



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 49

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Wednesday

30 October 1985

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Before calling Statements By Ministers, I would like to comment on the point of order raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) yesterday. He objected to the word 'smear' used by the Premier and the context. 'The only thing that the four matters that I have investigated show is that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to smear the character and integrity of a very decent and honest man.'

In my view, the comment is not unparliamentary. There is a difference of opinion between two hon. members, but no point of order.

To the point of privilege raised by the hon. the President of the Council, I think I erred in allowing the minister and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to get into a debate. There is a difference of opinion between the two hon. members, but no prime facie case of breach of privilege.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, on a point of privilege.

MR. BARRY:

The last day the Premier presented an answer to a question previously raised, he read out what appeared to be a prepared statement. That statement was tabled and distributed to the press, but in fact, Mr. Speaker, that statement

as tabled was not read out completely by the Premier. However, it has become part of the record by his tabling of the document. In that he refers to 'smear,' and Your Honour has dealt with that, and he refers to 'innuendo' and he refers to 'character assassination'.

Now I ask Your Honour to look at this full document, not what the Premier said because he did not have the courage to say it in the House. He would not read the full statement, he only read part of the statement. I would ask Your Honour if you would look at the document as filed in the House. And I would submit that, contrary to the rules of parliamentary procedure, it is a document which impugns improper motives to members of this House. It attempts to assign improper motives to myself in raising questions about the conduct of his administration, and I submit to Your Honour it is unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), I will study that document and refer to it at a later date.

Statements by Ministers

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise this hon. House of government's decision with respect to the Province's financial involvement in the operations of Ocean

Harvesters Limited. As hon. members are aware, following the Bank of Nova Scotia's withdrawal of its support and the subsequent appointment of a receiver/manager in early January of this year, the Province stepped in during late March, 1985 with an expanded financial assistance package which prevented the total collapse of Ocean Harvesters at that time.

The Province provided substantial financial support to the company through loan guarantees and reached a tentative agreement with the bank. This action allowed the company to operate for an initial six month interim period under the direction of the bank's receiver/manager, the Clarkson Company. This assistance package enabled Ocean Harvesters Limited to recommence plant operations and allowed its trawler, the Harvest Star, to commence fishing. Furthermore, this interim six month period afforded the necessary lead time for the Province to assess the overall viability of Ocean Harvesters Limited over the longer term. Government's direct financial involvement in the company at the present time includes debt and guarantees related to the M.V. Harvest Star of \$3.4 million, secured by a first mortgage position on this asset. There are also government guarantees related to the Harbour Grace plant of \$500,000, and operating loan guarantees of up to \$2.3 million. These guarantees are partially secured by inventory and receivables and certain of the company's assets. In addition, the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation has outstanding loans of approximately \$1.6 million which are secured by mortgages on the Harbour Grace and Port de Grave plants.

The assessment of Ocean Harvesters Limited undertaken in consultation with the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and the receiver/manager, involved a comprehensive analysis of the financial and operational difficulties surrounding the company. The comprehensive assessment addressed all aspects of the company particularly with a view to ascertaining which segments of the company could become viable over the medium to longer term. The assessment was completed in early October, 1985 and has now been reviewed by government.

Our assessment has concluded that Ocean Harvesters Limited is insolvent and continued operations would require a major new financial restructuring in view of its heavy debt position. The assessment further concluded that even with such restructuring, necessitating further significant government assistance, the company would not be viable over the longer term. In view of these findings the Province has determined that further financial assistance to support Ocean Harvesters Limited in its existing corporate structure cannot be justified.

MR. BARRY:
Shame!

MR. FLIGHT:
Another one.

MR. BARRY:
So much for all plants open.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:
Consequently, Hr. Speaker, government will be advising the

Bank of its decision and full bankruptcy procedures will likely commence immediately. It is likely that the company plants at Harbour Grace, Port de Grave and Old Perlican will be offered for sale by the receiver shortly thereafter. The owners, officials of the various towns affected, as well as union representatives, were briefed today in this regard.

In the meantime, the Province will work closely with the bank, the receiver, the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and the residents of the area to ensure, if at all possible, that all plants owned by Ocean Harvesters Limited will be back in operation on a timely basis. In this context, the Province is fully prepared to support, if necessary, any reasonable acquisition proposals for the company's assets, which may be forthcoming. Furthermore, the Province is fully prepared to have the trawler, the Harvest Star remain an integral part of any revised corporate structure.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this decision has been a difficult one for government and we have arrived at it only after taking every reasonable measure to assist the present company. Government is confident that the timing of this decision will allow for the potential reorganization of the company's assets prior to the start of the 1986 fishing season. For its part, government will assist in every reasonable way possible to make any transition as smooth as possible.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Port de

Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank the hon. minister for letting me know about the meeting that we had a short while ago concerning this.

I cannot say thank you for this shocking news of fish plants being closed down after a drastic failure in the inshore fishery and the consideration that has gone into trying to create some employment in the fishery with make-work programmes. We attend a meeting today and we get the devastating news that three fish plants are going to be completely turned down and neglected by this government, a government who a short while ago had a policy of all plants open. Now we find this Fall that in an area where the operation of those fish plants are the main source of employment and the main support for all business who are trying to stay viable, they will be closed. I find it very disturbing to bring back the news to people that this is the only solution that this government could come up with.

They had six months to come up with some sort of a programme, or a sale or whatever they saw fit to see that these three plants would stay open and at the end of six months we have absolutely no policy whatsoever. The only policy we have is we are going to allow the banks to put these three plants into receivership. Now that is a six month study and I think it is a total failure on the part of the present government to allow this to happen.

