



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 43

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Monday

21 October 1985

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, before we get on to the ordinary business of the day, I wonder if the House would join with me in passing sympathy and condolences on to the families of two individuals, deceased in the last little while, who made great contributions to this Province both in political life and in their private capacities. I refer to the hon. P.J. Lewis and Mr. Malcolm Hollett, both of whom passed away since the House last sat. I move that this House draw up an appropriate resolution of condolence to send to their families.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, we would certainly associate ourselves with that expression of sympathy to the families of both the hon. P.J. Lewis and Senator Hollett. We are going to couple in a moment the hon. Myles Murray to that expression of sympathy. Senator Hollett is well known in this Province. He is a former Leader of the Opposition, a former Senator, a former magistrate. He participated fully in public life and he made a great contribution to the affairs of this Province, particularly as Leader of the Opposition when oppositions were very small. He stood with the people who had a certain point of view in the Province at the time.

Similarly with the hon. P.J.

Lewis. Most members of this House know the hon. P.J. Lewis and some of us had the privilege to serve in the House at the same time with him. He was a very friendly gentleman, a man who had represented the district of Harbour Main since 1951. He was an eminent and highly respected barrister and solicitor and practiced law all of his life, as a matter of fact up until about two or three weeks before his death. The loss to the Province of these two gentlemen is great.

I would also like - and I know the Leader of Opposition will wish to associate himself with this as well - to extend our sympathies as well to the family of the late Hon. Myles Murray who also passed away since the House adjourned, I believe.

MR. BARRY:

We have done that.

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, if we have done it we have done it, but my impression was he had died since we rose. In any event, to the families of these distinguished Newfoundlanders the government associate themselves with the expression of sympathy.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

With respect to the hon. Myles Murray, Mr. Speaker, I thought that we had already passed that resolution in this House. But, of course, if we have not, then we join completely with government in having that passed on.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House will want to join me in sending a letter of condolence to the family of the late Dr. J.M. Olds. Dr. Olds, who is an adopted Newfoundland having been born in Connecticut in 1906, excelled himself and became a legend almost on the Northeast Coast and performed tremendous service to the people in that area. Dr. Olds first went to Twillingate as a student in 1930 following his graduation from Yale University and Johns Hopkins. He returned to Newfoundland in 1932 and in 1934 he became Chief of Staff of the Twillingate Hospital. Dr. Olds was a leading figure in the depression years in the fight against tuberculosis and beriberi. I would strongly suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier and the government opposite that Dr. Olds should be accorded the recognition that has been accorded other distinguished Newfoundlanders, physicians and others. I am thinking of Dr. Grenfell and I am thinking of Dr. Harry Paddon, the father of the present Lieutenant Governor. I think it would be fitting under the circumstances that maybe at some time in the future consideration be given to erecting a statue to Dr. Olds either on the site of the old Twillingate Hospital or on the grounds of Confederation Building. I do, Mr. Speaker, ask the House that a letter be sent to the late Doctor's family expressing our deepest sympathy.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The Hon. Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House take great pleasure in supporting your recommendation for a man who has given unusual

service to this Province over many, many years. He was instrumental in providing health care, primary, secondary and occasionally tertiary care in the Notre Dame Bay area. His patients travelled from wide geographic areas of the Province for his very special talents in previous years. He was also able to gather around him very capable men who were imbued with the spirit of service and a love of medicine that he gave to his people. In addition, because of these stirring qualities, he was able to attract students, interns, and residents to get tuition in his particular hospital and to learn of his wisdom. His passing has left a void in the medical life of this Province. He has also been honoured in the past by the Canadian Medical Association, he has been honoured, I believe, by the Governor General of Canada, and he received many other honours during his lifetime. I support your recommendation, Sir, and to his family and to his associates I extend our sympathies.

Thank you.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a matter of privilege, if I might.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) on a matter of privilege.

MR. BARRY:
This concerns the supplying of information to members of this House with respect to the agenda of the House, the scheduling of the legislative debate. Over a

month ago we received what I though was a very healthy sign from the Premier. He released something of a catalogue or a list of the legislative agenda for the Fall session. We in the Opposition took this action on his part as a sign that we might look forward to receiving more information from government than we previously had before dealing with legislation.

But once again we have been disappointed by the Premier. It was only this morning at 10:30 A.M., at our initiative, that we received from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) the order of legislative business for today. The Premier conducted a charade in releasing his Fall programme. We still do not have legislation relating to some of the most important matters, such as the Atlantic Accord and petroleum royalties.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

As I understand it, it is the government which sets the order of business in this House. I am not quite sure what the point of privilege is.

MR. BARRY:
If you Honour would permit me to finish. I will be fairly brief. I have another couple of sentences. I think Your Honour will understand the gist of what I am saying.

I understand it is not only the Opposition who has experienced difficulty and frustration in preparing for the proper and efficient conduct of this session's business, but various members of the media, who have a responsibility for informing the

public, have tried to pry from the Premier and the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) what was coming up this Fall.

We regard the withholding of information, the stalling, the delays in presenting the order of business as detrimental to our functioning as MHAs and Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. Indeed, the refusal by government to provide us in time with the government's planned, day to day schedule of legislation we believe constitutes a breach of our privileges as elected members.

* SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of the Council to that point of privilege.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, no wonder they are wearing flowers.

MR. PATTERSON:
No flowers by request.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, on September 24 the Premier and I had a press conference in which we indicated the Fall legislative programme. We indicated the nature of the bills and what each bill was to deal with. This was followed on October 9 at the direction of the government with a circulation by the Senior Legislative Counsel to all members of the House of legislation that was not already on the Order Paper, and a substantial part of it was already before the House. As it happens, 68 per cent, Mr. Speaker, of the bills to be considered were in the

hands of the hon. gentleman weeks before the House opened. Now, no other Legislature or Parliament does that anywhere in Canada or in the British Parliamentary system.

As to the hon. gentleman's response or his observation, I received a telephone call this morning from the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) in which I informed him that the Bill that was going to be called was An Act To Amend The Fisheries Loan Act. Mr. Speaker, that was on the Order Paper when we adjourned, had been circulated when we adjourned. We have given plenty of notice with respect to the bills. The bills that the hon. gentlemen are going to be discussing within the first few days of the opening of this House have been in their hands for about four or five months already. If the hon. gentleman is going to conduct this session of the House, and apparently is going to tear us apart as he said in the press, he had better start showing us a little bit of his teeth and not be so mealey-mouthed as he is right now, raising these spurious, silly, stupid little points.

MR. BARRY:

If I could just briefly respond, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Sixty-eight per cent of the bills listed, Mr. Speaker, the minister indicates have been tabled. What we have received in most cases are the minor technical housekeeping amendments and what we are saying is we have not received some of the most important legislation that the minister and the Premier have indicated will be coming up

this Falls. Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough, and it is not sufficient for government to table bills before this House several months ago and give us no indication of the order in which these bills are going to be brought before this House, and that is the problem. That is the technique that the Government House Leader has consistently used. Whether it be with respect to committees of the estimates or with respect to legislation, the Government House Leader refuses to supply the information, on the instructions of the Premier, that we need in order to effectively carry out the business of the people of this Province and this House of Assembly.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

This is the silliest thing, Mr. Speaker, I have ever heard the Leader of the Opposition bring up in this House. As the Government House Leader said, as we understand it, we are the only government in the British Commonwealth that has gone out of its way, weeks and weeks before a session opens, to define precisely the bills that are going to be presented to the Legislature when it does open. And now the Leader of the Opposition is crying, he is worried about the order of the bills that the Opposition have had for three or four months. Well, if the Opposition are doing their work, and he disburses the work amongst all the members, they are ready for any of the bills that were are on the Order Paper back in the Spring. What is wrong with this Opposition? Has it not got

its act together? Is it not ready to debate the legislation that was available last Spring? Do they want more time. They have already had four or five months on the bills that have been on the Order Paper. I think the Opposition have just put their foot right in their proverbial mouth, Mr. Speaker, because they are saying that they are incompetent, that they cannot study bills over three or four months and be ready to debate them in the House. Well, we are, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am sure that there is no prima facie case established.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Before we move to Statements by Ministers, I recognize there is no official section on the Order Paper for what I am going to ask the Speaker to do, but the government, of course, by leave can do anything that it wishes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

The House!

MR. TULK:

The House can do anything that it wishes. Of course, leave will come from this side and then it is up to the government.

I now request leave to table a report which I have here. Mr. Speaker, it is a report by fishermen that points out their concerns about overfishing offshore, Unemployment Insurance regulations, their lack of participation in construction of regulations that affect them, the activities of FPI, the Japanese marketing of caplin, the Fisheries Loan Board and so on, number of concerns that inshore fishermen in

this Province have that a Liberal caucus committee gathered this summer while going around the Province. I would like to ask leave of the House to table that report. Do I have that leave?

MR. SPEAKER: (McNicholas):

The hon. President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen were up on their feet a moment ago talking about notice and talking about rules and regulations. There are rules and regulations in this House, Mr. Speaker, Statements by Ministers is the order of business, Oral Questions, etc. There is another basic rule as well, Mr. Speaker, that after an election the majority party - and this one is a very substantial majority party; a twenty seat majority in a fifty-two seat House - determines the order of business. Now the hon. gentleman has plenty of opportunities to file any report at any time in any given debate that he wishes to, he can file it publically from time to time if he wishes to - as I understand it, he already has - but he should not be using the House to make the cheap little political ploys that the hon. gentleman is making, so we do not give leave.

MR. TULK:

I wonder then if I-

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I understand leave has not given and we are now on Statements by Ministers.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder, then, if I could present a couple of copies of this to the Government?

MR. SPEAKER:

No, we are on Statements by Ministers.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

The Opposition House Leader, (Mr. Tulk) has a report which he is offering to the Government of this Province. It is a report which concerns something that is of interest to this side of the House and we believe to most of the people of this Province. Now, if what the Government House Leader and the Premier are saying is that they are not interested in a caucus committee report on the inshore fishery, let them have the guts to say so. Tell it to the fishermen of this Province! Tell it to the fishermen of this Province!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh, Mr. Speaker, did you ever hear of the like, for the Leader of the Opposition who does not know a cod from a sculpin to get up and talk about the fishery? Go away! Our Duckworth Street lawyer is suddenly trying to tell this side of the House about the fishery of Newfoundland. I like his nerve, Mr. Speaker. If the Liberal Party of Newfoundland has a report, give it to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) have a meeting with the Minister responsible for Fisheries in this Province and go and discuss it with him. Do not try to make those little cheap, political points, especially the Leader of the Opposition who would not know how to jig a fish from catching a trout.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

This Report, unlike the one I have here called Appropriate Offshore Fish Harvesting Techniques was not done with the taxpayers' money, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

We are on Statements by Ministers at the present time.

MR. BARRY:

No, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the Chair, we are on a point of order on which I would like a ruling, that point of order being: Is a member of this House entitled to offer to members opposite, the government, a report which has been delivered, Mr. Speaker, using not party funds, not government funds, not the taxpayers' funds?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

As I understand it, we are not on a point of order. The hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) asked for unanimous leave to present his report and unanimous leave was not granted.

MR. BARRY:

I stood on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

You may have stood just a minute ago. As far as I know, I did not recognize the hon. the Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. BARRY:

Okay.

MR. SPEAKER:

We are now on Statements by Ministers.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Since the government refuses to give us leave to present a report on the inshore fishery, I wonder if I could ask leave of the government to present a resolution which states:

"WHEREAS the inshore fishery of this Province is enduring its worst crisis in over a decade -

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

On a point of privilege, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, this has gone on long enough. There are rules in this House that are set down for the purpose of the orderly conducting of the business of this House. It starts off with Statements by Ministers, Oral Questions, etc. Now, there is plenty of opportunity in debate and what have you for hon. gentlemen there opposite to make points but the hon. gentlemen there opposite, Mr. Speaker, are disrupting the proceedings of this House. It is not given to any member of this House just to get up and invent his or her own order, to get up

and cause what is, in effect, a disruption of the normal schedule of the House. If you allow that, Mr. Speaker, you are inviting anarchy in the House. So the fact of the matter is that the hon. gentleman got up on a spurious point to ask leave of the House and it was refused. Now, they are getting up again and again on points of order.

Now, I realize the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is very excited that the hon. gentlemen out in Corner Brook did not turn him out, as there were rumours that they were going to turn him out, at least not just for a while, but he should control his boyish enthusiasm, Mr. Speaker, and comply with the rules of this House which we are all bound by.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I assume that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) was speaking on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege.

