



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 44

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

22 October 1985

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, before we get into Statements by Ministers, I would like to rise on a question of privilege which I think affects all the members of this House and all those people who are engaged in the honourable profession of politics.

Yesterday in the House the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) asked a question of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), who stood in his place and answered the question, and it concerned the employment of a former member of this House and a former minister of the Crown, Mr. Hal Andrews.

The minister responded by indicating, yes, Mr. Andrews was hired to fill a vacancy that just occurred because of another appointment by the federal government for the person who had held that position, Mr. Collins.

Subsequently, the hon. member for Fenwick went outside of this House-

MR. FENWICK:
For Menihek.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
The hon. the member for Menihek, the two words have icks in them.

The hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) went outside of this House and did an interview with

NTV. I will table a copy of the interview, the transcribed words mentioned by the hon. member for Menihek. He said, and I will just read part of it, 'For example, there are indications that people keep saying that NDP governments do the same thing - that's not true. It's factually not true.'

Now the Liberal Party of Canada and the Liberal Party of Newfoundland, the Conservative Party of Newfoundland and the Conservative Party of Canada have been indicted by the member for Menihek as being the two political parties in Canada, through their provincial governments and through the federal government, who engage in this kind of activity, and that no NDP government in Canada engages in this. We have now a situation where a great negative pall is put over two political parties in Canada, and the only great political party in Canada and in this Province is the NDP Party.

MR. MARSHALL:
The great white knights.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I have three lists coming to me over the next couple of days, but I have, in ten minutes this morning, been able to get from the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Salt Charenick, former Minister of Finance, Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, no competition. Saul Miller, former Minister of Health in the NDP government, Chairman, Manitoba Telephone System, no competition. Ron McByrde, former Minister of Northern Affairs, appointed Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs, no competition. David Saunders, defeated NDP candidate in River Heights Constituency, appointed Deputy Minister of Urban Affairs, no

competition. Leonard Bye,
appointed General Manager of
Lotteries Corporation, no
competition.

I think the hon. the member for
Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) should do
the honourable thing and retract
those statements to the media
which left the distinct impression
that two of the established
political parties in this country
are the only ones which practice
from time to time helping some of
their friends, if you will, who,
through no fault of their own,
necessarily, or the party or the
leader or whatever, become
defeated in an election, and, from
time to time, are helped by some
of their other friends who happen
to form the government of a given
province or the national
government in Ottawa. I shall
substantiate this further with
another ten to fifteen names from
Manitoba, fifteen to twenty names
from Saskatchewan, and an
innumerable number of names from
British Columbia over the next
couple of days.

So I would ask the member for
Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) to please
apologize to this House for
statements that he made which cast
a reflection upon we who are
involved in politics, which
suddenly gave the idea that the
NDP Party of Canada, the NDP Party
of Newfoundland, and all the NDP
parties of the provinces of Canada
are the only lily-white people
around who really have the decency
to govern this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Menihek to
that point of privilege.

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I
understand that you get the
loudest yells when you cut closest
to the bone and I have a feeling
we have cut awfully close to the
bone in these accusations we have
been bringing up.

I do not retract any single thing
I said in this House, nor do I
retract a single thing I said
outside of the House. You have
there a bunch of unsubstantiated
allegations in which you have none
of the detail to prove one way or
the other. The fact of the matter
is this particular government is
embroiled in pork-barrel
appointments, has been embroiled
in pork-barrel appointments, and
continues to be embroiled in it,
not only by looking after their
former members of the House, but
in allocating funds of the
Department of Municipal Affairs by
deciding to knock Liberal and NDP
districts off the list and it does
it on a consistent and an
absolutely shameless basis. I
will not retract one iota of what
I said because you know damn well
that you are in the pork-barrel
right up to your eyeballs.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day in
the House of Assembly and I think
a sad day in the period that the
Premier has been in this House
that we see him step forward and
attempt to justify his own
patronage activities by references
to those of other provinces.

MR. PATTERSON:

Tell us about yours when you were a minister.

MR. BARRY:

If I could have a little quiet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Menihek attempts to engage in a little hyperbole, a little exaggeration from time to time in the heat of debate, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, in his references he did not mean to include the Liberal Opposition in his comments when he was making reference to the shortcomings of the government opposite and when he was making reference to the sad fall, Mr. Speaker, from this clean image that the Premier spent so much time trying to develop.

Now one thing we received here today on this matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, was a clear admission that his government has been and that he has been engaging in patronage. We have a clear admission by the Premier that he has been engaging in patronage and that he intends to continue, presumably, to engage in patronage. I think that that word should go out far and wide. We will be seeking, Mr. Speaker, answers to some of the questions, and we have them noted from Hansard, that were not answered during the last session. When we asked specific ministers such as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), the Minister for Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and other ministers, to explain, not just at the level of Protocol Officer but, Mr. Speaker, at the level of hiring for highways; we

asked the Minister responsible for Parks (Mr. Simms) about the depths of getting down to the kiddie patronage level of summer hiring, Mr. Speaker, and hiring relatives and friends of members opposite for summer jobs. Now, Mr. Speaker we have that admission that all of those questions that were raised in the last session of the House did have a basis in fact. Let that word go out, good bye, Mr. Clean! hello, Mr. Patronage!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I like what the Leader of the Opposition says because if my memory serves me right, after the Leader of the Opposition got defeated in Burin - Placentia West and went working somewhere else, as part of the Conservative Party and Conservative Government he was appointed by the former Premier, Mr. Moores, to positions in the government, the Labour Relations Board and so on. I just want to point out to the Leader of the Opposition that it is a case of the pot calling the kettle black.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that that was after a long search and discussion with many.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, Oh!

MR. BARRY:

In the same fashion that yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the Premier tried to muddy the waters

of the issue raised very clearly by the member for Menihek by referring to the hirings of certain individuals, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, Oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, could I have it quiet please?

MR. YOUNG:
Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:
It is a matter of privilege we are addressing here. There are no points of order. Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

We are on a point of privilege at the present time. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, in the same fashion that yesterday the Premier attempted to confuse the issue by attacking individuals outside this House, who were not here to defend themselves, who were hired after a competition, Mr. Speaker, in the same fashion he is now attempting to attack me, who was hired after a long, lengthy competition where they could not find anybody better to do that particular job.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

To that point of privilege, the hon. the Premier took the opportunity of giving a list of a

number of appointments in another jurisdiction, but there is no point of privilege.

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

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

MR. YOUNG:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition in his remarks cast some remarks on the Department and Minister of Public Works. I would like to clarify that summer employment in the Department of Public Works is carried out in a just manner. I feel that everyone hired down there when we have the open vote is hired in a justified manner. But, Mr. Speaker while the hon. member was a minister of Cabinet and if I had put up with the stuff he requested and the demands he made on the Department of Public Works, I would have resigned this portfolio long, long ago. He was the most corrupt minister and most demanding minister who ever stepped inside this Confederation Building.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. YOUNG:
You were corrupt from day one.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, I ask that the minister be asked to withdraw that reference to 'corrupt', or, if he would like, Mr. Speaker, to table

specifics of any such allegation, which even the lowest form of life would have the decency to do. If he is going to make this type of allegation now, I would ask, as a matter of privilege that, the minister - before I deal with his point of order - that either be asked to withdraw or to supply details to this House.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

I do not know what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition asked me to withdraw.

MR. BARRY:

The word 'corrupt'.

MR. YOUNG:

I will withdraw 'corrupt', but I cannot table phone calls and personal visits to my office. It is impossible for me to do it.

MR. BARRY:

I accept, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has withdrawn the intemperate remarks and inaccurate remarks that he made before this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I corrected myself, I think, when I raised the comment, I said it was the minister responsible for parks; however, Mr. Speaker, I did refer to Public Works and the reason I referred to Public Works I will explain, Mr. Speaker. I will be happy to explain, Mr. Speaker, why I referred to Public Works. It is because, Mr. Speaker -

MR. YOUNG:

You had four offices and never lost one of them.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

If I could just deal with the minister's statement?

MR. SPEAKER:

Please do so briefly.

MR. BARRY:

The reason I stated Public Works before I corrected it to the Minister responsible for parks -

MR. YOUNG:

I know nothing about parks. I do not have anything to do with parks.

MR. BARRY:

We will see now in a second what you had to do for parks. - was because of matters raised with us by constituents from Trinity-Bay de Verde, and as a matter of fact, I believe these questions are in Hansard, and we are now systematically going back through Hansard to identify all the questions, and there are many, where ministers last year said, yes, we will look into that and get back to you, and never did get back to the House on any type of question dealing with such matters as the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and the hiring of a labourer without competition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Get on with it.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I will be more specific. With respect to the matter of parks, we had information conveyed to us that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) influenced the minister responsible for parks to hire Summer students in the district of Trinity - Bay de Verde -

MR. YOUNG:

That is a lie.

MR. BARRY

- and the minister was asked to respond to that, that there had been influence brought to bear by the Minister of Public Works to have students employed in the district of Trinity - Bay de Verde in provincial parks, Mr. Speaker. Now, there were also questions raised with respect to the hiring by the minister responsible for labour, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), the minister responsible for forestry, hiring with respect to silviculture, an entire list of questions, Mr. Speaker, dealing with patronage questions.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order raised by the hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The Premier in attempting to lay a point of privilege has cast aspersions on comments that I have made as a member, on my accuracy as a member of the House, and the veracity of what I have said. I think it is important that we clear the record. So what I would like to suggest at this point, with the leave of the House, is that we ask for some select group of this body, a committee of this body, to investigate the patronage appointments of this government and of the governments of Manitoba, if they exist, and

Saskatchewan and British Columbia, and of the other allegations we have made, of patronage being used in a different method in terms of allocating funds from the Municipal Affairs people to communities that have Tory members and so on. If he is willing to look at the whole thing and he is willing to make an evaluation, I certainly am willing to stand here and say that the kind of wholesale pork-barrelling going on here does not happen in NDP governments, and I repeat it here in the House.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

How foolish of the hon. the member for Menihek!

MR. FENWICK:

You have not got the guts.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You brought it up yesterday. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member brought it up yesterday. I cannot help if the truth hurts. I will produce other lists which will be sworn to if the hon. the member for Menihek so chooses. All I am trying to point out is I am not defensive over the appointment of Mr. Andrews to the position that he now holds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am not defensive over that at all. All I am saying is that the hon. the member for Menihek got on

his lilly white throne yesterday, inside and outside this House, and tried to make the point that Conservative and Liberal governments throughout Canada exercise patronage but the NDP Party and the NDP governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan and British Columbia do not.

Well, I have proven the hon. the member for Menihek wrong. Now if he does not like it, tough!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
This flimsy list is not proof. Proof is a lot more than that.

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

I must rule there is no prima facie case of breach of privilege.

MR. FENWICK:
A question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I did not hear that last ruling. I could not hear you among the raucous uproar from afar.

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no prima facie case of breach of privilege.

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. John's North, a point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. For the second time in this session - I suppose I have to say the hon. - member for Furtune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) has cast aspersions on your office and on your person. To paraphrase his most recent quote, when the office

of Speaker was mentioned a few minutes ago in the interchange, he said quite loudly - we could all hear him - "We need one".

Now, Mr. Speaker, this House is very well served by Your Honour and I think that to cast aspersions on your office and especially upon your person, is highly irregular and he should apologize.

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

To that point of order, I will check Hansard and I will deal with the matter then.

Statements by Ministers

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, as most hon. members will remember, Labrador West underwent tough economic times as a result of the decline of the iron ore mining and processing industry and subsequent layoffs. This situation created problems with people losing their homes in which they had their life savings invested, as they could not meet their mortgage commitments. As a result, many people surrendered their properties to the various financial institutions. Because of the poor market situation, the sale of these houses did not fetch full value, and yet the former owners were still held responsible for their outstanding mortgages.

Mr. Speaker, our government has

been very concerned over this matter, and has monitored the situation very closely. In fact, our government took the initiative to institute a new task force to enquire into the socio-economic problems in Labrador West. Their recommendations were 1) that the government negotiate with the financial institutions to extinguish their interest in defaulted mortgages and consumer loans in respect of principal residences, including purchase of the assets, and 2) that government pay a portion of moving expenses for relocation for persons laid off.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that the Department of Finance was authorized to negotiate with the relevant financial institutions to settle outstanding defaulted consumer loans and mortgages in respect to principal residences in Labrador West.

After some negotiations, these lending institutions accepted the department's offer to pay 15 per cent of the total outstanding balance of \$3,661,070. This agreement is conditional on these institutions retaining title to these properties and releasing the people concerned from any further financial obligations.

Mr. Speaker, Cabinet approved the 15 per cent negotiated by the Department of Finance with the financial institutions to extinguish their interest in the defaulted consumer loans and mortgages with respect to principal residences in Labrador West. The financial institutions are to retain title to the properties and are required to issue quit claim deeds releasing the individuals from any further

claims on the Labrador West accounts relative to the consumer loans and mortgages on principal residences. However, the individuals would be responsible for other unrelated consumer loans and other debts incurred to finance vehicles and other personal property.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has approved an amount of \$650,000 in order for the Department of Social Services to fund the cash settlement and estimated additional interest charges.

Sir, I would remind the House that last year the government made payments to individuals totalling \$1,574,500 in assisting 848 laid off employees to relocate.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to inform the House that all the recommendations of the task force have been carried out and that our government has been able to alleviate some of the burden that the people of Labrador West have been carrying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in the opening lines of the minister's statement, he reminded us about the troubles experienced with the Iron Ore Company and the employees a few years back. Of course, during the last federal election, everybody across the country was reminded that it was during his tenure as

president of the Iron Ore Company by the present Prime Minister that the people got into such problems in Labrador City.