What they are saying in effect is that they have absolutely no idea and no control over those plants

and no control over the population or what the work force is going to be in the next several months in that area. They have no idea whatsoever how to handle or manage this problem. A six month study is a long time to study a situation. Yet, they have come up with absolutely nothing beyond stating how much money the Northern Development Association and how much money the Harvest Star owes. If the proper study had went into this in six months they would have been able to come up today with the sale of this plant or a way in which the plant could stay viably open.

We are now under the impression that six months ago the only reason that they kept this going was because there was an election on. It was just to gain a few votes in the area. Mr. Speaker, the situation here is the government has come out today and made a statement and painted this as gloomy as it is and yet, on the other hand, say that in the next two or three months or the next several months we are going to get a sale for this plant. How can you get a sale for something that is painted like this?

Here they are saying that we are not going to put any money into the present operation, yet, if a new buyer comes along, then we are going to put money into it. That does not make sense. That is saying one thing on one hand and contradicting it on the other.

If that is what takes six months study then I do not have much respect for the people who spent six months studying to come up with an answer like that. We have a total of 1,500 people in full peak periods of operation and multiply that by 2.5 in the work

force and you are effecting over 3,000 people. That is a lot of people who were depending on the present government to, at least, take the time and the decency to come up with some better solution than this.

So all I can say about this, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that this government has totally failed in its job again, as in all other aspects of the fishing industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

One down, fifteen to go.

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Premier. In light of the decision of the Newfoundland Court of Appeal on the CFLCo case which has found against the government position that the Province should be entitled to 800 megawatts of power as requested from CFLCo, would the Premier indicate to what extent this will require a change in the government's strategy with respect to providing for the future power needs of this Province and with respect to ensuring that there is a proper resolution to the Upper Churchill contract?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, because this

was a decision out of the Appeal Division of the Supreme Court, we had had an earlier decision out of a lower court, so obviously we have not had all our eggs in the one basket. We have been in touch over the last number of months with both the Government of Canada and the Government of Quebec and we are pursuing initiatives with these governments. Unfortunately certain political events have intervened, particularly the election in Quebec, but we are pursuing a number of avenues with both the Government of Canada and the Government of Quebec. As soon as the election period is over in Quebec we will be continuing to pursue those initiatives. Obviously, at this point in time, I am not at liberty to say any more than that about it. But in anticipation that the Appeal Division would find in the same way as the Lower Court found, we initiated several months ago a number of initiatives to try to ensure that our strategy for additional hydro developments in the Province would be secured by other means in the event that the decision came out as it did. So I think we were right in that kind of anticipation and we are now engaged in various initiatives with both the governments mentioned.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

First of all I am not sure if the Premier indicated whether or not there would be an appeal filed to the Supreme Court of Canada. It may be too early to have a decision on that. Could the

1
Premier indicate whether it is intended to continue this process by an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada? Also, would the Premier indicate whether he is aware that in recent days Mr. Pierre Marc Johnson of the Parti Quebecois has indicated that he is not as excited as is Mr. Bourassa by the hydro potential of either Quebec or, presumably, Labrador as part of a strategy for exporting electricity to the United States or elsewhere? I wonder if, in light of this, whether the Premier has been able to assess the respective policies of Mr. Johnson and Mr. Bourassa and indicate which policies would be better for this Province and of more advantage to the people of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I read the statements by Mr. Johnson early this morning and what Mr. Johnson was saying, within the context of the election campaign, is that all Mr. Bourassa has for the economic development of Quebec is hydro power and what Mr. Johnson is saying is 'I have hydro power plus agriculture, plus forestry, plus mines' and so on.' So I do not think it is fair to characterize the policy of Mr. Johnson to be one against doing other things in hydro development and Mr. Bourassa as all for it. As I read what Mr. Johnson is saying is that 'We must have many strings in our bow as a Government of Quebec in order to fully develop all of Quebec.' That includes hydro and many other things in the same way as it does for most provinces of Canada. But if I had to clearly and bottom-line indicate an opinion, it would be very difficult for me

to do. However, I can state a number of facts.

Some time ago, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) asked me, 'Have you read certain paragraphs in Mr. Bourassa's book?' And 'Have you had communication with Mr. Bourassa?' All I can say is that over the last number of months I have read Mr. Bourassa's book a number of times, and several times I read the sections dealing with hydro power which impacts or is involved in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I have tried to but could not contact Mr. Bourassa. He had asked for a meeting but I have had no reply from him. In contrast, I have communicated with Mr. Johnson and he has replied. So I can only go on the facts which are that I have communicated with both and I have only heard from one, that is, Mr. Johnson.

MR. BARRY:

We will see what we can do about getting him to reply to the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, very good, Premier of Quebec.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister responsible for Energy and the Petroleum Directorate. Will the minister tell us if, in the last day or so, an offshore related supply company has gone bankrupt and most of the people losing their jobs as a result of that

bankruptcy are Newfoundlanders?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I am not fully aware of this. I understand there was a report this morning from CBC that one did go bankrupt and I am not in a position to refute it. It happens in the normal course of events, I suppose, that companies go bankrupt and people lose their jobs. But I can assure the hon. gentleman that even though that happens because a company is shaky, as a result of what we have been able to achieve through the Atlantic Accord and other means, I am quite sure there will be many other capable Newfoundland companies able to start up and take advantage of whatever advantages the bankrupt company could get and employ Newfoundlanders as well.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, we understand that the hon. Pat Carney is today making a statement in the House of Commons regarding the replacement for the PIP grant programme. And we hear very disturbing reports indicating significant reductions in the level of activity in the offshore. If you use 1985 figures, there are seven rigs now compared to five, twenty-one supply boats compared to six, and those are 1985 figures. They would be significantly worse if you compared them with 1983 or 1984.

I would ask the minister, does he feel that the reduction in activity is directly related to the announced withdrawal of the Petroleum Incentives Programme?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman talks about disturbing reports, but, from the way the Liberal Party operates, I would say there is hope in his heart that what he says is correct.

