



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

First Session

Number 26

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**  
*(Hansard)*

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Wednesday

5 June 1985

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform hon. members that yesterday I had a conversation with Mr. Bob Martin, Senior Vice-President of the Iron Ore Company of Canada, and he informed me that, today, the company would be announcing a reduction in their work force.

The company is, therefore, announcing that seventy-five management and clerical employees will be terminated at both Sept Isles, Quebec, and Labrador City. The number to be terminated at the Labrador City operation totals forty-five. Thirty are management employees and fifteen are clerical and technical personnel.

Mr. Martin pointed out that the employee reductions are made necessary by the company's determination to maintain a competitive position in the iron ore industry.

The current work force at Labrador City totals 1,625 and had been trimmed to that level as part of the effort to weather the adverse effects of the recent recession and to prepare for longer term viability.

The senior Vice-President of the

company assured me that such alternatives as voluntary retirement will be employed to cushion the impact of the reduction on those who will be affected.

I have been assured, also, that the Iron Ore Company of Canada, which is back up to 85 per cent production capacity this year intends to remain fully competitive in world iron ore markets from the point of view of price, quality and the various other factors which make their products attractive to steel producers.

It is unfortunate that as part of the process of improving efficiency and reducing costs of production there has had to be a reduction in the work force; nevertheless, if these measures were not taken the company's survival and the jobs of the entire work force would be threatened.

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker, speaking for the Opposition, we regret any announcement that a reduction of work force is taking place anywhere, particularly in a community such as Labrador City where the basis of the whole economy and the survival of the town itself is tied to the mining operation. Now we see another seventy-five people being laid off in keeping with the Iron Ore Company's desire to maintain the

efficiency of the operation and maintain longevity.

Mr. Speaker, Labrador City has gone through some trying times and the minister in his estimates a few days ago gave some very, very pertinent numbers. He laid out to the Committee exactly what the conditions of the Iron Ore Company is labouring under and he made the comment, I think, that he did not want to frighten anyone in Labrador City or Wabush with regard to the statistics.

I would say to him, Mr. Speaker, that not in the process of frightening anybody. It is one thing to frighten somebody, it is something else to be realistic and make sure that the iron ore workers in Labrador City know exactly what the short-term and long-term outlook is on that job in that industry and in that town.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would want a chance to puruse the statement and determine exactly what this means to the operation and how this comes about before I would comment further.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I know that it is by leave that I get permission to speak at this time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Is this by leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. FENWICK:

I too echo some of the sentiments of the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight). It is unfortunate that we have these layoffs, that there are 45 individuals in Labrador City who will be affected by it, and I would like to point out, of course, that at this point these people have just had their lives ruined. They are now in a position where their homes most likely are unsaleable and they will be in a considerable amount of difficulties and I would like to say to the ministers concerned, since these are unique problems, that there has been a response from this government in the past, helping out individuals who have been laid off in Labrador City and Wabush in order to re-locate elsewhere.

I would again ask at this time that the government reconsider the cancellation of that programme which ended a year or a year and a half ago, especially for these kinds of individuals who will be cropping up from time to time. After all, they will now lose their homes, most of their savings of their lifetime and be forced to look for jobs elsewhere. That is a very difficult thing for people to do, especially at that time of life.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT

Mr. Speaker, as ice conditions begin to improve around our coastline, our inshore fishery is gearing up for its peak period. In connection with this, I would like to take this opportunity to inform this hon. House that as of June 3 my department's inshore fish distribution program has been fully operationalized throughout

the Province.

My department operates this program during the peak of the inshore fishing season to attempt to find markets within the Province for surplus raw fish which may result from glut situations in a particular region or area. Program co-ordinators monitor landing levels in their region and when a surplus to local processing capacity has been deemed to exist, they attempt to co-ordinate the movement of this surplus to plants in areas where there is a deficiency of supply in relation to processing capacity. This process is actively monitored and solutions are sought to any problems which may arise. In addition, personnel are actively involved with other agencies in determining the most effective utilization of over-the-side, over-the-wharf sales arrangements with foreign vessels. As in past years, seven program co-ordinators will be stationed around the Province: one each at Harbour Grace, Bonavista, Wesleyville, Gander, Port Saunders, Marystown and, in Happy Valley, Labrador. These co-ordinators will be on the job eight hours a day, six days a week.

These co-ordinators are now visiting all plants and chairmen of fishermen's committees in their region, providing program details and assessing the mechanisms, such as salting facilities, which are available for dealing with glut situations, normally June 15 to August 15; they will be contacting the plants in their respective regions on a daily basis. During non-glut periods, regular contact will be maintained. If a processor requires the service of the program during a non-glut period, he is requested to contact

the program co-ordinator immediately.

My department has operated this program for the past seven years and over that period, it has been effective in working with processors and fishermen to alleviate glut situations. I am hopeful that this co-operative effort will prevail again this year because, in effect, it is the processor and fishermen who benefit through being able to retain income which would otherwise be lost. In particular, I urge processors who are anticipating a glut or who require fish to contact the program co-ordinator as soon as possible. The office locations and telephone numbers of the program co-ordinators are attached to this statement and have already been made public.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for supplying me with a copy of the statement beforehand. I think he said this is the seventh year for this Ministerial Statement, every year it comes into the House when the fish distribution desks around the Province are set up.

Mr. Speaker, what this clearly illustrates, what this confession clearly illustrates is the government's inability to deal with the processing of a product that is most important to Newfoundland. Because, in spite of the distribution desks we have of for six or seven years, the minister knows full well that

there will be fish again this year that will be dumped, that will be sold over the side and so on. Now, he uses the correct word, he is very nice with the wording, it alleviates the problem. But it certainly has not solved the problem and my point to the minister is this, the problem has existed for years, this government, the government of which he is a part, and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), puts little into the fishery, less than 1 per cent of the budget this year has gone into fisheries. And I would ask him, rather than bring in this kind of a statement each year, why does he not come into the House and tell us how he is going to set up a process that solves the problem? In spite of the fact that he is claiming all the time that we have an over capacity in processing, when is he going to come into this House and tell us how he is going to deal with the glut problem in real terms and to the advantage of Newfoundlanders, rather than just coming in and saying, 'Well, we are alleviating the situation.' Year after year that is all we hear from him.

What this statement says to the people of Newfoundland and to this House is that we, as a Province, that was founded as a fishing Province, and whose history is tied up in the fishery, what this statement says is that we have not yet developed the ability to deal with fishermen when they catch a bit of fish. That is what the whole statement says and that is all the statements says. We have not yet found how to deal with successful fishermen catching fish. If they have a successful year, we cannot process it. They have to dump it over the side.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the minister that next year when he brings a statement into the House concerning the glut problem that he bring in a solution, a solution to this problem of the supply of fish not being able to be processed in this Province and having to be dumped, sold over the side or in some cases not even hauled up.

Why does the minister not put some solutions in place rather than coming in making excuses for his own failure and his government's failure?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Before calling Oral Questions, I would like to welcome to the galleries sixty-five Grade VII and VIII students from Little Heart's Ease, with their teachers, Wade Martin and Wilson Callan.

I would like to welcome fifty students from the L. R. Ash Elementary School, with their teachers, Wayne Dawe and Mrs. Marion Reader.

I would also like to acknowledge the presence of the Career Exploration for Women Group. The programme is conducted by the Adult and Continuing Education Division of the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

#### Oral Questions

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

Mr. Speaker, since we have had two governments of the one political stripe, federal and provincial, our land has been hit with a vicious, contagious disease. I do not know which level of government is responsible for spreading it or which level of government is catching it but, Mr. Speaker, it is rampant in our land. I refer to the disease of political patronage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether today the Government House Leader is more humble and more conciliatory and more sensitive to the rights of the people of this Province to know what is going on in their government and, therefore, I am asking the minister whether he is prepared today to table the salary details of the three defeated Tory candidates who were the latest recipients of political patronage by this government?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the salary of any employee of this government can be obtained in the normal process through the estimate procedures and what have you. I do not have any salary deals -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

- details of anybody in my head. I do not even know what the salary of the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) is, but from the quality and the caliber of his question, I would say he is considerably overpaid.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

This member is not going to be intimidated by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), I assure you!

Mr. Speaker, the members of this House and the people of this Province have a right to know the salary details of these latest recipients of political patronage, and I am asking the Government House Leader whether he is prepared today to table the salary details, the contractual details, so that the people of this Province will be informed as to what is going on and what the salaries are. There are people concerned about this, particularly the 30,000 to 40,000 unemployed Newfoundlanders in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Nobody is trying to withhold the salary details of anybody. I do not carry the salary details of anybody, except my own salary, in my head or in my back pocket or whatever. I say to the hon. gentleman there is no attempt to sweep anything under the table. The question is, I understand, by the way, already on the Order Paper. The member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) asked it. It was on the Order Paper yesterday. And, obviously, it will be answered. We will certainly give that information and, at the same time, I hope, in just as forthcoming a way, the hon. gentlemen will be able to tell us how much the defeated candidate in Placentia is being paid from the public purse, through the Opposition, so that we will know exactly how much everyone is being paid.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, am I to assume from the Government House Leader's (Mr. Marshall) answer that he is going to take the question as notice and that he is going to table the salary details of these three defeated Tory candidates? Is this what I gather from the minister, that he is going to table that tomorrow?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the hon. gentleman is picking on the poor Government House Leader. I mean, why me? I did not hire any of them. Ask the ministers concerned. I support it entirely because the hon. gentlemen who happened to be employed, whom he wishes to refer to - and he wishes to get down in the dirt the same way as his contemporaries do in Ottawa - are people who are being employed on the basis of their ability and their capacity to acquit the duties that they are undertaking. We do not mind, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the ministers and the ministry have no objection whatsoever to tabling the salaries, to tabling their duties and to tabling all relevant information, but I just do not happen to have it myself. I am not the minister responsible but the ministers responsible will certainly be happy to do it at the earliest possible opportunity.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier in view of the fact that the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) is not here.

Does the Premier disassociate himself from statements of the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) who referred, in the Committee and on public television, to the teachers of this Province as hooligans, that they were like trained terrorists from Morocco or Iran? Is this the policy of the government, or does he, in fact, disassociate himself from the statements that were made

by the member for Placentia?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, you know, 'Do I associate myself?' 'Do I disassociate myself?' with various comments. I do not know the comments that various members and backbenchers make from time to time about this group or that group.

MR. CALLAN:

You used to know everything at one time.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, no! Contrary to popular opinion, Mr. Speaker, in response to the interjection just made by the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) while he was still in his seat, no, I honestly do not know everything. I am sorry to disappoint him, but I do not. Obviously, the hon. member for Placentia has some strong views. I think the comments that the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) has made from time to time, in the last number of weeks, indicate the position of this government as it relates to the teachers and other groups. We want to finalize agreements with the teachers, we want to finalize agreements with other people who get paid out of the public purse, and we want to have good relations with all the employees who work for the government.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, to the Premier: Is the government having its cake and eating it, too, using two of its insignificant backbenchers - the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) and the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) - to blacken and savage the teachers while the Premier and ministers sit in the front rows of government and stand calmly aloof?

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, that question is out of order. It contains innuendoes and suppositions and what have you. Listening to the nature of the questions today, I can see full well why the former distinguished member for LaPoile did not offer himself for re-election. The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is out of order in that question. I mean, he is casting innuendoes, he is asking for various conclusions that are unwarranted, and he is taking an argumentative type of approach. Why does he not ask questions affecting the welfare of this Province instead of such silliness?

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order. Obviously, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) and the



member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) are hitting the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) where it hurts. There is no point of order. The member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) is asking a very important question on teacher relations in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, I would point out to hon. members that questions should not be argumentative in any way and in supplementary questions there should be no need for preambles. I ask the hon. member to state his question.

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) has stated that he will present the NTA with a list Friday. Could the Premier ensure that hon. members are told the number of complaints that are going to be presented? We do not want the documentation, we do not want any copies of the letters, but we do want to know the numbers. Could the Premier ensure that when the Minister of Education makes this documentation to the NTA, seeing it was brought up in the House and made a public matter by the Minister of Education, that the number of complaints will be made public in this House?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, firstly let me say to the hon. gentleman that obviously he does not understand the difference between being a member and being a member of the

government. In his first question and the preamble to his supplementary, before he was interrupted because he was out of order, he kept asking questions of the backbench. Certain private members are invited into the Cabinet and become part of the government as opposed to part of the General Assembly of the Legislature. Therefore, if the hon. member wants to address questions to me relative to the ministries, then I think I can answer them fairly definitively. When he asks questions as it relates to private members, that is a different matter altogether and it is really not a question to the government or to the ministry, it is a question to the House.