Mr. Speaker, this statement by the minister today is obviously intended to pre-empt or preclude or cut off at the pass Bill No. 100, a private members' bill which was sponsored by the member for Menihek, the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Fenwick).

Mr. Speaker, we in the Liberal Opposition intended to side with the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) in his efforts to try and help people in financial troubles, people who are no longer living in this Province but who are living in places like British Columbia and elsewhere, and who have been tracked down by financial institutions trying to get money for houses that they no longer live in.

Mr. Speaker, we compliment the government on this effort, but, as I said, we compliment the Leader of the New Democratic Party, particularly, on the bill that he was sponsoring in this regard.

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

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

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

MR. FENWICK:
My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the Ministerial Statement directly affects the district I

represent, and it is a problem that I have been working on for a full year, as well. I would like to have a few words to compliment the government on the work it has done.

MR. MARSHALL:
To that point of order. There is no point of order.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
As far as government is concerned, government has been working on this ever since the unfortunate situation in Labrador West became apparent. For no reason other than the fact that the hon. gentleman is the member for the district, even though there is only one response from the Opposition to a Ministerial Statement, as far as government is concerned we are prepared to give leave.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, without accepting this as a precedent, of course, we would also give leave to the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). It has been pointed out that the member raised the particular problem in Labrador West. I guess it should be noted, as I think the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) did, that the problem has not been solved on a general basis for the Province. This specific problem for Labrador West may have been solved.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Menihek,
by leave.

MR. FENWICK:
I thank members on both sides for permission to speak on this. This is indeed a very happy day. One of the major problems that I have been labouring with for the last year, since I have been the member, and I acknowledge publicly that government has also been labouring with it since before the establishment of the task force, and since then, has been how to get these poor, unfortunate people out from under enormous debt loads when they have lost their jobs and have had to move elsewhere. I knew that the particular piece of relief work was in the works for the last year and a half of so, anyway, and we have been informing our former constituents, because in most cases they have moved elsewhere.

Just to give you some small idea of the magnitude of the problem, there is an individual in B.C. now who was under a debt load of approximately \$45,000 that he would have had to pay on a continuing basis if this particular arrangement had not come about. I congratulate very much the government for doing it.

I will note that Bill 100, I understand, is due to come up tomorrow - is it? There is a section of Bill 100 which is retroactive to January 1, 1981. It seems to me that that is no longer appropriate now and I will ask in Committee stage on the bill that we delete that section. But as far as I am concerned, the general problem still exists and

Bill 100 goes ahead tomorrow at this time.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker, I have two brief statements. Firstly, I am very pleased to announce that a tentative agreement has been reached between the negotiating teams for government and the IBEW. The tentative agreement, which was reached during meetings in Corner Brook last week, covers a three year period to June 30, 1987.

I might say that the IBEW is the local unit in Stephenville which represents some twenty employees of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:
Both negotiating teams will be presenting the details of the agreement to their respective groups over the next several days and will be recommending acceptance. Further details will be released following the ratification process.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. WINDSOR:
Do you want to respond to that before I do the second statement?

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

Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would just like to refer to it briefly. We are happy whenever there is a successful conclusion to collective bargaining, Mr. Speaker. And, I must say, they are the rare exceptions, where we have agreements arrived at without long controversy and much unnecessary hardship as a result of the lack of responsiveness of members opposite.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to announce that government has recently approved for immediate implementation, a set of guidelines which outline government's policy for the hiring of external consultants.

Government has long realized the need to develop a set of comprehensive Consultant Guidelines, not only to provide greater direction to departments in the acquisition of consultant services, but also to inform the general public of policies and regulations relating to this sometimes controversial subject.

With these objectives in mind, my staff in Treasury Board, together with senior officials from other departments of government, have spent considerable time and effort in developing a comprehensive set of guidelines which reflect the operational requirements of government departments. They also reflect the often-times stated policy of the Peckford

Administration to acquire consultant services in a fair and equitable manner.

I believe that members of the consulting community will be pleased to hear that the guidelines reiterate government's intentions to encourage the development of local expertise in the traditional, as well as newly developing, disciplines. Also, the guidelines espouse the government's intention to acquire, where feasible, consultant services through a public call for proposals. Additionally, they are intended to complement the Public Tender Act and the provincial preference policy.

Copies of the Consultant Guidelines should be available for distribution to interested parties in the very near future.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of rooms on this floor where these consultant guidelines could be placed, and they are the washrooms, the one in here and the one out there, because they are going to be as much use as the paper that is now in those washrooms.

We have had the Premier acknowledge that decisions are taken by members opposite on the basis of patronage. There are already guidelines with respect to hiring. There is already more than guidelines, there is legislation with respect to the hiring of individuals and it should be done by open competition, Mr. Speaker.

We have had the minister get up and say the commitment of the Peckford Administration to - what did he call it? - the openness in government in calling for services and supplies. Well, as far as labour is concerned in this government, Mr. Speaker, the Premier admitted here today that it is done on the basis of patronage. As far as public tendering is concerned, we periodically see, as we did in the recent case of the ferries, just how much the Public Tendering Act is adhered to and that is legislation, that is not just guidelines. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that the hiring of consultants is the great sump, the great pit into which every principle of fairness is allowed to sink. Because the discretionary power of government is so broad with respect to the hiring of consultants that it does not matter what guidelines they set out, they will find a way to apply the Premier's principle of patronage, the philosophy of patronage, which we have had acknowledged here today. So let us not waste any more time on those guidelines with respect to the retaining of consultants, it is just a sham, a charade, a smokescreen. Mr. Speaker, I have to compliment the Premier and ask that the President of Treasury Board have the same honesty, get up and admit you are going to be doing it on the basis of patronage.

Oral Questions

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

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

I would like to direct a question to the Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who was the person who hired Clar Rogers?

MR. BARRY:

I would be glad to tell the member, the House, whoever wants to know at any particular point in time with respect to that, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question and I would like to be able to do it in silence if I could, to the Premier, we saw during the Summer Petro-Canada officials responding no comment when they were asked whether federal or provincial politicians were having an input into decisions on the dismantling of Come By Chance refinery, as to whether or not that would be dismantled, now has the Premier had any input, is he accepting Petro-Canada's position, is this just a business decision that politicians should have hands off, or has he had input and what is the status of the information that he is receiving and the decisions of Petro-Canada with respect to that refinery?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I note that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is deliberately staying clear of the unemployment issue in the Province in his questions to ministers and to the administration. I guess that is because we have had a decrease of 4 per cent in unemployment this year over this time last year and youth unemployment has gone down 7.5 per cent, the most of any Province in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
So we know why the Leader of the Opposition is not talking about that. As I have indicated to the Leader of the Opposition on a number of occasions in the Spring and during the Summer, that the Government of Newfoundland will have ongoing input with Petro-Canada in the question of Come By Chance and its future. I mean Come By Chance refinery and the complex that is there. This is ongoing and when a definitive statement is ready to be made on Come By Chance we will make it.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
I wonder if the Premier would indicate when is the Atlantic Accord legislation going to be placed before the House and is the status of Come By Chance going to be clarified before we deal with that Accord so that we can know whether we will have any chance at all to see oil and gas processed onshore?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) just reminds me that in the last number of weeks there were further meetings with Petro-Canada. To indicate that there is input from the Province, there were meetings between Petro-Canada and the Government of Newfoundland and we are still, with Petro-Canada, assessing the

various bids that are in and deciding upon a course of action. Obviously, we will have a major say into that matter before it becomes finalized. So that is where Come By Chance stands at the present moment. There is no final decision on it.

As it relates to the Atlantic Accord, I guess the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) is better able to answer that question than I. The date on which the legislation will be introduced into the House of Commons and into this Legislature has not been finalized to the day but I could say, with some assurance, I think, on behalf of the minister, that sometime around the middle to the third week in November is our hope when all the negotiations will be finalized on the legislation embodying the Accord. As it relates to the position of Come By Chance, obviously that will be embodied in that legislation as well.

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

MR. BARRY:
In light of these ongoing negotiations with Petro-Canada concerning the Come By Chance refinery, and indeed in light of the negotiations that the Premier has indicated are ongoing with respect to the Atlantic Accord, and with respect to petroleum royalties, and so forth, would the Premier consider it appropriate for members of his Cabinet to have financial or business involvement with Petro-Canada or any member of the Hibernia consortium? Will the Premier assure this House that there is no Cabinet Minister with any financial or business dealing

with such companies?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

With the companies that are now bidding on the Come By Chance refinery, you mean?

MR. BARRY:

No. That are making decisions with respect to the refinery or with respect to the negotiations you are having on the Atlantic Accord.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) is the minister who is doing the negotiations with Energy, Mines and Resources, and there is a team of officials who are assisting him in that regard who report to Cabinet. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is having the talks with Petro-Canada over Come By Chance, as has been the role of the Minister of Finance in this matter for some time. So the two ministers are involved in it, and under those two ministers would be a team of officials in each case. So the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate is handling the Atlantic Accord legislation and the Minister of Finance is handling the negotiations with Petro-Canada.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I have a follow-up, if I might, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Premier would comment on this document which I would like to table, Mr. Speaker, which is a power of attorney dated April 16,

1984, whereby Petro-Canada Inc. constitutes and appoints a partner of the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate as its attorney for certain specific matters in the Province. I wonder whether the Premier would care to comment whether it is appropriate for the firm of Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate to have this involvement with that company? I would like to have a copy of that delivered to the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am not familiar with it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with any particular power of attorney that the hon. gentleman mentioned.

MR. BARRY:

Well, maybe if you could pass it over and show it to the minister.

MR. MARSHALL:

I have not seen that power of attorney and I have no knowledge of the power of attorney. However, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman will accord me the opportunity, because he is making allegations that are tinged with great seriousness, to speak without interruption with respect to this. When I took the position of Minister responsible for Energy, I made a very careful search in my law firm. At that particular time I had been acting for some period of time for a firm called British Petroleum. The first thing I did was call British Petroleum in and tell them that I would not be acting for them any further. It is my understanding

that one of my partners in the firm, Mr. Derek Green, had been approached by Petro-Canada -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

This says Charlie White.

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, Charles White's name is on the power of attorney but I have not seen it. - purely and simply to handle a certain property transaction that had occurred because of his particular expertise in the thing. And there was another firm, I think it was the firm, actually, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was connected with that had been acting for Petro-Canada at that particular time. To my knowledge, anyway, certainly to my knowledge, and this is the way that I have conducted my firm all the time, that all that anybody in my firm would have any relationship to do with Petro-Canada would be purely and simply with respect to titles, with respect to gas stations. You know, just a normal, ordinary, commercial transaction. They do not act for Petro-Canada from the point of view Petro-Canada's involvement on the offshore in any size, shape or fashion with respect to it. And I can tell the hon. gentleman also as well, because these accusations have been made from time to time, I have been a member of a Cabinet - in, out and in - for a period of some sixteen years in this Province, and I have conducted a law practice because it is something that I have built up myself, but I have been very, very careful at all times to very scrupulously differentiate between clients and government. There were accusations made from time to time by the hon. gentleman's predecessor with respect to a

certain bank that I had always acted for. You do not hear any talk about the fact that the bank is now no longer the government banker. Every single, conceivable matter that could have come up with respect to any involvement of my firm with respect to any matter at all, I do not get up and make a declaration of interest or anything in Cabinet, but if and when it comes up I merely get up and very quietly tell the Clerk of the Executive Council to the effect that I am out and to note that particular fact. And as to the involvement, I am not directly involved myself with Petro-Canada. I do not know what they do with respect to the firm. The only thing I do know is that one of my partners acts from time to time in the matter of titles to gasoline stations, that and only that. So that is the position that I give to the House.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