Now, there are reports from time to time with respect to drilling and the East Coast of Canada. The fact of the matter is that there is and there will be enhanced exploration off the Province of Newfoundland. Unfortunately, and I say, very unfortunately, in the Province of Nova Scotia there appears to be less because of the very fact that we have oil and they have gas.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And they have not found anything new.

MR. MARSHALL:

They have not found anything new. And, if you remember, the hon. gentlemen there opposite, when they were trying to push us into signing the Chretien agreement, were saying it was all going to Nova Scotia. Well, I am sorry to tell the hon. gentleman, it is all coming here now. I know he will be very disappointed.

With respect to the statement that the hon. minister is making, that statement will be made at 3:00 p.m., which I believe is about 4:30 p.m. Newfoundland time. The federal government which has been

over the past year a government which confers fully with the provinces. Despite what the hon. gentleman will say, and he will say the same thing before the statement as he will afterwards because he has been programmed, I think he will find it a very interesting, intellectual and rational treatment of energy policies in Canada. He will find a Minister of Energy (Mrs. Carney) who looks on energy as an engine of growth rather than an instrument of division in the country, and he will also find, as all fair-minded people if they care to reflect on it, that the country itself is in very stable hands, indeed, in the hands of the present Prime Minister of Canada and his ministry, most particularly the Minister of Energy and Resources who has been so sensitive to the needs of the people of this Province and has seen that the people of this Province has a right, as any other people in any other province, to be full Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

It is not wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the journalists and people living in other parts of Canada are wondering who is setting the Newfoundland oil policy and who is governing Newfoundland since Premier Lougheed retired. It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, when you listen to the kind of garbage we just heard from the minister.

With regard to the PIP grants, it is well known and it is creating a lot of concern in the industry in Newfoundland, that the PIP grants being replaced by a tax incentive will only be advantageous to the major multi-national companies, which make large profits, and will adversely affect the small, local-based companies. Has the minister made representation to Mrs. Carney or Mr. Mulroney to continue the PIP grants as opposed to a tax incentive programme, such as Nova Scotia has done, for instance? Has the minister recognized the adverse effects that doing away with the PIP grants is going to have on the Newfoundland offshore development and exploration? Has he recognized that and has he made that kind of representation to the Prime Minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

That is a real pip, is it not, Mr. Speaker? That is the real thing. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has the unmitigated gall to stand in this House and talk about adverse effects with respect to oil and offshore development in this Province.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, when he wanted us to sign the Nova Scotia deal.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman wanted us to give it off to Nova Scotia with a three and two.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Give it away. We were wrong, they said.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman wanted to give it up to Marc LaLonde and Jean Chretien, who was governing by the heart. Some heart he had: He wanted to disembowel us and take every bit of money away from us and give it out to us by way of welfare.

Now, the hon. gentleman will be a 'nay' sayer, and the hon. the jealous Tory will be a 'nay'sayer with respect to it. But let me tell the hon. gentleman that that policy will bring energy back as an instrument of growth in Canada, and Newfoundland, as a result of a government which is sensitive to the legitimate aims and aspirations of the people of this Province, will benefit by it rather than have the resources taken away from them, as they were taken away over the centuries by the British and by the Upper Canadians with whom the hon. gentleman was in league up to a little while ago.

I am not going to comment, Mr. Speaker, about what statement the minister is making. That is a statement that she will make, as she is entitled to, and have it received by fair-minded, rational, reasonable Canadians as the great policy it actually is.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the minister concur that the present federal energy policy makes investments in oil companies a lot

more attractive in Alberta than it does in the Newfoundland offshore? Does not Prime Minister Mulroney intense catering to the Western oil interest adversely and detrimentally affect the development of our offshore? Is this not evidence that the Tory Government in Ottawa is not listening to their counterparts here in Newfoundland? They are ignoring them and they are paving the way for Alberta to take advantage of everything that is going to happen in the oil business in the next few years.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
I would thank the hon. gentleman if he would not inundate me with Rexographs. Mr. Speaker, he is obviously reading his questions, they do not follow any pattern. He is not asking questions. He gets an answer, but he goes ahead and reads the next question coming up.

Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the hon. gentleman should understand that - can he get this through his head? - look for something in the hope and expectation of finding something. Now I do not think anyone goes around looking for anything unless there is an expectation of finding something. The hon. gentleman might because the hon. gentleman has been going around in circles for years.

So the net result of that, Mr. Speaker, is that if people are going to look for oil, they are going to go where they expect to

find oil. Now, they have a great deal of expectation of finding oil off the East Coast of the Province of Newfoundland, and that is in itself is going to be the biggest incentive for exploration for oil and gas in Canada. So, you know, that is the situation.

Now I know the hon. gentleman hopes we will not find oil. He hopes it will not be developed.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
They hope the whole of Hibernia will not be developed.

MR. MARSHALL:
They had hoped that gravity based platforms would not be used.

MR. BARRY:
What about the refinery?

MR. MARSHALL:
The hon. 'Leo' talks about the refinery!

In his own caucus he was saying, 'I cannot find anything wrong with the Atlantic Accord.' You know, he almost had another nervous breakdown, another break of stability.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
That is what he said in his caucus.

MR. MARSHALL:
His friend, Mr. Neary, said, 'But you got to,' so he came out with this about the refinery. Well, Mr. Speaker, we came out with a good agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, we have come with a

good agreement. In answer to the hon. gentleman, people will look for oil, Mr. Speaker, where the oil is and the oil is off our shores and, as a result of measures that we have taken, we are going to get the same rights to that as other Canadians would as if it had been located on land. And so we should because it is located on our own land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I will recognize the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans for a final supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT:
Would the minister tell us now, Mr. Speaker, and this is the 140th time that he has been asked - we know that we are going to use a gravity base system, that we are approaching development - so would the minister tell the House how much Mobil is going to have to get for a barrel of oil produced from Hibernia? Now we have asked him a hundred times and he has refused to give the answer. We have to know. Will the minister tell us how much it is going to cost to produce a barrel of oil from Hibernia?