MR. BARRY:

Oh! A point of privilege! That is a biggie! Well, here is what has happened here today, Mr. Speaker, just to address that point of privilege. We had the Government House Leader, who chaired the Liberal caucus committee on the inshore fishery -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

- the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk), Mr. Speaker, who chaired

the Liberal caucus committee report on the inshore fishery, a report, Mr. Speaker, which was not prepared with the taxpayers' funds, as we see is the case of the reports coming out of the Premier's Office.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I have to interrupt the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. The point of privilege is that certain members are, if you like, disrupting the procedure of the House by raising other matters. It is not that particular report we are discussing.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could just have a moment. We understand whenever anybody takes a point of view that is different from the that of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) or the Premier, then that hon. gentleman, or in the case of the Minister of Justice gentilewoman, any member, is then, of course, disrupting the House, because there was disagreement, Mr. Speaker. Well, there is going to be a lot disruption in this House, Mr. Speaker, if it is considered a disruption for a member on this side of the House to get up and try and get through to members opposite some information on the inshore fishery which they have not had the interest to go out and get themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier falsely said, by the way, that it was the first case in the history of the Commonwealth that there had been a legislative agenda supplied. That is so ludicrous, Mr. Speaker! I would submit to Your Honour that it is probably the first time in the case of

British Parliamentary history that the government would not permit the filing of a report, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I must interrupt the hon. Leader of the Opposition again. The point before the House at the present time is not a discussion or any details about anything that the hon. member has at the present time. It is basically the timing and the position that that should or could be raised. At the present time we are on Statements by Ministers and I have called that.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, what was being done was the Opposition House Leader was standing to make available to members opposite, to the Government House Leader, to the Premier, to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), if he is interested and he does not appear to be, information that has been received on the inshore fishery which is of crucial importance to the people of this Province right now, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, would the Premier, without references to my ability to jig cod - I know the Premier must be very stung by the fact that the inshore fishermen of this Province are disappointed in his efforts - will he have the courage to reply to this: Do you want this report or do you not?

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

I am sorry to have to interrupt the hon. Leader of the Opposition again, but we are discussing the timing of the agenda at the present time, and there is time to

introduce another matter if there is unanimous leave of the House.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I make this statement and I am asking for leave at this point in time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:
It is the same thing. I am asking for leave, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
I am asking for leave of the House and by leave of the House we can do anything. It is the House that governs itself through the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
That is my point. I am asking for leave.

DR. COLLINS:
There is no leave.

MR. TULK:
You do not even know what it is.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

What kind of government is it that refuses to give you permission to do something when they do not even know what you are going to do? Now how can you do that?

For the Premier's information, we are not dealing with the report anymore. I am going to ask you for leave to present something else, to present a resolution to the Premier and his government. I am asking for leave, Mr. Speaker, to present a resolution to the Premier and his government. If he would provide me with the courtesy to read it to him, then he can tell me whether he is going to give me leave or not. So I would read it to him. Let me read the resolution to him.

MR. MARSHALL:
A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of privilege, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:
I am on a point of privilege now, and the privilege of the House is that the ordinary business of the House is to take precedence in this House over any other motion. No leave has been given to depart from the rules of the House and the rules of the House clearly state that the proceedings of the House will commence with the Statements by Ministers, be followed by Oral Questions, Presentation of Report by Standing and Select Committees, Notice of Motions, Answers to Question, Petitions and then ordinary debate of the day.

The hon. gentlemen there opposite know that whatever points they want to make, by way of resolution or what have you, can be brought up in the Question Period. They

can be brought up, Mr. Speaker, in the order of business today. They were complaining, first off, that they did not have adequate notice but they had adequate notice, and they know that the Fisheries Loan Bill is going to be brought in for debate, at which time they can make whatever points they make.

Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege is that there is no leave to depart from the established rules of the House as set down in the Standing Orders.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, there is no point of privilege. I was going to read this resolution to the minister. 'Whereas the inshore fishery of this Province is enduring its worst crisis in over-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, there is no point of privilege. How can you say there is a point of privilege when we know in this House that you can give leave to do anything regardless of the Order Paper of the day? The Order Paper of the day, sure, reads Statement by Ministers and on on, but the government and the House can do anything it wishes through leave. It is only just the government trying to block this Opposition from doing what its job is, and that is to be the Opposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution reads as follows:

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

That is not in order.

MR. TULK:
What is happening here?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
What is happening?

MR. SPEAKER:
The order of business is that we are now at Statements by Ministers.

The hon. member asked for unanimous leave to introduce another matter. That was refused. We are now on Statements by Ministers.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, is there a ruling on the point of privilege from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall)? I would like to speak to that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
It was ruled on!

MR. SPEAKER:
The point of privilege was that we follow the agenda as we have it here on the Order Paper.

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

MR. BARRY:
We are entitled to speak to a point of privilege.

MR. TULK:
Sure we are. What is this

puppeteering over there?

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my own point of order, please?

MR. BARRY:

No. Speak to the the point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

I will speak to the point of privilege.

MR. TULK:

It has not been ruled on.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, we are discussing here -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member for Gander on that point of privilege.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege concerns our use of the rules of the House, and we have heard from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) the fact that we do not know the rules of the House by doing what we are in the process of doing here, asking for leave. Mr. Speaker, I would refer the Government House Leader to Standing Order 29 which indicates that twenty-four hours notice should be given for a motion to bring in something by leave. Then Standing Order 30, which is the crux of the matter, says, Mr. Speaker, 'A motion may in case of urgent and pressing necessity previously explained by

the mover, be made by unanimous consent of the House without notice having to be given under Standing Order 29.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, that says that there should be an explanation by the mover.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I refer you to that Standing Order and I would submit that the statements being made by members opposite are ludicrous.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege that has been taken the second or third time by the Opposition. I would refer the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) to Standing Order 14, since we are referring to Standing Orders. It reads as follows: 'The ordinary daily routine of business in the House shall be as follows except where priority has been given previously by the House to other orders.' No priority has been given. It starts off with Statements by Minister.

Now what the hon. gentleman is referring to are rules in the House when leave is given. Obviously, the point is leave has not been given.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that the strategy of this great pow-wow in Corner Brook on the weekend was to come here and disrupt the public business of the House, which the hon. gentlemen are doing.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

What about Notices of Motion?

MR. MARSHALL:

What has happened is that the hon. gentlemen there opposite are really debating Your Honour's ruling. Your Honour has made a ruling with respect to this. They got up again on points of order and points of privilege.

Now if the hon. gentleman wants to bring in, as he says, I understand a notice of motion, there is a provision here after Oral Questions for Notices of Motion. One of the members of the Opposition can give Notice of Motion and then you would have that twenty-four hours notice that the hon. gentleman so mistakenly referred to in the Standing Orders.

But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there is an order in this House for the conducting of business. The order is set forth in Standing Order 14. There has been no leave been given to disrupt that or to alter that. There has been no determination at all by the House that anything would supercede it.

So the fact of the matter is what the hon. gentlemen are doing by persisting in getting up on these points is challenging Your Honour's ruling, derogating from the rules of this House and precluding the public business of the Province from being conducted. If they are really concerned about conducting the business of the House, Mr. Speaker, they allow the normal business that has been set down to facilitate that to go on, particularly in view of the fact that I understand that one of the points they are trying to make can

quite easily be made in the Fisheries Bill that is going to be called.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, a few brief comments.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

What the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) has pointed out is not questioning the fact that the government, which carries a majority in this House, can vote down leave. What the member for Gander has accurately pointed out, I would submit, is that from the clear wording of this Standing Order there must be an opportunity given for a member to explain what it is for which he seeks leave. Standing Order 30, "A motion may in case of urgent and pressing necessity, previously explained by the mover."

Now, Mr. Speaker, what the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and the Premier are attempting here is to muzzle, in this case, the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk), and they are trying to muzzle the Opposition from having the opportunity to present what it is for which leave is sought. This Standing Order makes it clear, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition House Leader is entitled to have an opportunity to at least read the resolution. How else, Mr. Speaker, can it be determined, how else can it be previously explained by the mover is not by giving him an opportunity to read it out?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, to that point, just let me say to the members of the Opposition that this is just a

tempest in a tea pot and an exercise in foolishness. There is provision, and as the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) pointed out, to raise this. The order of business is Statements by Ministers, Oral Questions, Presenting Reports By Standing And Special Committees, Notices of Motion, so thirty minutes from now, if it is all that urgent and pressing a question - I mean, that is the point - there is Notice of Motion there so hon. members can get up and give notices of motion. So if it is all that important, we could have now had Question Period over and the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) could be giving his notice of motion. I mean if it is all that important, is thirty minutes going to make all the difference in the motion? If we go on past practice, the motion that the Opposition House Leader is going to put forward is going to wait for a long period of time, Mr. Speaker, but we are only asking it to wait for thirty minutes and let the Orders of the Day go ahead. And, Mr. Speaker, you have already called the order, you have called Statements By Ministers, and the Opposition are muzzling this House in getting on with its business.

MR. SPEAKER:

Again calling for Statements By Ministers, I would refer the hon. members to our Standing Order that has been referred to and that is, "A motion may in case of urgent and pressing necessity previously explained by the mover, be made by unanimous consent of the House," and unanimous consent has not been given. I would call again for Statements By Ministers.

MR. BARRY:

We have not explained, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion that you proposed is quite understandable to me. From the comments that you made I understand it is a report by some group that you are presenting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

No, Mr. Speaker, that is finished with. This is a different point.

MR. HISCOCK:

It is a different point altogether. It has been ruled on even before we got a chance to explain.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no unanimous consent for that.

MR. HISCOCK:

The rules are there. If you do not follow the rules we will have anarchy.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I understand that Your Honour is ruling on what he believes to be an attempt to present a report by some group. That is not at all what I was doing in my second attempt. In my second attempt I was attempting to get leave from the House to present a resolution, and it is done quite often in this House. As the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) say, we have to give a clear statement of what it is we are doing before anybody can determine whether leave is to be granted or not. I was on another point and, if I

could, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read exactly what it was I hoped to present. It was not a committee report at all. We had dealt with that matter and moved on to another one, so I want to explain it as I am supposed to do under Standing Order 30. I have to give the necessary background before it can be determined whether unanimous consent is going to be given or not. It is this, Mr. Speaker:

Whereas the inshore fishery of this Province is enduring its worse crisis in over a decade; and

Whereas thousands of inshore fishermen and their families are enduring genuine hardship and want; and

Whereas action on the inshore fishery is a paramount necessity in Newfoundland's public life;

Be it therefore resolved that this House demand that the Prime Minister, the hon. Brian Mulroney, immediately appoint a successor to John Fraser and that the new Fisheries Minister be instructed to take immediate, emergency action on the Newfoundland fishery.

Now, do I have leave, Mr. Speaker, to present that resolution?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wishes to bring in any motion, there is a procedure here for Notice of Motion. He can put in on the Order Paper. There is no leave for the hon. gentleman to bring in that motion, neither is there going to be any leave, Mr.

Speaker, by this government for the hon. gentlemen there opposite to try and disrupt the proceedings of this House and take the House of Assembly on their back.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, I have a motion that I want to present.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There are no Statements by Ministers and the next order of business is Oral Questions.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. We have the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) on his feet. Now, is the Speaker telling the member for Bellevue that he cannot speak in this House? He is a member of this House of Assembly. He stood up, Mr. Speaker, he has Your Honour's eye, and he has asked for leave to present a motion.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

One thing I would say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is there is no need to shout when he is speaking to me.

MR. BARRY:
It seems, Mr. Speaker, it is the only way we can be heard here.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) did stand up. I had called Statements by Ministers and

I had not called Oral Questions and I assumed that the hon. member for Bellevue was going to ask a question.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker it is not -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I was calling Oral Questions so that the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) could ask his question.

Oral Questions

MR. FENWICK

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer). I would like him to stand up in his place and tell us if he has hired, if he is hiring or if he will be hiring in the immediate future Hal Andrews, the former member for Fortune-Hermitage, as the new Chief Protocol Officer of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the government has hired Mr. Hal Andrews and he commenced work today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

The supplementary is, Mr. Speaker, that we have already seen a litany of former MHAs being hired, and I would like to ask the same question I have asked in each other of those circumstances. One, was the position advertised so that all the people of the Province would have a right to apply for the job? Secondly, was there a competition held so that we could assure that the individual being hired is the best possible person? Thirdly, what are the qualifications of this individual for the job coming up? And, fourthly, what is the salary that this job entails?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, no. With both directors of protocol- the government has had two - there have not been competitions. It has been appointment on a contractual basis and the qualifications in general have been a person who is knowledgeable in public life in Newfoundland, who has a general knowledge of the issues facing the Newfoundland society and the Newfoundland public who can give in informed opinion on those matters. So it is a contractual appointment. The salary I would have to check. I do not know. It is thirty something but I do not really know or I do not remember. I can certainly check that.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member

for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

There were seven MHAs, if I recall, defeated in the last provincial election. We now have four with their noses in the trough. I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier would tell us if the last three MHAs who were defeated are on a list now of being hired into some other patronage positions?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, it will depend on what comes up from time to time, whether people who have been defeated in the last election may qualify for certain positions. I cannot answer that definitively. If something comes up for which they may be uniquely qualified, well then they may be considered. I would not like to exclude those people from the possibilities of employment in the future.

MR. TOBIN:

Even defeated Liberals.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes. Even people who have been in the NDP Party as a matter of fact, I think were hired by the government just recently. I think we have a new solicitor with the Department of Justice, the former Leader of the NDP Party, Mr. Faour, has come into the employ of government. So we do not discriminate. I think we have a former Liberal MHA, Mr. Leslie Thoms, who is also a solicitor with the Department of Justice. So we realize that whilst all collectively over there right now there might not be all that much ability, but from time to time

some does crop up in the other parties and we do hire them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

This supplementary arises from the Premier's answer to the question, otherwise I would not ask it. Can he please tell us whether or not these two individuals, Mr. Thoms and Mr. Faour were going into advertised positions and had to meet a competition in order to get the jobs?