If I could follow up, Mr. Speaker: We gave the minister an opportunity to explain because it is a matter of some import and the minister deserves an opportunity to explain, but I again direct my question to the Premier. And I have to say, as somebody who has done work for Petro-Canada myself, whose law firm has done work for Petro-Canada, but not, Mr. Speaker, when I was a member of government, not while I was a Minister of the Crown, I know, Mr. Speaker, be it only real estate work, it is work for which money is received, and I am looking, Mr. Speaker, at the conflict of interest guidelines for ministers, dated 1981. I have not checked to see, and I do not

recall, whether there has been an updating or some modification by amendment. But, Mr. Speaker, you have a Minister of the Crown dealing with corporations on behalf of government, and at the same time, albeit unconnected with that - and we accept the minister's statement that he has not represented Petro-Canada with respect to any matters that government is dealing with - I think we have the acknowledgement from the minister that his firm has been doing other work. Now I guess the Premier and every member here knows that there are fine lines, but I would ask the Premier whether he considers it appropriate that the ministers in his Cabinet be employed in a professional capacity and receiving fees from a corporation while that corporation is involved with negotiations with government and Cabinet that could have very momentous implications for this Province.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Well, Mr. Speaker, number one, as I said earlier, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is acting as the Minister responsible for negotiations with Petro-Canada as it relates to Come by Chance. As it relates to the Atlantic Accord, the Minister responsible for Energy, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is acting, in his capacity as Minister with Energy, Mines and Resources, not with Petro-Canada. So let's make that clear: The Minister responsible for Energy does not act for the government as it relates to Petro-Canada's involvement in Come by Chance. That is done by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and brought

to Cabinet. The Minister responsible for Energy is acting in his capacity in that portfolio to implement the Atlantic Accord and through that the minister has negotiations with Energy, Mines and Resources, not with Petro-Canada. The minister himself, I think I can say as can anybody in Newfoundland who knows the member for St. John's East - as a matter of fact, I do not know whether or not he still takes half of the salary as minister rather than the full salary - that if there is one hon. member in the House who scrupulously watches everything that he does and what his firm does and so on, so that he acts on behalf of the citizens of Newfoundland first, it is the hon. Member for St. John's East.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear! Hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
He does not need me to say that for him, his actions speak much louder. On the question of a partner in the law firm acting on some property for gas stations in the Province and whether that therefore creates a conflict of interest in the operation of the duties of the member for St. John's East in his capacity as Minister of Energy, I do not see it. Off the top of my head, I do not see that there is any conflict whatsoever. The minister is not acting in negotiations with Petro-Canada, the minister is acting in negotiations with Energy, Mines and Resources, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is acting with Petro-Canada on Come by Chance and reports to Cabinet and I am sure the Member for St. John's East, the minister, will, before the day is out, if there is any other interest that his firm has that might impinge

and create a potential conflict of interest, will let me know of them. I am sure there are not. At this point in time, I do not see, in the talks that are going ahead on various fronts, that the minister is in a conflict of interest situation. I will take it under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, while the Premier is taking it under advisement this is not something that should be sloughed over with this sort of vague comment that the Premier is making with respect to the Minister of Finance being responsible for the negotiations - I wonder would the Premier confirm that the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) has been involved in the negotiations concerning the Petro-Canada refinery?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, there have been public statements by the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, as he (inaudible) Minister of Finance (inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, would the Premier confirm that matters relating to the Petro-Canada refinery go to the Planning and Priorities Committee, of which the Minister responsible for Energy is a member, and go to Cabinet, of which he is a member, and are discussed there.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They are discussed in Cabinet. Most of the information that has come on the Come by Chance refinery has gone directly to Cabinet. Sometimes it comes to P and P and sometimes it has not, but most times it has not because it is a matter that is ongoing and therefore moves on to Cabinet. Where Planning and Priorities gets involved is in new initiatives or new policy formulations. From time to time, over the last three or four years, papers could have gone to P and P before they had gone directly to Cabinet, but in most cases on the refinery in the last couple of years, it has gone directly to Cabinet and the minister has not been directly involved in any negotiations, it has been the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).

MR. BARRY:

Directly involved?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, he has not been involved at all.

MR. BARRY:

What has that got to do with it, 'directly'?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He has not been involved in talking to Petro-Canada about Come By Chance.

MR. BARRY:

He is involved in Cabinet. It is in Cabinet.

MR. TULK:

He is involved in Cabinet decisions, is he not?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, it is in Cabinet for a decision on the recommendation that the Minister of Finance brings up, but he has not been involved in any negotiations.

MR. BARRY:

What?

MR. TULK:

He is in a position of conflict of interest.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Could I have a moment, 'Peter', to follow up with a supplementary on that?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, is the Premier saying that because the minister only is involved in decisions on recommendations from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that therefore he can have whatever involvement he wants with Petro-Canada?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No. He does not have any involvement.

MR. TULK:

He does.

MR. BARRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the point. Mr. Speaker, the minister's law firm, of which he is a partner and of which he shares the profits, has an involvement with Petro-Canada by the minister's own admission and is earning money from Petro-Canada. Now, would the Premier direct himself to whether

or not it is appropriate for a minister of the Crown, while taking decisions in Cabinet - let us assume it is only in Cabinet - on matters relating to Petro-Canada, to have a law firm acting for Petro-Canada, or, Mr. Speaker, on the refinery? Or, in another context, will the Premier admit that Petro-Canada is involved in the Hibernia consortium and any recommendations that the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) brings to the Government of Canada will have an impact on Petro-Canada? And therefore, in that context, should the minister's firm be representing Petro-Canada?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I would like to respond to that. If the hon. gentleman thinks that I can be bought for a fee, he should think again. There is one thing I want to point out very, very clearly, because the hon. gentleman does not mean to give this impression, I know, but it may be misinterpreted from what he says: Number one, I do not act directly for Petro-Canada.

MR. BARRY:

Your law firm does.

MR. MARSHALL:

I said I did not act directly for Petro-Canada. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what, if any, transactions go on in my firm for Petro-Canada.

MR. TULK:

How can you (inaudible)?

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, let me finish now. The Power of Attorney that I see here, it is the first time that I have seen it. I would have thought if the hon. gentleman were going to bring up a matter like this that -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He would have let you know first.

MR. MARSHALL:

- he would have let me know first, but I do not really care. Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, the only involvement the firm would have at all would be in acting for them in buying real estate for their service stations. Now, how did we get that? It came, I might say - lest I be coupled with the patronage that the hon. gentleman seemed to think comes from the federal government - at a time when the federal Liberal government was in power, and it came because of a certain particular difficulty that occurred and somebody in my own firm had a certain amount of expertise that they wanted.

Now, these are the facts, one can make what he wants of it. But I guarantee the hon. gentleman that, regardless of the way he wants to depict the situation - I realize he is in a political game and he will attempt to do as he has obviously done here - the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that I can guarantee this House, which I think has been exhibited in the Atlantic Accord, and to the chagrin of the hon. gentleman who wants to build his own house from disaster and Armageddon in this Province, and it will be exhibited as well in the negotiations that occur, that this Province will never be short-changed as a result of my involvement with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

And, Mr. Speaker, with respect to involvement with Petro-Canada other than searching titles, there is none.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I would just like to add in answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, that any time when there was even the slightest potential or indication that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) was aware of when it came to Cabinet, to Planning and Priorities, he always exempted himself. Even if there was not anything direct, even the slightest thing, the minister always exempted himself from those decisions in every case that ever came up. So, I mean, that is the story.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) but in his absence I will direct it towards the Premier. This morning we had news from the United States consul for the Atlantic area that in his opinion it looks like the countervailing tariff application being made in the United States against the export of fresh fish, as opposed to frozen fish from Newfoundland and Nova Scotia and so on, is going to be

successful. As we all know the Fisheries Council has been involved in trying to raise money in order to make a defense against that particular thing.

I know in Port au Port, for example, there is a fish plant in Piccadilly which is very much into the export of fresh fish as opposed to frozen fish. My question for the Premier is what action is our government taking to help in that particular action in order to oppose the imposition of the countervailing duties on this particular product?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. the member for Menihek for his question because it is a good one and I would like to give the information to the hon. member. When this matter came up first with the Fisheries Council of Canada and with the federal government and with the other provinces, it was quickly apparent that some of the people who knew most about the countervail were in the Government of Newfoundland. We immediately made available to the Fisheries Council of Canada, supported by the federal government and the other provinces, to have this person employed full-time on the matter of the countervail and preparing our case. So we are very, very intimately involved with the Fisheries Council of Canada and the federal government and the other provinces in putting together the case, and have expended money and personnel to them to ensure that they have the best case possible. So we are doing all we can to assist.

It was only yesterday that the matter came up in meetings that I had with National Sea and how appreciative they were of the work that the Government of Newfoundland were doing on behalf of the Fisheries Council of Canada in preparing that case. I heard the same news report this morning as did the hon. the member for Menihek and I was rather surprised to hear it. I have not had a chance today to check it out to see just why this person would make this kind of comment. But from everything that I have been told by our Deputy Minister of Fisheries and the Intergovernmental Affairs people, as well as the Fisheries Council of Canada, the federal government, the other provinces and the industry, they are very happy with the way things are moving and are more than happy with the contribution that we are making because it just so happens, by accident, that we have some of the top people who are involved in countervail and can provide the kind of substance to our presentation that will be needed for us to be successful.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I am not surprised that the Premier has not had time to check into that today since he was busy checking with Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia to find out how many people have been appointed. However, I am pleased to hear that there is at least some action going. But the same news report indicated that the Fisheries Council was looking for \$600,000 in order to prosecute

this case and to this point have collected something like \$10,000 within the industry. Quite frankly, I am appalled that we allow a council to be the lead hand in this kind of investigation. Surely it is the job of the Departments of Fisheries, both federally and provincially, and at least the Department of External Affairs to get involved.

My question to the Premier is: Are you not going to now at least make representation to these federal departments which should be doing the actual lobbying on behalf? They have the funds, they have the lawyers, they are the ones who are supposed to be doing it. Surely it should not be done by volunteer, cap-in-hand means.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Let me just say to the hon. the member as it relates to the preface to his question, it only took me about thirty seconds to get the names of those NDP politicians defeated or no longer running who now have jobs without competition. But, you know, the hon. member will be further embarrassed over the next couple of days as we produce another twenty or thirty names from his great lily-white cohorts out West.

To the question at hand, Mr. Speaker, just let me say, External Affairs is involved, the Department of Justice, federally and provincially, and Intergovernmental Affairs, all of these people are involved as a joint effort with the industry. It is a joint effort of the industry, the federal government and the various provincial governments.

And the lawyers for the federal government are involved now, have been for some time. External Affairs has been involved, through them to the Embassy in Washington and so on. So there has been no stone left unturned. There is a problem with money which we will have to address as governments with the FCC and we will do that and see to it that our presentation is made.

I think what is being expressed by the industry people is that they are disappointed with the financial support to this point in time from the industry. They are quite aware and have said nothing about the support that they have had from the governments because the support has been substantial. But they did expect at this point in time to have more money from the industry to balance what the governments have done both financially and with personnel. But everybody is completely involved on the federal level, through the Provinces of Quebec and P.E.I. and New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and B.C. and ourselves. There is a co-ordinated approach here. And all those departments in the federal government are working today, now and have been for some time on the matter. I think the problem is that the industry, because, perhaps, of their economic situation over the last year and so on have not come forward with the kind of dollars that the FCC thought that they should have at this point in time.

But the bottom line on it is that a presentation has to be made. And obviously it is in our best interest to make sure that it will be made, and we will be making every effort to ensure that it is made.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

If all that is true, it sounds like the Fisheries Council is not needed to raise this money. But I clearly heard this morning that the President of the Fisheries Council, or one of the representatives of the Fisheries Council very clearly stated that if they did not get the \$600,000 they are going to have to drop the case. That really does not jibe very well with the comments we are getting from the Premier. So could you please explain this apparent contradiction?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I cannot explain what different people representing the Fisheries Council of Canada say from time to time about the \$600,000. I will take the matter under advisement to find out from our people why the individual would say this, and where that sits in the system of the FCC and everything that is going on. As early as yesterday at around 12:05, down in my office in talking about the countervail business, I was told by Intergovernmental Affairs people and by Fisheries people, in our government here, that things were moving ahead very, very well. They do recognize that there is a problem from the industry point of view for financial assistance and that that has to be addressed. But everything else was on

schedule and moving ahead very, very smoothly. National Sea, as one of the industry representatives were very, very pleased with what was happening.

But I will take the matter of what that gentleman said today representing FCC and find out why the discrepancy or why that high degree of concern that the case would not go ahead and this kind of thing. I do not know if it was an attempt to frighten the industry into providing more money or he was quoted out of context or blah, blah, blah. But I do agree with the hon. member that there seems to be something askew there that I at the present moment am not aware of. Because my understanding as of this moment is that things are moving along very, very well and everybody is together and on the same wavelength and all the rest of it. So I will undertake to get some explanation of that kind of comment that was made today.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

There is just a couple of minutes left for a quick question and answer.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I broke to give the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) a chance, since he had been kind enough to give me some extra time in questions. Going back to the previous questions, I wonder if the Premier would assure this House that he will, under Guideline 16 of the Conflict of Interest (Ministers' Guidelines

1981), where it says that 'the Premier shall have the power to decide whether a particular situation involves a conflict of interest on the part of the minister,' undertake to investigate the matters that have been raised here today? I specifically refer the Premier's attention to Conflict of Interest Guideline 7 which says, 'That the minister shall not hold any employment, office, or position, including self-employment outside of his duties as a minister, that conflicts or interferes with the performance of his duties as a minister.' Would the Premier undertake to investigate the matter and report back to this House within a reasonable period of time?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I just took it as given. I hope that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) does not question my integrity to the extent that suddenly the matter of the question that was asked earlier was going to die and that I was not, therefore, going to follow through on it. One would presume that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would presume that a question of this nature would be something that as leader of the government I would automatically investigate and find out what the facts are on the matter. Obviously that is what I would do and I am sure any premier or leader would do so, of course.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
If I could, without hurting the Premier by making certain assumptions, I mean, I listened to the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) stand, and the members opposite stand to certify to his integrity and so forth. All we can do in this House, our obligation as members, as the Premier knows, is to table and request that there be an investigation. But I think, and I would ask the Premier to confirm, that the Conflict of Interest Guidelines apply to everybody, regardless of the stature, reputation or integrity of that particular individual. The conflict of Interest Guidelines are intended to apply to everybody and I wonder if the Premier would confirm that? Is it a fact that they apply to all ministers or only to some?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
No, no, Mr. Speaker, they only apply to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), and the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell), they do not apply to the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), or the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), of course not. What do you think I am running here, Mr. Speaker? I am not going to have a group of guidelines that are applicable only to certain ministers, of course not. I do not have double standards and triple standards, I have quadruple standards around here. Of course they only apply to one and not to others. I mean, that is the only way I like to do

business. Of course!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

Petitions

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, I present a petition on behalf of seventeen individuals from Red Bay and I will read the prayer of the petition. It says, "We the undersigned, protest the high rates charged for diesel oil generated electricity, when the people of St. John's area are charged the province wide rate even though they rely heavily on oil generated electricity from Holyrood.

This petition, Mr. Speaker, is one that I believe very much in.

AN HON. MEMBER:
How big is it?