Secondly, obviously if the hon. member is going to, in a number of questions and preambles, sort of indicate that we are trying to do something devious or underhanded here, and that is an attack on the government, then I cannot understand how the hon. member can get up on a supplementary then and ask, 'Will you give us the numbers?' Because, if we agree to give the numbers, then the Opposition can say, 'Here you are now trying to get some things out into the public, trying to get more of this out into the public.' I think the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) has handled this in a very responsible manner and that is, if there are certain written things - not verbal; verbal means nothing and is very easy to do - that come to the minister, who is responsible for primary, elementary and secondary education in this Province, then I think the way the Minister of Education has handled it is a very responsible way; pass it over to the agencies concerned, the Newfoundland Teachers' Association

and the respective school boards. I do not think it would be appropriate for the ministry to indicate anything more than that about it. Let those agencies take whatever action they think appropriate. If we begin as a government to indicate the number and then the next day somebody wants to know the nature of it, then before long we can be accused of doing the very thing that the hon. member says we should not be doing.

MR. HISCOCK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, the question is to the Premier. In view of what the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) and the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) have stated, has the Premier called them into his office and reprimanded them in any way? Has he sent them any letters stating that this is not government policy? With regard to private members, backbenchers on the government side -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!  
Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:

can they basically say what they want and slander any public group without due representation from these groups which can not stand up for their rights in this public forum?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, from time to time we have heard all kinds of slander and whatever from the other side, from that party, and I do not know how they handle it. If the hon. member is asking me as Leader of the Party as opposed to Premier, there is a caucus, there is a Provincial Executive of the Party, and there is an Executive Council of the Party. Obviously, that is a matter that would be up to the party and to the executive and the executive council to deal with if in fact they saw in their wisdom that they wanted to deal with it. As far as the government goes, the various ministers speak for the government.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome to the galleries Reverend Bert Cheeseman, Chairperson of the Newfoundland and Labrador School Trustees Association, and Kevin Breen, Executive Director of the School Trustees Association.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, my question relates to the fishing activities of the foreign fleets and, in particular, the West German fleet. I had intended to put my question to the Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), but he is absent from the House, so I shall put my question to the Minister of

Fisheries (Mr. Rideout).

I wonder would the minister indicate to the House whether the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs did indeed express a desire not to be associated with the representation made by the government to Ottawa on the subject of West German overfishing?

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
I think I can say, categorically, no to that question, Mr. Speaker. I guess I can also say that I know where the hon. gentleman is coming from. Last night, in Committee, I read part of a working document that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) and I had drafted, I believe on April 26 or April 27, to the federal government expressing our very great displeasure with alleged overfishing activity by the West Germans. And in I think the tabling of it will indicate that it was a draft. The piece of correspondence had been drafted by officials of Intergovernmental Affairs and the Department of Fisheries, but the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and I discussed the matter and we mutually agreed that that representation should be made directly by me to my counterpart in Ottawa. I undertook yesterday to table the official correspondence, which I will be doing at the appropriate place on the Order Paper today.

But no, Mr. Speaker, there was no disagreement. We collaborated, we co-operated in getting together

the best advice from Fisheries and Intergovernmental Affairs in putting together our representation to Ottawa, and we decided that it should go out over the name of the Minister of Fisheries, as I believe was appropriate, and I believe my colleague, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) felt it was appropriate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, I submit to the minister that is far from being a matter of mutual consent and agreement. There was a note from the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) indicating that he did not want his signature attached to the document. Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister, did he ever send the telegram or the Telex?

MR. SIMMONS:  
What he indicated last night to the Committee was that he had a draft. Did he actually send a Telex? And if so, on what date?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, I will find the working document that the gentleman referred to in a few moments, but I guess he probably has it. The representation for this government to the federal

minister was sent by special courier, I believe on April 30.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I understand, also, it was the original intention of the department to follow the process that the Premier had used over many, many years of whacking off Telexes to Ottawa, but that his colleague in Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) constrained him and indicated that the matter was not of sufficient urgency to be treated that way but, rather, to do it by letter.

Would he first of all confirm that is the reason he did it by letter rather than telex? Secondly, would he indicate to the House what response he has had - it has been now a month or so - to that missile, in whatever form it went? In particular, has the federal government explained the matter of not informing the provincial government for a period of over two months, although the federal government was aware this was going on, this activity out there just beyond the 200 mile limit, on the Nose of the Banks, and has it apologized for that failure on its part?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say that I am not governed in my actions by the devious mind of the

member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons). The hon. gentleman can read into any question or any answer exactly what he likes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) cannot stand in this House and cast aspersions on another member, either on his own side or on this side, and we will not allow him to cast aspersions on members on this side. He has just made a statement that the member for Fortune - Hermitage has a devious mind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

That kind of cop-out in trying to answer a question should not be allowed in this House, Mr. Speaker, and I ask Your Honour to ask him to withdraw it.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen on the other side are taking life a little bit too seriously today, I think. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was referring to the state of mind of the hon. gentleman and I do not see, really, that there was anything untoward about such a description.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I have just been checking through Beauchesne on various terms have been ruled as unparliamentary. And one cannot go completely on that, because I see that on occasion some words are parliamentary and exactly the same words on other occasions are not. But I certainly do not see that particular term, and, in the context it was given, I do not think it was out of order.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could put it this way, that if the hon. gentleman looks at a document that I tabled in Committee last night, as he did, and see written across the draft document, 'Letter or telex', and if you deviate from that and the hon. gentleman tries to insinuate that you decided on a letter rather than a telex, then, I suppose, because of the deviation his devious mind must try to work wonders to try to figure out why you deviated from what your were talking about. So, Mr. Speaker, that it all there is to that.

I decided in consultation with my colleague -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Answer the question!

MR. RIDEOUT:

There they go, Mr. Speaker. They ask questions but they do not want the answers.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, you, Sir, may not be able to find the word because the word is probably not there. But what is there very clearly, and had I a copy of Beauchesne I could find it for you, is that a member may not cast aspersions. It is there in those words, 'He may not cast aspersions on another member of this House.' He may hold that belief, which he has to answer for to himself, but he cannot cast aspersions. And this House would be much better served, Mr. Speaker, if he would withdraw that remark and get on with the question at hand. He is squirming, you can see he is squirming, he is squirming because he knows what I have here in front of me. But let him stick to the subject at hand instead of getting into personalities. I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, for some protection. He cannot cast aspersions on me and I ask you to make him withdraw that particular comment.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I will agree that nobody can cast aspersions on anyone, particularly nobody could cast aspersions on the hon. gentleman. But what he said was 'devious mind'. Now devious means to deviate, deviate means to change course, changing course means you have not got a fixed mind, and changing course, I would say, would be complimentary to anyone, particularly, Mr. Speaker, someone who is a Liberal because

it has lately come to somebody who is a Liberal to be able to think of more than two things at once.

So what the hon. gentleman is really doing when he is saying he is devious is a person has a changing mind in one or two or three places, that he has a mature mind. You know, he has a great mind, he has a good mind. I do not see anything wrong with that. I think the hon. gentleman is just a bit too touchy.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

If it were not unparliamentary, as I myself have already alleged, I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, there is an example of a devious mind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no prima facie case of privilege.

MR. SIMMS:

Shame! Shame!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Name him! Name him!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

He has shouted 'shame' twice already and you have not named him.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have already ruled on that particular point. In the context in which it was offered it was not

unparliamentary. I would ask the hon. minister if he would now answer the question.

MR. RIDEOUT

Mr. Speaker, I will be delighted to answer the question. The hon. gentleman just talked about making me squirm, but there is nothing to squirm about. Mr. Speaker, I gave the Committee a document which said letter not telex, as a suggestion, signed by one minister, not two, as a suggestion. Mr. Speaker, we are open and honest and frank over here. We consult with each other, particularly when my colleague happens to be the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) and we are interfacing with another government. Nothing to hide, Mr. Speaker, it is all aboveboard.

MR. SIMMONS:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, now will the minister answer the other part of my last supplementary? What response did he get from Ottawa on this urgent matter, urgent in his words in the draft, urgent from my vantage point, but not urgent from the vantage point of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs? What response did he get from Ottawa? In particular, did he get an apology from Ottawa, or at least an explanation for keeping him and the government of which he is a part in the dark for two whole months on this serious matter of raping our fisheries out there on the Nose of the Banks?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, after four or five attempts at supplementaries and trying to draw political conclusions and trying to pit one minister up against another, there is finally an urgent question, there is finally something of great public urgency. Well, the fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated last night in committee and to the press when I was interviewed, is I have had word from Ottawa; the federal minister has let me know about his activity and we are going to be further discussing that when we meet as a Council of Ministers next week.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro (Mr. Marshall). As the annual report was tabled in the House two days ago and we have had a chance to look through it, it is quite clear looking at that report that, even with bringing on Cat Arm in the Summer or Fall, there are going to be significant problems with hydroelectric power and its supply over the next couple of years. As a matter of fact, it seems to be getting more and more acute. What it does seem to show is that there will be a considerable shortfall and that the Holyrood generating plant will be needed on a more or less continuous basis in order to supply electricity. My question to the minister is, are there any plans afoot to try and keep us

from again going through the horrendous increases in cost that we experienced last year? In other words what are the plans of Hydro for supplying electricity at a reasonable rate?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, given that hydro generation depends upon the amount of water that is available, the whole electrical generation system in this Province is a matter of real concern to this government. Because we find today, despite the fact that we have more hydro power than any other province of Canada, we are probably as dependent or more dependent, except for the province of Prince Edward Island proportionately, on oil. So really what it comes down to is the amount of water that is available. Now, last year we had a very low water fall and we had to depend more on fuel. It is a fact of life, there is nothing that we can do about it. There is no such thing as rain makers or anything like that. There is no way that we can dictate the amount of rainfall available. We are very concerned about it. The amount of electrical bills that will have to be paid, this year and ensuing years for a little while, is going to be directly referable to the amount of rainfall and the amount of oil that we have to depend on. The more rain we have, the less the amount of the electrical bills. Now, what are we going to do about it? I think the hon. gentleman is well aware of the policy of this government, that we are working assiduously, and we will continue to, to get an interconnect with Labrador for the purpose of making electrical generation in this Province

completely dependent on hydro power. That is the only long-term solution. In the meantime we will do everything we possibly can to keep hydro rates down. But I have to tell the hon. member, as he well knows, that when you are dependent upon oil the high cost of electricity is not the high cost, really, of electricity as such, it is referable to the high cost of oil. The more oil we have to use to generate electricity, the higher the cost will be. It is a matter of concern and we are working on it in the long term. If we had been in the position of being able to work on this in the long-term some twenty years ago rather than at the point we are now, we would not be dependent upon oil generation..

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

As I hear the hon. minister's answer, he is saying that unless the interconnect goes ahead then we are condemned to ever-increasing hydro bills for the rest of our lives. Considering that this government has failed abysmally over the last six or seven years to bring any kind of agreement into effect with the province of Quebec in order to do his and has really frittered away this time to a large extent, my question to the minister is, if that procedure does not work, is there any other plan whatsoever in place to avoid these enormous bills that we are going to be facing?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, it is so easy for somebody who is not in government, and has no prospects of getting in government, to get up and make statements like that. How can the hon. gentleman say we have failed abysmally with respect to the generation of power? We have brought onstream in this Province every available environmentally safe hydro-electric project on this Island. There are others that are available but environmentally they are not acceptable to this Province because they will derogate from our way of life. Also, their input, their share of hydroelectrical generation would be so little it would not be significant enough when weighed against environmental considerations. It is so easy to get up and say, yes, we failed. Now, we cannot make rain, Mr. Speaker, we cannot generate rain. We can do many things but we are not omnipotent so we are dependent upon the rainfall. You ask what this government has done. This government has done everything it possibly could. It has taken the initiative to see what we could do to get a resolution to the Quebec problem through the courts and that did not succeed, that failed. The problem with it was that the Supreme Court of Canada decided that we were not able to amend or to repeal our legislation. So we have found, through long frustration but valiant attempts, that the court route is not going to succeed. What else did we do? We have entered into detailed negotiations with the Province of Quebec and the government led by the present Premier of Quebec. We made a report to this Province and to the Legislature and everybody agreed, at that particular time, there was



no basis for a resolution, but we are working now with respect to a resolution. We feel that the only resolution is through an interconnect with Labrador. This can only be achieved under the aegis of the federal government and, thank heavens, we now have a federal government which has indicated an interest in it and acceptance of the responsibility with it. As events unfurl in the next little while, we hope to be able to use the same means and bring to the table the same abilities which resulted in the Atlantic Accord to bring about a resolution of this situation. A resolution, I might say, Mr. Speaker, that has been exacerbated over the period of years and made more difficult because the party of the hon. gentleman there opposite actually accepted the fact that we could not transmit our power through another Canadian province, actually accepted the fact that we were not Canadians. As we found from the Atlantic Accord you cannot get equal rights if you go to the table not accepting that you are equal Canadians. So what we have got to do in this particular case is unravel a situation not of our making, a situation cast on us by the hon. gentlemen there opposite, who in their mealy-mouthed ways and their Uncle Tom ways and their desires to perpetuate themselves in power, as they did briefly in 1976, gave the shop away. But for that we would have it resolved.