MR. SIMMS:

They did not have to be accepted.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, that is a very good point. I will have to check the records on it. They were Order in Council appointments and there were a number of competitions held for the position and a number of individuals who came in just as well qualified as did Mr. Thoms and Mr. Faour. So it was an Order of Council appointment. Anybody could have been hired for the job. So I would just point that out to the member for Menihek. We thought, in our wisdom, that these people were very qualified, as were others who competed with them and we provided them, with the opportunity to work with the government.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I now have some

information which I did not have when the hon. member asked the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

The hon. gentleman asked the salary and the salary is \$36,000 per annum. Also the hon. gentleman might be interested to know that Mr. John Terriak, former NDP candidate in the last provincial election in Torngat Mountains, has been hired to carve a sculpture for the new Confederation Building Complex. I am sure he will do a good job. We wish him well and we hold nothing against him because he was a former NDP candidate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, how desperately do they flail around to try and equate having men and women obtaining jobs after a competition with the patronage that has just been indicated, where there was no competition, as the Minister of Justice confirmed! I do not think they are fooling anybody.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries whether he believes that the process of privatization, as outlined in Fisheries Product International business plan, is this government's sneaky and cowardly

method of closing out these fifteen plants so essential to the inshore fishery and essential to the continued existence of Newfoundland's key rural communities, these fifteen plants that Fisheries Product International, under the guise of privatization, say they will treat differently than the other plants?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the short answer to the hon. gentleman's question is no. Just let me say as well, Mr. Speaker, that in the five year business plan that was presented to the shareholders by FPI, there are no more second class citizens in this Province because of the actions of this government. That is what that five year business plan was able to achieve. There are no more social plants of Ramea and all those social plants that were designated on the South Coast of this Province. Everybody is given an equal chance. Everybody is given a fair and equitable chance. FPI is saying that they will continue to operate all plants in this Province for a minimum of two years. Everybody will have the same chance. In the process they will do a divestiture package and, if somebody wishes to pick up some of the fifteen plants that are named in that process, then there will be an opportunity to do so. But, Mr. Speaker, always will the opportunity be caveated by the fact that the shareholders will have to agree with any divestiture procedure that FPI may recommend to its shareholders.

So, no, Mr. Speaker, there is no sneakiness, there is no intent to make one group something that

another group is not; the intent is to make everybody equal to begin the privatization process so that the fishery in Newfoundland can, as a result of our efforts and the efforts of the Government of Canada, be put on a firm foundation.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. If the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) feels that all these plants are being treated equally, will the minister explain how it is that if one of these plants, for example, happened to be privatized - to use their jargon - tomorrow, how will this plant then be able to equally share in the advantages obtainable from the hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars being put into Fishery Products International? Is the minister pretending that the same financial and managerial assistance will be offered to these fifteen plants as offered in the plants which Fishery Products International wishes to keep?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, FPI and their five year business plan makes it very clear that they will be prepared to offer certain services to any private entrepreneur who may wish to purchase some of those plants. I mean, the key, Mr. Speaker, to all this is that in the restructuring programme the very intent of the restructuring programme was to return FPI to

private enterprise. Now this is phase one of that process. Fifteen locations have been identified as now being in a position, with a proper divestiture package, to be returned to private entrepreneurs. If that can be done, fine. If it cannot be done, then, at the end of the day, the shareholders have to face that question and there is a clause in the restructuring agreement for that to be addressed. But the fact of the matter is that there will be marketing expertise offered to the private enterprise. There have been no doors slammed in anybody's face. The divestiture procedure is very, very clear, the way it will go, and that in the final analysis then both shareholders will be in a position to make an intelligent and a reasonable decision. So there is no sneakiness, it is wide open, and the fishery, Mr. Speaker, in this Province I suspect will be a lot better off because of that wide open, honest and candid approach.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Now, Mr. Speaker, I again ask the minister - he must have forgotten the question - if he would explain how these fifteen plants, if one of them or two of them or all of them are divested, are they going to share in the advantages of these hundreds of millions of dollars. Will they get a portion of that last \$113 million passed on to the individuals or company in the private sector that will be taking this plant? Or is it not a

case of the money going to the healthiest plants? Is it not a case of these plants being treated as the lepers of Fishery Products International's organization? If they are not good enough for Fishery Products, if Fishery Products does not see them becoming profitable, how does the minister expect the private sector to be lining up in droves to purchase these plants?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I would assume the people in Twillingate and Port aux Basques and Rose Blanche and some of the other communities whose plants will be part of the divestiture process will be very pleased to hear the Leader of the Opposition in a public forum in this House refer to them as lepers. Mr. Speaker, there are no second class citizens in this Province. Whether they live in Port aux Basques, Mr. Speaker, or whether they live in Twillingate or Flowers Cove or anywhere else, they will be given an equal opportunity to make the fishery in their particular part of the Province work. Yes, Mr. Speaker, as part of the \$105 million equity injection that goes into FPI as a result of the approval of this five year plan, some of the money will be spent to improve plants in those communities so that they will be enhanced and become attractive to private investors. Mr. Speaker, who has ever said that those plants have been losers? Those are the words of the Opposition, that those plants have been losers, Mr. Speaker. Twillingate has not been a loser

traditionally. Mr. Speaker, Port aux Basques and Rose Blanche have not been traditional losers in the fishery in this Province. And I can tell the hon. gentleman that, yes, there are already people approaching, interested in the divestiture package, and while I do not know if they will be lined up at our doorstep there is a considerable amount of interest. And nobody in this Province should be allowed to call the people in one community "lepers" when, Mr. Speaker, we are trying to treat everybody equally.

MR. BARRY:

Tell Fisheries Products that -

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (McNicholas)

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, Fisheries Products International has listed the Ramea and Gaultois plants as six months plants. My question is what is actually meant by six months? Are these plants to be open for six continuous months or will they be opened three days a week for twelve months? So far since the Ramea plant has opened the most hours that any worker has worked there is thirty-two hours and it has gone as low as fourteen. So I will ask the Minister, first of all, to tell me what Fisheries Products International means by six months plants.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Honourable Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, six months means six months operation for the plant in

Ramea on a normal five-day operating week.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Honourable Member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Well, that has not been the case. Now if it is for six months continuous, they would like to know if it is going to be from January to June or from July to December, and they have not been told. They would also like to know what is going to happen to the inshore fishermen in these areas when the plants are closed down. Where are they going to sell the fish that they are catching during the six months the plant is closed? Are provisions made for the inshore fishermen or is this just another attempt to kill the inshore fishery? I ask the Minister to tell me that.

MR. SPEAKER: (McNicholas)

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of parts to the question. It is my understanding that the plants will operate for a normal six month period based on a fishing plan. As the hon. gentlemen may or may not know, there are certain times of the year when it is commercially viable to fish different species of fish and other parts of the year when it is not commercially viable to do so. So it will be a six month operation based on a normal five-day week based on Fisheries Products International fishing plan in any given year. The second part of his question had to do with inshore fishermen. Mr. Speaker, F.P.I. in areas where they have been closed down as part of their normal operating program for this year, have continued to

purchase from inshore fishermen and, particularly when it depends on the landings of those people, this is minimum, Mr. Speaker. If there is good inshore fishing in certain areas, you might be able to extend the six months - it might be seven or seven and a half months. But, Mr. Speaker, the intent, according to the five year business plan, is to operate those plants like Ramea for a normal six month operation. I have not had the opportunity to check out a lot of details today, but I believe that the Chief Executive Officer of Fisheries Products International and other senior executives are in fact in Ramea meeting with the people down there today.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand, again, a report on inshore fishermen in the Province, which be it noted, that the Government refused to have tabled and it indicates a total disaster in the Newfoundland fishery. I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries to inform this Legislature when we can expect the appointment a federal Fisheries Minister to replace Mr. John Fraser to deal with some of the problems there?

MR. SPEAKER: (McNicholas)

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to stand in my place in the House of Assembly of Newfoundland as Prime Minister of Canada. I mean, how silly, Mr. Speaker! How do I know

when a new Fisheries Minister is going to be appointed. I have publically indicated that I would like to see it sooner rather than later. We have, as a Government indicated, only last week, our concerns about certain areas of failure in the inshore fishery, but to ask me, the Provincial Minister of Fisheries, or to even the Premier as leader of the administration here in Newfoundland when there is going to be somebody appointed, just boggles the imagination, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister can get as excited as he likes. I want to ask him a supplementary. The Minister stated that it may be a good thing that we have no Federal Minister of Fisheries because of the FFT problem. Mr. Mulrooney is in no rush, apparently. As the Minister responsible for the Newfoundland fishery, has he made any attempt, and if so will he table the contents of any attempt that he has made to push that lackadaisical Prime Minister, his Tory buddy in Ottawa, to appoint a federal Minister of Fisheries so that the problems of the Inshore Fisheries in this Province, so ably put in this report by fishermen, can be solved?

MR. SPEAKER: (McNicholas)

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I will table any documents in this House from time to time that I deem I should table

that are in the public interest. But to ask the poor Minister of Fisheries in Newfoundland when I am going to appoint a federal Minister of Fisheries is beyond the imagination.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary. The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the tables have turned. Is the Minister of Fisheries now telling me that the good era of co-operation that was promised by the Premier and his government this Spring in the election, that process of consultation and co-operation is dead, or is he just saying he does not care enough about the Newfoundland Fishery to make any representation to his Tory buddies in Ottawa? Is that what he is saying? That is the issue.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's question was could I appoint a Minister of Fisheries-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: -

No, no!

MR. RIDEOUT:

- and I just told him candidly that I could not. But I am very pleased to tell the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that despite his wildest wishes, despite the fact that he would like to see all the era of co-operation and consultation crumble around our ears, that consultation and co-operation between this government and the

Government in Ottawa is alive and well and, Mr. Speaker, it is working well for the people of this Province and will continue to work well for the fishermen and the fish plant workers of this Province, which to the hon. gentleman's utter incomprehension, he will see again in a few days, Mr. Speaker, in Spain.

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A final supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The people of Newfoundland and the fishermen of Newfoundland are very well aware of what the co-operation of this government with the federal government has done. Now will the minister answer the question, and will he table the results: Has he interest enough in the Newfoundland fishery to have made any representation to Ottawa to get a federal minister in place to deal with some of these problems, or does he believe that it is a good thing not to have one and let those centralized Canadians deal with problems such as FFT and the problem of the inshore fishery? Just what does he believe and where does he stand?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Just as the hon. gentleman was trying to slip some kind of a report before the House here today that he made public weeks ago, I have already publicly stated that we want to see a new Fisheries Minister appointed as quickly as possible. We do not have to sit on our laurels and take any advice

from the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker. We have said we want to see a new Fisheries Minister appointed as quickly as possible. But as much as I would like to have the power, I do not have the power to do it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question, again, is for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). Some months ago, and still, the inshore fishermen and their wives were crying out for immediate help as a result to the disastrous inshore fishery. Would the minister now list the programme that he and his federal counterparts have put in place to answer the cry for help, and not what they are talking about, but what they are doing?

MR. BAKER:

That is a good question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be very pleased to answer the very serious and sensible question from the hon. gentleman for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford). Back in the early part of July, I guess, it became very obvious to me, as Minister of Fisheries, that we should begin to prepare for what may be the worst, at the end of the day, in terms of the inshore fishery in this Province. At that time I set a working group in my department working on a possible contingency plan that we would be able to take at the appropriate time when the numbers were all available to us

and go to the federal government to make a presentation concerning a contingency plan for the inshore fishery. That, Mr. Speaker, I did on September 3 with the former Minister of Fisheries, which I believe was on a Tuesday, and following that, the same week the Premier and I met with Mr. Fraser again and further discussed the components of the contingency plan that we had in place.

My colleague, the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power), and I met with Mr. Nielsen, the acting Minister of Fisheries, and with Ms MacDonald, the Minister responsible for Employment and Immigration, and we been working very diligently. Mr. Speaker, we have put a contingency plan to the federal government that we believe has a lot of merit. I might say as well that it has the support of the union, who were in Ottawa last week, I guess it was, for meetings with us with the federal ministers, and we are optimistic that within a short period of time we will be able to make some announcements that will see the results of all our effort over the last couple of months come together in a beneficial package for the fishermen and the fish plant workers of this Province.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I wish the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) could tell the fishermen of this Province that they could eat a contingency plan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Because I visited a lot of fishermen around the coast this year who, back in August and September, had absolutely had no food in their house at all due to the early inshore fishery failure. Now that we have gone through a Fall inshore fishery failure where they do not have even enough to pay their expenses let alone buy groceries. So I would like for the Minister of Fisheries right now to tell us why there has not been some plan put into the same programme put in place before now, and why have we still got to wait for somebody up in Ottawa to make up their minds while the fishermen down here are literally starving?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we are trying to do and have been trying to do over the last couple of months, to put a plan in place so that, yes, to quote the hon. gentleman, they will be able to eat. You know, the concern for the state of the fishermen and fish plant workers in this Province, Mr. Speaker, is not the sole prerogative, shared only by gentlemen on that side. I happen to represent a fairly large fishing constituency in my own district, so I know firsthand what the hon. gentleman is talking about. I also know, Mr. Speaker, that the numbers are not as desperate, the picture is not as desperate as the hon. gentleman would like to infer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that in terms of qualifying for UIC benefits - and that becomes another question after you say that - there are more fishermen and fish plant workers qualified for UIC benefits today than there were this time last year. That is a fact that cannot be denied, Mr. Speaker. Figures current to October 15 indicate that and prove that beyond any doubt. The problem is that they are at the low end of the scale. That is where the problem is and that is what we will be trying to address over the next few days, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the problem and the question is: Why has been nothing done in the past couple of months to put some sort of a programme in place so that the fishermen and their wives could obtain some employment and have some income?