MR. FENWICK:
From Red Bay seventeen people I think is a good number. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:
The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we have continued to have arguments back from the minister responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro arguing to us that the reason that the rates are higher in isolated

communities where they have PDP districts is because it would cost more to generate the electricity due to using a lot of oil. Now that is true. It certainly does cost more. But if that principle is applicable to these isolated communities then surely it is applicable to the Island as well where Holyrood which has been operated as we only know to our horror for most of last year and consumed a tremendous amount of oil, yet we did not see communities like St. John's, which is very close to Holyrood and presumably uses very much of the electricity generated that way, we did not see them to take the onerous rates they have on the Coast of Labrador and in other isolated communities in the Province. And I raise the question again because it is just a case of clear discrimination against people who are in isolated areas versus those in more urban areas. And I also suggest that wiping out that differential, in other words charging them the same rate by whatever means was accomplished would cost so little that it would be barely noticeable in the total budget.

I am aware of the arguments I will get from the minister who will say that it is being subsidized already. I agree it is but the fact is it is still plainly unfair to charge one group of people who generate their electricity with oil while you do not charge the other group of people who generate their electricity with oil. And I submit the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I support the

petition from Red Bay which is in my district. I am quite pleased that we have a petition again. I remember long before the fuel adjustment ever came into play, about four or five or six years ago, presenting petitions for rural areas and getting petitions coming in from Conche and from Grey River and from Petites and from St. Brendan's and also Coastal Labrador, and again I am glad that we have a new session and this issue is still alive.

I believe that the people in rural areas of Labrador, about twenty something communities all around the Province now, that we have one rate for the people on diesel, which is extremely high, we have three or four rates for electricity in actual fact in the Province, Labrador City has one, Goose Bay has one, Coastal Labrador and rural areas isolated has another, and then the Province generally has one. I think that we should have one rate of electricity all around this Province, Newfoundland and Labrador and I hope that the government will see fit to have one uniform policy.

I have presented petitions, and I will have other petitions to present. We pay the same sales tax, the income tax, we end up having other taxes, the same price for cigarettes, the same price for beer, and yet we have four different types of rates for electricity and I think it would be interesting for the government to try to get one rate for the Province.

The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), and also the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) said when the member for Menihek presented the

petition, how many is there? Seventeen? What is the size of the population? Are we going to start, Mr. Speaker, giving things to our people on the size of the population? Is this the reason why St. John's is going to get everything, Mr. Speaker? What about Torngat?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Just for the purposes of the record, and so the record will be accurate, the hon. member said that I asked how many were involved in this particular petition -

MR. HISCOCK:

Or the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. SIMMS:

- I want to assure the hon. member and assure the hon. House that I did not ask such a question and if the member is going to make those accusations then he should get his facts straight.

MR. HISCOCK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

I made the comment that it was either the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Simms) or the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) who

was in that corner.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, you did not.

MR. HISCOCK:

The point that I am making, and it is a point that is felt in this Province, that you have to have a population of fifty or 20,000 before you can get anything. If you represent a community of 300 people, there are not enough votes to change anything in the Province. So I hope to know what the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is doing on this issue.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order. It is a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

MR. HISCOCK:

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can state that in this Province we are not giving things to people only because of the size of the population because, if that is the case -

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about Pinsent Arm?

MR. HISCOCK:

What about Pinsent Arm? They have fifteen families and they deserve it. That is what about Pinsent Arm. What about Norman Bay? I would hope that the member for Torngat Mountains, who crossed over onto the government side to get things, will be able to get them. I also hope that he will be able to get things for the rest of the small communities in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

The people of Red Bay as well as

Coastal Labrador deserve what they get, not because of how they voted. In actual fact, if they get it because of how they voted in the last election, I would assume that they will get a lot more now because they voted Tory. The people in Red Bay deserve their road. They also deserve the water and sewer and a new school, as well as the one rate of electricity.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I hope when the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) gets up to support this position, because if he gets up, he has to support it, that he will support the one rate of electricity all throughout this Province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, what an ingrate! Here the hon. gentleman represents Eagle River. It is the first time that he has gotten up in the House since Pinsent Arm has been electrified and he does not get up and even acknowledge it.

He acknowledged the fact that the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) -

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We now see the height of deception that the minister carries on. He took a press contingent with him, Mr. Speaker, and set out Pinsent Arm as an example of what people should be grateful for. Again he

raises the question of gratitude. He says that the member is an ingrate. It was not a matter, Mr. Speaker, of the favour of government entitling the people of Pinsent Arm to electricity. They finally managed to scrape up fifteen customers to make the formula and the minister had no discretion then, they were entitled to electricity.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, it was not a matter of that either, it had something to do, as well, with the hon. member for Torngat Mountains coming up and making us aware of the needs of Southern Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

But for the member for Torngat Mountains the people of Pinsent Arm would not be enjoying electricity by Christmas time.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HISCOCK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Another point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

On another point of order, the President of the Council said that the government was only aware of it because of the member for Torngat Mountains. All I can say

is that the government over there is absolutely deaf to the media of this Province, to the Opposition and to petitions that I presented. I presented five petitions in this House on this matter. It was in MacLeans Magazine! It was in Atlantic Insight!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

If they are saying, Mr. Speaker, that anything that is given by the media, anything that is given by the Opposition or anything by the outside media of this Province, that they are going to turn a deaf ear to that and the only thing that is ever going to be done is when everybody marches over to that side like sheep and then an enlightenment, an awakening and then the problems are finally acknowledged, if that is what the President of the Council is saying, then this Province, Mr. Speaker, is in the dark ages. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is where a district has a member who is ineffective, who is not doing things and cannot communicate the needs of his constituents effectively, the government of this Province puts other members on this other side to alert and we have. The member for Labrador in this House, for the entire Labrador, is the member for Torngat Mountains and he is doing his job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Now I shall not be distracted by the hon. gentleman. I want to respond very briefly. The hon. gentleman knows that we are pouring large amounts of subsidy into the PDD and into diesel generation, some \$20 million or \$22 million this year. We would like to see all the rates in this Province made uniform, number one. We would like to see all of the rates lowered, number two. What we do is charge on the basis of costs, related to consumer cost and there is a fuel exclamation, as the hon. gentleman knows, put on in St. John's and elsewhere. The only place where it is not related to costs are these very places with diesel generation through the PDD. We are already pouring \$20 to \$22 million into that, Mr. Speaker and we just have not got the money to do anymore.

Let us be fair about it as well. What we do do is there is a much lower rate for normal consumption, for average consumption. I am not sure what it is, I think it is 500 kilowatt hours per month or something like that, there is a lower amount that we charge.

So we are doing everything we possibly can for the people of the Province in respect to electricity and, as I say, where, as we do in the case of Eagle River, have a defective member, we have another member over here shadowing his district who brings the needs of the people like Pinsent Arm to our attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of fifty consumers of electricity in the town of Postville in the district of Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Speaker, I should note to that Postville has something like 83 voters and 50 have signed this petition. It is only about one third the size of Red Bay.

I also noticed, Mr. Speaker, in the petition presented by the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) and from comments made by the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) that they spoke for some length of time but they did not have any facts or figures to back up the petitions that they presented. However I hope, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate the concerns that are expressed by the signatures of this petition which reads identically to the petition that the hon. member presented:

"We, the undersigned, protest the high rates charged for diesel oil-generated electricity when the people of the St. John's area are charged the Province-wide rate, even though they rely heavily on oil-generated power from Holyrood."

Mr. Speaker, I have this petition some time but, as you know, the House was not in session during the Summer months so this was my first opportunity to present the petition. Subsequently, over the past number of days I have had some calculations done. In fact, I

have used my own electricity bill as an example. For the month of September and the total consumption was 1,640 kilowatts. I have spoken to Mr. Dalton with Hydro in Goose Bay and he has advised me that there are a large number of people in coastal Labrador that use in excess of 1000 kilowatts and in excess of 1500 kilowatts per month, especially during the months from November until March. Those are the months that people have to pay very highly for electricity. Just to give an illustration to the House, Mr. Speaker, taking my electricity bill for 1,650 kilowatts, applying this to Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Labrador City, Northwest River, Mud Lake and surrounding areas, that invoice would cost the consumer \$64.32. It costs me \$86.91 in St. John's, a difference of roughly \$22 more than Happy Valley-Goose Bay are charged. Meanwhile, what is so astonishing and so ridiculous is that the same person in Nain, if he had received this invoice, would have paid \$154.79. This is what is disgusting. This is why the people in coastal Labrador are so terribly upset with the rate of electricity that is charged in our Province. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, they do have a beef, particularly during the winter months when you consume more electricity.

Subsequently, taking an invoice of 1,500 kilowatts, Mr. Speaker, as a usual thing that Mr. Ford in Makkovik used last November, it would have costed him \$137.00 as compared to \$60.00 in Happy Valley, Goose Bay. We are looking at a people that are on a lower income scale in our Province - our coastal Labrador people, isolated people - therefore, I think it is unfortunate that the formulas that are used by Hydro are definitely

discriminatory against those people who are living in isolated areas of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, it really hurts people who use in excess of 500 kilowatts. For example, in Goose Bay the first 600 kilowatts costs 4.1¢ per kilowatt, in the St. John's area, all kilowatts are an equal 4.72¢ per kilowatt.

Let us look at the remote areas of our Province. The first 500 kilowatts costs 4.7¢ per kilowatt, the next 500 kilowatts costs 8.8¢ per kilowatt and any other kilowatts costs 11.9¢ each. This is where the most unfortunate is taking place - anything over 500 kilowatts - and it is the people in the remote areas of the Province that are sacrificing their income to pay their light bill. I know people in Makkovik, a Mr. Eugene Anderson, that has paid \$297.00 for an electricity bill last November who has nothing in his house other than a refrigerator and a television and a toaster. Those are the only three electrical appliances that he has in his house and Mr. Speaker, I believe that Hydro -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member has spoken for five minutes now.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member has leave.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, about thirty seconds for leave. Mr. Speaker, in concluding I would like to say I believe the Hydro rates in this Province definitely should be more adaptable to the living conditions of the people who have to pay electricity bills. With that I

present this petition and wish it laid upon the table for the minister it relates to.

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Speaker, we have seen an example of a person changing to the government side so he could get things done for his district. We will see the proof of the pudding is if the minister listens, unlike ministers like the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) and some of the other ones who instead were making comments about how many were on the petition, the size of the Community, and how many votes were there, so the end result is that rural Newfoundland is not going to be getting anything and rural Labrador in particular.

The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was quite correct. When he was on this side, both of us used to present petitions and we use to support each other. We also pointed out that there are four rates, Mr. Speaker, here the bill is \$87.00, in Goose Bay it is \$67.00 because it is hooked up with Churchill Falls but if it were in Nain, Red Bay, Cartwright, Port Hope Simpson or Lanse au Loop, it would be \$150.00. That is what we are trying to point out. Everybody in Newfoundland last year, on the Avalon, in particular, got up in arms when they found out the price of their electricity bills each month with the fuel adjustment charge. We have been trying to tell the media of this Province, the House of Assembly and the general

population, that this has been going on all the time in Labrador and in rural areas. I agreed it is subsidized by \$22 million, but it also has to be pointed out that the federal government, because of PEI having high rates of electricity, gave \$20 million to PEI to help lower their rates and to attract industry in that area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you are operating a motel, or you are operating a small business in Coastal Labrador or in these isolated communities, it is impossible to operate them. We feel that we should have one rate of electricity in the Province and I support the people in Postville and in Red Bay and I hope that when the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) states that he supports this and says he wants one rate of electricity, I hope he has the support and the backing of his people in Wabush and Labrador City who may have to pay a little more. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should have one electricity rate.

The President of the Council (Mr. Windsor) made a point of trying to say, "we subsidize them with \$22 million and we also have a lower rate for them starting off," but the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) can attest to this, and seeing the President of the Council will not listen to me, now I hope that the member for Torngat Mountains will explain to him. It is quite true that for the first 500 kilowatts there is a low rate, but after that it goes up extremely high and it ends up tripling in the end. As a result, on the fuel, if it is generated by Hydro, the higher your rate of consumption, the lower your bill, it begins to go down. Whereas on diesel, the more you consume, the

higher your bill escalates. That is a built in thing that needs to be changed.

Maybe one of the things that needs to be changed, instead of the basic 500 kilowatts, maybe we need to raise it up to 1,500 kilowatts at the low rate, as the member for Torngat Mountains said, and then after that, start increasing. But, Mr. Speaker, I remember last year people had to pay over \$600 a month, \$500 a month, \$400 a month, and this was for basic electricity! We had Hydro go in and do some testing and whatever and the end result is they said no, they burnt it and used it. To this day, Mr. Speaker, I still cannot understand why people in very small communities with just very small basic appliances, are having to pay \$100, \$200, or \$300 a month.

So I hope that since the member for Torngat Mountains is on that side, he will have the minister listen to him, that they will show compassion and we will end up having one rate of electricity in this Province. I think it is ridiculous that you have a bill -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please! The hon. member has spoken for five minutes.

MR. HISCOCK:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In concluding, I hope that the Province will come up with one uniform rate for electricity.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am thankful indeed that you allowed me to be the second member from this Party to stand in support of this petition. I would hope that where the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has now become a member for the other side of this hon. House.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
I cannot understand what is happening here. There is supposed to be one speaker from each side of the House, in addition to the person who presented the petition, speak to a petition. I understand the member for Torngat Mountains presented a petition, there was a member over there from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) responded, now there is no provision for another member on that side to respond to the petition, unless there has been some sort of an agreement or something. So could Your Honour perhaps clarify the matter for me?