Mr. Speaker, in the meantime I hope I have answered the hon. gentleman's question. We are working very hard on it.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Answers to Questions for which  
Notice has been Given

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Question Period and again in Committee last night, I undertook to table correspondence that this Province with the federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Fraser) regarding the overfishing activity by the West Germans offshore, and I am pleased to do that now.

For the benefit of the hon. the gentleman from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), the first line of the letter is: "It is with a sense of alarm and urgency that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, the hon. G. R. Ottenheimer, and I". So I will table that, Mr. Speaker.

Also, Mr. Speaker, yesterday there was a question raised by my colleague, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), regarding a Russian/Canadian incident offshore in 1978. I indicated yesterday that I would have officials in the department check out this matter with the appropriate federal authorities and I have been advised, Mr. Speaker, that a collision at sea did occur on May 9, 1978, and damages were sustained by a Russian supply vessel during a boarding procedure. The incident

was reportedly carried in the local media here in Newfoundland, in the newspapers, radio and television at the time. We have not confirmed this, but the incident was subsequently investigated by MOT, according to officials of Fisheries and Oceans, as all such incidents at sea are.

I can also tell the House, Mr. Speaker, that we have also been advised by federal Fisheries that a negotiated settlement with the Russians was undertaken through the appropriate channels, the Departments of Justice and External Affairs and so on, and that an agreement was reached. As to the monetary settlement, that has in fact been paid by the Government of Canada.

The final part of the question raised by the hon. gentleman, I believe, is that I have been advised by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans that there is no accommodation through allocations of fish to resolve such indebtedness. It was not and is not now the policy of the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

So the incident did take place, there was a monetary settlement reached between Canada and the Soviet Union, the monetary settlement was in fact, according to the advice received, paid, and that there has been no trade-off of fish, according to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, to compensate for damages of such a nature.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon. member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

In reference to the answer to the question posed to the minister yesterday, I want to point out, to clarify that I did not ask yesterday for the local officials of the federal Department of Fisheries to give replies or to investigate matters pertaining to overfishing of our offshore fish stocks. Because that is the whole problem, Mr. Speaker, his receiving answers from local federal officials. The answer should come from the minister in Ottawa.

I said yesterday, and I repeat it now, that the minister in Ottawa should investigate. I am not satisfied at all with the answer given by, I assume, officials to the minister. I am not blaming the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) here, it is a federal matter. But the federal officials are not supplying total information and accurate information to the Provincial minister. And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this, that my question was -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That is not a point of order. If the hon. member is not satisfied he can take that matter up on the adjournment on Thursday.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order. I am clarifying my question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this another point of order?

MR. MORGAN:

I am not saying I am not satisfied. I want to clarify the question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:  
My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is to stand to clarify the question that was asked yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I have already ruled on that point of order.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Speaker, can I not stand in the House to clarify a question that was raised yesterday? Because the question was, obviously, misunderstood. And I am not saying that I want to debate the issue tomorrow evening. Some of my colleagues are here trying to advise me how to act in the House of Assembly. I will be governed by the Chair, not by any of my colleagues here. If I want to debate the issue tomorrow evening in the late show, I would say so.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is I want to clarify the question. I asked the minister yesterday to have the Federal Minister (Mr. Fraser) investigate, not to have his local officials here investigate. Because my information still stands, that there was substantial damage and the bill is still outstanding to the Russians, to the Soviets. The bill has not been paid in funds to the Soviets by Canada. And it is in millions of dollars, not a few

thousands of dollars. And the matter is so serious, because of overfishing of our cod stocks, it warrants investigation from Ottawa, not from the White Hills here in St. John's.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman raised the question yesterday I undertook, I think as the record of the House will show, to investigate the nature of his question and to report back to him at the earliest opportunity. Now the documentation that has been provided to me is what I provided to the House. And if there is documentation to the contrary, then I would certainly like to have it and I will follow whatever course needs to be followed to ensure that it is investigated.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Before calling petitions, I would like to rule on the point of order raised by the hon. Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) yesterday in connection with the petition presented by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). I have had an opportunity of reading this petition. Actually, the hon. member for Eagle River stated in the House yesterday that he had altered the petition to read 'Provincial Government' instead of 'Federal Government'.

I would like to state that petitions should be addressed to

the hon. House and it should contain a prayer. But the fact of the matter is, admitted by the hon. member, that he altered this petition. I am quite sure he altered it with the idea of clarifying the intent of what the people who signed the petition had in mind, but the fact of the matter is that this is not what the people who signed this petition signed. It was altered. So I must rule that out of order in the circumstances.

MR. HISCOCK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. To that I would like to -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I have already ruled on that point of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

With all the respect that one should have for the Chair of this Parliament, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) rose on a point of order.

SOME HOM. MEMBERS:

No, he did not.

MR. TULK:

He rose and said, 'I am rising on a point of order.' And, Mr. Speaker, if you know what the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) was going to say next, I certainly do not, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

If the hon. the member for Eagle River wants to rise on another point of order, I will hear him now.

MR. HISCOCK:

This is a question, Mr. Speaker, not a point of order. I would like direction from the Chair. With respect to my petition which has been ruled out of order, I apologize for signing it, and Your Honour is quite correct, it was not done with intent. I should like to ask if that petition will now be returned to me so that I can take it back to the community involved and have it properly executed?

MR. SPEAKER:

Certainly I would think that that can be done. I can appreciate the difficulty of hon. members if they get a petition signed by quite a large number, twenty or thirty or forty people, and it is worded incorrectly. But, in this hon. House we have to go by the rules that are here. I cannot alter the rules. Certainly, as far as the hon. member is concerned, I see no reason why he cannot bring that petition in again, worded in the correct manner.

I might also point out that petitions should be produced as originals signed by three members who are making the petition.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, there is a point of privilege on the floor and it has not been ruled on. I raised the point of privilege, there was some discussion, but it was never ruled on.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! I thought I said

there was no point of privilege. If I did not, I now rule that there is no point of privilege.

MR. MORGAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that when a member of this House rises at any time to speak on a point of order that the person be permitted to make his point of order without interruption. A moment ago, Mr. Speaker, I was standing on a point of order and was in the midst of trying to make my point of order when, Sir, with due respect to the Chair, I was interrupted by the Chair. Surely, Sir, we are not going to have a House of Assembly in which we cannot, as individual members, make points of order when we feel we need to make them. That is the reason why I rose on a point of privilege, which takes precedence over a point of order. So, Sir, what I am saying is that, surely, any member of this House has a right at any time to stand and raise a point of order on a matter he considers appropriate. In order for him to do that, he must be given ample time to put forward his point of order before a ruling is made, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I want to speak briefly to that. Obviously, any member of this House has a right to rise on a

point of order and to make his points. The supreme authority in this House is Your Honour. I appreciate what the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) says, that one has to be given ample time to develop his point of order. That is one thing. But there has to be somebody who decides whether what has been said constitutes a breach of privilege or a point of order. And from my understanding of it, that resides with the Speaker. This is the only way in which the House can preclude itself from being tied up on points of order and points of privilege interminably, and the ultimate authority really is the Speaker. That is my assessment of the situation.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

I would like to assure all hon. members that I will hear them and I am obliged to hear them. But if a point of order - and I am not referring to this one specifically - is drawn out too long, it is up to the Chair to decide on that matter. Certainly, I will try to be absolutely fair and let every member have his point of view and will rule to the best of my ability in that matter.

Are there any petitions?

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I realize it is now four o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It is now four o'clock and it is Private Members' Day. You can present your petition by leave.

Does the hon. minister have leave

to present his petition?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs, by leave.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present an original petition. This is not a copy, it is an original petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, let me say that it is an original petition on behalf of some 350 people from the Marysville - Georgetown area.

In presenting this petition, Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the hon. House something that came to my attention only today, as a matter of fact, and that is that this petition I am presenting today, this original petition, was presented last week. It was photostat copy that was presented last week by the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford). I might add that the photostat copy that was presented contains not one original signature except for the member for Port de Grave himself.

So I consider that, first of all, Mr. Speaker, to be a serious breach of the rules of order in this House and the hon. gentleman from Port de Grave should be reprimanded for doing what he has done. However, the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is a new member and he is probably not familiar with the rules of the House.

But be that as it may, I have been

approached by representatives of the people of Marysville and Georgetown -

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, we have given the hon. gentleman leave to present a petition in this House, we did not give him leave to get up and lecture the member for Port de Grave. We will not sit in this House and take that and he can be assured right now leave is withdrawn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Oh, no, the hon. gentleman has given leave for the hearing of the petition of the hon. gentleman.

MR. TULK:

It is withdrawn.

MR. MARSHALL:

Now having given leave you cannot withdraw it -

MR. TULK:

Oh, yes, you can.

MR. MARSHALL:

- otherwise, Mr. Speaker, God help us. The hon. gentleman stands in this House and speaks at the fiat of the hon. member.

MR. TULK:

When leave is given, that is correct.

MR. MARSHALL:

In other words, if the hon. gentlemen likes what he is saying, they can go on. If the hon. gentlemen opposite agree to what he is saying, he can go on. Sure that is not acceptable.

MR. TULK:

No, Mr. Speaker, nonsense.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

Leave has been withdrawn.

#### Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

This is Private Members' Day.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. TULK:

Thank you for getting to the fact that I am at last allowed to present this motion.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, first of all, that it is a pleasure for me, as a member of this side of the House and, indeed, as a member of this Legislature, to present this resolution calling upon everybody in this House to reaffirm the policy that we have developed in this House of an all-plants-open policy.

It is a pleasure because fisheries in this Province has always been a priority on this side. Our first policy positions have always been put forward on the fisheries. As

a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think it is usually the case that our first Private Members' Bill on the Order Paper, as soon as there is an opening of a new session, deals with fishery matters. This time we said, 'Let us drop it to second place in the hope that the government who has no intention, apparently, of dealing with the fishery, would, at least, put their first motion down, their private members' motion on the fishery.' Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we saw the wishy-washiness and the conversion of the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) as he praised the government about its policy on Churchill Falls. That same member, last year, was, of course, over here, berating the present government on its stance on Churchill Falls and the records of this House will show that.

They chose not to put anything on fisheries, Mr. Speaker. The government has taken the route that it has always taken. It has mouthed platitudes about fisheries. We have heard the Premier stand up and issue motherhood statements about fisheries but when it comes to concrete action and when it comes to putting their money where their mouth is, nothing happens. That has not changed over the past five or six years. It was the same last year as it is this year. It was the same regardless of what minister occupied that portfolio.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be repeated, the fishery is very important to Newfoundland. It is the lifeblood of this Province. Everything starts and ends with the fishery. As the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) or the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) and, I suppose, any members from

St. \*John's will tell you, that once the fishery starts to go downhill, then the whole economic life of this Province goes downhill. It is part of our history. It belongs to us, it is in our blood, it is part of our culture and, indeed, it is part of our society. That is particularly true, Mr. Speaker, of the outport way of life in this Province for it would die without the fishery being there, without that fishery being developed in the way that it should be developed.

You would expect, Mr. Speaker, that being the case, that the government of the Province would give it a high priority and place it high on its priority list of development. But is that the case with this government? The answer is clearly, no.

The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) would do much better by encouraging his government to make fisheries a priority rather than going into committees and calling the teachers of this Province hooligans and what else was it?

MR. PATTERSON:  
Are you a teacher?

MR. TULK:  
Of course I am a teacher and proud of it.

MR. PATTERSON:  
Were you a teacher?

MR. TULK:  
Of course, and I am proud of it.

MR. PATTERSON:  
Then the same thing applies to you.

MR. TULK:  
There you go, see, look at the nastiness.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):  
The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:  
We do not have a quorum in the House and the Whip on the government side is more interested in talking about hooligans than keeping his members in the House. We do not have a quorum, we are on a very important topic.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Call in the members.

#### Quorum Call

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, if you look at what this government undertakes to do in its budgetary process, it is obvious that it does not put its money where its mouth is with regard to the fishery. For example, if you look at the budget, as we have noted so often in Committee and in this House, you will notice that less 1 per cent of the total budget of this Province is used in the development of the fisheries.