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

MR. MARSHALL:
I hope Mobil gets a healthy price for the oil because the higher the price that Mobil gets, as a result of our actions the higher the royalty and the return to the people of the Province of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, could I have some order please?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member has asked for silence and I would like if you would give him that privilege.

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the members opposite heed your words.

I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle). In a public meeting in Seal Cove attended by about 200 witnesses the minister said that the decision to annex Seal Cove and Foxtrap was a collective decision over his objection and that if he had his way Seal Cove would be on its own. Now I would put to the minister that either this is a very serious breach of Cabinet secrecy or the minister lied to the people of Seal Cove. I would like to ask the minister which it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BAKER:
Did the minister relate -

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman in framing his question has said that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs either told the truth to the people or he lied. Now you cannot say indirectly what you cannot say directly. One of the things that an hon. member in this House cannot do is imply that another member is lying. Now I would ask the hon. member be asked to withdraw his question or to re-frame his question and apologize to the minister.

MR. BAKER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BAKER:

I appreciate the words spoken by the Government House Leader. I realize that I cannot say that an hon. member has lied to the House or has lied. However, I could perhaps remove the word lie and ask the minister instead, if I am allowed -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member is speaking to the point of order now.

MR. BAKER:

I will withdraw the specific word lie.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I accept

what the hon. the member says and I would ask him to direct his question to the hon. the minister.

MR. BAKER:

My question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) is, in talking to many residents of Seal Cove who attended that meeting, and in reading reports from the press people who were at that meeting, it was said that if the minister had his way Seal Cove would be on its own and the decision was a collective decision made over his objections. Now, first of all I ask the minister, ask did this in fact happen?.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I should thank the hon. gentleman for asking me the question because I have been dying to get the opportunity to stand up here in the House and address it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I can say categorically that I did not make that statement in Seal Cove. I explained that already to the press, the next day when I contacted the editor, Mr. Finlay, regarding that particular issue. There were two press people at the meeting that night and when I was asked if I supported having Seal Cove on its own, I stated, categorically, "no, I did not support that, I supported the Cabinet decision which my department recommended to Cabinet, and I will stand by that. If the hon. gentleman wishes any further explanation, what I said at that

meeting that night was made quite clear. I said, if I had my way, from a political point of view, it would be more politically palatable for me to have Seal Cove on its own. However, the decision was not made because of politics, it was made because it was a sound decision to make to have that community integrated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. DOYLE:

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman as well that it had been originally thought that there was only one press person at that meeting that night. I happened to get a call a couple of days after and I was informed that there was a second person there, from another newspaper in Conception Bay South, who indicated to me that she would be writing a letter to the effect that I did not make that statement, that I had been misquoted very, very unfairly. The next day, when I contacted the editor of The Evening Telegram, he saw fit on the following day to misquote me again, to misquote the misquote.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

It is rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, to listen to the minister's explanation. It reminds me of John Crosbie, who is quite adept at eating his own words while he has his foot in his mouth.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BAKER:

I have a supplementary question

for the minister, I have spoken to many people who were at that meeting and the impression given to the people at that meeting was not the impression that the minister obviously tried to give, and obviously he was practicing some kind of wizardry on the people out there, or mass hypnosis, so I would like to put it to the minister again. Is it not true that the minister was trying in a roundabout way to sell one bill of goods to the people in Seal Cove and another bill of goods at the Cabinet table?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, that is not true. Again I would like to state what my position was and what I told the residents of Seal Cove on that evening. In response to a question that they had asked me, if I would support Seal Cove being on its own, I stated from a political point of view it would be better for me to have Seal Cove on its own. And the reporter wished to misquote me and she said that I had stated it would be better to have Seal Cove on its own. I made the recommendation to the Cabinet of this Province, through my department, to have Seal Cove become a part of Conception Bay South. That was a recommendation that had been made to the department by an independent Commissioner who did a study on whether or not that area should become part of CBS. Again I will state exactly what I stated at the meeting, that I support that decision totally and I was a part of that decision. I made my position quite clear the next day in a letter which I wrote to the editor stating that again.

Now if the reporter who reported on that story wishes to misquote me, that is her privilege. There is nothing I can do about it except to make my position perfectly clear, again, and that is that I support the decision totally and was very much a part of it.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
After the minister wrote his letter to the editor there was also a letter to the editor in response from somebody who was at the meeting and is now working with a citizens group in that area. I would like to ask the minister how is it then that these people, particularly the people in Seal Cove who voted 97 per cent to not join Conception Bay South, how is it that these people at that meeting did not hear the minister say that he was in favour of Seal Cove becoming part of Conception Bay South? How come these individuals from Seal Cove, 200 of them, did not hear the minister's say that? Was he speaking too low for them to hear?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, I can say that the people of Seal Cove did hear me say that, and quite a number of people who were at that meeting were absolutely appalled, because some of them contacted me the next day, at the press coverage of that meeting and indicated to me that I had been misquoted. The other

individual, from the **Skipper** newspaper, was also at that meeting and called me the next day to say as well that I had been mistreated by the press and has been misquoted on a couple of different occasions in the same article. I will take this opportunity to say again what I said at that meeting. When asked if I supported having Seal Cove on its own, I said, 'If I had my way, from a pure political point of view, Seal Cove would be on its own.' And I went on to say that the decision was not made based upon politics but based upon the Commissioner's report which recommended that Seal Cove become a part of Conception Bay South, which I recommended to the Cabinet of this Province and which they went along with.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) and it concerns the minister's effectiveness at the Cabinet table. Englee, Mr. Speaker, is one of the oldest incorporated small towns in the Province of Newfoundland. The Premier is aware of that because at one time he served there as a welfare officer. This town, as the Premier can attest to, has been very responsible and looked after its own affairs since 1948 when it became incorporated. For the past six years Englee has been applying to the Department of Municipal Affairs for capital funding to pave their roads, they have been looking for the 60/40 funding.