MR. DECKER:
If I could speak to that point of order, Mr. Speaker?

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

MR. DECKER:
I am very much aware, Mr. Speaker, of the way things are done, albeit I am a new member in this hon. House. But I could not sit in my seat and wait for the rest of this day to see if some of the member's

colleagues were going to speak to that petition. It is a very important petition, Mr. Speaker. If we can make it more known to this hon. House, and if the other side is not going to stand up and support their colleague, then I am going to see that it is going to be done.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

There had been one hon. member who presented a petition and then there was a member on this side who spoke. I did look around for quite a considerable few moments to see if an hon. member on this side would get up to speak. Nobody indicated that he or she wanted to do so. Then I did recognize the hon. member. I think technically I was incorrect because if we look at our Standing Orders, it is whoever presents the petition and then it is one on either side. So really the hon. member should have leave of the House to speak at this stage.

MR. FLIGHT:
The House Leader gave leave.

MR. MARSHALL:
No, I did not.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
I actually did recognize him at the time and, technically, I was incorrect. The point of order is that the member is correct and it is out of order for him to speak. I was incorrect in recognizing him without getting unanimous consent, if we are going to stick strictly to our Standing Orders.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, if I could on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
You are technically now correct and the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) is correct when he says you have to move back and forth across the House.

MR. SIMMS:
No.

MR. TULK:
Oh, yes, the petitioner presents the petition and you go to the other side and then you come back to this side or the reverse, one on each side, or the reverse. It works both ways. We understood on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that leave has been given to the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) to speak on a very important matter to the people of Labrador. If that is the case and leave has not been given, then we understand if the government does not want to give leave to the member for the Strait of Belle Isle to speak on something that is very important. We understood that that leave was given. If there was no leave given then Your Honour is perfectly right and the member for the Strait of Belle Isle has to sit down.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

As I understand it, no leave has been given.

MR. TULK:
No leave?

MR. SIMMS:
Now, Mr. Speaker, just to make the point. I mean the point is here that there are rules and procedures to follow and everybody should be aware of them and

familiar with them. The point I was making was that there cannot be two speaking on that side on a petition. But I did not hear a request for leave being made. I checked with my colleagues on this side and none of them heard -

MR. TULK:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
If the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) would let me finish, I will try to tell him what I am trying to say. We did not, I have checked with all of my colleagues here, nobody heard a request for leave for the hon. member to speak. Now if there is a request then we are quite prepared to consider it. I have had discussions with the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and he says, well, I can use my own discretion in this particular case. But if there is a request for leave for the hon. member to speak to the petition, we have no problem with that. But he certainly should make the request.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Is there leave for the hon. member to speak?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I am asking is there leave for the hon. member?

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I will resolve it by responding. I mean I am just

going to repeat exactly the same thing because the hon. gentleman has somebody on the other side up on his feet. But the fact of the matter is, it is exactly the same, I repeat exactly the same things as I said before about Pinsent Arm, particularly about Pinsent Arm, and the fact that Pinsent Arm is going to enjoy -

MR. TULK:
You are on a point of order, are you?

MR. MARSHALL:
No, no I am speaking on the petition, which is my right to speak.

MR. TULK:
Oh, you are going to?

MR. MARSHALL:
I can speak on the petition and that is what I am speaking on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

As I understand it, I have requested is there unanimous consent of the House for the hon. member to speak? I would like to ascertain that now?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No leave!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
There is no leave.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I want to respond further to that petition along the same vein as I did before and I want to compliment the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

AN HON. MEMBER:

Torn or turn?

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, I mean Torngat Mountains, yes.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL:

I am not as high ploy as the hon. gentlemen there opposite are. I tend to speak with an Irish brogue from time to time. I know the hon. gentleman does not mind me mesmerizing the name of his district. So the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is a very, very responsible member and but for the member for Torngat Mountains these particular issues would not be brought forcibly to our attention. It was the member for Torngat Mountains who managed to persuade the government as to the necessity of providing electricity to Pinsent Arm and the plight of the people from Pinsent Arm because that member got up and when he was putting the position of those people, he was not playing narrow little, petty little politics like the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) is doing from time to time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I refer once again to the fact that the government is doing everything it possibly can with respect to the Power Distribution District which is the vehicle which provides the power for diesel-generated electricity in the Province. It pours in some \$22 million a year which is rising from time to

time. The Province would like to see all electrical rates, and most particularly those paid by the people in Red Bay and the people in Postville looked after and their electrical rates come down, but there is only so much money, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial government has at its disposal. We are doing everything we can.

I would also remind the hon. gentleman there opposite that all these particular problems that we meet in electricity would not have come to pass or certainly would not have been acute if we had had access to the Upper Churchill power and we had had some of the cheap power that our neighbors on the other side, the Province of Quebec, are now enjoying. The fact of the matter is these people on the opposite side - except for the member for Menihek, who was not a member and did not participate in that decision, neither did his party - speak with forked tongues because they are the people and they represent the interest that gave away the electrical birthright of the people of the Province of Newfoundland as a result of which many people in Newfoundland, including those under diesel oil-generated electricity, would be enjoying much lower rates, rates that would be comparable to the rest of Canada, rates that would allow these areas to be developed and rates that would allow a much more cheaper provision of electricity being made for people for residential purposes.

I certainly endorse the petition as presented by my colleague, the member for Torngat Mountains. I do not endorse the sentiments that were expressed by the members on the opposite side. I did not hear

what the member on this particular petition said because I was out of the House at the time but I, generally speaking, take it as read but there is nothing that a Liberal living or dead has ever said that I have ever agreed with, nor ever will.

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

Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:
Order 15, Bill 21.

MR. SPEAKER:
The debate was adjourned by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Bill 21, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), my colleague from Mount Scio adjourned the debate yesterday. I would like to continue on right now on Bill 21, "An Act To Amend The Fisheries Loan Act". As my colleague said yesterday we were given notification of this on September 24th. The information that we were given at that time, as the explanation said, "To permit the Province to apply a third party demand in certain circumstances". Was that the original intent of this bill or when they realized that they were not going to get away with it and there were going to be a lot of problems and every fisherman in the Province was going to be up in arms about it,

was it changed?

As the first part of the act now reads, we have no objection to supporting it. The act now reads that the fish processors must set up a trust fund for funds collected on behalf of the fishermen. We can support this without any problem at all. This would seem to be a very logical and a good way to perform business and the way that business should be normally performed. If you collect funds for a third party, it should be put in a trust fund and passed over. This is certainly within the realm of everything that we know as decent and honourable.

The second part of the act talks about the fact that if the fish processor were to go bankrupt or go out of business, the board, in certain cases, may forgive the interest on payments of principal that processor was to have made to the Fisheries Loan Board on behalf of a fisherman.

Now, the point we object to here is there should be no such a thing as 'may' in this legislation, it should be 'shall'. In the event of financial trouble or bankruptcy on the part of a processor, the Fisheries Loan Board 'shall' forgive the fishermen the interest on payments of principal made to the processor and not turned over to the Fisheries Loan Board. This is the point that we feel should be changed. And if the bill has the intent to set up a trust fund for moneys collected from the fishermen to be held in trust, this must be enforced. The second part of it is redundant and should not be there. "The loan board, at its discretion, 'may'" - this is where we have objection to this bill, and we would recommend that

this part of it be changed and the word 'shall' put in so that no fisherman in Newfoundland will ever have to pay twice to the Fisheries Loan Board for money that was taken out of his honest days work, and was supposed to be turned over but was not. With that point changed, we will be able to give it our full support.

Now, to get away from the bill itself and talk about some of the problems that we have in our fishing industry in Newfoundland.

I noticed that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) could not stay yesterday afternoon after he introduced this bill, and he failed to be here today, so obviously, it shows the type of interest that members opposite have in the fisheries, this much maligned industry in Newfoundland and one that has had all kinds of problems over the last couple of years. As members opposite are no doubt aware, we in the Liberal caucus, over the Summer months, have done a study and prepared a report on the inshore fishermen in Newfoundland and we found that there were very serious problems with the inshore fishery in Newfoundland, as has been pointed out in this report. I will quote from it later on.

The failure of the inshore fishery was not restricted to the areas that my colleagues covered, but at their insistence, I did cover the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir and did a survey of the inshore fishery in that area. You are well aware, I am sure, that July and August are not really the two prime months for fishing on the South Coast of Newfoundland, but September and October should be the peak season. I had the occasion three weeks ago today to

be in Grey River, Francois and McCallum. Over a two-day period, I was in each of the places, and I found that the fishery there is a failure, too, as was reported on the Northeast Coast and the West Coast of Newfoundland this year. Outlined in our report are the reasons the fishermen give for it.

To give you an example, while I was in Grey River, six longliners came in. They were handling from seven to eight tubs of gear. Normally, they would be expecting to catch 3,000 pounds of fish in a reasonably good day, and they were coming back with between 500 and 600 pounds of fish per boat, not enough to pay for their fuel to go out the fifteen or twenty miles to their fishing grounds.

It was the same story in Francois. In McCallum, they have a little different method of fishing. It is the only place on the South Coast where they are using gill nets. It is much the same story there, the boats are coming in with 600 to 700 pounds, again, not enough to pay for their expenses. In McCallum they have a problem in that they have been harassed by federal Fisheries this year about the size of net they use. Traditionally those fishermen have used a five inch mesh net, and every once in a while down through the years Federal Fisheries in their wisdom will come and tell them, 'We must discuss this again.' At one time this year they told them, even when they were on the verge of starvation due to the amount of fish they were catching, 'Take up your nets, you should have five and a half inch mesh.'

Now, it is hard for those people to understand why they have to have five and a half inch mesh

nets when the rest of the people in the area and along the coast are fishing with trawls. I am sure we all know that in trawls you do not have the same selection method you have with cod nets, because with trawls, Mr. Speaker, you can catch everything from tomcods to sculpins. And despite what some of the members over there feel, all members on this side of the House are well aware of what a tomcod and a sculpin are, but, more importantly, we are concerned about the fishery and the plight of the inshore fishery. The identification of the species is not the thing that worries us, we are concerned about the fact that there is a problem in this industry and it is not being addressed by members opposite.

Our committee went out to the fishermen of Newfoundland and as we talked to them we found their needs were the same. Whether they were on the South Coast, the Northern Peninsula, or in Labrador does not really matter, the problem is there. The fish are not there and that is where the problem is. Those fishermen want to fish and would like to be able to make a living at it.

The minister said in his statement yesterday that there are more fishermen qualified for unemployment insurance this year than any other year. I would like to know where, because it is certainly not along the South Coast, where I am.

The other point I would like to make has to do with unemployment insurance for fishermen. I was talking to a couple of fishermen in McCallum last week, and someone else in Grey River, who are qualified to get \$220 every two

weeks. Now, Mr. Speaker, as they pointed out, they would be better off on welfare. They just cannot support families on \$220 every two weeks - \$440 a month. Every once in a while we hear of political appointments being made, for which the pay is \$36,000 a year. The fishermen in Francois and Grey River do not want \$36,000 a year, Mr. Speaker, they just want to be able to make a decent living, \$14,000, \$15,000 or \$18,000 a year, which they think is their right; they certainly cannot live on \$440 a month. This is the sort of thing we are finding.

Now, if we are going to talk statistics, what we should really be concerned about is -

MR. TULK:
People.

MR. GILBERT:

That is right, my colleague for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), people, not statistics. If we are going to talk statistics we can say that everybody in Newfoundland is getting unemployment and justify it, but not if you are going to give them \$220 every two weeks. The point I am making, a point I think should be borne in mind, is that fishermen tell me, Yes, some of us have qualified but have qualified for starvation assistance, we would be better off on welfare. This is not what those people want. Those people are honest, god-fearing workers and they want to make a living. But if the fish are not there they cannot do it. We hear fish must swim, and we hear all those buzz words that are used in the industry right now to make us all a little more comfortable, but we really have not solved many of the problems by using those things.

I think we have to talk about the communities in my district. Before I go a little bit general, I would like to point out some of the problems. I realize that Fishery Products International put out their five year business plan and they talked about opening a lot of plants and keeping them open. From time to time there are fifteen plants which are going to close and be gone forever, or be sold, Fishery Products wants to wash their hands of them. We have the St. Anthony plant which they want open seven or eight months a year; Port au Choix five to nine, Bonavista five to six; Triton seven to eight, and Burin is going to be open eleven to twelve months- that is good. Ramea is going to be open for six months, so I am told, although I now think there has been a change in that. Yesterday, the minister pointed out to the House that he thought that the President of Fishery Products International and the Executive Vice-President were in Ramea as a result of a letter which was sent them by the local of the union in Ramea. Art King is President and Charlie Kendall is Vice-President, people who sat down and realized what the problem was. It is great to make up a fishing plan for the plant in Ramea, a plant which has been in operation as long as there have been fish plants in Newfoundland, and then all of a sudden have it taken over and it was going to go to a six-month plant.

The people from the union local there wrote Mr. Wells and outlined some of the problems at the Ramea fish plant, and it was a list which I think must have attracted some attention, because they got the President of Fishery Products International and the Executive Vice-President to go to Ramea. I

am happy to say that I was talking to the Vice-President of the union local there last night and he thinks there has been some progress.

When we sent our caucus members out around to listen to the inshore fishermen this year, they were sent with the idea, 'Let us go to the source. Let us find out really where the problem is, and let us find out if they have some solution.' And it was proven that the people at the source can make a lot more decisions and know a lot more about where the problems are in their industry than those sitting in some office in St. John's.