Now the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) yesterday evening made a very important point to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and you will note that even when we are on a fisheries question that the Minister of Fisheries chooses to duck out of his seat and either go to some political meeting or, at least, he disappears from the House and that shows the interest of the government again. It has been a



political football for them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Twillingate yesterday evening made a very important point in speaking on the excessive processing capacity that is supposed, and I use that word guardedly, that is supposed to exist in Newfoundland. He made the point that indeed there may be no overprocessing capacity at all in this Province and, indeed, we had an indication of it today that at least at certain times of the years, in the glut season, that we cannot even handle the fish that we have. The member for Twillingate went on to point out, that it would do well for government members to listen to the argument that the member for Twillingate put forward, he went on to point out that our problems are perhaps more in the marketing aspect of our fishery and more in the secondary processing that takes place in this Province than they are in overprocessing capacity.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to address another problem that I have addressed in this House before and that is this idea of surplus stocks, and I use the words very carefully. We will hear the government come into this House, and we will hear the federal government, regardless of whether that federal government is Liberal or PC, we will hear the federal government talk about the fact that they are giving surplus stocks to foreign countries.

Now what does that word "surplus" mean? Why are those stocks that are off our shores, those fishery stocks, called surplus? Surely we are not going to - does the member for Port au Port want to come on back? Surely we are not going to

believe that we cannot handle that fish. But yet that is what the very term "surplus stocks" says, we cannot handle that fish, so we are giving away fish to foreigners that we say is surplus to our needs. Now what an admission of failure.

MR. PATTERSON:

Who started doing that? The Liberals started that, Trudeau.

MR. TULK:

The narrow, buttoned-down mind of the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) has shown itself again. I do not care if it was Trudeau, if it was Mulroney, if it was Lester Pearson.

MR. PATTERSON:

You would have done better to talk about it when Trudeau was in power.

MR. TULK:

Oh yes. Where have you been? Where have you been? Where has the member for Placentia been? Has he been hiding somewhere? If he would stay in this House, listen -

MR. PATTERSON:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, that violent attack from Placentia is about -

MR. BAIRD:

And I agree with him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Old landslide is into it. The next thing you know now there will be something thrown across the House again. You should be quiet because the next time you may hit me.

But, Mr. Speaker,\* to get back to what I was saying, I do not care if it was John A. MacDonald who adopted that policy, the fact that it was adopted does not make it right today. It did not make it right when it was adopted and it does not make it right today. So let the member for Placentia open up his mind, get it opened up so that we can put something into it, some wisdom. He is an old man and he should be wise. One wonders when one hears the words that comes out of his mouth sometimes whether he is or not. We know he is upset that the Premier will not put him in the Cabinet, we know all about that, he is terribly upset and I do not blame him. I do not blame him. He should have been in the Cabinet a long time ago. Then perhaps he would have opened up his mind, indeed he might have. He is a great gentleman outside of the House, but when he gets in here, all of his nastiness that he should be taking on the Premier of the Province and the government of which he is a part, he tries to throw across here. Slime and mud, the man who calls teacher hooligans, what else did he call them?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Terrorists.

MR. TULK:  
Terrorists. Was it terrorists he called them?

But in any case, Mr. Speaker, let me get back to my original point that there is absolutely no way in this Province that we should be considering stocks surplus. Surely a country that has been in the fishery for the years that this Province has been in the fishery should have developed the technology to harvest that fish

and process it.

Mr. Speaker, we do not catch that fish, as I said, because of our inability in marketing and secondary processing technology. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us ask the government a very important question, let us ask the member for Placentia a very important question. How much is his government, which stands on a record of supporting the fishery, making motherhood statements about the fishery, how much is his government spending this year on marketing? Does the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) know?

MR. PATTERSON:

Well, last year we put \$40 million in the inshore fishery.

MR. TULK:

I am asking you a question. How much? Does he know? Well, I will tell him.

MR. PATTERSON:

And I will tell you it was your leader who put Fishery Products into bankruptcy when he was fronting for the Bank of Nova Scotia. The Liberal leader.

MR. TULK:

This year in the estimates - is he going to on like that or do I have to ask for your protection, Mr. Speaker?

He is frightening me to death, over there. I am shivering.

How much money did his government put into marketing this year? Let me tell him - \$331,500, big deal - in our most important industry. How much did they put into improving our processing capabilities? - \$492,400. Let me ask him if there is any subhead in those estimates for technological

development? Is there? No. Not a word. That used to be there a couple of years ago, when the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) was Minister of Fisheries. Is it there this year? No. Nothing!

So is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that we have a fishery in the state that it is in today? Is it any wonder that we are giving away fish when our own government, the people who are supposed to be primarily concerned with the fishery, sit back, do nothing, and let everything slide by the board?

Mr. Speaker, one other point: If there is any area that we have noticed this government neglecting in the last couple of months and using as a political football, and playing around with their political buddies in Ottawa, then certainly it is in the area of fisheries. I do not need to go into that, it is well-known; we saw it again this afternoon when the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) asked a question of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). When he cannot get back to the former Liberal Government, then he will accuse us of politics and hide behind smoke screens.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the real action we see from this government is the Premier making all sorts of motherhood statements, and we have all kinds of examples of them. I think I have one here somewhere. Yes, here it is, this thing called a discussion paper on major bilateral issues - Canada and Newfoundland. That has been printed by the propaganda machine upon the eighth floor about one million times. That has been passed around. You read that at least three or four times a year, the same kind of statement, with

PC blue all over the place, with the Premier's only claim to fame, the new flag, on it. You will get that at least three or four times a year, virtually a motherhood statement which is reprinted over and over and over.

If that does not work for the Premier politically, then he will start lambasting. He spent the last three or four years lambasting a former federal Liberal government. Now, what do we see? We see an extreme quiet on the part of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and the Premier. They do not send their little telexes from the eighth floor any more, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) puts a little note on draft copies to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and says, 'By letter, not telex.' Slow down the process, give the issues time to go away.

Mr. Speaker, do we get the same kind of headlines now from the provincial Fisheries Minister that we used to get from the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) when he was Minister of Fisheries? 'Morgan wants meeting with federal minister.' 'Potential crisis looming in the fishery.' 'Morgan unhappy with the fishing plan.' Presumably he was speaking for the government. We have not heard this Minister of Fisheries stand up and say anything about the fishing plan, which has not substantially changed, if at all; if anything we are probably giving away more fish. 'Morgan angry over Northern cod quota' - another headline. Any anger being expressed now through the media over there? No, Mr. Speaker, not a word. 'Morgan raps Nova Scotia on cod stock policy.' 'Peckford denounces federal cod quotas.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, is that the kind of enthusiasm we are seeing over there now about the Newfoundland fishery? Absolutely not.

MR. TOBIN:

I have the headlines too.

MR. TULK:

You will get a chance to speak. Just be quite. You do not need to be brought to order now for being unruly in the House, you can make your maiden speech when you are ready.

The only thing that has changed in the policy of this government toward the fishery is that they are now the quietest people that we ever saw in Newfoundland, and, Mr. Speaker, there is a very good reason for that. There has been a change of government in Ottawa. They are now the handmaidens of Ottawa, as the government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) use to look over here and call us. They are now the handmaidens of Ottawa, they are now toeing the party line.

I see that the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is ready to jump up over there and go to town. I hope he does, because if he does he will get up and support a government, again, that has no policy on the fishery and has really nothing to say about the fishery anyway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after making those general comments about why we introduced the resolution, let me speak to some of the specifics in this resolution, and I want to speak, first of all, to the first two Whereases:

WHEREAS all parties in this hon. House have formerly had an all plants open policy; and - that is a correct statement, there is no

doubt about that -

WHEREAS the Government adopted such a policy during the negotiation of the Restructuring Agreement; and - there is no doubt about that, the government did adopt that policy. Well, I want to tell the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), who at the time was in Ottawa, that he is right, and the member for Burin - Placentia West knows this, he is right when he says that - my time is gone already, Mr. Speaker?

MR. FLIGHT:

And you making such an excellent speech.

MR. TULK:

The member for Burin Placentia West knows this, that when this whole issue developed, the Premier started off in this Province by admitting that certain plants might have to close. It was not any member on this side, nor it was not any federal member in Ottawa who was in front of the television cameras talking about the negative fallout that might exist.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I just got notice that I had five more minutes. Is there something wrong?

MR. SPEAKER:

My watch is wrong. Carry on.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, you mean you are going to interrupt me when I am just getting into full flight?

He knows that the Premier was in Ottawa on January 3 spouting out

that kind of thing after meetings with federal officials, that there may very well have to be some negative fallout, that there may very well have to be some plants closed. That was January 3, 1983.

Where did this all-plants-open policy come from in Newfoundland? Well, the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) knows full well where it came from. It came from a combination of two groups of people. The people on the South Coast of this Province, who were determined that their fish plants would stay opened, and in November of 1982, when the Premier was still making those statements about plants would have to close, it came from the Opposition side of this House. Hansard will show that. I know the member for Burin - Placentia West, when he gets up, will admit that those are the series of events that took place. We saw the Premier in January in Ottawa making points that the plants would have to close. In November the Opposition of this Province was saying no. And the Premier recognized after the People's Conference in Holiday Inn that this was a good political issue, that it was a good political stance for him to take, to have an all-plants-open policy. So, what does he do? I think that meeting took place on March 25, 1983 and I believe that the Premier walked into this House - you can check the numbers - walked into this House on March 26, 1983 and that was the first time that we heard from the Premier of the Province, March 26, 1983, that he was now adopting an all-plants-open policy. That was the very first time that that was said. I think it was March 25 or 26, 1983.

Now, what do we see? Is it any wonder that the Premier, through sending those different signals to Ottawa, on top of having his Fisheries Minister up there making deals and the Premier vetoing them, is it any wonder that we ended up with an agreement in September of 1983 that was less than satisfactory, and we pointed that out at the time. It was less than satisfactory for the Newfoundland fishery. The Premier on one occasion, when he signed it, called it 'the greatest agreement since Confederation.' In this Session of the House, I believe - Mr. Speaker, will remember this because he pays attention to everything that is said in the House - the Premier in this particular Session of the House rose and said he was forced into that deal. So what we have here is the Premier has been sending all kinds of conflicting signals to people he is negotiating with and he ended up with a deal that was less than desirable. One of the policies in that deal - and, Mr. Speaker, I think my time is just about up and I am probably going to end and let that master mind from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) stand up in his place and defend his government - but the Premier has on occasion adopted an all-plants-open policy. When it suits him, he will allow FPI or the federal government or whoever happens to be around at the time, to close down plants.

Now, I ask all of the members on the other side to stand and support this, I know they will, they will not be offended by the fact that the word 'Liberal' is in there, surely, because it was a Liberal policy in this Province that there be an all-plants-open policy. It was first delivered by

the Liberal party in this Province.

MR. PATTERSON:  
Delivered with treachery.

MR. TULK:  
It is treachery?

MR. PATTERSON:  
Yes.

MR. TULK:  
To keep all the plants open?

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):  
Order, please!

The hon. members time has elapsed.

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TOBIN:  
Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to speak to this resolution that is put before the House today by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). I can honestly say, Mr. Speaker, that as the member for Fogo was putting forth the resolution he tried to give credit for the all-plants-open policy to the Liberal party. Well, Mr. Speaker, have we ever heard it.

The Liberal party in this Province, the Liberal party in this country, the Liberal government of the day and the House Leader for the Opposition, acting Leader today I would assume, knows full well, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal party in this country and the Liberal government of the day have one policy as it related to the opening of the plants in this Province and that, Mr. Speaker,

was to close them.

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

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

MR. TULK:  
I just want the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) - and I promise him I will not interrupt him too many times - but I just want him to see if he can point out the difference to this House - and then perhaps there will be some intellectual honesty in what he is saying - point out the difference in this House between the Liberal party in Ottawa, the Liberal party in New Brunswick and the Liberal party in Newfoundland. Does he know there is a difference, that we are free minds down here? Does he know that? Has he not recognized that yet?

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:  
The only difference I know is that this group here followed the Liberal government in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I can tell the hon. gentlemen that

the Liberal party in this Province stood foursquare behind the Liberal party in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. They stood foursquare behind Mr. De Bane when on July 4, 1983 at a press conference in St. John's. What did he say about plants, Mr. Speaker, about the district that I represent? Probably, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman would like to know what he said. I will tell you what he said.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What did De Bane say?

MR. TULK:

I do not care what he said.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You supported him.

MR. TULK:

No, I did not.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and that is what the hon. member did.

MR. TULK:

No, I did not. He was a kissing cousin with the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), remember?

