. Patterson) giving me leave. I appreciate that very much and I am sure that I will continue in a most sensible, logical manner, as I have been doing for the past fifteen minutes.

I still believe restructuring will not work in this Province. I am still very doubtful. The way the federal and the provincial governments have decided to go about restructuring in this Province is going to drive the inshore fisherman out of his boat. It is going to be fine for the offshore or the middleshore fleet, but inshore fishermen are going to be driven out of their boats. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was only about two weeks ago the Chairman of the Makkovik Council, who is also, I believe, the Chairman of the Fishermen's Committee in Makkovik, sent a telegram and letters to both Ministers of Fisheries, provincially

MR. WARREN: (Mr. Morgan) and federally (Mr. De Bane), asking that some consideration be given to the inshore fishermen, because those people with longliners are coming in and going right in on the shoreline and catching fish that is there for the inshore fishermen. I believe we are going to have problems and more problems than we can contend with. I really believe that there are competent men in the backbenches over there that the Premier should

MR. WARREN: seriously look at and appoint one of them as the new Minister of Fisheries at this crucial period

MR. SIMMS: How about you coming over.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, no, I am sorry, I have no ambitions of going on that side of the House at the present time, but I am sure after the next election is called I will be only too glad to sit over there with my thirty-five other colleagues. I am sure we will have lots of space over there, and maybe at that time I may sit in the chair that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is presently occupying.

MR. SIMMS: Dream on.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the Northern fishery restructuring as it pertains to Northern Newfoundland and Labrador, my colleague today tried to ask the Premier a question -

MR. MATTHEWS: And he did not want to answer.

MR. WARREN: He wanted the answer, yes. He wanted the answer, that is right. The hon. member wanted the answer and he was expecting to get the answer from the Premier who is also Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. So why would a Premier who is Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, which oversees all the other departments, why would he want to pass the question on to the Minister of Fisheries? It shows that the Premier is not competent himself.

Now, my friend look, the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews), I just paid you a compliment. In fact, I was referring to you as a possible Minister of Fisheries. So surely goodness you can just relax. But do not expect it overnight.

MR. WARREN: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, in concluding

MR. WARREN: I have to support the resolution that was placed on the Order Paper by my colleague from Fogo (Mr. Tulk). I believe that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) realizes there are serious problems in the fishery, however, it is unfortunate that as long as we have Mr. De Bane in Ottawa and as long as we have the present Minister of Fisheries in Newfoundland the fishery in this Province is doomed.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HEARN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, earlier this evening I thought we were going to have a good debate on a fisheries resolution, a resolution that affects everybody in the House. The lead-off speaker for the Opposition was quite good followed up by the minister, but now it seems that over there they are starting to flounder a little bit, acting as foolish as caplin, trying to cod the people of Newfoundland. But there is no doubt about it, after the next election they will all be well salted down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: In the resolution as introduced by the member for Fogo there are some good points, points that nobody, especially those representing fishing districts will disagree with. However, there are a number of other points that we have to take issue with, one in particular which says: 'The present government has a lack of fishery development policy and is threatening to destroy the economic, social and cultural fabric of Newfoundland and Labrador society'. But perhaps we should have a look at what this terrible government has been doing the last couple of years in relation to the fishery. I am just going to quote a few little things that happened in my district, a district which is an entirely fishing

MR. HEARN: district, both the inshore fishery and, of course, we are affected by the offshore fishery in relation to the plant in Trepassey. During the past couple of years, since April of 1982, that we have been involved, the provincial government has provided forty-three special grants to various fishermen's committees throughout the district to help them in relation to improving their facilities. Now, some of the things do not include small boats, slipways, baited trawl units, crib work, wharf extension, fish plant repairs, ice-making equipment, electrical repairs and on and on and on, forty-three different grants amounting to thousands of dollars. Along with that we have another \$160,000 spent yearly to maintain a marine service centre in the area. Besides that we have guaranteed loans provided to companies, the inshore companies that operate, Blue Ocean in particular which operates

MR. HEARN:

two plants, one in Branch and one in St. Bride's, who employ around 150 plant workers, and that does not count, of course, any spinoff in the area, and buy fish from every fisherman fishing on the Cape Shore. The year that we came in here, back in '82, the plant in St. Bride's was closed. They were trucking the fish out of the area and we said, "No way." We said, "Any fish caught in the area is processed in the area when we have the processing facilities out there to do it." With the help of the government that was arranged, a new company moved in, took over the plant, the plant was reopened and 85 new jobs provided in that area alone by this terrible government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

Once again a guaranteed

loan helped Atlantic Fish operate the plant down in Admiral's Beach, a plant that has been on again, off again for a number of years and now, with the assistance of both the federal and the provincial governments is on a sound footing and this year looks excellent.