Last Spring the hon. minister told me that he would recommend to the Cabinet that capital funding for Englee be approved. I have no reason, Mr. Speaker, to doubt that the minister recommended that funding would be approved for Englee. He is an honourable minister and I have no doubt whatsoever that he kept his word.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Would the hon. member please pose his question?

MR. DECKER:
I will get to my question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the minister was overruled, or appears to be overruled by the Cabinet in the Seal Cove case, and in view of the fact that the minister was definitely overruled in the Englee case - let him repute it; he recommended it as he told me he would so obviously he must have been overruled - it is obvious that the minister is no longer effective at the Cabinet table. Can the minister get up in this hon. House today and assure all the municipalities of Newfoundland, including Englee, that he indeed is effective at the Cabinet table? And can he guarantee that the interest of municipalities in this Province will continue to be protected or do we have a rubber stamp instead of a Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, with regard to the

hon. gentleman's request regarding Englee, I indicated to him the same thing I indicated to every member of the Opposition and every member on this side of the House, that I would take the \$175 million worth of requests that came from the various municipalities around this Province to my colleagues in Cabinet who would be making decisions on those requests. I have done that and we were able to approve approximately \$35 to \$40 million out of that \$175 million of requests for a capital programme. We will again take the hon. gentleman's request next year and hopefully funding can be made available in light of the available funds that we will have.

As to my effectiveness around the Cabinet table -

MR. SIMMS:
We will let you know.

MR. DOYLE:
Yes I am sure I will be told when I am not affected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
In connection with the comment just made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, will he now - and I have asked for this a number of times and I have written letters to him and in a Committee meeting in the first part of this session he promised he would provide the information - release the public information as to which communities were funded on the

60/40 programme and the amounts given to each of the communities that were funded under the 60/40 programme? Because I have repeatedly requested this public information from the minister and he has absolutely refused to provide it, I wonder what he is trying to hide? Will the minister now give us this information?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to hon. gentlemen opposite in letters that I have written to them in response to requests regarding where the capital monies have been spent that I would make available to any member on the opposite side as to what monies have been approved for his district. It is very difficult, sometimes, to come up with entire lists. For instance, the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) the week before last wrote me looking for a list of what communities over the last five year period have had capital projects approved. It is very difficult sometimes, Mr. Speaker, to come up with that information at a moment's notice.

I have indicated the capital programme has been announced in *The Evening Telegram* on a couple of different occasions, the entire capital programme including 60/40 road programmes and water and sewer programmes. When the budget came down, an itemized list was printed in *The Evening Telegram*. If the hon. gentleman would avail of the newspaper he can find out where the money was spent.

Also, on a weekly basis it is published in the newspaper with respect to the calling of public

tenders. However, I have absolutely nothing to hide with respect to the amount of monies that were made available this year to Liberal districts.

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. BAKER:

I would like to, on a point of order, refer to something the minister just said. He referred to his replies to my written requests. I have received no replies to my written requests and I do not want it on the record that I have received replies. I have received no replies. The minister is not answering the question. Will he provide me with this public information? He is not answering the question, Mr. Speaker, and I would like him to get to the point. Will he table tomorrow in this House a list of the projects?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

Notices of Motion

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce the following resolution:

WHEREAS National Sea Products Limited has applied for a licence to the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans to use a factory freezer trawler; and

WHEREAS this application does not involve just one such trawler but others in the near future; and

WHEREAS these factory trawlers involve accessing the Northern cod off Newfoundland and Labrador; and

WHEREAS this means over a time greater effort against the Northern cod stock and therefore more fish taken from Newfoundland; and

WHEREAS the Northern cod stock is needed in Newfoundland, the nearest land to this resource, to make many of our fishermen and fish plants, which are uneconomic, a viable business; and

WHEREAS there are 30,000 metric tons of Northern cod stock now being landed in Eastern Canadian ports outside Newfoundland; and

WHEREAS Canada should take more effective measures to terminate overfishing by foreign vessels within the 200 mile limit and undertake to extend the jurisdiction to include the entire Continental Shelf, including the Flemish Cap; and

WHEREAS a provision in the 1983 Federal - Provincial Restructuring Agreement specifically prohibits factory freezer trawlers being used to harvest Northern cod; and

WHEREAS the use of factory freezer

trawlers has more to do with distance than quality or economics, both of which are highly questionable:

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this hon. House go on record in opposition to the application by National Sea Products Limited and that this hon. House communicate to the federal minister its opposition to this application.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder would the hon. members like to postpone their petitions until tomorrow because we have to call Private Members' Day in five minutes time. If the hon. members proceeded, I will have to interrupt him in five minutes.

MR. GILBERT:

That is fine, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:

I know you will but I do not wish to delay the introduction of my petition.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

My point of order is simply that obviously the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) and the Leader of the NDP Party understands that it is now six minutes to four -

MR. FENWICK:

I understand that.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- and that he has five minutes to speak to the petition. At four o'clock, we have to go into Private Members' Day, so nobody on the Opposition side of the Liberal Opposition or of the government side will have an opportunity to respond. He will be the only one who will have a chance to say anything on the petition today and I think that is extremely unfair.

MR. BARRY:

Unless you do it by leave.