MR. TOBIN:

He said, 'If management decides to merge Burin with Marystown, Grand Bank with Fortune, not reopen St. Lawrence, and a labour adjustment package including early retirement-

MR. TULK:

I would put Mr. De Bane on a raft and let him drift to England, or Ireland, or wherever. He was the kissing cousin of the member for Bonavista South.

MR. TOBIN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, what else did he say? They came down here, the

federal Liberal government, the crowd hon. members opposite supported, talking about all plants open as it relates to the restructuring agreement in this Province. Well, I guess we got to deal with the restructuring agreement when it was put in place. And Mr. De Bane came down here and said how happy he was to come down and deal with the issue, the issue, Mr. Speaker, that put Burin down the tubes, that put Grand Bank down the tubes. That was the issue they were so happy about.

Where was St. Lawrence going? It was never to be reopened again.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. TULK:

I do not believe the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is intentionally misleading this House, I do not believe that at all, but for him to stand over on that side and suggest that the Opposition of the day was in agreement with the federal Minister of Fisheries, Mr. De Bane, when, in fact, the kissing cousin of the federal Minister of Fisheries at the time was the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), who happened to be the provincial Minister of Fisheries at that time, is misleading this House, Mr. Speaker. I know he is not doing it intentionally, but he is misleading the House and I have to point it out to him. I think it is out of ignorance that he is doing it, ignorance in the sense that he does not have the knowledge, rather than any desire to do that.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, does the truth ever hurt the hon. member for Fogo. Does the truth ever hurt.

MR. TULK:

No, No. When you tell the truth, I will sit here quietly.

MR. TOBIN:

He was going to open Ramea, Gaultois and Harbour Breton, merge Burin with Marystown and merge Grand Bank with Fortune. Now, does that not mean the closure of Burin?

MR. TULK:

Who was?

MR. TOBIN:

The federal Liberal government.

MR. TULK:

De Bane?

MR. TOBIN:

You were part and parcel to it.

MR. TULK:

No, no, no. We disagreed with him violently.

MR. TOBIN:

Oh, yes. Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, when they used to vote against the resolutions that were brought to the floor of this House to condemn him for it.

What else did he say?

MR. TULK:

You go back now and check Hansard, November 23, 1982.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

What else did he say? He said, 'The agreement also ensures that employees who lost their jobs as a result of plant mergers and could not find re-employment in the fisheries' - and what was going to happen to St. Lawrence? - 'and the employees at St. Lawrence, which would remain closed, would receive severance pay.' Now, 'which would remain closed,' Mr. Speaker, 'which would remain closed', that is what the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) did, aided and abetted by the party opposite on July 4, 1983.

Mr. Speaker, probably the hon. member would like to know what the people of Burin said about the restructuring agreement, the people of the district I represent. "It is a monster." That is what they said about it. What did the clergy say, Mr. Speaker? Reverend Chaulk, a very great, respectable and distinguished gentleman on the Burin Peninsula, said he was disgusted that Mr. De Bane did not announce the reopening of the Burin Plant. "It is utterly unbelievable that the federal government is leaving the decision on the future of the plant to the new management." He agrees with Mr. Peckford's position. Yes, Mr. Speaker, he agrees with Premier Peckford's position that 'the plant should have been allowed to operate for a three-year period before any decision on further operations would be made.'

Mr. Speaker, that is what the people of the South Coast said when the Liberal Party of this Province was standing foursquare behind the Liberal Party and Government of Canada. When they



were putting the shaft to 6,000 Newfoundlanders on the South Coast, that is where the hon. gentlemen opposite stood.

But that is not where this party stood. Because on June 30 the Premier of this Province finally had to make known the position of the provincial government as a result of the action or inaction of the Federal Liberal Government of the day, the federal government that did not want to keep all plants open. What did the Premier have to say? This was on June 30. He said, "The provincial government presented its submission to the Federal Cabinet Committee on Fisheries Restructuring which contained an all-plants-open policy for this Province." That was the position as it relates to the restructuring agreement of the provincial government.

Mr. Speaker, what else did the Premier have to say that day? "After several months of negotiations, the Province and the federal government have now arrived at an impasse insofar as plant utilization is concerned." Mr. Speaker, why was there an impasse as a result of plant utilization? It was because the Premier of this Province and the government which he leads could not agree with the actions of the federal Liberal Government in closing plants such as Burin, in closing plants such as Grand Bank, in closing plants such as St. Lawrence, to put the locks on these doors and say to the people who were employed there, We are going to do what? - "We are going to give you your salary for one year." Mr. Speaker, is that not utterly despicable?

Now, Mr. Speaker, he went on to

say, 'As I have indicated, our position has been that all offshore plants currently operating in this Province should remain open.'

MR. DINN:  
Who said that?

MR. TOBIN:  
The Premier of this Province. That is what he said, "We believe that each and every one should be given at least a chance, at least an opportunity to demonstrate their viability that no plant," and I repeat, Mr. Speaker, 'that no plant should be arbitrarily closed without a reasonable chance to succeed an achieved profitability.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, what was the position of the federal government? The position of the federal government was to remain adamant that two plants, the plant in Burin and the plant in Grand Bank should not have a future. Now that is what the Liberal government wanted, that is what the gentlemen opposite wanted, that is the philosophy of the party in this Province that you served and are now part of. And the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) should not smile at the fact that people are going to be thrown on the unemployment roles. He, Mr. Speaker, has gone through it, I am sure, in Gander as a member of the council, and it is certainly a very serious matter. The plant in Burin and the plant in Grand Bank should not have a future. They were proposing, Mr. Speaker, that the future of Grand Bank should be decided upon by the management of a new company to be established after restructuring.

At that time the provincial government's position was that all

plants should remain open. And, Mr. Speaker, the government of this Province, even to try and accommodate, to try, at that point in time, to have the federal government come at least within the scope of solving the problem, at least within the scope of having an agreement, Mr. Speaker, that could be put forward whereby Newfoundlanders on the South Coast could continue to be employed.

MR. FLIGHT:  
(Inaudible)

MR. TOBIN:  
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I heard about him. As a matter of fact about twenty years ago I had a little crackie who ran away and I never saw him until after April 2. The hon. gentleman was part of this party that wanted to put the shaft to Newfoundlanders.

As I was saying, the provincial government went so far as to suggest to the federal government, 'change your attitude, forget the fact that you want to close Burin, Grand Bank, and St. Lawrence, forget it. Let us at least give them a chance, let us give them a three-year period to see what they can do.'

No, Mr. Speaker, the federal government would not hear of it, and on July 4 Mr. De Bane totally came out, disassociated himself from what the Premier had said, walked into St. John's, said how happy he was to be here, and that the great contribution he was going to make to the Newfoundland fishing industry, the great contribution was to announce that Burin would be closed and that 500 jobs would be down the tube, that Grand Bank would be closed and another 500 jobs would be down the tube, and nothing at all for St.

Lawrence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, today I checked with Fishery Products in Burin, and as a result of the Premier of this Province's effort, and nobody but the Premier of this Province can accept responsibility for it, Mr. Speaker, the secondary processing and the refit going to Burin, nobody but the Premier of this Province. I hear the hon. gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), all you want to do is fight with Ottawa, you are not interested in the fishery. That was the cover of supporting the actions of the federal government. Well, Mr. Speaker, today in Burin, I think, it is 223 people that are on the pay roll.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):  
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
I think the world of the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), I think he tries his best to convince himself that what he is saying is right. But I ask him to go back to a certain day in November, 1982 when this hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) stood in this House - it is in Hansard. He can read, and if he cannot I will read it to him, and see who took the position that every plant in this Province had to be open. Now, for his own education, Mr. Speaker, call him to order and ask him to do that. I will supply him with Hansard if he cannot find it himself.

DR. COLLINS:  
To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. Minister of Finance, to

that point of order.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite clearly made such a poor speech, when he was up on his feet before, that he feels he did not get his points in, so now he feels that he has to interrupt the right of another hon. member to make his point. I would say that there is no point of order and that the hon. member should be reprimanded, both for the bad speech he made, and secondly, for interrupting another member.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Newfoundland's care bear should know that what I was trying to do, and he is a jolly, good-looking fellow, he is a poor Finance Minister, he should know -

MR. WARREN:

(Inaudible)

MR. TULK:

Would the glare from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) be quite? He should know that what I was trying to do, and what the House has a right to have done to it, on a point of order I rose to correct the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and ask him not to keep pounding his desk. I will show him Hansard where he should be corrected. Do not go making political speeches, get up and say something sensible.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the Premier of this Province on several occasions and, I think, one occasion was March 23, 1983, and on another occasion he went public on June 30, 1983. What did he say, Mr. Speaker?

MR. TULK:

Go back to November, 1982.

MR. TOBIN:

Okay, but what did the Premier say? For example, I have proof here of what he said on June 30, 1983, and that was simple. He said he had indicated our position to the federal government and that position was that we believed that each and every plant should be given at least a chance, at least an opportunity to demonstrate their viability, that no plant should be arbitrarily closed without a reasonable chance to succeed and achieve profitability. Is that not, Mr. Speaker, a policy of all-plants-open by this government?

MR. TULK:

I said that.

MR. TOBIN:

Okay, you are agreeing that that is the policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has agreed that on June 30, 1983, Mr. Speaker, this government had an all-plants-open policy. On July 4, 1983, just four days later, the

federal minister, Mr. De Bane, came in here and said, 'The future of the plants at Grand Bank, Burin and St. Lawrence will be decided by a management board and the new company and the plants will remain closed at this particular point in time.' Now, what is that? Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that on June 30, 1983 this government's position was made perfectly clear that we wanted all plants open. On July 3, 1983, the federal Liberal minister came into this city and announced the closure of three or four plants.

That resolution, Mr. Speaker, is something else!

I would like to move the following amendment, seconded by the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), that all words after the first 'Whereas' be deleted and replaced by the following: "WHEREAS the government adopted an all-plants-open policy during the negotiations of the restructuring agreement; and

WHEREAS fish plants are most often the sole means of the economic survival of fishing communities and the foundation of their social fabric; and

WHEREAS it is necessary to provide time for fish plants to prove their economic viability through the restructuring process;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this hon. House commend the present administration for adopting a policy ensuring that all fish plants covered in the agreement remain open."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Now, that amendment, Mr. Speaker, is certainly in keeping with the resolution as put forth by the hon. member.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. TULK:

I think Your Honour is perhaps going to need some time to make a ruling on whether the member has changed the intent of the motion.

MR. FLIGHT:

And he obviously has.

MR. TULK:

He obviously has dickered with it and tried to. Mr. Speaker, let me make a point to him: I do not mind commending his government as long as they adopt that all-plants-open policy and as long as we hear them stand up foursquare and say, 'Yes, we do.'

Mr. Speaker, I would say the amendment is out of order because it changes the whole intent of the policy. The policy was stated by this party and we are asking the government to support that. When they do, we will commend them. You may need some time, Mr. Speaker, to rule as to whether or not it is out of order.

MR. TOBIN:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

There is certainly no point of

order. The point of the motion, Mr. Speaker, that was put forth by the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), was that this administration adopt the policy of ensuring that all fish plants in the Province were open.

Now, Mr. Speaker, throughout what I had to say in the debate, it was clearly indicated from all the statements issued that this government already has a policy, the restructuring agreement. The policy is there that all plants must remain open. That clearly indicates that what the hon. member was suggesting has been done and that means, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment is certainly in order, the intent has not changed the motion whatsoever. It is certainly in order and I present it, Mr. Speaker, to the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I will reserve my ruling until tomorrow.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, we certainly respect your ruling in this regard, but I do not think it would be out of order, or at least, in any way against the precedent of this House, if Your Honour wished to recess for just a few moments and perhaps would just inspect the wording of the motion. We would certainly have no problems with that approach.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Fortune -

Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I clearly heard the Deputy Speaker say that he was reserving on this matter until tomorrow. The only intervening development was an interjection by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), which had the effect of questioning Your decision.

But, that aside, his suggestion was that you recess and then suddenly I hear the Chair indicate it is going to recess. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that your first decision was a good one and I would urge you to preserve the impression of impartiality of the Chair to go with your first decision and not be intimidated by the gentleman from St. John's South (Dr. Collins). There is no urgency, we do not have to vote on this matter until next Wednesday. It has no implications for the time of the gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), so we can proceed and we can await, with bated breath for your decision tomorrow, but there is no need for you to appear to be intimidated by the gentleman for St. John's South.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I believe I rose on a point of order and I am not sure if Your Honour has ruled on my point of order. I understand that the hon. member opposite rose on another point of order which I do not think is quite proper until the point of order that I rose was fully disposed of.