The resource-short plant programme has provided fish for plants in the area which has provided employment during this time of year when the inshore plants cannot operate, because our fishing season goes from anywhere around the 1st. of May up until November. We have people working in fish plants right now, because of the resource-short programme, once again a result of the work of this provincial government.

Right now we have negotiations underway to reopen a plant up in Riverhead, a plant that has been closed for about two or three years. That will provide another 40 to 50 jobs in the area. Once again all these initiations on the part of the provincial

MR. HEARN: government, of course with our own assistance. No help from the Opposition, or no help from the union that has been spouting off.

Also, we have secured markets for fishermen, especially during the glut season, through the provincial distribution desks that are around, and many nights we had to spend late hours on the phone ourselves, finding markets in the areas where fish was scarce and where we had an abundance of supply.

This is not to mention at all, Mr. Speaker, the help of the Fisheries Loan Board, which has helped many fishermen in our area partake in the fishing industry, with help to buy boats and engines, etc. Not only did the loan guarantees help our area, of course, but we have a whole list of various companies right throughout the Island, many of them in districts now represented by members of the Opposition, fish plants that are kept going simply with the help and the backing of this provincial government.

In the restructuring we are affected also in our area, and that is with the major plant in Trepassey, a Trepassey which was on the blocks, ready to be dropped. If we were not for the provincial government, helping ourselves and the people in the area, the town councils, etc., that plant would probably be closed today. As it is it is open, we have two shifts going, we have approximately 600 workers working, not counting the people involved in the trawler trade, and, of course, the spinoff in that area, the whole Southeast corner of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: Do not be modest tell them your role, how hard you fought.

MR. HEARN: That is known in my district and that is where it counts.

MR. HEARN: In relation to the restructuring, besides the help that it gave us in our own district, look at places like Burin, look at places like Grand Bank, look at places like St. Lawrence. Where would they be today without the Provincial Government of Newfoundland? They would be closed, which was what was intended.

So, Mr. Speaker. today we have a viable fishing industry in Newfoundland simply because of the determination and the fortitude of the Provincial Government of Newfoundland and particularly the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) who has been so downgraded by the people opposite -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: - who would not know a sculpin if he bit them. Perhaps, though, what we should look at are some positive things which should happen in the fishery. We know, even though the restructuring has helped out, it has reopened plants, it has provided jobs, it has given the people who work on the trawlers an opportunity to get back to work, and, of course, it has put Newfoundland back on its feet, there are still many, many problems, very, very serious ones facing us.

MR. HEARN: Several things are needed and here we have to take once again the initiative. And when I say 'we', would it not be great if 'we' meant provincial government, the federal government, the members of the Opposition, in both Houses, and the Fishermen's Union along with the people involved in the various places around Newfoundland? Would it not be great if we could all get together and work on some of the problems. Marketing: An aggressive marketing approach has to be taken, new markets have to be found and developed. We already know that the two Ministers of Fisheries, the provincial one and the federal, have already been working on this trying to develop new markets so that we can sell more of our product. It is no good catching it if you cannot sell it.

An aggressive stand must be taken against giving away allocation to foreign countries. Here we are killing ourselves in two different ways; not only are we giving away fish that we can catch and process to create extra jobs and extra income, but we are also putting fish into countries where we could sell our own processed products. We have to refrain from giving away allocations of Northern cod to other provinces, especially provinces that have never partaken in the fishery of Newfoundland. Once again, here we have a Newfoundland resource being taken and given to other parts of Canada.