But here is what the people of Ramea, the local plant workers' union sent to Fishery Products International when they heard that the plant was going to be a six month plant - they know where they are. I will just list some of the concerns: (1) Why were we taken from a twelve month operation to a nine operation and now to a six month operation? (2) What are the six months in question, January to July, July to December, or something we have to take when other plants cannot handle our product? (3) Since taking over this operation the company has made very little effort to make this plant viable. Why? (4) Was the company plan not to make a profit so we could be pushed into a six month bracket? (5) Since the company has started, it has used the oldest of its side trawlers while the Ramea side trawlers, which we believe to be the best in the fleet, lie idle. Why? (6) The company took the stern trawler Penny Smart from us to Catalina for almost nothing in return. It also took the Penny Fair. We saw this

happening and believed it to be good for the company, and anything that made the company work in the long run would be better for us. We were badly mistaken. We now know it apparently does not pay to co-operate anymore. Ours was used to build up somebody else's, while we got nothing in return.'

This is a plea from fellows who want to make a living. If you take a fish plant out of Ramea there is nothing else left. You have an island ten miles out in the Atlantic that exists because of a fish plant.

'(7) Senior management personnel visited other communities, why not ours?' Well, now, I think they have corrected that and with some results, I believe. '(8) What does the company plan to do with the inshore fish while our plant is not in production? Is it the plan to ship it to another plant in another community, higher up on your list? (9) Is the plan designed to send all the redfish to this plant to be processed? That in itself will give our less senior workers very little opportunity for unemployment stamps. It is not that we want unemployment insurance, what we want is work.' And, finally, 'If you are not part of the company's plan for the future, when can we expect this operation to be sold back to private enterprise with all the same assets that we came into the company with?'

Now, this is a plea from the people of Ramea. This tells the sad state of affairs that they have found themselves in, when someone can sit down with a pen and make a stroke and say, 'This plant is going to be a six month plant, and this plant is going to be a nine month plant, or this one

is going to be sold. Privatization is going to come in.' And this was pointed out as we talked about Fishery Products International five-year plan. It is all very well for someone in St. John's to sit with a pen and make some strokes and say they are going to be working six months of the year, but you are talking about the lives of decent, hard-working Newfoundlanders who are out there and who have no other way to make a living. They want to work. They did not want to work six months of the year, they wanted to work twelve months, but the people of Ramea were prepared to accept whatever was good for the company, whatever was good to make a long life for the company. The plant was shut down all Summer. It has been open now for seven weeks and last week was the first week they had forty hours work in that plant. They have had as low as fourteen hours, and up until last week thirty-three hours work per man was the most they had.. In other words, the plan was to give those people six months work and then put them on unemployment insurance - \$220 every two weeks or \$440 a month. We heard about light bills here today in petitions that were submitted in this House, light bills, I might say, which apply, as well, to the people of Ramea, Burgeo, Francois, McCallum and Grey River. They get diesel generated electricity, too, and they have to pay over \$400 a month in the Wintertime just for their electricity.

So I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that it is very easy, with the stroke of a pen, to doom people to welfare or worse. I think some thought should be put into this by members opposite, particularly the Minister of Fisheries (Mr.

Rideout) who is not here today.

Now we get to Burgeo in my district. Burgeo's very existence again depends on a fish plant, one owned by National Sea, that company that we have all heard so much about of late, the one that was going to bring new things to fishing in Canada, the factory freezer trawler that we have all heard so much about. Members opposite have now had to go back to an agreement that was made with the federal Liberal government in 1983. We heard the hon. the Premier say that he hoped that his friends in Ottawa would now live up to the agreement that was made in 1983. Because if for some reason or other this plan by National Sea is put into effect, it is the tip of the iceberg. They have one factory freezer trawler on order now and, I understand, four more in the planning stage. As I said in my release, if they are allowed to do that, they will fish and they will not come to shore, they can take their draggers out of Nova Scotia and they will not touch a rock in Newfoundland.

MR. TOBIN:

How come your Leader supports that?

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, we forgive them for they know not what they do when they speak. I understand that members opposite have started another campaign to prevent the use of factory freezer trawlers. I feel it is a great idea. But now that they are all of the same political stipe, the members opposite and our Government in Canada, you would not think that they would have to do that. It was bad enough that they claimed they had to do it when they got the agreement in 1983 with the

Liberal Government in Ottawa. Now we have got to the point again where instead of waiting to go to Ottawa they are now saying, let us get out there, get the people of Newfoundland roused up again. Maybe that is the way the hon. the Premier has to deal with Ottawa. As long as he realizes it, that is good. But I sort of think that if this goes through and factory freezer trawlers from Nova Scotia are allowed to fish, coming out of the Lunenburg plant, it will not be very long before you are going to have to find a lot more jobs for the people who are working in the National Sea Plant in Burgeo. This is the very, very important thing that somebody is forgetting about right now.

You can talk about the factory freezer trawlers, again in an abstract sort of way, the same way you are talking about Fishery Products International five-year plan, but why do you not sit down now and have the Premier go to the Prime Minister of Canada and say, 'If you do, it is the death knell to the offshore fishing industry in Newfoundland'.

MR. HISCOCK:

Why do you not tell them to live up to the Liberal agreement?

MR. GILBERT:

This is the point. Ask them to live up to the agreement you had in 1983. The Premier has asked for this agreement to be kept. I just heard the salient cry that came from the other side, "Burn your boats!". There seems to be, somewhere along the way, not an ounce of imagination or new ideas. They start talking about burning boats, something that was said twenty-five or thirty years ago, Mr. Speaker, that is the only answer they have for the fishing

industry to this day. A policy that was supposed to be espoused by a Liberal Party that none of us here were old enough to be even a member of when this was supposed to have been said. This is the ideas that is coming from that side. A government that is devoid in ideas. That is the point I am making, Mr. Speaker, this is the sort of ideas we get from over there - burn your boats.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from the Liberal caucus committee report on the inshore fishery and some of its recommendations.

"In the case of demonstrated need, the revision or the relaxation of all pertinent UIC regulations for the coming year." This is the short-term, this is positive stuff. You fellows would not understand that.

"A program to be immediately implemented of work projects for fishermen, their wives and families.

"In the case of a demonstrated need, the relaxation of payments scheduled to the Fisheries Loan Board. A reduction in the amount and forwarded into a new year of payments of a fishermen's license fees."

I would like to table this report, Mr. Speaker, and maybe the members over there would get a chance to read it and I am sure that there are some good ideas in it that we would like to have implemented and that should be implemented and would help the inshore fishermen of Newfoundland. The people that are experiencing a crisis and who we must look after. It is our job as government, opposition and members opposite. Members

opposite must put some plan into place in order to ensure the continuance of the inshore fishery.

I ask the members opposite to read this because there are some good ideas in it that you could use and might possibly save the inshore fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Greening)
The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few short comments on Bill 21. There is not much I can say about it that has not already been said. I can only say that I would be much happier to support it had it gone a little further in the operation of the Fisheries Loan Board. I am thinking primarily of the policy of the board that was implemented three or four years ago where fishermen who are borrowing money in excess of \$50,000 were forced into the clutches of the chartered banks. I believe that that section of the Loan Board Act should be amended. I think fishermen, whether they are wishing to borrow \$10,000 or \$55,000 or \$75,000, should be able to apply to the Fisheries Loan Board and be treated just like any other fishermen who borrows a smaller amount.

I must say that I am not overly impressed with the action taken by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) in his statement a few weeks ago, in which he announced the governments intention to reduce interest rates from twelve per cent to eight and a quarter per cent. I think that the

Fisheries Loan Board, bearing in mind the importance of that industry to the Province, the importance of the Fisheries Loan Board to the fishermen who are involved in that industry, they could have gone a bit further. For example, when you look at the figures you will find that although the interest rate has dropped by two per cent or three per cent, in the overall picture it does not mean very much to a fisherman with a \$50,000 loan. I do not have the figures here in front of me, but I think you are only talking a saving of less than \$170 a month in interest. That is not going to do very much this year to help the fishermen over the very critical period in which they are now finding themselves.

Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleague for Burgeo (Mr. Gilbert) said, the Fishery Products International management plan is something that, I think, deserves some attention on the part of hon. members because it is a far-reaching plan and I believe one that can have and, in fact, will have some very far-reaching effects on the future of the Newfoundland fishing industry and quite possibly on the future of the Newfoundland that we know today.

I was never fully convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the action taken at that time, called the nationalization almost of the fishing industry of Newfoundland, was the right action. I realize that there were problems. I realize that some of the so-called giants in the industry Fishery Products Limited, the Lake Group and others were teetering on bankruptcy. I am still not convinced that the action taken at that time, endorsed by the government opposite, was the right

course of action.

We have seen small independent plants remain in business, in fact, some of them continue to thrive. Yet this big company, Fishery Products International, with which they are now forced to compete has been given many, many millions, in fact, I believe up to this point well in excess of \$250 million of taxpayers money to make that industry work.

I was rather amused by the comments of the Chairman of the Board of that corporation, Mr. Victor Young, when he dared suggest that maybe, just maybe, the company would be in a position to show a profit next year. Having being given a choice of the jewels in the crown of Fishery Products International, as it were, the fish plants that are now making money, Burin, for example, Catalina, and others; having being the recipient of in excess of \$250 million of taxpayers money; having now the security of being a ward of the federal and provincial governments, Mr. Young now believes that there is a possibility that the company in 1986 will show a profit.

Mr. Speaker, I would almost be inclined to ask Mr. Young how can he not make a profit in 1986? By what strange twist of faith will he end up with a big loss again in 1986? Surely with that kind of initiative taken by the governments and the Bank of Nova Scotia into the company, and now having the choice of, like I said, the jewels, the gems in the crown of that company, surely it is not expecting too much for the company to show a profit in 1986.

The questions, Mr. Speaker, that kept coming up at the hearings

that we conducted in the Province is that if Fishery Products International makes a profit, and there is nobody against profits, profits are part of the free enterprise system to which we subscribe, if Fishery Products International makes a profit, the feeling is generally felt, by the way, by the smaller fishermen that it will be on the backs of the small inshore fishermen and on the backs of the plant workers who now work in the so-called seasonal plants that have been almost condemned by Fishery Products International.

The government can talk all it likes about privatization. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, they have identified fifteen plants in this Province that they have now literally condemned to death. In my own district of Twillingate there are two plants. A plant in Twillingate, for example, that employs for a certain period in the year up to 500 people. One can only imagine just how important that plant is to the social and economic life of the people of Twillingate district. There are other plants around the Island that have been equally condemned that are employing a like number. So, Mr. Speaker, it is not something that we can take too lightly, the so-called attempt on the part of this new, big company to privatize fifteen of their plants.

Mr. Speaker, the question that I ask the government and Fishery Products International is what happens at the end of that two year period? They are promising to keep the plants operating for two years unless a buyer comes along in the meantime. What assurance do we have that at the

end of that two year period that those plants will continue to operate? What assurance do we have, Mr. Speaker, that in their anxiety to unload these plants and to, as they say, privatize them, that these plants will not be handed over to some fly-by-night operator, some operator without any commitment to or interest in the areas in which they are situated. There is a very real danger of that happening. What assurance do we have that the plants will not be closed within the two year period or after the two year period has expired? What chance, Mr. Speaker, is there that we will attract the right kind of a buyer, a buyer with a real commitment to the industry, with the kind of money that is necessary to make it work? How can we possibly attract that kind of a buyer knowing that the plant in question has been condemned by FPI and sloughed off, as it were, under the pretense of privatization? Mr. Speaker, I have very serious doubts that the right kind of buyers will be available to take these plants and to do the job that they should be doing in them.

Fishery Products International, Mr. Speaker, if they had any real interest in the continuation of these plants or in making them viable operations should have taken the money that they are now getting from the taxpayers of our Province, because the people of Twillingate also pay taxes, it is their money that is now being used by that company, for example, to buy up or to rescue the plant in Burin or Catalina, they should have taken that money and used it to help the plants that do have a chance of making it for the next couple of years and then, if they wanted to privatize them, go out

and look for a buyer. They would have had a much better chance by that time of attracting the right kind of a person but I fear now that there are very few serious buyers in this Province or outside of the Province that will come along for plants that, by the government's own admission, are money-losers and have very little chance for becoming viable in the future. That I think, Mr. Speaker, is a very serious mistake on the part of this government and one that is going to be a costly mistake for a lot of Newfoundlanders.

In looking over the management plan that was presented by Fishery Products International, Mr. Speaker, I was rather intrigued to see that, for example, they have announced that they intend to close down plants like the ones in Twillingate, Englee, Charleston, Cow Head, and I think Port au Basques, yet they have singled out the plant in Triton.

I have nothing against the people in Triton having their plant remain in operation under the auspices of FPI. In fact, I say good for them. But the plant in Triton now is to be operated, the management plan says, for a period of approximately seven to eight months utilizing the existing FPI fleet to land at this plant the specific offshore quotas of 6 million pounds of Northern cod. It will also require extensive purchases of inshore cod. Then it goes on to say that the operation of Triton by FPI is subject to the completion of satisfactory acquisition arrangements with its present owners and bankers.

I am wondering if the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) or maybe his parliamentary secretary or

somebody can explain to me, Mr. Speaker, why this sudden interest in the plant at Triton. What does the plant in Triton, for example, have over and above the plant in, we will say, Twillingate or the one in Englee or the one in Charleston or the one in Port au Basques?