In my point of order I preambled

my remarks by saying I was not questioning the Chair in any way whatsoever. What I was doing, I was bringing forward a suggestion that if Your Honour wished to recess for a few moments to consider the wording of the motion - this is not, in any way, against your original ruling - but if you wished to recess for a few moments to consider the wording of the motion, we on this side would have no objection. That was the sum total of my point of order.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) did, indeed, rise on another point of order and he was right in doing so because Your Honour had already made a ruling that you would reserve your ruling until tomorrow. It was a good ruling, perfectly acceptable to this side and you have the right to do that.

Then the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins), the member for St. John's South, rose in his place and, in essence, questioned whether he should have made that ruling or not and as the member for Fortune - Hermitage said, you do not have to be bullied by the Finance Minister over there, who is not good at anything anyway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. TULK:

He already said that he would reserve his ruling.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The Chair will recess and make a ruling this afternoon and, if need be, I will repeat it again tomorrow.

MR. SIMMONS:

Bullied again.

### Recess

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

Order, please!

To that point of order, the Chair has ruled that the amendment to the motion is in order.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I want, first of all, to congratulate my esteemed colleague from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) for having the foresight to put down this motion, a motion that incorporates good Liberal policy.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I want to have a close look given that it took ten minutes of our valuable time for the Chair to decide if the motion was in order. I am sure the motion required some scrutiny on the part of all members before they rush in to support it or to oppose it. I would want to have a look at the wisdom embodied in the amendment put down by my friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin).

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I shall plunge on to say, first of all, that I found rather interesting what the gentleman

from Burin - Placentia West was saying on the subject of plants being opened and who was for it and who was against it. In particular, and perhaps in this respect I help him to make his point, I have no difficulty doing that. He needs all the help he can get, but he, at two or three points in his speech, he kept saying, "And what was the policy of the Federal Liberal Government?" These were the essence of the words he put out several times, what was the policy, and he would scream into the microphone that it was the policy of the Federal Liberal Government to have plants closed. Many times he said that. He said it in this Chamber, and he said it outside this Chamber, so we can only believe that he believes that to be the case.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he quoted at length from a number of documents and missals that the Premier has sent up to Ottawa. I thought it passing strange that he omitted to quote from one document in particular, a document that for him would be most instructive because it would put the lie to his newspeak approach. You know Orwell, Mr. Speaker, Orwell's book 1984, how everybody was to mouth the official line no matter how big a lie it was. But in that vien I find the gentleman from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) engaging in newspeak because, Mr. Speaker, it is passing strange that the gentleman from Burin - Placentia West, and others on the government side, do not pay more attention to one of their government's own documents, a document that I regard almost as my bible on the fishery. I refer to a document dated May 5, 1983 entitled, 'Restructuring the Fishery, a Detailed Presentation

by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to the Government of Canada,' and that document in commendable detail, Mr. Speaker, in commendable detail, sets out the problems facing the fishery at that time, May '83, and incredibly they have not altered appreciably since then, but it addresses the issue of resource utilization and the processing sector and marketing and allocations and so on and so forth.

What I find of particular interest in the document, in terms of what has been said by the gentleman from Burin-Placentia West, are a couple of sentences on pages fifteen and sixteen of the document. On page fifteen the authors of this document, and I assume it had the endorsement of the Premier because it was sent with a letter from him to the Prime Minister of Canada of the day, Mr. Trudeau, and the document on page fifteen points out that Price Waterhouse had predicated their figures on five existing plants being closed, the plants at Grand Bank, Burin, Gaultois, Fermeuse and St. Lawrence. Price Waterhouse, the Toronto firm that had been engaged by the task force to do some studies had predicated their deliberations on five plants being closed, and the document from the Government of Newfoundland correctly reflects that point.

But then, Mr. Speaker, on page sixteen: here is a statement that I wished the gentleman from Burin-Placentia West would have had the courage to quote, and it should not take an awful lot of courage, Mr. Speaker, to quote from a document put out by the government which you support, dated May 5, 1983. Here is what the Government of Newfoundland is

saying to the Government of Canada on May 5, not only the month but the day is important because I will mention a couple of other days in that month shortly, on May 5, 1983 the Government of Newfoundland is saying to the Government of Canada, and I quote directly from the document, "We were encouraged to learn that, notwithstanding the Price Waterhouse analysis, the Government of Canada has no fixed position with respect to plant closures. We understand that the federal government is prepared to give consideration to various means whereby an effort can be made to upgrade as necessary and to continue the operation of marginal plants through a joint effort by all parties."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the Government of Newfoundland saying that on May 5, 1983 it understood, and remember that at this particular point in time it was much excited about attacking the federal government at every turn, it said very few good words about the federal government on any particular subject, but here is a document, Mr. Speaker, in which the Government of Newfoundland is quite candid is saying, 'We understand the Government of Canada not only has no fixed position on plant closures but is prepared to enter into an effort to keep those plants open.' That is what the Government of Newfoundland is admitting to be the position of the federal government on May 5.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how can the gentleman from Burin-Placentia West, and others on that side, stand with straight faces and go on with this nonsense about some great big plot to close down fish plants?

MR. DINN:  
DeBane did it.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, I hear the gentleman from Pleasantville remind us of Mr. DeBane, who was the Fisheries Minister at this particular time. Well there were a couple of Fisheries Ministers at this particular time, one was by the name of DeBane, the other I am not supposed to mention by name, I will mention him by riding, he is the member in this House for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), and on May 5, Mr. Speaker, this is the understanding of the provincial government of the federal government's position.

Now, I take you two days later, May 7, because on that day those two ministers sat down and they signed a piece of paper. You have to assume that they were doing it on a mandate from their respective governments to negotiate.

I understand in recent conversations with the former Minister of Fisheries, (Mr. Morgan), the gentleman for Bonavista South that, indeed, was the case, and I would be surprised if it was not the case. He was the full-fledged Minister of Fisheries in the administration, as was Mr. De Bane on the federal side. So two days after this document is prepared, or is dated, at least, the two ministers on behalf of their respective governments signed an agreement, an agreement, which among other things, provides for the closure of some plants.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if, not by my heresay, but if by the statement of the Government of Newfoundland, one of the parties, it admits freely that if it knows the other



party the Government of Canada has no dark plot to close plants on May 5, what can you construe from the fact that two days later representatives of those two governments, this government and the one in Ottawa signed a document agreeing to the closure of certain plants? You can only construe that the two governments entered, coming at it really from the same motivation that, where possible, they would keep plants open. You can only construe that both of them coming at it from that motivation and with that objective in mind, made an agreement which their ministers judged to be within the mandate given them by their respective governments.

Now we all know what my position on the issue was. We know what the gentleman for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) position was. Let us put the politics aside. He was not out aiding and abetting the process. He was not saying, let us close down Burin. I was not saying, let us close down Burin. We both represented the same constituents in different orders of government, I federal, and he provincial. But there is no need of a lot of partisan nonsense on this because he was doing his best, as I understood it, to ensure that the plant was kept open. I was doing my best.

But two ministers went into a room with a mandate to negotiate. And what came out the other end was as unacceptable to me, as I believe it was to the gentleman for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). Then we know what transpired since. We know that there were subsequent initiatives to keep those plants open for an interim period.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the government in Ottawa is changed. The tone of urgency of the fish plant issue has been wound down, it does not have the urgency it seems to have had any more with those governments. We heard all of the rhetoric about how those plants had to stay open or else. Now we are hearing that somehow FPI is going to make all of the decisions.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I give notice for our side here that we are not going to stand by and let FPI make decisions which fly in the face of the spirit of that particular agreement. That agreement was hard won by people on both sides, irrespective of the partisan politics involved. It is an agreement that reflects the needs of parts of this Province which depend heavily on fish plants, and I am thinking of communities like Ramea, Harbour Breton, Gaultois, and so many other communities that I could mention, where the social reason was written into the agreement as the justification for keeping those plants open, if everything else failed. If economic viability were not a sufficient criterion for keeping them open, they ought to be kept open for other reasons. I stand by that, and the agreement is foursquare behind that. And we cannot, Mr. Speaker, under any circumstances allow a dismantling of that agreement. And while I say that, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the present Provincial Government has allowed some dismantling of it.

I know and I appreciate the sentiments of the newly appointed Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). I think his heart is in the right place on this one. I do not say that in any condescending

way. I think his heart is in the right place on this one and I think his head is in the right place on this one. But I say to him that he is going to come to the same grief that his predecessors before him have come to, not because of lack of will on his part, and not because of lack of commitment or lack of understanding on his part. He is going to come to grief on this one for the same reason the gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) came to grief. The rug is going to be pulled out from under him, because sooner or later he will come to realize that the Premier of this Province is the real stumbling block when it comes to improving fisheries administration in this Province. He is the person who sent confusing signals to the bureaucrats in Ottawa. And no politician in Ottawa, not Tory, not Liberal, is on the record as favouring the closing of any plants. No politician.

Some bureaucrats, who were giving instructions to Price Waterhouse, who have always had the attitude in Central Canada you should close down everything East of Montreal anyway. And it is the same bureaucrats who are serving the Tory Administration in Ottawa, so do not expect different advice from them.

One of the things that rankled me more than anything else during my period in Ottawa was the attitude that somehow if there was not a million people in a given spot, it was not worth keeping going. The attitude is that somehow if it did not exist in the Toronto - Montreal - Quebec triangle or corridor then it was not worth addressing, the attitude that they had to tolerate concerns about the less-populated parts of this

country. It was not a partisan attitude in the political partisan sense, it was the old Central Canada attitude, that the people in the West have been rankling under, that we have been rankling under.

Now for a while, Mr. Speaker, it got packaged differently. When we had a Liberal government in Ottawa and a Tory government here, it got packaged in the sense of being big, bad, federal Liberals versus good, pure Tories in the provinces. But the water has changed on the beans now, Mr. Speaker, and already we are beginning to see, we saw it last week in the statement of the Solicitor General, the gentleman from Nova Scotia, Mr. MacKay, who says publicly that the budget of the government of which he is a supporter and a member is not as good for Nova Scotia as it is for Central Canada. He said that publicly in Halifax last week. They are beginning to twig to something that we have understood for a long time down here. There is not a question of Tory versus Liberal very often, it is a question of the mentality that you are fighting up there in Central Canada. I digress but I wanted to make the point that the people now, Mr. Fraser, the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa, they will get the same advice from the same quarters as Mr. De Bane did and Mr. Lalonde and Mr. Breau, briefly, and other ministers got from those people.

Nor is that kind of advice the sole property of bureaucrats in fisheries. Indeed, I would say that in fisheries they tend to have, perhaps, a slightly more enlightening approach because they do have a number of native sons of this Province in positions of

influence. But when I was making comments about this Central Canada mentality I was thinking also of DREE and Transport and other departments of government like Treasury Board, for example.

The hon. gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and I could tell, again, partisanship aside, he and I could tell a big long story about one Mr. Bailey. I am talking about Petit Forte, and that particular bureaucrat, okay. Well, again, I say, partisanship aside, what a story we could tell there about how a bureaucrat decided what was best for Placentia Bay, without consulting anybody.

Indeed, I sat in on a meeting in Ottawa with Mr. Pepin, who was then the Minister of Transport, and heard him give a direct instruction to his bureaucrats. This particular bureaucrat went out, and when he was finished with the instruction, he had the boat going in the opposite direction because, in his wisdom, he thought it might save somebody a few dollars. He had forgotten, like a lot of bureaucrats forget, that sometimes dollars and cents are not the only qualifier, that there are other considerations for people who live in Placentia Bay and who, traditionally, have a connection from a medical standpoint, from a education standpoint and from a shopping standpoint, a connection to Argentinia, as opposed to the other side of the bay, Baine Harbour.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that very soon with the stated philosophy of the federal Tory government about private enterprise solves all our problems, and I agree, it has the potential to solve a fair number, but not all of them. But I

believe and I fear with that mentality, the Central Canada mentality is going to become married with it fairly soon and we are going to be the victims down here.

Mr. Speaker, I started to say that the gentleman from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) is going to come to grief and I hope he does not. He is a person I have known for a long time and admire greatly, he knows that, but he is going to come to grief if he does not keep his eyes wide open on the antics of the Premier on this particular issue. The Premier has said many things on many occasions and very few of them very consistent. It depends on the mood of the moment. There is a transcript, there is a scrum in Ottawa, I mentioned it the other day, and the Premier is quoted, in January 1983, as saying, 'Some fish plants will have to close,' in one of his candid moments on national television. What a place to be candid! And it was that signal that the bureaucrats -

MR. TULK:

Is that when he talked about the negative fallout.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, exactly, and he went on to say that there would be some negative fallout and so on and so forth. But it was that signal, that unguarded moment, that sent a confusing signal to those bureaucrats with the Central Canada mentality I talked about, that they latched onto and every opportunity they got they shoved a piece of paper in front of the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) and Mr. De Bane and others about fish plants closing. That was what we were fighting. It was not a partisan fight, it

was a fight that I have already summarized of the Atlantic Canadians against the Central Canadians.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is so much more that could be said on this resolution, but I have had an indication that my time has all be expired so I will clue up as quickly as I can.