MR. FENWICK:

Well, exactly, I would love to do it by leave but I would ask therefore, if the member for Menihek would agree, that we go from now, five to four, to five after four so that somebody, other than just the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), has a chance to talk on the petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, without giving up my right to present it, even if we do not extend it to five after four, I agree that, if that is acceptable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Do I understand clearly the hon. member will speak for five minutes and a member on the opposite side will -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, could we have one member from the Liberal Opposition and one member from this side? So therefore we will go to ten after

four?

MR. FENWICK:

That is acceptable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, I know, but I am just saying, because we are now doing it by unanimous consent, none of the rules apply and we are making the rules now. Therefore, it is five for the Liberal Opposition and five for us and five for the member for Menihek.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

In that case we will go on until ten minutes past four.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is probably appropriate because the petition comes from Nain and the Private Members' Day is also on behalf of the member for Nain, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

The petition is quite long. I will read you the wherefore.

"Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitions, humbly pray and call upon the House of Assembly to use its best efforts to convince the Government of Canada to reinstate fully indexation of universal family allowance and to rescind the unfair tax increases."

Mr. Speaker, that petition is signed by 51 individuals from Nain and I will pass it over to you.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know in last Spring's budget in the

federal government a number of programmes were undermined, one of them being the Old Age Pension, another one being the family allowance payments that were made to families.

Mr. Speaker, it is a position of my party and I think it may be a position of the other parties as well in this House, although I would be interested to hear their reaction to it, that that is the wrong people to attack, that it is inappropriate to attack children and to attack mothers, which is essentially what we are doing when we are allowing the deindexation of family allowance payments. It is a particularly insidious thing at a time when additional taxes have been levied by that particular budget in a whole bunch of other areas, such as hidden sales tax increases on things such as pharmaceuticals, on drugs, on shampoo, on soap, and a whole bunch of things like that.

Unfortunately, in the House of Commons now they will be debating the legislation which will enable this de-indexing to occur, and I think it would be very appropriate if this House would put itself on record - all three parties present - to indicate that we oppose this kind of a cutback, especially since we have rather slightly larger than average families in our Province and it would be a proportionately larger loss to the people of our Province.

Mr. Speaker, I endorse the petition and I look forward to endorsements from both other parties. And I give you two extra minutes.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

As Opposition spokesman on Social Services, I want to stand in my place and support the prayer of that petition, and support the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) in his efforts to try and convince the good people in Ottawa to do the same as they did when they planned to de-index the old age pensions. They made an about-turn and, of course, reneged on that ill-fated effort, and we hope that the same thing happens with respect to the federal government's efforts in trying to de-index the family allowance.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition I cannot help but wonder and believe that perhaps rather than the federal government taking the negative road of trying to take away the family allowance from families who are in dire need, large, large numbers of people across this country because of a lack of employment - for the parents, in many respects, the family allowance is something that feeds some of these families - I cannot help but wonder if, rather than doing the negative things that the government has been up to, in Ottawa, they should be doing positive things like, for example, instituting a guaranteed annual income.

Yesterday, actually, Mr. Speaker, we saw \$9.5 million being pushed at this Province to give people some employment. The fishermen and plant workers who did not qualify for enough UIC contributions this Summer, they will be getting less on UIC this Winter than they would if they were on welfare. Of course, we are not socialists in the Liberal

Party, Mr. Speaker, but successive Liberal Governments have brought many, many social reforms to Canada over the years.

The leader of the Fishermen's Union is on record as saying that the best thing that could be done for these fishermen and plant workers would be to average out the last three years income and then let these people have that. These are the sorts of things that our friends in Ottawa should be doing, rather than involving themselves in negative programmes. The \$9.5 million announced yesterday will prove to be a negative programme for this Province, Mr. Speaker. The make-work programmes announced earlier, a month or so ago, are negative programmes as far as this Province is concerned. They cannot work in rural Newfoundland. They may work in St. John's South -

DR. COLLINS:

But you are against them.

MR. CALLAN:

- and they may work in Toronto, and out in Calgary, but they do not work in rural Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we on this side, the Liberal Party, support any efforts to try and convince the federal government to change their minds on de-indexing the family allowance.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few

words on this petition now that I have had a chance to view it. Probably I should first compliment the member for Menihek. I understand he has been sending letters around to various communities throughout Newfoundland and Labrador trying to get some petitions to present in the House. I notice that he does have here fifty-one names from a voting population of 434, in the community of Nain, and it does at least show some concern. Also, looking at some of the names that are on the petition, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note, in fact, of the first fourteen there, seven of those are old age pensioners which I am sure, Mr. Speaker, these are the same people that the federal government have just reversed their decision on and are not de-indexing the old age pension on.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember at the same time that this petition is coming from probably one of the poorer towns of this Province, one of the towns with the lowest incomes in this Province. What the federal government is doing that the member should realize and what all members should realize is that if there is going to be any changes whatsoever in the Family Allowance Indexing is going to be for the benefit of the poorer people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, this is what is so very, very important, if any de-indexing is going to take place, it is going to be beneficial to the people of Nain, because the people of Nain are on the lower scale of the income bracket.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, unfortunately, until I know more about the indexing that is going to affect the family allowance in this country, and if it is going to help the poorer class, and have the rich people pay for it, then, Mr. Speaker, I am for it. That is the way I work as an elected member for the district of Torngat Mountains. I think for sometime yet I will get re-elected.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for any programme that will help the lower class society in our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

This is Private Members' Day and I now call on Motion No. 10.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great opportunity to speak on this resolution. With the indulgence of all hon. members on both sides of the House, if it is okay, that I will be quite willing to clue up the resolution at the end of today's proceeding or we can continue next week, whichever the members desire.