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the big thing going for the plant in Triton is that the Premier is representing the district in which the town of Triton is located. As I said, I am happy for the people of Triton, but it is little consolation to the people in Twillingate and the other places I have mentioned that the Triton plant has been singled out. I am told that the Triton plant will be now serviced. In fact, FPI does not, at this point in time, own that plant. They are hoping to negotiate the satisfactory acquisition of the plant and then, having done that I am told, they are going to assign, I believe, six or seven or eight Fishery Products International trawlers.

MR. MORGAN:

Six million pounds.

MR. W. CARTER:

How many?

MR. MORGAN:

Six million pounds.

MR. W. CARTER:

Six million pounds, and the number -

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) in my district (inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

That is right. My hon. colleague from Bonavista South has a plant in his district, a good plant, a

plant built, I believe, by the same company - was it not Nickerson that built the Charleston plant?

MR. MORGAN:

The same company, the same funds.

MR. W. CARTER:

The same company, same funds, equal opportunity as far as availability of the resource, work force, and everything else. The plant in the hon. member's district is being condemned to death, as it were, yet, the plant in Triton has been given an extension on its life and, in fact I suppose, with the backing of the Premier and his government, the federal government and others, will have a long and happy life.

MR. MORGAN:

They are both inshore plants.

MR. W. CARTER:

They are both inshore plants. Both were built as inshore plants; both suffer from the same disabilities of inshore plants. They both have to contend with ice blockades during a rather extensive period of the year. One is no less or no more than the other. Both are subject to the uncertainties of the inshore fishery and the fact that they were never intended to be serviced by offshore vessels. Now, I am told, the plant in question will have at its disposal the services of six or eight FPI trawlers that during that six or eight month period, in addition to inshore landings, will supply the plant with around six million pounds of Northern cod.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious matter. The plant in my district, and that is the thing that must be of prime concern to me, is the

heart and the social and economic soul of that district, and without it, Mr. Speaker, the people of that district will suffer greatly. Their future is being jeopardized.

I would strongly urge the government, Mr. Speaker, to reconsider the so-called management plan of FPI, to overrule, maybe, the wishes of the Bank of Nova Scotia, whose only interest is in protecting their rather substantial investment in that company. I would ask the government to overrule the actions of their federal counterparts, such as Mr. Sinclair Stevens, a man, I suppose, who hardly knows that places like Twillingate and Charleston and Port aux Basques and Englee and Cow Head exist. I would ask him to do the decent thing and to give some undertaking now that the plant in Twillingate, the plant in Englee and, indeed, the other thirteen or fourteen plants that have been condemned to death be given a new lease on life and that the moneys that have been forthcoming from the federal government, taxpayers' dollars, be made available to make these plants work, plants that have the potential of being viable.

I am not suggesting that money be poured down the drain or just thrown away. I know it is not a wise thing to throw good money after bad. I believe that some of the plants, such as the plant in the district of my hon. colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell), the one in Port aux Basques, a plant that, again, is almost the heart and soul of that district, should be given a chance. These should not be condemned as they are being condemned now by the management plan of FPI.

I do not care what you say, Mr. Speaker, we had occasions during this Summer in our travels around the Province - we did have twenty-two meetings - to hear stories from inshore fishermen who are dealing with some of these plants, saying that the decision was obviously made to start to downgrade these plants.

For example, we were told by a fisherman in a certain part of the Province, an inshore fisherman, that he could not sell his catch the previous Wednesday in the height of the inshore fishery. On the door of the plant to which he would normally sell his fish, an FPI feeder plant, was a sign reading, "Fork-lift out of order. Plant closed." At the peak of the inshore fishing season that fisherman could not sell his fish because the fork-lift was out of order and was being repaired.

We were told in another rather large community on the Northeast Coast of the Province the fishermen requested that the managers and owners of FPI install a few more tables on the wharf. In fact, in that particular community, which is one of the largest inshore fishing communities in the Provinces - all selling their fish to this particular plant - there was only a limited number of tables on the wharf. In fact, there was quite a pile up. The fishermen just could not get in to do their thing, so they asked that a few extra tables be provided the fishermen. The answer, of course, that came back from the management was to the effect that, "our funds are exhausted and we do not have any money for any improvements to the plant."

Mr. Chairman, before I take my

seat I cannot let the opportunity pass without making some reference to the state of the fishery at the present time and the serious social and economic consequences of what has happened this year.

Contrary to what the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) said yesterday to the effect that we were exaggerating the problems of unemployment insurance and the lack of the necessary stamps, I can tell him now, Mr. Speaker, and I can tell the members opposite that in the Twillingate district, and by God there is no - and I am not just saying this because I am the member for that district, but anybody who knows anything about Newfoundland will agree - the people of that district are now known as slingers when it comes to fishing, they are, I suppose, better than the best when it comes to eking out a living from the ocean. That is their whole livelihood, it is their past and it is their present and they would like to think it is their future. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that less than 50 per cent of the fishermen in that district have enough stamps to get unemployment insurance benefits this coming Winter.

I can tell you as well that in many cases where people do have enough stamps, stamps are so low in value that the amount of money that they will get as unemployment insurance benefits will probably be less than that which they would get under the welfare scheme.

I saw cases this Summer in my district where fishemen just could not afford to go out and haul their nets because it would take \$25 or \$30 to steam out and back and they could only hope to catch maybe 100 pounds of fish which

would net them a lot less than the actual cost of going to their nets.

So, Mr. Speaker, the problem is very serious. I believe we did make some very substantive recommendations. For example, we believe, and I do not think we are asking for too much, there should be changes made to the Unemployment Insurance Act. We see no reason why fishermen in Newfoundland should be treated differently from any other members of the work force in Canada.

I am not a lawyer but I believe now that a case could very well be made that these people are being discriminated against under the Charter of Rights. These people are being treated differently from other workers in this country. We see cases where fish plant workers, the people who make a living processing the fish that the inshore fishermen catch, have no investment in the industry whatsoever. Where a fisherman has got an investment of anything from \$10,000 to \$300,000, a plant worker does not have that kind of investment. He works with his or her hands, yet having worked a certain number of weeks, he or she can qualify for unemployment insurance benefits for, I believe, eight or ten months of the year. But a fisherman, who makes that kind of investment, will not qualify, for example, until November 15.

It does not matter that the fishery could have petered out in August. It could not matter less that the fishery, maybe, never even got off the ground this year, as it happened this year. If he is lucky to qualify for UI benefits, come May 15 it does not matter that the place is blocked with ice or that there is no fish

or dirty water, his benefits will cease. I know in this year, because of pressure brought to bear on the government, mostly by members on this side, there was a special programme of assistance for fishermen after the May 15 deadline. But the fact of the matter is there is no guarantee that that extra assistance will be forthcoming as badly as it might be needed.

We recommended as well, Mr. Speaker, that there will be a make-work programme initiated for fishermen and their wives and their families. I, having travelled the Province, and I am sure most members opposite have done likewise and I am sure we must agree there is no shortage of things to be done in this Province. There is enough work to be done today in rural Newfoundland, especially in the fishing areas, to keep every unemployed fishermen busy for the next two or three years. I do not mean putting the second fence around a graveyard, I mean, good meaningful work, work that will have a lasting and a long-term benefit for the fishermen and their families now and far into the future.

We have asked that in demonstrated needs that there be a moratorium placed on payments on principal and interest owing to the Fisheries Loan Board. I was glad to hear yesterday my friend, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) promised that that action would be taken and that no fisherman would be prosecuted or allowed to be foreclosed upon by banks or by the Loan Board itself during the coming year, if, again, the need has been demonstrated.

In our travels around the Province

we encountered, everywhere we went, for example, the complaint that fishermen were being over-regulated. It was impossible to keep abreast of the regulations that were being thrown at them by the federal government. I saw cases, for example, where young men were not allowed to catch squid for their fishermen father after a day fishing because he did not have a licence. Surely that is the sort of thing that we can do without in this Province, in a Province where the fishing industry is so important.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge the government opposite to contact their friends in Ottawa, to impress upon them the need to, first of all, relax the unemployment insurance regulations, make it possible for fishermen and their families to get unemployment insurance benefits this coming year, even though, they may not have the required ten stamps.

I would ask the government to press upon their federal friends the need for some kind of a meaningful make-work programme, not the kind that we have in place now where the emphasis is strictly on training. We do not have the private sector in a place like Twillingate or Herring Neck or Summerford that makes the existing programme viable. This is not asking too much.

The fishermen of this Province rightly or wrongly, the inshore fishermen are now pretty well convinced that their industry is on its last legs. In fact, we were getting the story that, maybe, in a couple of years time there would be no inshore fishery left. That might not be as strange as it sounds, Mr. Speaker,

because if plants like the one in Twillingate, for example, and the one in Englee and Charleston are going to be allowed to be closed in two years time, that then spells the doom of the inshore fishery. If there are no plants operating in those places, where are they going to sell their fish?

I would strongly suggest that the management plan presented by Fisheries Products be reviewed and where necessary, changed and that they make recommendations to their federal counterparts to the effect that certain other things be done to help the fishermen over this very critical period.

Mr. Speaker, I intended to rise on a point of personal privilege today but I did not. I thought maybe I would be dignifying the comments that were made and the member who made them. Yesterday in the course of the debates when we talked about the Fisheries Loan Board, I rose on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, when we were endeavouring to initiate a debate in this House on the serious problems now being encountered by our fishermen and the House Leader on the other side (Mr. Marshall) rose in his place and he said, "I just want to respond to the hon. gentleman," referring to me. He said, "If the hon. gentlemen want to they can debate all the matters they want to bring up on this Bill. That and much more." Then he said, "We can also debate the Fisheries Loan Board when the hon. gentleman," meaning myself, "was Minister of Fisheries and I think that that would make some very interesting debate as well."

He did not make a specific charge in that statement but I think he certainly left the impression that maybe while I did have the

privilege of serving as Minister of Fisheries and as minister responsible for that Board, that there were certain shady dealings going on or something that was unbecoming to a minister that were conducted during my ten years as Minister of Fisheries.

I heard - I wish I was in his place - the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), in his peculiar way, make reference to 'the one dollar boats' everytime I rose in my place and made reference to the Loan Board.

I do not take anything too seriously that the hon. minister says but all I can say is that if the hon. members opposite have any evidence to the effect that there were 'one dollar boats' given away during my term as minister or as the House Leader might have inferred in his remark that things were not on the up and up, then I would like for them to present their evidence here, not to stand behind their desk and in a slimy way - and that is the only way I can refer to it - make little suggestions that maybe when I was minister certain things were done, maybe my conduct may have been unbecoming or certain deals were made or certain things done that were not quite right. That is the only thing I have to say, if you have any such evidence, lets have it. Let them be men and gentlemen and produce their evidence, otherwise as my colleague here says, "shut up." They have no right to infer allegations or to make remarks that would reflect on an hon. member unless they have proof of it and I would ask the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and anybody else opposite to stand in his or her place and to make those kind of allegations to present the proof.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible.)

MR. W. CARTER:
He did not have the courage to do that, he did not have the courage to make the allegation because then he would have had to produce the proof. He would prefer to sit behind the microphone and do little inuendos, little smears.

Mr. Speaker, that is about all that I have to say on this debate. Thank you very much.

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HEARN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After listening to the remarks of the last speaker, I do not mean the last few remarks, but the main portion of his speech, he has made it quite clear that there are a number of problems around the Island and problems that we all have shared and appreciate. A number of the issues that he mentioned he mentioned them, I am sure, in good faith, quite factually and truthfully. These concerns the people on this side are also very much aware of and hopefully we have been doing something to address them.

In relation to some of the topics he brought up, especially fishermen's insurance, a couple of years ago I drafted a resolution for the Order Paper which addressed the very topic, suggesting that fishermen should be treated the same as all others. To give an example, the average fisherman in most of the Province - now we have areas where they fish during the Wintertime or

start early in the Spring, etc. - but in many parts of the Province, certainly on the Northeast Coast and the East Coast of Newfoundland generally, people start some time in relatively late Spring, perhaps late May and June. The first dollars quite often are not made until near the end of June. In many areas, especially in recent years we have had a history of Fall fishery failures.

The Southern Shore, for example, St. Mary's Bay, for a number of years, even if the trap fishery was a complete failure, you could fish during September and October and usually do quite well. During the last few years that fishery has been a complete failure. Consequently most fishermen now, if they make anything worthwhile at all, it is from the middle of June until perhaps the middle of September. Then they have to wait in the Fall until Christmas Eve practically to get the first UIC cheque.

In the Spring, their benefits are cut off the middle of May. Quite often, as I said, they do not get any earnings at all until mid or late June. In the Spring, that is a period when these people are trying to get their gear ready for fishing, to buy paint for their boats, buy materials for repair, purchase new nets, etc., etc. and the funding has run out. It is also a time when they have families and Summer clothing, etc. will have to be bought. In the Fall, when the fishery ends early, they have a long Fall once again with Winter coming on, provision of clothing, school opening, the purchase of books, what have you, and here they have absolutely no income.

Another case in point is a young

person, it does not matter a young person or old person, but an individual in a community who perhaps has not been able to find work in another area and decides to stay home and go to work on a make-work programme. Perhaps it is somebody who does not put the same effort into it as a fisherman does because the typical fisherman in Newfoundland is undoubtedly the hardest working person you can find.

You can find somebody who perhaps does not want to work and decides that he will get ten stamps by going on a make-work programme. He can get on the programme work for ten weeks and then draw UIC immediately upon finishing his job and he draws it for forty-two weeks, whereas the fisherman who puts so much effort into it, is penalized and can only draw it for a very small portion of the year. That is a great injustice as the hon. member mentioned. It is an issue that we have addressed before and, perhaps jointly, we should address again and keep addressing it until our petitions are heard.