Mr. Speaker, the motion that the gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has put down is a good resolution because it allows us to get on record, as a House, in favour of the plants-open policy. That is going to be much more of a weapon than perhaps we see it to be at this particular point in time because the onslaught is going to come. That is the whole point of what I have been attempting to say in the past twenty minutes. The onslaught is going to come. There is going to be all kinds of sweet talk about how their other solutions, like the thing they just bamboozled the people of Cape Breton into, all kinds of sweet talk.

But the bottom line is going to be if we are not very guarded as a House, as a collective membership, the bottom line is going to be that just as the people from Cape Breton got bamboozled out of their heavy water plants, and maybe they should have gone - I will not get into the merits of that, I do not know them well enough - but I will just draw a parallel for you, just as they got bamboozled into thinking that they were going to get some kind of a plum if they agreed to that, we are running the danger of getting bamboozled into allowing some of our plants to close on the basis of a lot of sweet talk from Ottawa, not manufactured by Mr. Mulroney or

Mr. Fraser, manufactured by the Central Canada mentality I talked about just now, an easy to pedal approach to politicians from Central Canada, a politician from Quebec like Mr. Mulroney, a politician from Ontario like Mr. Wilson, easy to pedal, because it is not a problem that they have to live with day in and day out that, we, who live on this rock, have to. So, I send a signal, Mr. Speaker, and I make an appeal to members of this House, whatever the final wording, that we agree on one thing, that we, as a House, work together, we are unanimous, on the need to be on the record in terms of an all-plants-open policy and have that as part of the mandate that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) can take to Ottawa and continue saying again and again and again, that we can accept nothing less in Newfoundland for social reasons, for political reasons, for reasons of basic humanity. We can accept nothing less than this and so he can pull out of his briefcase the resolution from this House and say, 'Here is what our House passed in June, 1985 on this issue.' Both parties, all parties, hopefully, on a continuous basis on this issue of all-plants-open even if it requires some dollars out of the public purse to achieve that, at a least for a four-year period. We are not unreasonable, we are not saying for ever and ever. We are saying let us look at it again in four years but from my perspective now, Mr. Speaker, in knowing what I do about the South Coast where many of those plants are located this resolution, more than any resolution - we can discuss about offshore, about electrical rates or about anything else -

MR. TOBIN:

And the amendment?

MR. SIMMONS:

I have not really had a chance tonight. I say to the gentleman in all kindness, I did not really dismiss the member I said that I really had not looked at it. So I just chose to talk to the general subject at hand and I would submit to him that from what I heard of his wording there is a bit of partisanship in there, but that aside, we are coming at it from the same direction that we want to see a resolution which puts us all on the record as favouring an all-plants-open policy. That is the point that I have been attempting to drive home in the past few minutes and I would invite other members to do so.

I believe my colleague from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has it worded in the appropriate way but I leave that to individual members of the House to decide. I understand my time has expired.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to speak to this most important resolution on the subject, that I suspect will occupy more of my time as Minister of Fisheries than any other subject, or perhaps should.

Let me just begin though, I notice the hon. gentleman from Fogo in his usual political dart fashion had to have a little shot at me while I was out of the House, thanks to his colleagues, doing a

little interview with the press by saying that I -

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:

They get me on everyday, Mr. Speaker, they are a great bunch. I really appreciate it. I just hope the bubble does not burst.

Mr. Speaker, he indicated that as soon as I answer a question in the House I duck out. Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that there are times when we have to run upstairs. Just take yesterday, for example, after Question Period when I ducked out at 4:00 p.m., do you know where I was, Mr. Speaker? Down meeting with the Board of Directors of the Fogo Island Co-op trying to do something for the fishery in the hon. gentleman's district and then he takes a pot shot at me because from time to time I got to pop out of the House. I do not really mind, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:

If the minister - we know he is hurting, there is no doubt about that, he has been severely tested in the last little while - but if the minister is hurting at all under our attacks, if he feels we are personally hurting him, Mr. Speaker, I would apologize to the hon. gentleman. Let me tell him that the people from the Fogo Island Co-op were pretty pleased, too, yesterday evening, in the

meeting with him. I would not want to hurt the member personally, not at all, Mr. Speaker. I apologize to him.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Obviously there is no point of order. Mr. Speaker, I would not even hurt if the hon. gentleman rolled over on me. I just want to let him know that sometimes it is necessary for us to have to pop out of the House once in a while to meet with a delegation from Fogo or a delegation from Port de Grave like I had to do the other day. So from time to time we have to do that.

Mr. Speaker, to get more into the meat of this resolution and the amendment, just let me say first of all, I understand some of the complexities. I understand some of the feeling and compassion that members like the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), like the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) and I guess many other hon. members of this House can try to portray to this House, to the public of Newfoundland and Labrador when they talk about the fishery, particularly the meat of this resolution, when they talk about the restructuring of the fishery. There is a whole range of different sectors to the fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, but the meat of this resolution sort of centers around the restructuring agreement that was entered into by both governments a couple of years

ago and tries to focus in on where we are all going to be in trying to make sure that the spirit and the intent of that agreement is lived up to by this government, by the federal government, so that the restructured deep-sea fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador is hopefully better off because that restructuring agreement was put in place.

I can understand the deep feeling that people on all sides of this House, particularly members that represent fairly historic and strong fishing districts, would have in that regard. There was a lot of emotion, there was a lot of passion, there was a lot of will, there was a lot of determination went into trying to bring about a potential saviour for the deep-sea fishery in this Province over a lot of months. A lot of work went into it, Mr. Speaker, by politicians at all levels. There was a lot of work went into it by officials at all levels, no doubt. I am not interested in the twenty minutes that I have available to me today to go into a history lesson.

There are only a few things that I know and there are a few things that cannot be disputed by fact. The fact of the matter is that this Province, as quoted by the hon. the gentleman from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), on May 5, I believe, proposed, in writing, and stood in writing behind an all-plants-open policy.

Another fact is that on June 30, a few days later the Premier of the Province proposed, in writing, publicly, an all-plants-open policy. The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, was that on July 4, the federal government, represented by the Minister of

Fisheries, proposed an agreement that did not accept the principle of an all-plants-open policy. Now I cannot dispute that, nobody in this House can dispute that, no individual in Newfoundland and Labrador can dispute that.

You can argue the politics of why it happened, you can argue whether you blame it on the central mentality of officials in Ottawa, you can make that argument, as was made by a member here just recently. But that is where we come from, that is what happened, that is the history.

Now, I am more concerned about the reality, Mr. Speaker. The reality of the matter is that we have before us today an agreement signed in good faith by the government of Canada at the time, never mind the badgering, never mind the political warfare, never mind the rhetoric that had to go on, but the deal was signed in good faith by the government of Canada of the day. The deal was signed in good faith and with a great deal of enthusiasm, I might add, by the government of that day that represented the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and it is still the same government today. So the reality of the matter is that the fisheries restructuring agreement, whether you like it or not, whether you agree that it was the ultimate or not, whether you think that there were deficiencies in it or not, is here in front of us.

That agreement, Mr. Speaker, is very clear on some very specific issues.

First of all, it has within it an all-plants-open policy for a reasonable period of time. And I say to this Legislature, Mr.

Speaker, as I have said to the federal government, and as I have said to the new senior management of that corporation, that a reasonable period of time, in no man's imagination, is three or four or five or six months. That is not a reasonable period of time. It might be four years, it might be three years, it might be a five-year plan, which we are going to have on our tables by the end of June or the first part of July, but it is not six months, it is not three months, it is not twelve months. And that is the first principle which we have, Mr. Speaker. That is the first principle that was enshrined in that agreement that must be protected in letter and in spirit, no matter who they are or where they are that may want to have it changed. It cannot be changed and it will not be changed with the agreement of this administration, and we have made that clear.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we also must realize that there was a year and a half or so when this corporation was not directed by the kind of - not that there was anything wrong with them - but they did not have the senior management direction that they now have in place, the chief executive officer, the new administration for finance and public relations, and that has to go on down through. That has to find itself down to the middle management level, to the plant management level and to the floor of the plant, all around this Province in the plants that that corporation manages, before, Mr. Speaker, anybody can say that that agreement was given a reasonable chance to succeed. That has to happen, and that has to be the first principle that we come from as a government in maintaining the integrity and the honesty and the

determination of that restructuring agreement.

If we do not do that as a Legislature, if we do not do that as a government then, Mr. Speaker, we deserve to be condemned. And it is not going to be done by playing political partisan games of using one political label in a resolution versus another political label in a resolution, it is going to be done by men and women of good will, people who are determined to see the future of the fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador develop as it should be, not for what it was.

You can go around to any community, Mr. Speaker, in this Province, and you will find an expert on the fishery, and I do not propose, after five or six weeks, to be one. But somehow or other, all of us, as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, whether we lived in Ming's Bight or Main Brook or, I suppose, in St. John's - I do not know if Flower Hill in St. John's would qualify - but in whatever part of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador that we lived, we always considered ourselves to be the instant experts, to have the answers to whatever the problem was in the fishery.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we faced the problem a year and a half or two years ago for a whole bunch of reasons, whether it was economic reasons or marketing reasons or bad management reasons. I would suggest to you, Sir, that it was a combination of all those factors and perhaps more that we do not know about that brought about a crisis.

And where did we find it at first? We found it first in the

deep-sea sector. That is where it manifested itself perhaps more in a visual way, it caught the attention more. Because when you see Ramea and Burin and Grand Bank and Catalina and all the other places going down, big employers, a big part of the industry, when you see that happening, then it is catching, it is sensational, it gets the news. Everybody is uptight, everybody is upset. So it caught not only provincial attention, Mr. Speaker, but it caught national attention.

So there was an effort made to try to do something about it. And I have heard the detractors already, saying that there is no way it is going to work. We heard it here again today from a gentleman who maintains that he put a lot of effort, when he was sitting in another place, into bringing about this restructuring agreement, and explained to us that it was not the political will that was the problem, it was the problem of the bureaucrats of the civil servants, the central Canadian thinking. He cautions us that it can happen again.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope he is wrong. And I hope that this House will agree, as we did three or four weeks ago on another issue related to the fishery and, I think, we have an amendment here that we can all support, I hope we will agree unanimously to convey to the federal government, and let me say, Mr. Speaker, for the peace of mind of the hon. gentleman, there is no reason to indicate, we have no evidence to indicate anything but the federal government is prepared to live up to the letter of that agreement. We have no evidence to the contrary. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the evidence is all



in the other direction.

The Premier and I were in Ottawa only a few days ago, shortly after I was named Minister of Fisheries, because there had been four or five fairly important irritants outstanding from the original agreement that we were never able to get agreements on when the other government was still in power in Ottawa. And I do not say that for political purposes. They were outstanding in September 1984, Mr. Speaker, and they were outstanding in April, 1985.

MR. TULK:

Only because of Provincial Government.

MR. RIDEOUT:

No. They were outstanding.

But, Mr. Speaker, we were able to reach agreement on every one of them. And those four or five irritants that were there are now out of the way.

MR. TULK:

What were they?

MR. RIDEOUT:

The hon. gentleman will find out in time. They are now resolved. They are out of the way, Mr. Speaker, so that the senior management of that company now know that both governments are on side, that both governments are behind the agreement, and they, with the comfort of that, knowing that the required financial support is forthcoming are now able to plan, they are now able to put together a plan that, I hope, and I hope that every member of this House hopes, will see that restructuring agreement come to the fruition for which it was meant in the beginning. Now, Mr. Speaker, that might take a lot of

optimism, I do not know. It might even be considered to be said by some that it is naive if the highest kind.

But we have seen evidence so far, look at Burin, for example, I mean if there is anything positive that you can point to after four or five months of new management in this company it is what is taking place in Burin. They have gone down there in a plant that was suppose to close. They have taken out their primary processing equipment and geared up the secondary processing equipment and started marketing new products. Products that we have never seen before processed in Newfoundland. We have never seen them, we have never turned our initiative, our ability to doing them before.

And where are they marketing it, Mr. Speaker? Marketing it in the United States despite a 20 per cent tariff on secondary processing. Marketing it in the U.S. and making a good dollar at it. So it proves that it can be done. So the future of Burin, I would say, Mr. Speaker, from what information I have has never looked better under this restructuring agreement than it looks today. So they expect that is going to continue. They expect they can build on that initiative. They expect they can build on that expertise. And they have made a lot of other programmes in marketing. An awful lot of other progress, some of which I went into detail in the Committee last night.