However, Mr. Speaker, I will not read the resolution, but I would also like to suggest to all members of the House that the last five words of the resolution be deleted, if it is okay with all

members of the House. I think, probably, we can end with the last phrase 'such benefit until first earnings.' I will speak on that resolution, if it is okay with all members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, if I came into the House today and brought forth a resolution with just very basic and sad, I move -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would like to remind the hon. member that he cannot amend his motion unless there is the unanimous consent of the House. So does the hon. member have that consent? Do I understand the hon. member does want to amend his motion?

MR. WARREN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied to delete the last six words of the resolution. The end of the resolution would be the word 'earnings'. I think it would be much more simplified because in Newfoundland and Labrador we do have two different fishery seasons and it would only be confusing for everybody.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is not unanimous consent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

There are no 'nayas'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed. Agreed.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, do I have consent or not?

MR. SPEAKER:

The position is that the hon. member cannot amend his motion without the unanimous consent of the House. I cannot see that he has got unanimous consent at the present time.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, there have been no 'nays', have there?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed! Agreed!

MR. SPEAKER:

Put the motion.

Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Nay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed. Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

No, there is not unanimous consent.

MR. WARREN:

What is that?

AN HON. MEMBER:

There are no 'nays'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Carried. Carried.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I will say that if there are no 'nays', Mr. Speaker, it has to be unanimous.

Anyway, I will continue Mr. Speaker. If I came in today and brought in a very straight forward simple resolution and said that there should not be any UIC for any fishermen in Newfoundland and

Labrador, if I brought that kind of a resolution into this House, I bet there would not be one member who would support me in that resolution. I do think there would be one member. Likewise, Mr. Speaker, I do not think they should support me in that kind of a resolution.

But, Mr. Speaker, what has happened and the reason why I am bringing in this resolution is under our present system, it is useless to have a UIC regulation for fishermen if it does not treat all fishermen equally. That is why this resolution is being brought in today. All fisherman in Newfoundland and Labrador are not treated equally.

Mr. Speaker, I was elected on June 18, 1979 and I want to go through chronologically what has happened with my attempts with officials in Ottawa since then.

My first letter went out to the hon. Ronald Atkey, he was the new minister of Mr. Clark's government on July 3, 1979. That was the first letter that I wrote to a federal politician from a new member in the Newfoundland legislation. Mr. Speaker, I requested at that time some of the concerns that were expressed by fishermen living in my district and in other areas of Labrador.

Basically, there were two things. One referred to changes made in December, 1978 to the UIC regulations that required anybody in the work force to have twenty weeks of insurable earnings. That is impossible to be done north of Cape Harrison. Secondly, I suggested that the UIC regulations should be in line with their labour force or fishermen and the labour force should be equal. Mr.

Atkey wrote me back with a poor response.

Subsequently, the next letter I wrote was to the hon. federal member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador, the hon. William Rompkey and I asked him for support for the people in my district which also included his district. I received a letter back from Mr. Rompkey on August 30, 1979, and I will read quotations from that letter: He said, "I understand that, in fact, there is no exemptions for the Labrador Coast." He realized there were no exemptions and he goes on to say - I would like to read this for the record, Mr. Speaker - his last paragraph goes like this, "I certainly think this is a serious matter and one that we have to fight as hard as we can. I hope you will join me in this effort and I look forward to discussing it with you." In joining him with the effort when, in fact, I started the effort going in the first place. He came back and asked if I would help him with the effort. Sure I would help him with the effort.

But Mr. Speaker, we must realize too that shortly thereafter when the governments changed, Mr. Rompkey got in the position of being Minister of National Revenue and, Mr. Speaker, I could not support the Minister of National Revenue at that time on what was being done to the fishermen of Newfoundland and Labrador. I think history speaks for itself in what has been done by the tax audits of all the fishermen in Labrador while Mr. Rompkey was Minister of National Revenue. Naturally, I could not join forces and support him in these kinds of actions. Subsequently on May 3, 1980 the Fishermen's Committee

wrote to Mr. Rompkey and wrote to me concerning the same thing.

I wrote to Mr. Lloyd Axworthy, the Minister of Employment and Immigration. I again explained to him the seriousness of the UIC regulations as pertained to the Labrador Coast. I said, "With the above in mind, I hereby present to you suggestions as received from constituents. Number one, consideration should be given to reducing the number of UIC contributions required for fishermen from twenty to twelve for new entrants. Number two, consideration should be given to extended benefits over a longer period of time at least until June 15, whereas now it ceases on May 15."

Now, Mr. Speaker, it comes to the mentality of Central Canada towards Coastal areas of Canada. Here it comes, Mr. Speaker, with the reply or the answer from Mr. Axworthy on July 30, 1980. He thanked me for the letter. He said, "While it may seem unfair that first-time fishermen must work for twenty weeks in order to qualify for benefits, I would point out to you that this requirement applies to all new entrants into the labour force." Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am sure it does but I am sure it is much easier for a person to get a job in St. John's or in Toronto or in Ottawa or Winnipeg than it is for somebody in Davis Inlet or Nain. Mr. Speaker, that was the hon. minister at the time, Mr. Lloyd Axworthy.

He goes on to say, "I will clarify that the mid-May cutoff date for fishing benefits results from the fact that in most of the Maritimes and British Columbia the fishing season is well under the way by

that time." So, he said look, if it is good enough for some places in the Maritimes, if it is good enough for B.C., then it has to be good enough for Torngat Mountains, which is ice bound for ten months of the year.

Mr. Speaker, he goes on to say, "Your comments are taken into consideration. However, there is nothing I can do for you." Now, what happened after that? The Torngat Fisheries Co-op wrote to Mr. Rompkey with a carbon copy to me in February, 1981. They explained then to the minister, who was in the government at the time, something that could be done. Again he says, the fishermen do not make any money at all from May 15, when they receive their last unemployment insurance cheque, until the middle of July.