An aggressive stand must be taken on those who are trying to destroy our fishery by interfering with our markets, and I refer here especially, and I am sure everybody agrees with this, to the people opposing the seal hunt, the people who are using not their money but our money to try to kill our markets throughout the world by blackmailing the various major companies, the major buyers of Canadian fish. This has to stop. It can only stop if we, and once again 'we' means everybody, take a strong stand against

MR. HEARN: them and tell them to go to - well,
a place where they will not find any ice.

 We must continue, Mr. Speaker, to do what we are already doing in relation to making the best use of federal and provincial funding to develop various fishing facilities and improving fishing facilities throughout the Island. A lot of people criticize the various make-work programmes. Those make-work programmes, if properly run, combined with some federal or provincial capital money can create, and are creating in many areas of the Province, badly needed facilities that otherwise could not be provided, if we can properly handle a programme like this, we once again can help the fishermen of Newfoundland. We must encourage further work in the fields of fish farming and salmon enhancement. And once again I am pretty proud to say that in our district we have gotten into both of those quite heavily. The salmon enhancement programme up in the North Harbour area is an example for all the Province and we are looking at fish farming in areas such as Holyrood Pond, a seventeen mile long body of water that holds practically every type of fish, an inland pond where you can catch fish in codtraps or you can catch it through the ice in the Winter. So not only are we looking upon that economically as it relates to the fishery, but also as it relates to the tourist industry.

 And coming up, in a couple of years time, we will have our own St. Mary's Bay regatta up there, and those taking part in it can stop half way down the pond when they get beat out to catch a cod fish. You know, it is quite a spot.

 So, Mr. Speaker, we have to get into salmon enhancement, we have to get into fish farming, and other experimental work so that we can help fishermen supplement

MR. HEARN:

fishermen are treated fairly under the UIC regulations. A little later on in this session the member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid) will be introducing a resolution that suggests fishermen should be treated the same as everybody else, that when the designated fishing season ends-there would have to be a designated point - in the various areas works he or she can then start drawing UIC benefits. They will keep drawing benefits until they start making some income from the fishery, the same as anybody who works ten weeks starts drawing immediately and keeps on drawing for the next forty-four weeks. That is one of the things that we have to fight for.

we must also see that from the fishermen who are catching the fish down to the retailer who is selling the produce, whether it be in the Boston market or the guy who is selling it over the counter in a corner store out in Joe Batt's Arm, we must make sure that everybody is conscious of each one's part in the total fisheries operation. We must make sure that quality is assured. The fisherman who is out in his small eighteen footer, and the guy in the big longliner or the dragger, have to be quality conscious. Handling has to be done properly. That is not going to come easily and it is not going to come cheaply, but it has to come. Processing must be efficient, and everyone agrees that we have to improve the efficiency in the processing areas. Management has to be reasonable, it has to be responsible and it has to be businesslike. If we do not run the operation properly, in a few years time we are going to be right

MR. HEARN: back where we were a couple of years ago. We are now in the process of at least putting something together. Last Summer we had fish plants closed. My own fish plant in Trepassey closed in August when Fishery Products went into receivership. Without restructuring it would still be closed, So maybe it does not have all the answers yet, but do not knock it because it is a long ways ahead of what it was last Fall. We have to make sure that transportation of the product, once again from first landing right to the eventual market, has to be efficient. Carrying fish in open trucks over dusty roads, etc., certainly does not do anything to enhance the product.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: Our marketing must be aggressive so that the end result means a premium price for a premium product, If we get that we can do a number of things. We can make sure that the companies profit so that they can keep their operations open. Everybody says, 'What odds about the fish companies. They are making all kinds of money. What odds, let them go in the hole.' If any company cannot make a profit that company cannot operate - common sense. I do not care how much money the fish companies make as long as they can provide the jobs and provide wages that are suitable and agreeable to the people who work in those places. So consequently, if we can put out the right product and we can get the right markets, we can then make sure those companies make a profit. A profit to the company means that the plant workers and the