We know, all across Canada, the farmers out West, people in Ontario and in other parts of the country, if they have a problem, are immediately looked after. But always, and I say, always, the fishermen here in Newfoundland have to get down on their hands and knees and crawl and beg for something before it is done. Now, the question is, Why was it not

done two months ago? Why are we still waiting for a plan?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The fact of the matter is that nobody had to come on his hands and knees to this government to get us to start moving to put the contingency plan in place. I initiated it myself in July when I saw what was happening. But, Mr. Speaker, you cannot put a contingency plan in place in the middle of August if you have to actually wait to see how the inshore fishery is going to come out in the month of September. I would say to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, we have not sat back and done nothing. What about the positive changes we have made to the Fisheries Loan Board regulations over the last few weeks? They have been beneficial to fishermen in all parts of this Province. Mr. Speaker, we have not been wearing blinkers. We have focused on the global problem facing the fishery in this Province. I think we have done a good job and the hon. gentleman, like most of his colleagues, will be dismayed over the next few days when we announce some more positive plans to help fishermen and fish plant workers in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) about something over which he does have control. To set the minds of the thousands of our Newfoundland fishermen at rest, those who had boats and loans with the banks and who, more than likely, will not be able to meet their commitments to the Fisheries Loan Board this year, would the minister, in cases where the need arises and is demonstrated, undertake to recommend to his colleagues that there be a moratorium placed on the payment of interest and principal on Fisheries Loan Board loans, certainly for this year during the critical period?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the gentleman for the question. It is certainly an important one. We have done the numbers, Mr. Speaker. We have made some changes already, as the hon. gentleman knows, that have been beneficial. I think one of the first requests I had from the Fishermen's Union was to try to initiate a programme to get the higher interest rates in previous years dropped down. We were able to do that. We had the banks agree to a moratorium while we were re-evaluating the Bank Loan Guarantee programme, to which I announced changes a couple of weeks ago. We were able to do that. We are embarking on a leasing programme. There is a whole range of positive features that have been beneficial for individual fishermen. But yet, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's question is a good one because, yes, we are, in fact, looking at

now the areas of the Province individually, person by person, with respect to their landings and their income during the past season, where we may have to do exactly what the hon. gentleman is thinking about. I have had my officials in the Loan Board and in the department putting that together for me now for some time. We are anticipating that we may have to do that and, if in fact we have to do it, we will be putting the proper procedure in place to do it.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I take it now, then, that the minister is saying that the fishermen in Newfoundland have nothing to worry about, that there will be no legal action taken to repossess boats or to call loans, in cases of demonstrated need that there will be no such action and the fishermen can rest easy that no such action will be taken?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The hon. gentleman uses the phrase 'demonstrated need'. It is much wiser to use that phrase than to just use the blanket phrase that fishermen in Newfoundland have no worries about a general moratorium on repossession or payments. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that in some areas of the Province this year, there have been fishermen who have done relatively well, just as well as and perhaps better in some areas up around St. Mary's Bay, I

believe, than they have done for the last several years. So there have been areas of the Province where the problem is not as acute. I say to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that it is those areas of the Province where fishermen can prove to us - and it will not be a rigorous procedure - that they have had a really desperate year, that they cannot meet their principal and interest payments, then this government will overturn any stone to make sure that those fishermen do not suffer and their vessels and equipment are not repossessed. We have already proven that to them, Mr. Speaker, and we will continue to prove that to them over the next short while.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), a moment ago, alluded to the UIC benefits. We will now give the minister a chance to talk about the UIC benefits. As he knows, one of the iniquitous features, one of the discriminatory features with respect to fishermen in terms of receiving UIC benefits has been the period for which they qualify to receive UIC. Inshore fishermen, Mr. Speaker, have made representation to have this changed, and I am wondering if the minister can indicate to the House what he has done to support their request in this respect to get the UIC benefits changed, and whether or not he has received any commitment from his federal counterparts by way of changing these harmful, these iniquitous provisions at the moment?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly one of the problem areas that we have identified and it has been with us, as the hon. gentleman knows ever since a UIC programme for fishermen was put in place several years ago. We have maintained for some time, as a Province, that it certainly is an area that should be changed. The hon. gentleman is aware, I assume, that the federal government has instituted, I believe, a Commission of Enquiry to review the whole UIC programme in Canada and there are various department of government in Newfoundland working on a presentation to that particular commission. One of the areas that I am extremely concerned about is to try to address the problems that the hon. gentleman refers to for fishermen. The fact that a fishplant worker who earns UIC benefits by processing fish from a fisherman can draw UIC for forty-eight to fifty weeks and a fisherman can only draw from the middle of November to the middle of May is just iniquitous in its very form. So we will be continuing, since I guess it has been done before through the Kirby Report and so on, to support the Fishermen's Union in making our presentation to that Commission and we are working on that document at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Justice.

Notices of Motion

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The District Court Act, 1976." (No. 34)

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Marine Institute Act." (No. 36)

I give further notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Provide For The Payment Of Financial Assistance For Students Attending Post-Secondary Educational Institutions." (No. 29)

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve into a Committee of the Whole on Supply To Consider Certain Resolutions For The Granting Of Supplementary Supply To Her Majesty. (No. 26)

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act." (No. 40)

I also move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole To Consider Certain Resolutions Relating To The Guaranteeing Of Certain Loans Under The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957. (No. 38)

Also, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole To Consider

Certain Resolutions Relating To The Advancing Or Guaranteeing Of Certain Loans Made Under The Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957. (Bill 35)

And, finally, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Conflict Of Interest Act, 1973." (No. 39)

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Pippy Park Commission Act." (No. 27)

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting Municipal Taxation Of Electric Power Utilities And Cable Television Companies." (No. 34)

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Social Assistance Act, 1977". (No. 44)

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce

a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Land Development Act". (No. 41)

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I present a petition on behalf of the 360 individuals who have signed it. I will read the prayer of the petition.

"We strongly object to proposed school board policy restricting candidates eligibility for school board elections. The stated religious affiliation of United, Anglican, Salvation Army, Moravian, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, Seventh-Day Adventist or Pentecostal is discriminatory.

"People of other religious affiliations or of no religious affiliation will have no voice. It is, in effect, taxation without representation.

"We, the undersigned, do hereby petition the government to take steps to ensure representation on school boards for all people."

Mr. Speaker, before I talk to the petition I want to make it quite clear that as Leader of the New Democratic Party in Newfoundland and Labrador the position of the party is that we support the denominational education system. We have supported it in conventions where we have adopted our policies. Despite that, I think it is important that we not neglect looking at the entire structure of the educational system, having a look at where stresses have occurred in the

past, and seeing what can be done to ensure an even better educational system in the future.

There are a number of items I would like to address. The first is what the prayer of the petition addresses and that is the disenfranchisement of various religions that have not been listed constitutionally and the discrimination against parents of children who put their children in school systems in which they have no legal right to run for those particular school boards. I am not suggesting any particular solution to it because I think the problem is indeed a complicated one and one that will require a bit of study.

The second problem I can see is that children are now going into special programmes offered by only one school system in an area, like French immersion, for example, and these particular children go into these systems and their parents now have no access to running for the school boards that now control their education.

The third problem is with teachers. I will just give one problem although others, I think, are apparent. Divorced Catholic teachers, for example, who wish to remarry are in some jeopardy of losing their jobs. This imposes a standard on them considerably above those which the general public have.

A fourth one is the duplication of facilities. In my district and I think in all districts in this Province we have duplicated facilities in order to provide for the denominational system and although that may be a necessary cost for the system itself, I think we have an obligation to

look at it since we are primarily the agency that authorizes the payments to support this system.

What I am suggesting is these are an indication of stresses in the system and that I would that the most appropriate method of dealing with this would be to strike a Committee of this House of Assembly in order to investigate these particular problems and others related to it to see if there is some way of modifying our system so that we keep its essentially denominational nature but, at the same time, allow for these individuals to have full educational rights as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to present the petition and ask the Clerk to come and take it and Table it to be presented to the appropriate department of government.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the petition. I have listened to my learned friend and he seems to have modified his position somewhat. I got the impression that it was his feeling that the denominational educational system should be done away with in the Province and he has not said that today.

I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that any remarks I have with respect to this petition should start very clearly from the premise, as we made clear in the last session of the House when we supported the incorporating of the Pentecostal Assemblies protection

under the denominational education system, that my remarks are confined to this aspect of elections for school boards and eligibility to run as a candidate. I do not in any way want to see the denominational educational system endangered or done away with in this Province.

What I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, with the information that I have available to me, is what I see as an unnecessary extension of the denominational educational system, or, it is not an unnecessary extension of the system, it is an attempt to imply that the denominational education system should be carried to this extreme where you have only persons of the same denomination entitled to run as candidates.

First of all I think the point should be made, Mr. Speaker, that it is only if there is support from those entitled to vote for a particular school board that you would see a person of another denomination elected to a school board. It would only be, for example, if the vast majority, who would be Roman Catholics, say, voting for a Roman Catholic School Board, were prepared to vote for a person of another denomination that that person would actually get on the board.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it is extremely difficult to see how the majority of the denomination could ever be affected by having the occasional individual appointed to the board who was not of the same denomination. What bothers me is the unfairness of the situation where you may have an individual living in a particular part of this Province who may be of a religion where there is no school board of his or her denomination.

He or she has a child within a school system. He or she may be entitled to go out and vote to elect a candidate and that candidate by the way may have been born into a particular denomination, may not have attended church since baptism at the age of six weeks or three weeks or two weeks, may hold no particular religious beliefs, but may, because he or she was born into a particular denomination, be entitled to stand as a candidate, may have less religious beliefs connected to that particular denomination than the person of another denomination who wants to run as a candidate.

It seems to me that if you have proper controls in place with respect to ensuring that there are statements of religious affiliation, ensuring that you can never have a majority of the board controlled by individuals of another denomination, this would eliminate any possibility of damage to the denominational educational system and the method in which religious instruction and other instruction is carried on within the schools. I think it is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that you will have now individuals, whether they be, for example, members of the Buddhist persuasion, or Jewish, or Moslem, and the many other religions that are out there, who will have children in the school system, they will have to pay school tax, and they will not have the opportunity to run as candidates even though their neighbours and their friends and the general public may be prepared to vote for them because they have something to offer the system. It strikes me that there is something wrong with that.

I cannot pretend to be completely

knowledgeable about the system, and I am going to sit down with members of the various school boards, both church members and other members of the boards, and try and get a greater understanding from them as to what they are concerned about, what their fears are because from the information that is made available to the public, it is not apparent that there is a real problem here. I understand from the boards that there has been information conveyed to government.

Mr. Speaker, I will not go on much longer. Your Honour is being patient with me by giving me this extra time. It is a matter of some importance. I would be very interested in listening to a spokesperson from government, whether it be the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) because I think there are certain implications here under the Charter of Rights, whether it be the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), or whether it be the Premier. I think we should have some indication of why it is that government is not prepared to act. It may be too late now. I understand today is the closing day for nominations for school boards and it would only be if there were an extension granted and government were prepared to take some action within that period of extension a change of the regulations could take place.

I understand the regulations, Mr. Speaker, have been there for some time and the qualification is that, unless otherwise decided by the constitution of the board, a member of a different denomination could not run. At least some of the school boards were not enforcing that requirement until

the recent change where a majority of the board now will be elected. They were not as concerned when more were appointed members. Now that seems to indicate some lack of confidence in the democratic process and in the common sense of individuals of the same denomination.

Your Honour has been very patient. I will close off my remarks with that.

I would just say again that I do not want to embark upon an attack upon the denominational educational system. I think that has served the Province well in the past. There are, at times, improvements that can be made in the approach taken under that system, but that will be room for debate in education. But I really think that government should take a look at what is taking place. I would be very interested in hearing some comments from government members.

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to say that I am pleased to hear both hon. gentlemen state quite categorically that they support the denominational system of education and they do not want to see anything done to destroy that system. I think the concern was issued by some people when they read in the paper that these two gentlemen were taking up a certain cause, there will be an attack on the denominational system. Knowing them, I perceived that this would not happen.

I appreciate the concerns expressed. These concerns are ones that actually have been addressed to a certain extent with the DEC's, in particular. In the school board regulations provision is made for others to be elected to school boards, if the constitution of the school boards so requires. However, the constitutions of school boards have to be accepted and approved by the appropriate DEC's. Even though a local school board might make provision for others, percentage-wise or whatever, that constitution may not necessarily be accepted by the DEC's.

Apparently, the problem that we are faced with now, which did not seem to surface before, is because the Denominational Education Committees for this school board election period seem to have closed up any opportunity for others to run except people who are adherent to the particular faith of that particular school board. Now, that is the right which they brought into Confederation. It is part of the BNA Act, now enshrined in the Constitution. However, up until this year only one-third of school board members were elected. I do not think there was any great concern by the various educational committee because the door was thrown wide open as it was in most occasions, and even if all those who were elected were not of the particular faith, it did not make any difference, they still had two-thirds controlling interest. However, now with two-thirds being elected there was some concern as to, I suppose, the control of the system and that is legitimate and understandable. Because of the complicated manner in the way school board members are elected, with the number of parishes making

up school boards or the number of zones, etc., it was very, very hard, I think, with the time that they had to come up with a formula for making provision for others.