The make-work programmes, especially fishery-related ones, have this past few years taken up some of the slack when we have had and in areas where we have had poor fishery. This year, in certain parts of the Province, in fact, in many parts of the Province, where we have had a very poor fishery, undoubtedly we will be looking for more of them and hopefully better programmes than have been brought forth in the past.

We have received indications, of course, that something will be forthcoming shortly and the quickly the better in many areas

of the Province. Certainly we look forward to putting in place programmes that will offset the tremendous hardships that are presently being faced by fishermen out in the field.

However, during the last couple of days in discussions from the opposite side we have been hearing all the negative things about the fishery and what is not being done to help the fishery and fishermen of the Province. Perhaps we should also look at some of the positive things that have been done.

The hon. gentlemen toured parts of Newfoundland, selected parts undoubtedly, and met with fishermen and got complaints which they brought forward, certainly solid, legitimate complaints. I have no argument with that at all. But, we do have areas in Newfoundland also that had a relatively good year and, to a great extent, it was because of assistance from the government on the initiative of the local areas themselves, with perhaps the help of government members and a fair amount of planning early in the year. We did not necessarily go around the Fall and say, 'Boys, you had a bad year, did you? Tough stuff! Well, go in and complain to the government'.

I think all of us, as representatives of the people out there, owe it to them to try to assist in the planning, provisions, and the opening up the lines of communication through the various agencies that can help them. With the help of the government and the Department of Fisheries, in particular, this past year, I know in our own area we were able to put in place new markets to encourage fishermen who had given up because of

frustration with markets perhaps, to get back in the boats again. We did not say burn your boats, but they shoved them out again and that is what they did.

We were told by the federal Department of Fisheries that more plants could not operate up in St. Mary's Bay, for instance, because the total amount of fish you could possibly catch was around two million pounds, not enough to keep plants going. One plant, just one new plant that we had reactivated this year has handled approximately ten million pounds itself so far. So it shows that if you can put a solid operation in place and encourage people to fish, guarantee them that you will buy what they catch, undoubtedly they will go in there will full effort and you will have a successful industry.

Many of our fishermen have been frustrated in recent years by both operators and, also of course, in some areas by lack of fish. But when fish was plentiful, especially during the glut season, when they can make a dollar, and people who use cod traps in particular, who catch a lot of fish in a short time can make a lot of money in a short time. You might say it is only three weeks and it does not make any difference but during those three weeks they make the bulk of their years income. If they cannot make the money during that period the rest of the year, even though they fish for another fifteen weeks, the rest of the year is no good to them because they cannot make up the deficit they lose during the three peak weeks.

In recent years what has been happening is that many of the fish plants have been buying caplin in

particular, filling up their freezers and telling the average ordinary inshore cod fisherman, which is the basic fish, that we cannot buy your product during this period. So what has happened? The fishermen have given up, in some cases, in frustration or have gone out and hauled their nets and thrown away the catch because the markets were not there.

What we have been trying to do, at least in areas where we have been involved, is to make sure that the markets are solid, that fish plants will operate, especially if we are going to assist them in operating and that they will buy what fish fishermen catch within reason. There may be the odd day that any plant, it does not matter how big or what potential it has, cannot handle the amount of fish that is caught, but certainly this year we found out that those days were few and far between. When the element of competition is brought in, good competition, and where there is an element of concern from the government and especially in relation to passing out funding to helping those plants operate, then the responsibility is on them to produce. If they do not produce they know they are not going to be assisted. This has paid dividends. A tremendous amount of fish was caught, fishermen had a bit of faith again, they shoved out their boats, went out and caught what they could, two or three trips a day, whatever, and landed the fish, it was sold immediately, processed quickly, the product was good and recognized the world over, and consequently it ended up where we had more people involved, more money made than ever before in the history of the district. That was

because of, once again, the co-operation, the planning and a little bit of belief in the inshore fishery by, especially our own Department of Fisheries, who provided us with licenses and so on that were being objected to in other quarters.

This may perhaps have been a lucky year for us because the fish did come in in all parts of my district. From Portugal Cove South to the Cape Shore we had an excellent Summer. If the fish does not come to land, then, consequently, it does not matter how well our plants are operating, how good and reliable our operators are, there is not much we can do. But the combination of factors, of poor management at the fish plant level, of operators making a quick buck and worrying about themselves more so than about the fishery in the Province, these things, coupled with poor fishery, aggravate the present situation. So it is something that requires a fair amount of planning and it also requires a fair amount of co-operation at the local level. Quite often you get different groups and agencies bickering for any dollars that might be available. Instead of turning the make-work funds that are available into some kind of an organized approach to solving their problems, instead of building the third slipway, quite often we are getting organizations not pooling their resources to develop maybe an extension on fish plant, to repair the wharf which will lead to better landing facilities, etc., something that will contribute to the success of the fishery in that area and I think that is extremely important.

In many areas our fishermen

themselves have caused some of their problems when, instead of getting together to look for a solid market where they can sell on some of their own terms, they have been splitting off and each guy selling to whoever came first. In cases like this, usually the fisherman was the one who was ripped off. So it calls for a fair amount of organization, a fair amount of discipline at the local level, and co-ordination with funding efforts and with any other assistance that can be availed.

The main issue I suppose in all of this is what happens the inshore fishery in Newfoundland. Insinuations have been made by previous speakers that it is the intention of this government and the government in Ottawa, and I have no intention of speaking for the Government in Ottawa but I certainly can speak for this one, it is the intention of the government here to destroy the inshore fishery in Newfoundland. It is a recognized fact, a publicized fact, that this government has stood in defence of the inshore fishery. If we take the inshore fishery out of Newfoundland, we destroy Newfoundland.

MR. TULK:

Come on over here.

MR. HEARN:

We have been saying this for years. The quote "Burn your boats", did not come from this side. Perhaps it is a quote that is as outdated, as was mentioned earlier. But we have been saying "Shove out the dory", because there is a future in the fishery, if all agencies and organizations start getting together and planning, provided, of course, the

fish is there to come to land and as of yet I have not found out the way to do that. We did a fairly good job of it up in my district. I just have to learn next year how to get the fish to come into the other districts around, Mr. Speaker.

But we do stand for the inshore fishery. Every move that the government has made in relation to the fishery has been to defend, to try to stabilize the inshore fishery in the Province.

The Loan Board, which is the issue at stake I suppose in the act that we are supposed to be talking about, was set up to help fishermen buy boats and whatever else to get into the fishery. In recent days the minister has shown how flexible that body can be in relation to the present position that the fishermen find themselves in out there. If they have not had a good year, undoubtedly that will be considered by the loan board and whatever changes have been made to the agreements they have with that board I am sure will be reconsidered.

Quite often I think it is the worry -

MR. SIMMS:

A good man, boy. The best member they ever had in St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. HEARN:

Well, they proved that by the vote, did they not?

The worry that some people have out there is that -

MR. TOBIN:

Well said 'Loyola', well said.

MR. TULK:

A bit of vanity, do you not think?

MR. W. CARTER:

(Inaudible) Branch plant.

MR. HEARN:

I suggest to the hon. member, he has one friend - I have to throw this out - he has one friend in Branch who votes for me even but is a friend of the hon. member and he keeps telling him that this hon. member apparently is not accepted in Branch. He should look at the vote that came out of Branch and -

MR. SIMMS:

That is why he did not run there.

MR. HEARN:

Exactly. Of all places to mention. I can walk into Branch and, in fact, somebody told me last week they were starting to build a statue out there. They are now in the process of stabilizing an industry. They have had problems there the last few years, some of them created by decisions made by a former member.

MR. TOBIN:

What was the vote?

MR. HEARN:

The vote was 144 to 44.

MR. DAWE:

No. Is that right?

MR. HEARN:

Yes.

MR. DAWE:

A complete and utter rejection of the member?

MR. W. CARTER:

He was against the fish plant in Branch.

MR. HEARN:

No, of course not, against the fish plant in Branch. He is the one who has gone out and encouraged the agencies to get together to get that fish plant back on a solid footing.

MR. W. CARTER:

Did it work?

MR. HEARN:

Sure it did. Wait until the Spring and see what has happened during the -

MR. W. CARTER:

Not the people who are calling me.

MR. HEARN:

Well of course, the people who are calling you would not be the ones who are working on the various committees to get the thing done anyway. They may be part of the 44 and even that is cut down considerably now because of the latest endeavours out there.

MR. W. CARTER:

(Inaudible) Admiral's Beach.

MR. HEARN:

Admiral's Beach, the biggest boat that ever came out of Admiral's Beach. The best year Admiral's Beach fish plant ever had. The Riverhead plant has been out of action since before I came into politics, this year Riverhead plant not only has been reactivated, there is presently an eighty by one hundred foot extension going on to make sure that any fish that cannot be handled locally in the fresh fish processing will be salted on site.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

The St. Mary's plant that was built during the years of the hon.

member and then given to, well, a gentleman who operated it as a crab plant, operating for a few weeks of the year when there was too much crab to handle it in his own area.

MR. TOBIN:

There was a crab plant where?

MR. HEARN:

In St. Mary's. - now had been turned into a fresh fish plant or, perhaps, I should say, a multipurpose plant that this year employed over 190 people.

MR. TULK:

What?

MR. HEARN:

That is the one I talked about. There was not one fish landed in St. Mary's Bay this year that was not sold, not one. This never happened before. Of course, if people wanted to know how the fisherman and the fish plant committees etc. feel about this government and about the representation, I would suggest to them that they contact any fishermen's committee out there and, in fact, I know during my campaign most of the chairman of my various rallies -

MR. SIMMS:

Were working for you anyway.

MR. HEARN:

- were chairmen of the fishermen's committees I spoke of.

MR. TOBIN:

How did you do in St. Mary's?

MR. HEARN:

Well, I am not sure. I do not worry about that stuff. I just know -

MR. SIMMS:

What was the total vote in the district, just to set us at ease?

MR. HEARN:

Oh, the total vote? My first - I usually do not say this though.

MR. SIMMS:

But we are asking you.

MR. HEARN:

The first time I ran in the district I came within twenty-seven votes of the most votes even taken by a candidate in the district, and that was the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter).

MR. SIMMS:

Yes.

MR. HEARN:

I said to myself, I have to get twenty-eight votes in the next election because he was a second term member at the time and well known. I have to show I am representing the same party and the people still have faith in this party.

MR. SIMMS:

Right.

MR. HEARN:

This time, of course, we outdid that greatly and our majority alone was within, I think, a couple of hundred votes of the amount of votes that the gentleman got.

MR. SIMMS:

The majority alone.

MR. HEARN:

The majority alone. So consequently it shows that being in a fishing - I think the bottom line -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. HEARN:

That is enough of that. The bottom line is the fact that St. Mary's - The Capes is a fishing district. Every person up there is affected by the fishery whether it is the fish plant worker, whether he is a fisherman, whatever, whether he is a businessman. The fishery affects all of the district.

When a fishing district turns around and elects a member who stands for government, who is suppose to be doing nothing for the fishery, I think, that is a bit contradictory. It shows that the people of that area have faith in this government because of what has been done and what is being done, not because of me, but because of the party I represent and because of what I was able to do for them with the backing and assistance of this government.

MR. WARREN:

He did more than you did for nine years.

MR. HEARN:

I do not say this to take away from the efforts of the hon. gentleman. They have concerns. Many of the districts represented by them, some of my own colleagues did not have this type of year. We could not have done what we did if the fish had not come to land. But consequently, we can sympathize with the problems that they faced. They are problems we have faced in the past. We have tried to do something about them. Hopefully, things will improve in the future.

Mr. Speaker, we want to make it quite clear that this government does stand for the inshore fishery

of Newfoundland. I will say once again that if the inshore fishery of Newfoundland goes, so goes the Province of Newfoundland.

MR. DAWE:

Hear, hear! A good speech.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, all I am hearing is a cliché that was suppose to have been stated thirty odd years ago, namely, "burn your boats." I happen to hear the former great Premier of this Province explain the circumstances in which that statement was actually said.

MR. J. CARTER:

And you believed him.

MR. DECKER:

See, Mr. Speaker, it was a different age. It was an age, Mr. Speaker, when fish plants were being built up. It was an age when a plant was being built in Bonavista. It was an age, Mr. Speaker, when a plant was being built in Charleston. It was an age when a fish plant was being built in St. Anthony. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, in his struggle - I heard him say it - to get funding for those plants at an age when you were building up, not tearing down like we have today - there is the difference - he put forward his argument, he said, "If we are not going to build those fish plants in St. Anthony, if we are not going to build our fish plants in Bonavista, if we are not going to build our fish plants in Charleston, then we might as well burn our boats".

Mr. Speaker, truer words were never said because if the devastation that this irresponsible government has brought upon this Province is not soon brought to an end, then the fishermen might as well do what the former Premier allegedly said, they might as well burn their boats, Mr. Speaker, because without fish plants there is no other option but to burn the boats, which leads to the next question. What are we going to do with our fishermen?

Mr. Speaker, I will adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I have to talk. I do not want to bully boy the hon. gentleman.

MR. DECKER:

He is not going to, Mr. Speaker. Nobody is going to bully this man from the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. MARSHALL:

No, I would not even attempt to. Nobody would attempt to bully boy the hon. gentleman. I am just trying to be nice to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman has used up three or four minutes and he adjourned the debate and I would not allow the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) to try to intervene in this speech I know that we are all looking forward to on Thursday when this debate resumes.

So, Mr. Speaker, having said that I move the House at its adjournment do rise until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 23, 1985 at 3:00 p.m.