But as I hinted just now, Mr. Speaker, it is going to take a little bit more than that. You can have the best of management, you can utilize whatever resources you can get your hands on to

promote marketing - that will be important - you can institute the best quality control programme that is available, you can do all those things, but there has also got to be a commitment by all of us.

The very fabric of life in Newfoundland and Labrador is threatened if this does not work. If the inshore fishery does not survive, the very fabric of hundreds of other communities is threatened. And somehow or other that has to penetrate the mentality and the intellectual ability of everybody. And we have to, perhaps, redirect and refocus our effort and refocus our thinking into that direction by coming to the conclusion that everything else is good, oil is good, trees are good, hydro is good, and tourism is good, but, if the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador dies, there is not much reason for Newfoundland and Labrador left to exist.

And that has got to penetrate everybody whether they are in the fishing industry, whether they are in the teaching profession, whether they are in the political field, whether they are a doctor or whatever they are, that somehow or other all of us in this Province is coloured and affected by, by whatever happens in the basic industry. First whatever happens in the basic industry, the first industry that brought people to this rock, that has got to always be in the back of our minds. So I say to this House, Mr. Speaker, that I have no difficulty about the commitment of the Premier to this restructuring agreement, although one hon. gentleman raised it here today, because I have seen him, even when there was a political party of his

own stripe in Ottawa, take a stand that had to be taken because it was right and proper that it be taken for Newfoundland and Labrador. So that is not going to bother this administration and it never has. But we have the commitment as a government, and I hope we have the commitment as a House, to the restructured deep-sea fishery, to a revitalization of the inshore fishery, to the proper management and surveillance of our stocks, despite all the problems that have been brought up in that regard over the last several days. But if we lose that will here, and if we lose that determination to try to bang that will into the heads of whomever we have to deal with in Ottawa, whether it is the civil servants, as the hon. gentleman from Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) said it was, or whether it is the politician at the political level, if we lose out on that score, then none of the stuff we are debating here today is going to make any difference, Mr. Speaker. I believe it is important, and I hope that we could agree, in the final analysis, on a resolution that will show our commitment, that will show our concern, that will show our determination and that will show everybody that the restructuring agreement that was entered into last year, or a year and a half ago, for one sector of the fishery, there is dedication and firm commitment to that agreement here in this Province by all politicians in this Province, by all sectors of society in this Province, because to do any less than that would make sure that we sell one of the vital areas of our fishery down the drain forever more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I never cease to be amazed. During the brief period that I have had in this hon. House, I have seen so much time being wasted by the members of this administration who tread so timidly out of fear that they might offend the government in Ottawa. So much time is spent in grovelling. My colleague for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) put forward a perfectly legitimate motion. The intent was to put some interest, to show some concern, for the fishery in this Province, to try and keep our fish plants open for a four year period. And there is only one little word that inadvertently slipped into his motion, Mr. Speaker, and that was the word 'Liberal'. This word slipped into the motion and immediately the administration jumped to its feet, came to attention and attempted, once again, to water down and make spineless like an eel, to make spineless, an otherwise perfectly sound motion. And now, Mr. Speaker, out of a sense of devotion I have to rise and speak. But what have I got to speak to? Something that has been watered down and ruined by abusive power, ruined by the administration, To what limits they will go to refrain from saying something which might in some way offend the administration in Ottawa, I do not know. I wonder when I am going to find out how far they will go? Will they put in place some sort of a royal commission which will go back through the glorious pages of Newfoundland history and attempt to delete from our history books

anything which might in some way offend the administration in Ottawa? Are we going to see this happen, Mr. Speaker, a complete rewriting of history? This is the mentality that I have witnessed in this hon. House during the brief period that I have been here, Mr. Speaker, and I would not be surprised in the least if this administration attempted to change history for the past 500 years we have lived upon this great Island. This could happen if someone were to believe that we could offend the administration in Ottawa. I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, of Gulliver in Lilliput where we see this little man, small enough to fit into the hand of the Queen, trying to walk the tightrope. A pitiful sight it was, Mr. Speaker, this little man walking the tight line in front of the Queen, fearful that he was going to fall from one side or the other. We have such an administration in this Province, trying to walk the tightrope, fearful that they might offend their bosses in Ottawa. I almost said buddies, Mr. Speaker, but there is no buddy relationship between this administration and the administration in Ottawa. The very word 'buddy' suggests to me, Mr. Speaker, equality. I have buddies throughout the land and we sit down as equals, because a buddy relationship means that I will do something for my buddy and he will do something for me and in the end we are equals. But what we see today is clearly no semblance of equality, what we see today is cap-in-handedness, what we see today is people grovelling in the sand.

I think, Mr. Speaker, when I was a boy, when I was a boy in Northern Newfoundland we had a dog team. Ten dogs, Mr. Speaker, we relied

on those dogs, they were the same to us as an automobile is to people today. They were transportation to us, they were used for our work, they were used for us to take food all around the place, they brought in our mail. We had ten dogs, and at certain times on a weekend, Mr. Speaker, the duty came to me to feed those dogs. Now this was not an easy task, believe you me, because out of those ten dogs, we had nine dogs who were absolutely vicious. I can see them coming, they would wag their tails and they could take a piece out of your leg, Mr. Speaker, so fast that you would not know what struck you, and maybe, as my colleague says, even further up. But on that dog team, Mr. Speaker, there was one dog who as a pup had a tremendous potential, so much so that we called him Newfie, but Newfie, Mr. Speaker, turned out to be a tremendous let down. Because even when we would go out to feed that dog team, Newfie would not come up and demand his dinner. Newfie used to grovel. Newfie would come up on his stomach and he was always frightened to death, he was laughable. He was an insult to that generation of dogs. You know, poor old Newfie who had all this potential as a pup never even had enough dignity to walk up to the dog team like the other dogs and demand a bite to eat.

And, Mr. Speaker, when I look at the way this administration takes a perfectly legitimate motion - not just this motion, Mr. Speaker, they do it with anything that the Opposition bring forward - and they water it down, they grovel like Newfie, they come on their stomachs to Mulroney in Ottawa. Why? Why I ask, Mr. Speaker? Why?

Let me refer you to a few months

ago when there was - what do you call those things you have in Ottawa, those economic things, on television - the federal/provincial conferences, a while ago, just after the new Prime Minister took over, Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to watch one of those events on television, I am saying watch, I did not say listen, because I turned the sound down.

Mr. Speaker, what I saw was the new Prime Minister sitting at the head of this table and all around him, Mr. Speaker, all the Premiers were just nodding, nodding, it was a funny sight to look at, nodding, nodding. There is a little toy you can buy it is a little duck picking at the water, the same thing, and I see the same thing when I look across this floor, whenever something comes forward that will in some way play up to Ottawa, not a sound, just nodding, nodding.

This is pitiful, Mr. Speaker, because this reflects on me as a Newfoundlander, that is why it is so pitiful, Mr. Speaker. This grovelling is unbecoming to the Fighting Newfoundlander. This is unbecoming to our culture. We should take the memorial down in Bowring Park, the memorial to the Fighting Newfoundlander, and put up some scrap heap to the grovelling Newfoundlander if we do not soon change our attitude. We have to change our attitude, Mr. Speaker.

I am utterly disgusted with this administration who will attempt in every way to play up to their task masters in Ottawa and in seeing this, Mr. Speaker, I had to ask why, and I finally got a clue to the why when The Evening Telegram came out yesterday, I

got a clue. You see, Mr. Speaker, there is such a thing as a rite of passage, or a rite de passage, where people have to prove themselves in some Indian tribes. The young man as he comes to manhood will in some cases have to cut his flesh as a rite de passage. In some cultures circumcision is a rite de passage. Male and female circumcision is a rite de passage in some cultures, Mr. Speaker. And there exists in this administration a rite of passage.

Now we saw evidence of this when the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) got up some while ago and lambasted a professional group in this Province. I thought that he had some animosity toward a professional group, but I have learned today, or in yesterday's paper, that his reason for doing this was to prove that he was now a Tory. The paper says, referring to the hon. member -

MR. MORGAN:

You have to table that now.

MR. DECKER:

I will gladly table it. You have been formed into the most nearly perfect Tory, like Myron's cow, sculptured so exquisitely -

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, in relation to what we are discussing, the fact of the matter is that there is an amendment on this table that commends this government for its

all-plants-open policies and I do not think the hon. member is being very relevant to that right now. I think that he should be dealt with.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

I know there is no point of order but I want to point out the ignorance of the hon. gentleman in view of the ruling of the Speaker some time ago that there was no point rising in this House on needless points of order and yet he continues to do it and make a fool of himself.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I must rule there is no point of order. The hon. member is developing his theme and I would ask him to continue.

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point I am making is that in order for the member for Torngat Mountains to prove that he was a Tory, he had to go through a rite of passage, a rite de passage had to go through a rite of passage, a rite de passage, and, as this letter in the paper says, 'You have been formed into the most nearly perfect Tory -

MR. FLIGHT:

'Garfield' thinks that is complimentary.

MR. DECKER:

- like Myron's cow, sculptured so exquisitely that even the bulls were deceived.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

I went back into my mind to see what the writers of this letter were talking about, and they were talking about the bronze sculptor of the fourth century, B.C., Myron. Myron was so precise in his work that he sculpted a bronze cow which was so exquisite and so perfect that even the bulls were deceived.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren), who takes on the teachers and who attacks them so viciously, becomes so anti-teacher, so anti-labour, so anti-negotiations, that even the Tories -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

I do think the hon. member is now straying from the amendment.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not continue to say what I was about to say, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, had I been allowed, I would have said that just as the hon. member -

MR. TOBIN:

Do not say it, that is abusing the rules..

MR. EFFORD:

Go on! Let him alone, boy!

MR. KELLAND:

He is going to tie it together.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to tie it

all together in the end.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:

After going through this rite of passage, the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) now has proven beyond all doubt that he is a Tory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to tie this all in: This is why this administration is so anxious to take perfectly valid motions and water them down, because they want to prove to their taskmasters in Ottawa, just as the member for Torngat wanted to prove to his new-found Tory taskmasters that he was one of them, by the same token, the administration wants to prove to Mulroney in Ottawa that they are on side and, like Myron's cow, Mr. Speaker, they are doing a good job of it, because they are grovelling in the mud, they agree to everything that is put forward, and they are frightened to death to open their mouths, they are frightened to death to say anything which in any way could be misconstrued as offending their taskmasters in Ottawa. This is the whole problem. This is going to continue to be a problem, no matter what motions this side of the House attempt to put forward. No matter what we attempt to do for the enlightenment of the members on the other side, no matter how genuine our intentions may be, everything that we attempt to do will be watered down by amendments by an administration that wants to win favour. So they take cap in hand, Mr. Speaker, and they grovel to an administration -

MR. FLIGHT:  
Adjourn the debate.

MR. DECKER:  
I think I have said enough. I will continue tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Is it agreed to call it 6:00 P.M.?

The hon. member has three minutes left next day.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Before we adjourn, Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the House of the sittings of the Committees.

Tonight, in the Colonial Building, the Resource Committee will consider the estimates on Fisheries. This is not the Colonial Building. The building down on Military Road is the Colonial Building. So, in the Colonial Building, they will continue their examination of Fisheries.

Tomorrow morning, the Government Services Committee will meet here to consider Municipal Affairs. Now, that is right here in this House at 9:30 A.M.

At the Colonial Building, we will have the revolving Committee on Privileges and Elections, which will be meeting at 10:00 A.M.

MR. FLIGHT:  
What about Friday?

MR. MARSHALL:  
We will get to Friday when the time comes.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:  
This is a good time to service notice on the Government House Leader, if we could for a minute, that the Resource Committee is tentatively slated for Friday afternoon, and I want to tell the hon. the minister before my colleagues, there will be no Resource Committee meeting on Friday afternoon or Friday night.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Why not?

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
I am absolutely shattered. I am shaking here, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is threatening.

Now, the hon. gentlemen there opposite are playing their usual games, and their little game is to be, when the time is up, to say they did not have enough time to consider the estimates. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to allow that. We are going to provide plenty of time for them to consider. If they want to pass them, they can pass them, but they can deal with these Committees -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
No Saturdays?

MR. MARSHALL:  
Well, we may need Saturdays and Sundays.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

We will exempt Gospel Hour, that is all.

MR. FLIGHT:

We have to deal with our constituencies on Fridays.

On motion, the house at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 6, 1985 at 3:00 P.M.