However, all of the DEC's have stated quite categorically that they will make provision for the appointment of others. They still have discretionary powers in appointing one-third of the school board members. They have said that they will make provision for the appointment of others to school boards to make sure that minority groups are represented. However, of course, the pressure from the people who want to run openly, to have the same rights as anybody else to run for the board, is there.

Perhaps it basically boils down to a period of time where the various DEC's felt that they did not have time to put an appropriate formula in place that will make provision for others to run this time and yet make sure that the system is protected.

I have had meetings with the DEC's. They are receptive to making provision for others and in my discussions with a number of people who have concerns about running we have also discussed that. I would think between now and, hopefully, the next time we have school board elections provision will be made for others who are interested in running to run openly. It is a concern and perhaps it is the time element that has caused the confusion.

Once again, I am sure the people involved can be accommodated within the system. The system will be strengthened perhaps by accommodating people and yet ensuring that the system that we

have is protected and strengthened.

MR. FENWICK:

But they are not being accommodated now.

MR. HEARN:

No. Well, in the appointments they are, yes, but they are not allowed to run in this present election because the DEC's have chosen to have only representatives from the various faiths run simply for the reasons I have pointed out. Perhaps it is a matter of time. They did not have the time frame to put a proper procedure in place that would ensure protection of the system and yet make provision for others.

AN HON. MEMBER:

But is that not (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned when the hon. gentleman was talking to somebody else that we already have had discussions. They are certainly quite susceptible to sitting down and discussing ways of accommodating other people. I am sure they will discuss that with the various groups who have concerns.

In discussions we had just a few days ago with some of the people who are initiating the right to run or whatever, it was suggested that if we had had a discussion like this six months ago, if the time had been right, undoubtedly many of the concerns that we are facing today would have been eliminated.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Are there any further petitions?

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure to be back in the House again and to hear the way you intone the name of my district which pleases me greatly. It is certainly a change from the general caterwauling we hear from the other side of the House on most occasions.

I do have a petition, Mr. Speaker. It relates to the housing of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. I am glad to see the minister managed to make it back in out of the cold prior to the presentation of the petition.

The form of the petition, if I may say so, Mr. Speaker, before I read the prayer, is in the form of a letter addressed to the minister responsible for Housing. As we know, most of our citizens are not in a position to be familiar with the exact detailed procedures to present a petition in writing and, therefore, we receive them in many forms. So the letter in itself is the prayer of the petition. I would like to read it.

"We, the undersigned, being tenants in the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation's units on Roberts Road and Cooper Crescent, Happy Valley, Labrador, are protesting the rent increase proposed by NLHC for our area. On July 1, 1984 and January 1, 1985 we had a two-part increase in our rent with unit rent being raised from \$205 to \$226 per month. At the time the reason given was that a survey - and that is in

quotations - of rental rates in the area indicated that these particular units were being rented for less than units compared with in the survey. Again, there are quotations on the survey.

"Recently we were advised by the local NLHC office of further increases in rent rates. Effective November 1, 1985 the rent will be raised to \$243 per month. A further increase is to be effective on May 1, 1986, bringing our rent up to \$260 per month.

If a reasonable official from NLHC was to inspect and live in one of these units for one Winter, he or she would surely relate with our reaction to these unjustified and inconsiderate increases.

"It should be noted that these units are not economical to operate, especially during Winter months. Also the units rented come without any appliances or furnishings. We realize that an effort is being made to improve the properties, i.e. installation of new windows, proposed driveway paving - part of which has been done, Your Honour - and the filling and reseeding of lawns. The bottom line is we are not satisfied to pay for improvements such as tree planting and lawn seeding when we see other imperfections that should take precedence in a long list of priorities.

"The number one priority should be the replacement of the metal siding with a siding of some insulating value. Another priority should be the installation of electrical hot water tanks, the possibility of converting these units from the present oil furnace heating system

to electrical heating should be also given extensive consideration.

"We have been advised by the local office that these increased were ordered by NLHC authorities in St. John's. We insist that your office defer this increase and approve a moratorium to reduce the financial impact on our families."

Though lengthly, Mr. Speaker, that is the prayer of the petition in the words of the residents, some sixty-five of which who are tenants in Newfoundland and Labrador Housing units in the Roberts Road/Cooper Crescent of Happy Valley who have affixed their signatures.

If I could make a little point in reference the petition.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member has now spoken for five minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER:
By leave of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:
By leave.

The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to make a comment on the fact that since I have been a member of the House of Assembly and the number of complaints, petitions, requests and so on for information, that sort of thing, or action, if we were to pile ones relating to the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporations in one pile, and all other government departments in another pile, the piles would be about equal. That

is to say, it is a great concern, the provision of housing either subsidized or economic or complaints from people who are already tenants who are not get satisfactory services from within the department or that section of the department.

Labrador has some special considerations due it, I think, from the point of view of the fact that we are much further North than a lot of the other portions of our Province. I think the points taken here by the petitioners are quite valid in that if you do have metal siding, without proper insulation, there is a greater consumption of the various types of energy required to heat the places in the Winter. We have a very long Winter, even though you have snow on the Island now in places our Winter starts sometime in around October and ends around the time the first boats get back in, so we are talking about an eight-month Winter, perhaps, when extra heating is required in those units.

Recently a small group, the nucleus of the group who signed here, have formed a committee. I wonder, in speaking of that petition, if the minister might not consider having some mechanism put in place whereby a formal committee of concerned tenants could be put together with some assistance, perhaps, from that portion of the minister's portfolio so that they may present on a regular basis their concerns and ideas and suggestions as to how better to administer and how better to run the housing units that are in Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

We have already corresponded, Mr. Speaker, on the shortage or the

inadequate number of housing units in our area, but this is quite another thing. We are talking here about people who already occupy Newfoundland and Labrador Housing units and who see the expenditure of money, which has some aesthetic value and perhaps some functional value, but they see the priorities, as outlined in this petition here, as being of greater priority than the work that has already been done, reference tree planning, pavement, and so on.

I respectfully submit this petition, Mr. Speaker, to the House of Assembly.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to stand and support that petition by my colleague from Naskaupi. I also have a district which is served by NLHC - a major office is there - and a fair number of my constituents live in NLHC housing. I think the statement by my colleague that half the complaints that he has to deal with are on housing needs and concern NLHC, I would say I have to make the same statment and probably even more as a matter of fact.

There has not been a lot of co-operation given me on a lot of those complaints. I have talked to many of my constituents and they are, to say the least, extremely disappointed with the way some of the policies have been laid out and the way they are administered. I have talked with the Harmon Tenants Association in

Stephenville, who are representing the constituents who live on the Harmon base, and they have expressed many times the desire to meet with the management. They have become extremely disappointed that they have not been able to get meetings going to discuss their many problems.

So, as I have had to deal with this problem a great many times, and I am sure it exists across the Island, I think a petition by my hon. colleague is a very good one and I sincerely hope that NLHC will look into the matter of increasing the rates and also the reasons for doing so. If they are going to do it, they should make sure that improvements are done in the proper places and that the money is used adequately because I do not believe, in my area for sure, it has been used as adequately as it could. I will be making a further statement on that later as I will also present a petition in the very near future. I would like to support my colleague and I think it is a very good petition.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's petition. The letter was addressed to me and, in due course, I will get back to all the individuals who are noted on the petition.

There have been rental increases in Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, most of which have been precipitated by the assessment of rates in particular areas. We had rent increases, or will have rent increases, in St. John's, in the Pleasantville district, in Meegan St, in Pleasantville, Pine Bud, and so on, and Happy Valley-Goose Bay, of course. Stephenville is another area where the rents will be going up. The hon. member mentioned in his remarks that he would like to see an operation whereby a tenant association would have the capability of having an liaison with Newfoundland and Labrador Housing and with the Corporation so that they can indicate what some of the complaints are.

We have instituted a tenant relations programme and I will get to the people in Roberts Road/Cooper Crescent, through the officials of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, to see to it that their tenant relations committee is one of the committees that is officially set up. They will be given operating funding, which is what we are doing now, because we are interested in receiving complaints from tenants. We are attempting to replace windows, insulate, and make the grounds a little more presentable for the people who are living in there. We are spending quite a sum of money on that and I would be very interested in hearing from them. As a matter of fact, I receive the minutes of meetings of tenant relations committees from several committees throughout the Province. We now have several set up here in St. John's. We have them set up in Corner Brook, and we are attempting to get them set up in all the areas where Newfoundland

and Labrador Housing Corporation have apartment units. What we have done is provide a grant to these tenant associations so that they can set up, number one, and that they have some administrative funding. We did it on the basis of a formula of so many dollars per household and that seems to have worked out well. You obviously could not supply the same amount of money to each committee. In some areas you have 250 or 328 people in an area that would have one tenant association and in another area you would have say, nine, so obviously you could not give them a big grant so that they could operate a tenant association or a tenant relations committee. But we are interested in hearing from the tenants because we are spending a lot of dollars in upgrading housing throughout the Province and I for one would like to know whether the dollars are being spent in the right places.

I realize that there is a lot of work that needs to be done in the Goose Bay area. As a matter of fact I was up there this Summer and did go around and visit some of the housing that was up there. Some of the housing is very difficult to do a lot with. You have those duplexes and I believe it is in the area where the hon. member received this petition from, those duplexes there that are very difficult to work with and it cost a lot of dollars to reinsulate and so on. But we are doing the best we can.

The other thing is that any rent increase that people are not particularly happy with - of course nobody is happy with a rent increase - but there is that capability that we have put in place with respect to these

tenants applying to the Residential Tenancies Board. I think that is a good system to have in place because it basically makes Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, as a Crown corporation of government, answerable to a quasi-judicial body for any rent increases that they are attempting to impose.

The other thing is uneconomic rental units themselves have an obligation to break even and in looking at the financial statement of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing for market rental units throughout the Province, they are still not at a point where they are breaking even in those housing units. So we are attempting to at least get to that so that we are not subsidizing. We are subsidizing to a great extent people who are in social housing, but we should not be, I guess, subsidizing people who are in market-rental units. Some people in those units may require subsidization but they should attempt to move to the social housing areas.

So these are the kinds of things that we are trying to address and I realize that nobody wants to see a rent increase. But we are attempting to set up tenant relations committees so that we can get input from the tenants through those committees. We are providing funding so that they can operate their committees, and I am very interested. As a matter of fact, I take a little time out of my day the odd time just to read the minutes of their meetings.

We receive quite a substantial set of minutes from a tenant relations committee in Corner Brook and it listed all the problems that they had in their units and what they

would like to see updated, and what playground facilities they would like and so on. These are very helpful to the corporation because we are attempting to make these places a little bit more amiable for the people who are living there.

Thank you, very much.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of information, please? I could not hear part of the answer.

MR. SPEAKER (McNickolas):

The hon. member has presented a petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave. By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. KELLAND:

Just a quick piece of information, if the hon. minister would inform me again, I did not quite understand what he said. Did you say direction has already been given to the Happy Valley-Goose Bay office to institute the tenant committee system, or did you intend to do it? I did not get that part?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

We intend to do that with every tenant association that is in place right now. We have them instituted in St. John's, Corner Brook, and I believe there is one in Grand Falls. We certainly have talked to the office in Goose Bay to see to it that these people are formally set up so that they can avail of the funding that we are

putting in place for the operation of those committees so that they can put their complaints in and send in the minutes. We have some tenant relations officers in place in some areas but we have not got that fully done to this point in time. But the funding is available and if the hon. member would inform the president of the association in the Roberts Road/Cooper Crescent, they could send a note in to me, then I will see to it that something is done with respect to setting them up formally and giving them some seed money.

MR. SPEAKER: (McNicholas)
Are there any further petitions?

Orders of the Day

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
May I ask leave to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 23 for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent Public importance, namely, the financial and economic plight of Newfoundland's inshore fishermen and their families?

MR. MARSHALL:
If I could just address that Mr. Speaker, I will take out the well-worn authorities in Beauchesne, on page 91. This is adjournment of the House because of extraordinary importance: "The question must be specific and must require urgent attention." Now, Mr. Speaker, get this and the hon. Leader should get this: "It must

deal with a matter within the administrative competence of Government" - this is relevant - "and there must be no other reasonable opportunity for debate." And "urgency" within Rule 287 does not apply to the matter itself, but means "urgency of debate", within the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the House."

Mr. Speaker, always the economic situation of any group of people in the Province is urgent, but it is not a matter of urgent debate. There is obviously a reasonable opportunity for debate, because, as I have told the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, the Fisheries Loan Bill is now going to be called and there is no bill, Mr. Speaker, where the principle of the bill would be more relevant to that.

Now, I understand that when the hon. gentleman heard about the Fisheries Loan Bill, he misinterpreted it. Even though it had been on his desk for ages, he thought what we were going to do was go out and execute against all the fishermen or, as matter of fact, execute all the fishermen. But that is not it, Mr. Speaker, it is a general debate of the Fisheries Loan Bill. So the motion is not in order. Really and truly, the hon. gentleman came in here with a rose on today, and I wondered what would wilt first, the rose or the hon. gentleman. I think it is the hon. gentlemen, as shown by the type of motion that he is bringing in.