MR. HEARN: trawlermen can obtain a reasonable wage. And the main thing is that our fishermen can be guaranteed a resource to catch and that goes right back to our giveaway of the Northern cod that is affecting our inshore fishery, because the last few years around the inshore fishery areas of Newfoundland, my own district one of them, there is no fish to catch. As one of the members opposite said, there is very little fish to catch. One of the reasons for having problems the last few years with people in the industry getting out is because there are no fish to catch. There is no bait to attract the fish and, like anybody else, if you cannot find food somewhere you are going to stop going there. Hopefully there will be an increase in bait, the bait fish will come to shore - squid and caplin, etc. - to be followed by the cod. Things might turn around and hopefully this is the year it will. But if all these things come to place and we can do what we have suggested, then we can make sure that the fishermen will be guaranteed a resource to catch at a price received so that they can make the living that they so well deserve. There is nobody - and I do not hesitate in saying this is nobody on this Island of ours who deserves a fairer deal or a better deal than the fishermen. Our Province was built on their backs we are keeping it going on their backs. And if we can put everything together, and 'we' once again cannot be the provincial government acting alone, it has to be in co-operation with everybody, instead of knocking each other, instead of criticizing, instead of going out acting politically trying to gain

MR. HEARN: political points or a prestigious position , if you can call it prestigious, let us start acting responsibly, let us sit down and work out our problem. There is one way to solve the problem and that is to go to work at it, that is not to talk about it. If we can do that, the problems that we face in the fishery today , we might not solve them all, Mr. Speaker, but they will be a whole lot better than they are right now.

Thank you.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I listened to the hon. member opposite. I noticed he is wearing his red tie and red handkerchief today. He gave a very liberal speech. It was more moderate than many of the speeches that we have heard on that side of the House and it contained a great deal of sense. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that that hon. gentleman, when he decides to speak, gives it some thought, and I notice as well that the content of his speeches has some substance in them as he tries to suggest alternatives.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I am intrigued by the Liberal tie, the red tie. He is one of the very few members on that side of the House that we would love to have over here with us because he does have a bent for policy, he is a fine fellow and he is a hard worker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

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

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

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, I think we are supposed to be debating the issue of the resolution that is before us in the House today and not the colour of a person's tie, so I think the hon. member should get back to the resolution at hand.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port, to that point of order.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is just trying to waste my time. I was complimenting a colleague of his and, of course, he never gets any compliments for anything he says because he never says anything, so he was not mad at me, Mr. Speaker, he was just jealous that his colleague was getting some praise.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) rose on a point of order which certainly in the opinion of the Chair is not really a very valid point of order.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of remarks in the time that I have left.

I would like to point out to the minister - and, of course, the minister is gone again now - some of the problems that I have with the super company and some of the problems that fishermen have put to me in fishermen's meetings I have held around the district. I have met with fishermen in various areas my district and they have a lot of concerns about what is coming next. And one of the points I might deal with for a few minutes today is the aspect of quality control.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody in this House or anybody in the Dominion of Canada or any fisherman that I have ever heard would not want to bring the best quality fish in to market that he could. And I do not think that any fisherman would disagree that a first rate quality fish should be more useful to the fish companies than a fish that has been sitting in the sun for a day and a half or has come in ungutted and uncleaned.

Mr. Speaker, the fishermen whom I represent are small boat fishermen and their concerns

MR. HODDER: are that when you have an eighteen foot boat that you haul off the beach - and many of the fishermen on the West Coast fish right from the beaches, from slipways with haul-ups. They used to have the type of haul-up where you got four men and you hauled your boat up. Now, some in specific places, thanks to that wonderful federal government, the Small Craft Harbours Division -

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: - have provided them with winches. But basically, they must fish from the beach.

MR. SIMMS: Did De Bane put the winches there?

MR. HODDER: No, these winches came in when Mr. LeBlanc was the Minister of Fisheries. But anyhow, Mr. Speaker, I will not let myself be detracted, because I am talking about a very serious matter. And this is a matter not only dealing with fishermen that I have talked to on the West Coast, I am talking about fishermen who fish in that method, in that type of boat all across the Province. Mr. Speaker, if a fellow is fishing out of Fox Island River with an eighteen foot boat, first of all, under the new regulations, he must carry ice in that boat; he must then go out, he must gut the fish at sea and then he must ice them down, put ice down in the fish and bring those back. First of all, for that, when he gets back to

MR. HODDER:

port he receives a few cents extra because he has the proper type and quality of fish. Now up to this point I would suspect that all members would say, well, that is fine, why should he not do that? Well, the problem that these fishermen are experiencing is that they only fish about three or four miles away from their harbours anyhow and when they bring the fish in they are still wiggling. When they spilt them onshore the fish have only been out of the water ten or fifteen or twenty minutes. The fish are still alive.