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

MR. BARRY:
Again we see the callousness, the hard heart of the Government House Leader and, in fact, members

opposite, as far as the inshore fishermen and their families are concerned. The minister refers to the proposed Act to Amend the Fisheries Loan Act. Mr. Speaker, that is a very, very narrow aspect of the problems that are being dealt with by inshore fishermen which they are incurring right now. The Fisheries Loan Board, sure that is one aspect, Mr. Speaker, but it is a very narrow aspect. There are other matters relating to the fact that they have either not qualified for unemployment insurance, or, Mr. Speaker, that they will receive inadequate unemployment insurance because of the small amount of earnings that they had that particular period during the summer, \$20 per week, \$30 per week, \$40 per week; the unemployment insurance is going to be so much lower as a result of these low earnings - that is another problem; the lack of adequate work programmes for fishermen, Mr. Speaker, and on and on we go.

The items which are contained in this Liberal Caucus Committee Report on the Fishery, Mr. Speaker, that is the debate that this House should be having, not this technical admendment to the Fisheries Loan Act. Mr. Speaker, it is again an attempt to keep the interests of fishermen off the floor of this House of Assembly because the Government House Leader and members opposite are afraid of the fishermen of this Province, they know they have their number.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: (McNicholas)

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

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, those of us who took the trouble and time this Summer to travel around the Province to visit some of the fishing communities in Newfoundland will appreciate just how serious a matter we are attempting to have debated in the House. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems is that the fishermen feel that they are being neglected and forgotten, and today we are being denied an opportunity to bring this very pressing problem to their House. I think, Mr. Speaker, the record must show that in the last session this House spent almost six hours debating a motion by the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), having to do with files that were allegedly misplaced by people in the Department of Fisheries. You know that, Mr. Speaker, does not say very much for this House of Assembly or interest on the part of government. We are being denied the right to debate the problem, yet last year we could afford to spend six or seven hours of the time of the House debating so-called lost files.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I just want to respond to the hon. gentleman. If hon. gentlemen want to, they can debate all the matters they want to bring up on this bill, that and much more. We can also debate the Fisheries Loan Board, when the hon. gentleman was Minister of Fisheries, and I think that would make some very interesting debate as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

About this motion for adjournment of the House under Standing Order 23, there will be an opportunity to debate the matter under the bill which will be considered shortly, "An Act To Amend The Fisheries Loan Act" (Bill No. 21), and there is also an opportunity under Address in reply, which is still on the Order Paper. I rule the motion out of order.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fisheries Loan Act". (Bill No. 21)

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, let me begin the debate on this bill, bill No. 21, "An Act To Amend The Fisheries Loan Act", by saying how pleased I am today as Minister of Fisheries to be able to introduce to the House this very progressive amendment for the protection of all fishermen in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, back, I guess, in about 1984, my colleague, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), who was then Minister of Fisheries, introduced a very progressive programme to help fishermen meet their obligations to the Loan Board, known as the Assignment of Catch Programme. After there started to be some trouble with some of the processing companies, I guess, the member for Bonavista South, who was then the Minister, very quickly noticed that because of legislation setting up the Fisheries Loan Board it was possible that fishermen could be left out in the cold and not have

any legal protection against their money which had been paid to processors in the Province, on their behalf, for transmittal to the Fisheries Loan Board. The then minister, my colleague for Bonavista South, began the process that we are finishing up here today, and that is amending the Fisheries Loan Board Act. It is not a technical amendment, Mr. Speaker, as so glibly points out the Leader of the Opposition, but a very major amendment to the Fisheries Loan Board Act so that fishermen in all parts of this Province will never face the same problem that they faced two or three years ago when they had several thousands of dollars, hundreds of thousands of dollars into the accounts of fish processors in this Province who went into receivership or went into bankruptcy and, lo and behold, they found that that money, which had been collected on their behalf, could not be transmitted to the Fisheries Loan Board so that their loans could be reduced accordingly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was a very unsavoury state of affairs and the then minister moved very quickly, as I said - and I am finishing it off here today - began the process to make sure that never happens again to the fishermen of this Province. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is to make sure that no matter what happens the funds which are paid into an account of a fish processor, whether that processor happens to go into receivership or happens to face financial difficulty and goes insolvent, those funds are protected so that the fishermen in Twillingate, or LaScie, or Fleur de Lys, or wherever the fishermen might be, the hard earned money that they paid through the

Assignment of Catch Programme to be transmitted on to the Fisheries Loan Board on their behalf by the company concerned does in fact take place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one other aspect to this amendment today, but that is really the crux of what those amendments are all about. Mr. Speaker, I was flabbergasted to hear the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) on this particular legislation. After we had announced our legislative programme for the year several weeks ago, and remembering, Mr. Speaker, that this particular bill had in fact been on the Order Paper from the Spring session and had in fact been distributed, the Leader of the Opposition is saying that this piece of legislation is a blow against fishermen. That was the headline, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition saying this piece of legislation was a blow against fishermen; we were bringing in a piece of legislation in this House that was going to enable the Loan Board to go out and repossess fishermen's houses, and their boats, and their nets, and their gear, and their engines, and their cars and everything. I mean, this was a great monstrosity that this administration, this heartless, gutless administration was bringing into the House against fishermen of this Province.

If the Leader of the Opposition or anybody else in the Opposition had taken the trouble to read the piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, one does not have to be a lawyer to very quickly see that this piece of legislation is meant to do just the opposite. It is meant to set up a special trust so that fishermen who pay their hard earned money into fish processors

and fish companies through this Province will be able to ensure that no matter what happens those funds are transmitted to the Loan Board so that they are applied against their accounts, so that there will not be a lengthy legal battle, so that there will not be the possibility that the funds may never, in fact, reach the Loan Board if there happened to be a bankruptcy or an insolvency procedure. That is the whole idea, Mr. Speaker. That is this terrible legislation that this government is bringing into the House today, asking us as legislators to amend The Fisheries Loan Board Act so that we can protect forever and a day the funds that are paid into processing companies in this Province by fishermen.

So that is really what we are doing. No where in your wildest dreams, Mr. Speaker, in this legislation, in those proposed amendments, can you come to the wild conclusions that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) came to, that some how or other this piece of legislation is detrimental to fishermen. It is quite the opposite, Mr. Speaker. It is meant to protect the fund, to protect the investment of the individual fishermen. By the way, Mr. Speaker, the legislation does not stop there. If there happens to be some kind of lengthy court battle as the result of a bankruptcy, the Fishery Loan Board, by those very amendments, also has the authority to be able to write off any interest or principal charges that were accrued as a result of the company who held the funds in trust not paying those funds over to the Fisheries Loan Board on behalf of the fishermen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how can you construe that to be something that is detrimental to individual fishermen in this Province? It is something my predecessor, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), noticed when there happened to be a couple of bankruptcies back a couple of years ago and through the legislative process we are now asking that the Fisheries Loan Board Act and Regulations be amended so that the funds of fishermen paid to fish companies in this Province are protected, so that it has a better status in law, so that it has an effective lien in law. And even if the worse should happen and there happened to be the necessity of some kind of illegal harangue over all this, the Board, on top of that, will also have the authority and the right to be able to write off interest, to write off principal so that because it was not the fishermen's fault that the funds did not get paid promptly into his account, he will not be the loser.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is why I can say that this is, I believe, very progressive legislation. It is an excellent amendment that will benefit every fishermen in this Province. Because we have been moving over the years, Mr. Speaker, to the advantage of fishermen. We have been moving over the years to the Assignment of Catch Programmes so that fishermen, rather than having to once or twice a year find several thousand dollars, perhaps, to pay on loans, can, every day that they are landing fish, have a percentage of that landing placed into an account at the company level so that it can be transmitted on a monthly basis, or whatever, to the Fisheries Loan

Board and applied against their accounts. When in January or February or December, whenever the payment might become due, they might have to find several thousand dollars in a normal operating year, they do not have that headache any more, each day there is so much going into their account, held in trust by the company, and passed on to the Loan Board on their behalf.

And all those amendments are doing is seeking to make sure that the fisherman does not suffer if something happens with that system, seeking to ensure that funds do, in fact, get to his account at the Loan Board, and if, in fact, they do not get there, that the fisherman is not penalized as a result. So there is nothing sinister, Mr. Speaker. This is straightforward, good, progressive legislation and I am very pleased, as Minister of Fisheries, to be bringing it in.

The second thing that this amendment does, Mr. Speaker, is ensure that the funds that are paid into the fisheries loan account can be paid on a monthly basis, or whatever the Lieutenant-Governor in Council decides, into the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the Province. For whatever reason, when the act was originally drafted that was not the case and it has been raised from time to time by the Auditor General. Again, it is common with other loan agencies of this type that we have in the Province, not only in this jurisdiction but others, that those funds as collected are paid on a regular basis into the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the Province and then each year in the budgetary process the Loan Board is given whatever their requirements are

for operating. The Auditor General had asked for this some time ago, and, again, my colleague was in the process of bringing in that amendment to ensure that we could put that into effect.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all fishermen who had difficulty with the Assignment of Catch Programme because of the lack of those amendments over the last couple of years, on behalf of all those fishermen who will now have that uncertainty and that difficulty removed, I am very pleased, as Minister of Fisheries, to sponsor those amendments.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I would just like to read out to members of this House the press statement issued by the Premier on September 24, 1985, where he gave the legislative agenda and indicated what would be coming up for debate. First of all, let us remember, Mr. Speaker, the fact that there is a bill on the Order Paper does not mean that it is ever going to get to this House for debate. And if members opposite think otherwise, then perhaps the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) would care to explain how is it that we had a Public Elections Act on the Order Paper - how many times did we have that, Public Financing of Elections?

MR. TULK:
In '81 it started.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, at least 1981. Because the Premier made the promise, Mr. Speaker, that he would be bringing in that legislation during the 1979 election, over six years ago. So the fact that there is a bill stated on the Order Paper does not at all mean that it is going to come before this House for debate. Just look at what the Premier said they would be bringing before this House for debate, and the minister should listen to this. It says that under the Department of Fisheries they will be amending the Department of Fisheries Loan Act to permit the Province to apply a third party demand in certain circumstances. Where is there a reference to a third party demand in this bill? No where is there, Mr. Speaker. So what has happened is they have chickened out. They had another sneaky little piece of legislation that they were going to try and slip through this House before we brought to the attention of the people of the Province and to the fishermen of this Province what they were up to, Mr. Speaker. They backed off from it.

If Your Honour were to owe money to the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), and if the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), Mr. Speaker, owed Your Honour money, the member for Windsor-Buchans would be entitled under a third party demand to go and seize the money in the hands of the Minister of Fisheries that was owing to you so that you would not be able to get it and make off with it - not to say that Your Honour would, but so that you would not be able to get the money owed by the Minister of Fisheries and make off with before you paid your due debt, your honourable debt to the member for Windsor-Buchans. That is what

a third party demand means, Mr. Speaker. So what is this nonsense that we have now where the Premier says that they are going to amend the Fisheries Loan Act to permit the Province to apply a third party demand in certain circumstances? Where are the circumstances? Where is the demand? Who are they going to make the demand on? Mr. Speaker, here is an example of the amount of information that the Premier supplies on his so-called agenda, 1985 Fall Legislative Programme. That is how much information was supplied with respect to what was intended under that legislation. If the Premier thought he was referring to this bill that was already on the Order Paper, Bill 21, "An Act To Amend The Fisheries Loan Act", why was that not set out? There was no reference to a third party demand in this Bill 21.

Now let us look at the principle that is involved here. Let us look at how far this act goes. Members on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, have no trouble supporting Clause 11 (1) which says, as far as I read it, that once a fisherman lets the processor keep money that is owing to the fisherman so that the processor can send it into the Fisheries Loan Board, that right at that point in time that money is considered to be in trust for the Loan Board. It is not a problem, Mr. Speaker, with members of the official Opposition. We wonder why it has taken government so long to ensure there are safeguards in the event that a processor goes bankrupt after a fisherman has left money entitled to him in the hands of a fish processor. If a fish processor went bankrupt in the past, presumably, the fisherman still had to pay that money to the

Fisheries Loan Board even though it had been left in the hands of a company that had been buying his fish.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Minister of Fisheries is going to supply some information as to the meaning of section 11 (2). Because if 11 (1) operates as it should operate, why would a fisherman's interest continue to tick? As far as the Fisheries Loan Board is concerned, the money, once it has been left in the hands of a processor, is then the money of the Board. Why is it necessary to say that the Board may forgive in whole or in part the interest owing? Would the minister explain why there would be any interest owing if it becomes the money of the Board once the processor has it? If there is some technicality that we are missing here, Mr. Speaker, in heaven's name why does it not say the board shall forgive the interest if for some technicality it is considered still owing? The fisherman has left the money with the processor to go to the board. Under what circumstances, will the minister tell us, would the Loan Board be then going after a fisherman for interest on that money? The fisherman, in good faith, has left it in the hands of the processor and under 11 (1) it becomes money in trust for the Board, how then can interest be continuing to accrue? And if for some technicality it does, under what circumstances would the Board not forgive that interest? The minister is going to have to explain that before we vote in favour of 11 (2).

Now, clause 2 of this bill seems to be the purest of housekeeping. It is a power that, if it is not already there, I think should be there to permit payments out of

the fisheries loan fund. But, Mr. Speaker, I think there should be some provision for bringing this information to the House of Assembly, that under this clause there should be a provision to inform the House of Assembly, as soon as it is possible to do so, how much these payments are and why the payments were made out of the fisheries loan fund into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I would like to say about the specifics of the bill itself. What I would like to deal with now are the broader aspects of the financial system and the financial position that inshore fishermen find themselves in today. We have a situation where the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) took some action during the Summer, and we acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, it was a positive step, although a very small step -

MR. TULK:

About 1 per cent of what was needed.

MR. BARRY:

Yes. The Opposition House Leader says about 1 per cent of what was needed to help fishermen - when the interest rate was reduced for fishermen and when the government indicated that they would be transferring back from the banks to the Fisheries Loan Board certain loans. Mr. Speaker, I think we have here some indication that the system has not been working whereby the fishermen were forced to go to banks in order to obtain financing.

Mr. Speaker, inshore fishermen today have communicated their plight to the Liberal Caucus Committee on the inshore fishery. And, in this report that the

government refused to accept when the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) attempted to table it today, there is a very clear explanation given of this process by the Liberal Caucus Committee whereby they went out and listened to fishermen and asked fishermen themselves to indicate what are the problems that fishermen see that they have to deal with and where they made recommendations to the Committee as to ways in which their problems could be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, listen to some of the comments here. From the very first meeting that was held in Port de Grave district, one thing became abundantly clear: The inshore fishery this year has been an utter disaster. 'We had a late start due to ice conditions, we had a poor caplin fishery, we had meagre supplies of groundfish, little market for mackerel, grossly inflated insurance premiums' - again, thanks to government policy, a basic increase of 33-1/3 per cent from what the premiums were last year - 'we had high prices for bait fish, we had fluctuations in the selling price of squid, we had increased fuel charges, we had too many just plain stupid regulations being applied to fishermen by the bureaucrats.' Now, this is the list that was heard over and over again by the Liberal Caucus Committee as they moved around the Province. Fishermen have been operating since March in many parts of the Province this year on little or no income. The majority of fishermen in Port de Grave, as many as 90 per cent, had not earned enough to qualify for even the lowest form of unemployment insurance benefits.

Now, we will have to take a hard look at, and we would like to see,

information. It is not good enough for members opposite to say, for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) to say, 'Oh, there are more people or as many people qualified this year as last year for unemployment insurance.' We want to see just where, in which areas, Mr. Speaker, they have information: Does this apply all around the Province? From what the fishermen in Port de Grave told us, it does not apply in Port de Grave. It is not what the union is saying, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. CARTER:

It does not apply in Twillingate.

MR. BARRY:

It does not apply in Twillingate.

MR. FUREY:

It does not apply in St. Barbe.

MR. BARRY:

It does not apply in St. Barbe, Mr. Speaker. So where are these statistics coming from that members opposite are using to attempt to justify their own neglect, indifference -

MR. W. CARTER:

Incompetence is the worst of it.

MR. BARRY:

- and often, Mr. Speaker, incompetence, that is right. That is the worst of it.

Mr. Speaker, fishermen say three stamps, four stamps, six stamps, there is no way most fishermen here are going to get ten stamps to tide them over the Winter, and the few fellows who got ten stamps got low stamps because their income is way down, no better than welfare if they are as good, they say. Now, again, that was the refrain in all parts of the Province over and over again.

Many were barely able to continue operating, barely able to continue to meet their operating expenses and, indeed, many of them found it cheaper not to go out, that if they went out they would lose money; if they caught a few fish it would not cover the expenses of fuel and of going out. Most, as far as their families were concerned, were extremely strapped and most are looking ahead to this Winter with great fear and trepidation. They are not able to qualify for unemployment insurance benefits or they have very low stamps, they are not able to make payments on their loans and they fear the loss of their boats and gear and some, indeed, even fear the loss of their homes and their property. They are having writs issued against them. And, you know, the fishermen who were here in the gallery today looked down and said, "There is nothing going to happen. There is nothing going to change until it is too late." Finally, Mr. Speaker, when the frustration grows and then we have the demonstrations, the utter frustration of fishermen who, if anything, are so quiet and so willing to accept what is going on - even though they know it is the stupidity of politicians causing it, they are a very tolerant group of citizens in this Province - eventually even they will reach the boiling point and we will see some action taken, in a few months. You know, the sad part about it is that there will have been much human hardship and misery by the time that action is taken that for no additional expense or cost but just for earlier action, earlier initiatives could have been avoided. That is the sad part about having a government that is indifferent, a government that is unresponsive, a government that

does not stay in touch with what is going on amongst the people of the Province, particularly, in this case, amongst fishermen. By the way, we have a Minister of Fisheries who does not even get interested enough to stay in the House during debate on the Bill.

We will see when he comes back in, and we hear his response, just how many notes he is outside taking. Mr. Speaker, we had this committee going around and the interesting thing was the large turnouts that the committee found. There were even cases where in the middle of a working day you had fishermen staying in, skippers of boats sending their crews out and they staying in for the day to make sure that the message got across to the Politicians as to what was happening. It is really an insult, a gross insult to the fishermen of the Province that the result of this work, this report, cannot be tabled in the House, that government would not accept it. But it is going to be tabled. I am going to table it now. I am referring to it, Mr. Speaker, and I have an obligation. As I am reading from the report, it has to be tabled. They are going to get it whether they like it or not, Mr. Speaker! They do not have to read it, but it is going to be tabled. It will not be the first thing they did not read and obviously they are not going to read it. They did not want it earlier, they would not accept it, they would not give leave, Mr. Speaker, to have it delivered to them.

Mr. Speaker, we had comments such as, "If action is not taken this winter, there is very real fear that the inshore fishery itself may not last another year." That is the biggest concern. And there

is a real belief out there, Mr. Speaker - and anybody who is here today would have to say that that belief was confirmed - that the provincial government, aided and abetted by the federal government, is out to see the end of the inshore fishery in this Province. We hear the Premier and the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) hold out middle-distance fleets as the answer to the problems of the fishing industry. Where, Mr. Speaker, are the fishermen going to get the dollars to buy these multi-million dollar boats when they cannot pay for the ones they have now?

MR. W. CARTER:

Where are they getting the boats?

MR. BARRY:

Oh, the question, where are they getting the boats? Little birdies are telling certain stories about where the boats are coming from. It is quite similar to the situation of how they got the ferries, I think. Mr. Speaker, there will be more to say on where the boats are coming from and whose arranging to deliver the boats. Maybe the minister might be able to say a little bit about where this great middle-distance fleet is coming from and how that is going to solve the problems of the inshore fishery. This is his answer he has held out. How are the fishermen going to pay for these boats? Who is going to own them? Where is the money coming from for these vessels?

Mr. Speaker, the Premier indicated, in correspondence to me, that he sees the middle-distance fleet being crewed from the existing inshore fleet. Again, another step in eroding away that inshore fleet. Instead

of working at it in the other direction and ensuring that the quotas are there so that there is sufficient fish for the inshore fishermen now in the industry, they have decided that they are going to erode away the numbers, Mr. Speaker, who are able to participate in the inshore fishery, they are going to wittle them away by encouraging them to participate as crew members - I cannot see how they are going to participate as owners, but maybe the Minister of Fisheries will be able to tell us that - on these middle-distance fleets.

Mr. Speaker, people in this Province, the fishermen particularly, feel that the present Minister of Fisheries provincial, and the Government of Canada - we cannot say the present federal Minister of Fisheries because the acting Minister of Fisheries for the great port of White Horse has a few other things on his plate, you know, a few minor things like defence and Deputy Prime Minister. And he has a lot to be deputy about up there now. You need a few good deputies in that House to keep control of the stuff that they are putting in tins these days. He is also slasher. He is the man who is appointed to cut back and save on government expenditures. He is really the man who is going to be interested in spending on the fishery in this Province. You talk about a fellow being schizophrenic by the time he tries to carry out those two functions - trying to be the tough guy, the toughest guy on the block when it comes to slashing departmental budgets - and, at the same time, the provincial Minister of Fisheries is satisfied that we are going to get attention for our fishery when we have him as acting

minister, not to mention the amount of time he is going to have to be down talking to Mr. Reagan about his Star Wars initiatives.

MR. TULK:

And defending the Prime Minister.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, and defending the Prime Minister, trying to keep the Prime Minister afloat, trying to keep that particular leaky boat from going down with all hands, as it is rapidly appearing to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries is going to have to tell more than he did today about why he is not up to Ottawa saying, 'For heavens sake, will you give us a full-time, permanent Minister of Fisheries? At least permanent until the next election. That will be the extent of his tenure, Mr. Speaker, as it will be for most of them up there on that side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, another thing that worries inshore fishermen is the way in which they are discriminated against with respect to unemployment insurance. That was made clear in this resolution that was passed in Musgrave Harbour and Twillingate, where one of the aspects of the resolution was that they urge the Premier, the provincial minister, demand of the federal minister at the earliest opportunity the following: 'In the case of demonstrated need the revision or relaxation of all pertinent unemployment insurance regulations for the coming Fall and Winter.'

Now, the minister himself, I think, indicated that even those individuals who are qualified for unemployment insurance this year, many of them have very low

entitlements - their incomes were so low they are not going to get very much in terms of unemployment insurance. They cannot be expected to exist and to keep their families going on the size of the payments that they will be getting from the Unemployment Insurance Commission. Also, this Musgrave Harbour-Twillingate resolution asked that a programme be immediately implemented of works projects for fishermen, their wives and families and, in the case of demonstrated need, the relaxation of payment schedules to the Fisheries Loan Board. This has been partly done, and we have to give credit and admit that there was a small step taken in terms of reducing the interest. But now they are talking about attention being paid, as the member for Twillingate (W. Carter) rose in Question Period to ask about today, to a relaxation of payment schedules to the Fishermens Loan Board, principal and interest. Also a reduction in the amounts and a forwarding into the new year of the payment of fishermen's license fees. In other words, a delay in the timing of when these license fees are payable.

Mr. Speaker, on a broader basis the inshore fishermen want to see, and this relates to their income, as well, and to the number of times they are going to have to go to the Fisheries Loan Board and to their ability to repay their loans if they take them out to purchase vessels today, and I think this is one of the main things that came out all around the Province, a significant reduction in offshore dragging operations by foreign and Canadian fleets.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are other matters that, as I have already

pointed out, were of concern to inshore fishermen this Summer: There was not a sufficient degree of federal and provincial involvement in the marketing of caplin to the Japanese. We had situations where it appeared to fishermen that a Japanese technician on a wharf, whether it be on a wharf on Bell Island where they had an unnecessarily nasty incident, or whether it be in other parts of the Province, could be arbitrary, could be discriminatory. By taking a small bowl of caplin and testing them for red feed, he could force the dumping of an entire vessel load of caplin. In some cases, fishermen said, when they were turned away from one technician they went a little ways to another wharf and they had their catch accepted. This just reinforced the arbitrariness of the process for them. Really, what should be available is at least an action Hot Line. If you cannot have the inspectors down on the wharves as the fishermen are selling their caplin, at least have some form of action Hot Line, where you have people ready to come in and intervene when these types of decisions are required. Because let us face it, there are many thousands of dollars and many man-hours of work involved, not to talk about the potential waste from a food point of view, when you get into dumping boat loads of fish, caplin or otherwise. There has to be a better system.

In a sense, I suppose, you could look at it and say we are fortunate to have the Japanese in purchasing caplin. We have to ask, why is the market restricted to the Japanese? Is it a lack of attention on the part of the provincial and federal governments to finding other markets? But

even if there is only one market, Mr. Speaker, that does not mean that we cannot have reasonable regulation, keeping in mind at all times, unlike the former federal Fisheries Minister (Mr. Fraser), that quality has to be there or you harm yourself badly in the long-term. There still can be a way, Mr. Speaker, of ensuring that even though the Japanese concern about quality is recognized, that fishermen are not subjected to a completely arbitrary process, based upon a decision of a technician, where there is no appeal. There has to be some way in which fishermen can question what is being done where they feel they are not being treated fairly.

Getting back to unemployment insurance for a moment, inshore fishermen feel that the time has come to look at why their entitlement and the manner of payment for them should be different from any other worker. With the Charter of Rights, they feel they are being discriminated against. They want to have this looked at.

We have not seen any indication from the Provincial Fisheries Minister (Mr. Rideout) other than general lackadaisical comments. We have not seen any degree of intensity of effort. We have not even seen an intensity of statement showing that he is aware of the problems the inshore fishermen are going through or showing that he is communicating these concerns to the Federal Fisheries Minister.

I wonder if it is possible that this is part of the syndrome that we have seen developing where they are not only telling the Premier to go home and stop bothering them, but they are now telling

other ministers as well. "You have your Atlantic Accord, go home, stop bothering us and keep quiet." I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Minister of Fisheries is going to have to explain why it is that he has not been up to Ottawa bringing these matters to the attention of even the Acting Federal Fisheries Minister (Mr. Nielsen).