MR. STAGG:

Do not let Greenpeace hear you say that.

MR. HODDER:

That is right, we should never let Greenpeace know that they kill them, or strangle them.

But, Mr. Speaker, basically these small fishermen bring in catches which are fresh, the best, number one quality fish. They bring them in alive but yet now they are being required to take ice out, to do the gutting at sea. This all means that they cannot get out as quickly, because normally what happens with the small boat fisherman is he brings in his fish, he has some other people there who will gut the fish while they are still alive or still quivering or just out of the water or just dead, and then they will be immediately iced. If he has got to take his eighteen foot boat and carry ice out with him and then gut the fish out there - he cannot carry in a small boat four or five extra people for gutting fish, he cannot afford to do that; but he might have his family inside waiting to do the cutting - then he cannot bring nearly as many fish ashore in that small boat. And many of our fishermen across this Province are small boat fishermen. He cannot bring

MR. HODDER: nearly as many fish in in that small boat as he would normally have been able to do had this regulation not been there, and the fish he is bringing in is of first quality fish anyhow. I talked about this to some people on the East coast, people who have, say, a good trap berth which is not far away from the Harbour or the wharf or the fish plant, and these would be fishermen who have had traps over a period of time, in some areas they do it in different ways, but he has got to gut that fish, ice it down and bring it in and, I will say again, I have seen it happen in various parts of the Province where these small boat fishermen are bringing in the fish alive anyhow. What does this mean to the fisherman? It means he has to make another run out to be able to make that days pay, which might not seem like very much to hon. members or to those people who are high on quality control to the point where they have gone to the ridiculous.

The minister was not in his seat when I was speaking, so I would emphasize again that everyone cares about quality control, including the fishermen, but when it is taken to the ridiculous, where fish that are alive anyhow coming to the wharf, yet these fishermen have to take out ice, gut the fish at sea, they are losing income. The extra income that would be paid for that top quality fish has been lost. If these people are going to be made to take out ice and gut the fish at sea. I understand there are a group of quality control people who are very fanatic, but I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that -

MR. NEARY: The bureaucrats.

MR. HODDER: The bureaucrats, yes. I suppose the minister has not stopped to think this out yet, as he rarely ever stops to think very much out, but he has not stopped to think this out.

AN HON. MEMBER: His colleague in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: He is the handmaiden of Ottawa now.

MR. HODDER: Oh, his colleague in Ottawa! I was going to relate a story about his colleague in Ottawa. I met with Mr. De Bane a little while ago and I had my colleague with me, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was there. And Mr. De Bane told us a story about the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), which I always thought was consistent with the Minister of Fisheries and I thought for once that the Premier was handling him in the correct way. Mr. De Bane related to us that he had met the Premier in Toronto at a meeting which was not planned, but they got together - I think the Premier was coming back from the Super Bowl - so they got together and they started to negotiate. Now this is not second-hand information; three members on this side of the House can swear on any stack of bibles or anywhere that we heard Mr. De Bane say this. Anyhow, Mr. De Bane said to the Premier, 'Well, I must call your Minister of Fisheries, because I was supposed to meet that weekend with the Fisheries Minister.' And the answer that came back from the Premier, 'Oh, I have instructed him this weekend not to answer his phone.' So I would ask the Minister of

MR. HODDER: I would ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) does he have his telephone privileges back yet? Because that tells us something about the way the Minister of Fisheries is regarded by the Premier and certainly -

MR. MORGAN: Keep away from the media - that is right.

MR. NEARY: You were silenced.

Move the adjournment, 'Jim'.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, it being 6:00 o'clock I move the adjournment. I will get back to some more serious comments on the next day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

It being 6:00 o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until 3:00 o'clock tomorrow, Thursday.