Mr. Speaker, another point made by fishermen, and this is one that is deserving of attention. It is that the Provincial Minister provide a better system for having direct input from inshore fishermen themselves into the types of regulations that they come up with and for the Provincial Minister to help see that they have some input into the regulations brought into play by the Government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, over and over again we heard the statement that you cannot catch the same fish twice. Fish that is caught in January, February, and March by draggers cannot be caught again by inshore fishermen in June, July and August. There is a concern that fish are being attacked when they are most vulnerable. You have the spawning grounds of fish ravaged by draggers and this is having an impact upon, not just the total allowable catch, but on the portion of that catch which moves inshore.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot here in this report which I hope members opposite will read, even if only members in the backbenches read it. If the ministers are not interested, surely there must be some individuals over there who have the interest of fishermen in this Province at heart, who have a few constituents who are

fishermen.

I can look over and see some hon. members who must have some concerns about the cavalier attitude and approach of those on the front benches, whether it be the Premier, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) or the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). I think the neglect of the inshore fishermen is going to be the downfall of members opposite and the downfall of that government. I think that by now it has become apparent and very obvious to fishermen that they are neglected and that they will continue to be neglected by members opposite. Once that perception sets in, Mr. Speaker, it is not going to be changed very quickly.

Even if it is merely to save their political hides, if they have no higher motives than that, Mr. Speaker, it is time that members opposite start looking at the inshore fishery and operate on some principles and on some sense of morality and concern and compassion for the inshore fishermen and their families.

We hear a lot from members opposite about being concerned about Newfoundland's rural lifestyle. On what does Newfoundland's rural lifestyle primarily depend if not the inshore fishery? Nowhere are members opposite clearly shown to be hypocritical then, Mr. Speaker, in the way in which they throw out these platitudes about protecting Newfoundland's rural lifestyle and then turning around and avoiding any attempt to help ensure that that rural lifestyle sees satisfactory jobs available to the people in our rural communities. The jobs are in the fishery and

these jobs are at stake, Mr. Speaker. We will get that message home. I am not sure we will ever see them act on it. They are so busy, Mr. Speaker, with other crucial matters such as renovations on the eighth floor and matters of that extreme urgency that they do not have a lot of time for these 20,000 or 30,000 fishermen who are effected. It is a little too much. It is not sexy enough for members opposite.

MR. TULK:

This government is lucky if it brings in one major piece of legislation a year.

MR. BARRY:

I am not sure that they have averaged one major piece of legislation a year if we looked at their record. They surely have not brought in an average of one major piece of legislation a year on the inshore fishery.

I must say though it is a great joy to stand up now and listen to the Premier having to fall back upon an agreement given him by the previous Liberal Government in Ottawa. It is very interesting to see the Premier having to fall back on that in order to try and influence the Government of Canada on the factory freezer trawler issue. Does that not say something, Mr. Speaker, about the status of that new era of consultation and co-operation? Whatever the Provincial Minister of Fisheries attempts to say about that era still being intact and still upon us -

MR. TULK:

In one breath he says it is, and in another he says it is not.

MR. BARRY:

It is very curious is it not, that there is consultation and co-operation and still the acting Federal Fisheries Minister (Mr. Nielsen) is giving serious consideration to factory freezer trawlers -

MR. TULK:

Against the wish of this government.

MR. BARRY:

- against the wish of this government. Members opposite have to fall back upon the agreement given them by a previous Liberal Administration. Did anybody think that they would see the day, as of a few months ago, that members opposite would have to swallow their pride, bite back their venom and their bile and say, "By heavens there is something good that came out of that previous administration in Ottawa." Well, I think if anything is shown it is that Liberals generally are concerned about the fishery. Liberals generally know the inshore fishery, know what the problems are, and react to those problems, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MITCHELL:

Yes, like the burn your boats policy.

MR. BARRY:

Members opposite have burnt their political boats on this issue.

MR. TULK:

They believe in starving people to death.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if the extent of their contribution to the debate involves going back to - when was that statement supposed to have been made, 1968 or 1969 or 1970?

MR. TULK:

Before my time I will tell you that, way before that. It must have been at least 1955.

MR. BARRY:

The member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) must have all of thirteen was he when that statement was supposed to have been made.

MR. TULK:

If it was at any time.

MR. BARRY:

Well, we will be very interested, Mr. Speaker, in hearing members opposite participate in this debate, participate in discussing the concerns of inshore fishermen. I am going to be sitting down in a minute because I am touch and go here now as to whether I am going to keep a voice.

I had a very interesting weekend. We had a lot to cheer about and, Mr. Speaker, the vocals cords had a hard going over.

MR. TULK:

You gave excellent speeches out there.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, I think I gave sixteen speeches in the course of a day and a half, Mr. Speaker, and neither one of them had to appeal for support for the leadership.

I was very curious actually when we were looking at a prior convention held out there a week or so before that that there was no leadership review carried out. I wonder why it is that there has not been any sort of -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

All the leadership contenders are pepping up a little bit, Mr. Speaker, because they have to protest the loudest. Remember how we saw Mr. Mulrooney go out and sit down with Mr. Clark and say, "My good friend, Mr. Clark, has my fullest support. He is my leader, my dear leader, I will support him until death do us part,"

MR. TULK:

In the same breathe he was saying to Wolfe "Get ready for Winnipeg."

MR. BARRY:

Yes, he had the wolves set upon him in the background, ably assisted, I might add, by the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) and by some members opposite. The wolves were sent out. If I were the member for Ferryland, I would not be too quick in jumping to conclusions about the winning side. It depends upon the time frame to which you refer.

Mr. Speaker, the interesting part of the comments of members opposite on this is that they are obviously saying that, "This will never get back to the grassroots of the Party. They will never have a say until the next election is lost. Until they loose the next election, there will never be a say on the Leadership of their Party." You say every four years! Have I missed something over the last six years? Mr. Speaker, the member for Ferryland is one of the front runners, but I think he has the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) close on his tail. The member for St George's (Mr. Dawe) has certain inclinations in that respect as well. He is one of the darker horses.

MR. TULK:

The Minister of Fisheries is being groomed. Did you hear that?

MR. BARRY:

The member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford) is sitting back with great interest, listening when these comments are raised, so maybe the member for Humber Valley is quietly doing his thing, garnering support. Mr. Speaker, there are a few people in the Government of Canada presently, either in elected or appointed positions who, from time to time I understand, inquire as to when the next leadership review is going to be carried out.

MR. TULK:

They are finding it a bit cold in Ottawa.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, they can be sure that the fishermen of this Province would love to have that question put to them, to have the opportunity to participate, because I think that they would have to go for a change of leadership. Mr. Speaker, they would have to opt for a change of leadership because they are being ignored. The fishermen are being ignored by the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) and by his colleagues in Cabinet, by the Premier of whose Government he forms a part of.

The member for Ferryland refers to Mr. Cashin and that reminds me of the interest that is shown by hon. members opposite in the fishing industry. I think it could be summed up by the fact that in the five years leading up to that restructuring agreement, the Premier had not met with the President of the Fishermen's Union on one occasion. It was only, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier was told

by the Government of Canada after he had walked away from the table, "We are going to do it without you, we are going to put money into the fishing industry, we are going to put it back on its feet, whether you are there or not, Mr. Speaker, it was at that point, in desperation, he invited the President of the Fishermen's Union to come in for a chat. Now, I think he has had one meeting with him since, but apart from that, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have very clear evidence of the interest level in the fishery. Can you imagine the Premier of this Province not meeting with, refusing to meet with the President of the Fishermen's Union? He should be meeting with him on a regular, ongoing basis. Every month he should be meeting with him, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the reason he does not want to meet with the President of the Fishermens' Union is that he does not want to give that gentlemen too much profile in case that gentlemen should challenge him for the leadership of the Tory Party. I think that a lot of it might be that, that the Premier does not want to give Mr. Cashin too high a profile or the Leader of the NDP Party (Mr. Fenwick) might lose one of his union bosses. He might not have anybody to give him guidance in the House of Assembly if that president of that union gained too much prominence by being invited in to talk to the Premier of this Province. But regardless of these small partisan considerations, I would submit to this House, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that the Premier of this Province went for so long without meeting with the President of the Fishermens' Union is a clear indication of his lack of respect and his lack of concern for the fishermen of this Province.

MR. TULK:

He refused to meet with some fishermen.

MR. BARRY:

He refused to meet with fishermen! Surely not! Surely not! Well, again we see it. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the fishermen would have loved to have been brought down to the eighth floor and invited in. You know, as a matter of policy, I think that that is what we are going to do from now on. Whenever we have the individual coming in saying, "I have been unemployed for six years. I have looked desperately around. I have spoken to my MHA on the government side. He has done nothing for me," we will refer him up to Buckingham Porch on the eighth floor. When we have the individual coming in to say, "Look, I have these low earnings, low stamps for unemployment insurance or no stamps", we will send him up to Buckingham Porch on the Eighth Floor. When we have the individuals coming in saying, "I am unable to get my aged mother into a nursing home or to get my relative into hospital because there are no nursing home beds or hospital beds because government says there is no money", we will send them up to Buckingham Porch on the eighth floor, Mr. Speaker, and we will let the people themselves decide whether the priorities of this government are correct. We will let the people themselves decide whether there is no money for hospital beds or no money for works programmes or the inshore fishermen.

MR. EFFORD:

Send them to the Queen in Buckingham Porch.

MR. BARRY:

Buckingham Porch, Mr. Speaker, in

the words of the member for Port de Grave - where is he gone? I hope that that elevator is programmed, Mr. Speaker, that it stops automatically on the eighth floor, to have those elevator doors come wide open.

MR. PATTERSON:

You need not worry about it. You will never go up there.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, just do not get that carpet too dirty before we do because it will not be that long.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we see a pure perversion of priorities where they will ignore the plight of the inshore fishermen, they will ignore the need for financing of our inshore fishery, and they will make the expenditures on the types of things that are barely visible as that elevator door flashes open on the eighth floor.

Mr. Speaker, we have a government that is now attempting - this is very interesting - to divert attention, develop another smoke screen, the way in which offshore oil and gas was used as a smoke screen to avoid dealing with the important issues of the day. We now have an attempt to use the factory freezer trawler issue in the same way. I mean the mere fact that there is nobody in the Province supporting factory freezer trawlers and everybody in the Province says that the application of National Sea should be opposed, the mere fact that we have this unanimous support in the Province is no reason why the Premier should not launch out into these great public relations campaigns and declare war. He is declaring war on the Government of Canada. How much has he declared

war when he goes up to Ottawa to meet with the Prime Minister? Why is he having his press conferences here in St. John's? Is it mere posturing, Mr. Speaker? Is it merely attempting to engage in a little shell game, trying to divert attention from the fact that they have done nothing for the inshore fishery?

They are permitting Fishery Products International to use the taxpayers dollars on the plants that need it least and the plants that need it most they are permitting Fishery Products International to ignore. That is the cruel reality of the fisheries policy of this government and that is what they will have to answer for, Mr. Speaker, before very long in this province.

MR. TULK:

I say Mr. Victor Young is too smart for that crowd.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be very interesting to see now the extent to which members opposite will fight to keep these plants open. To what extent are they are going to try and pass the buck to the management of Fishery Products International the way they passed the buck to municipal councils and forced municipal councillors to do their dirty work in raising taxes after cutting back the grants to municipalities? They are now going to try and shelter themselves behind the skirts of Fisheries Products International, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Even though they only own 85 per cent of the company.

MR. BARRY:

Well, no, they did not quite

manage to become majority shareholders, but with their good buddies in Ottawa they have clear voting control. With that era of consultation and co-operation, anything that is done by Fishery Products International is done with the approval of the shareholders, with the approval of members opposite and their Tory buddies in Ottawa. That is the reality. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province know that. It does not matter how much they try and pass the buck to the management of Fishery Products International, they will not get away with it. They are the ones upon whom the decision rests as to whether these fifteen plants will stay open or whether they will be forced to close, Mr. Speaker.

I am telling the minister right now and putting him on notice, we had an answer from him today and we will be looking very closely at these plants in Gaultois and Ramea and elsewhere where you stated that they would be ongoing on a continuous basis because the minister knows that Fishery Products International has not been running these plants on a continuous five-day-a-week basis. People in Gaultois have been going now for sometime, for almost a year, I think, being subjected to having two, at most, three days a week work. They are living, Mr. Speaker, on lower than poverty level wages as a result. They are semi-employed, part-time employed even though they wish to be employed full-time. It will be very interesting to see and we will know very shortly and I hope the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) is going to put his seat on the line on that particular point, I hope he is going to follow through, because, Mr. Speaker, he is going to have to

answer to this House if that commitment is not followed through as to keep those plants going in Gaultois and Ramea and elsewhere.

If we look at the months in operation that are contemplated here, in the fifteen plants -

MR. FUREY:

They were contemplating three months for Cowhead and the Cowhead plant was open for five weeks.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) said they were contemplating three months for Cowhead and the Cowhead plant was open for five weeks out of three months.

MR. FUREY:

That is in the good times.

MR. BARRY:

Five weeks out of twelve weeks, less than half of the time -

MR. MARSHALL:

Would the hon. gentleman like to move the adjournment of the debate?

MR. BARRY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

I will just close off my remarks for a second. Now we have fifteen plants and we have indications of them going to be open from anywhere from six months to as little as three months. The real question is whether they are going to be kept open on a continuous basis during that period and whether they are going to get the financial and the managerial assistance they need in order to survive?

Mr. Speaker, I will adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 22, 1985 at 3:00 p.m.