Mr. Speaker, before I go through the rest of my correspondence, I want to reiterate and tell the hon. House - I have said it time and time again but just to let you know - how unfair the UIC regulations have been treating my constituents. This past Spring, and last year the same way, there is a special programme allotted for fishermen throughout different areas of Newfoundland and Labrador who could not catch lobster or catch salmon or catch cod fish because there was ice in the bay. I think we all realize that there was a special assistance programme. The programme came out and included any fishermen in Newfoundland and up in Labrador as far as Cape Harrison. For those hon. members who are ignorant to the Coast of Labrador Cape Harrigan is about 100 miles north of Goose Bay. Now, this programme included all fishermen South of Cape Harrison, but not North of Cape Harrison. So what do we

have? We have fishermen in the hon. member for Carbonear's (Mr. Peach) district, we have fishermen from the hon. member for Fogo's (Mr. Tulk) district, from the Premier's district, from the member for the Strait of Belle Isle's (Mr. Decker) district, I think at least nine different districts who have fishermen fishing North of Cape Harrison. Those fishermen were fishing North of Cape Harrison. Now what happened? When the fishing season is over, they came back home. And when this special programme came into effect, because they are living in those bays and there is ice in those bays, they qualified for the special assistance. But the fishermen who they fish within Makkovik, because they were North of Cape Harrison, did not qualify because they lived North of Cape Harrison.

Mr. Speaker, this is complete discrimination and a violation of human rights. So, subsequently, I wrote a letter to the Human Rights Commission of Canada, I have wrote them and asked them to check out and see was there an infringement on the human rights of the individuals. And they wrote me back, which I think Human Rights Commissions in this country and in this Province, I have my second thoughts about them, however, they wrote me back and said they do not dictate where a person lives. That was their answer. They said they do not dictate where a person lives. I agree they do not dictate where a person lives, but if a person from one town can go into another town and leave that town and then qualify for assistance and the fisherman who stays there all his life cannot qualify then, Mr. Speaker, I think that someone else needs to examine the Human Rights people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Labrador Resources Advisory Council also wrote to the hon. Lloyd Axworthy with recommendations on how to change the system for Labrador. But, no, Mr. Speaker, the same thing came back, we could not do anything about it. Mr. Axworthy said there was an Insurance Review Task Force that was going to check out all the areas of the country and see what kind of recommendations would be brought in. That was on September 16, 1981. I have not, as of today's date, received any correspondence saying that things would change.

On July 5, 1984, I wrote to the hon. John Roberts at the time who then was the new Minister of Employment and Immigration. At the time I congratulated him and it was a pleasure working on his election campaign for Prime Minister and so on.

MR. TOBIN:

You supported John Roberts?

MR. WARREN:

Yes, I supported John Roberts at the time and in fact I wrote him a nice little letter and said, "Look, here are some of my concerns I hope you will address."

MR. TOBIN:

Anyone else over there?

MR. WARREN:

I do not know if there was or not. Some fellows stayed on the fence for some while you know.

MR. TOBIN:

Did 'Hodder' support him?

MR. WARREN:

No, I think the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) went with Mr. Turner for some reason. However, do not distract me from

my thoughts.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

However, Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) was then on this side of her.

Mr. Speaker, the Combined Councils of Labrador on May 11, 1985, wrote to Flora MacDonald. They asked Ms. MacDonald, "Look, we are running into a problem on the Labrador Coast, our fishermen are not treated fairly, can you help us?"

I sent a telegram on May 16 to Ms MacDonald, the Minister of Fisheries' predecessor, Mr. Goudie, wrote to Ms MacDonald and on May 13 she responded to the hon. present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and she said, "I most certainly share your concern for the fishers in the Northern Labrador region who experience a shorter fishing season." We realize that these benefit periods do not coincide exactly with the non-fishing period of all fishers. However, they have been established to accommodate the majority of fishers across the country. Mr. Speaker, I do not give a damn about the fishers across the country. I am concerned about the fishers in my district and that they be treated equally. All I am asking in this resolution is that they be treated equally.

Mr. Speaker, I think if you are working, whether it be fishing, in a lumber yard, or at in any other field, if you have a UIC regulation, let us have it all the same or none at all. I would just as soon come into this House, Mr.

Speaker, and vote against the resolution for fishermen completely if you are not going to treat them all the same. I think we have seen in this Province, in Northern Newfoundland, in the White Bay area, and even as far down South as Fogo, fishermen cannot fish on May 15, it is impossible, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, there has to be amendments made to the UIC regulations to benefit all those fishermen.

Where do we go from here, Mr. Speaker? I think the resolution says where we go from here. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) has indicated that this resolution should be addressed and I think members on this side of the Legislature believe that this resolution should be addressed in a most positive manner. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, all members on this side of the House, on both sides of the House, can get behind this resolution and get this House to send a telegram with unanimous support to Flora MacDonald, to Sinclair Stevens, to John Crosbie, to Jim McGrath, and to the rest of the federal cabinet telling them that we are presently being discriminated against in this Province and it is high time that the people that make the decisions in Ottawa, the Central Canadians, who have a certain mentality, not having seen salt water, will wake up and realize that there are human beings living in this Province, human beings that need action by those that make the decisions. By bringing in an amendment to the UIC regulations, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, it would be good for those people and it would be good for any government.

With those few remarks, Mr.

Speaker, I thank you.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution I would refer hon. members opposite to the Liberal Caucus Committee Report on the Inshore Fishery. It addresses the question quite well.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:
I do not have a bible like the Liberal Party has so I can just get up and quote a few verses from it, like the member just did.

Certainly the resolution is a very serious and a very important one and the issue itself, as it relates to the inshore fishery in Newfoundland, in particular, is a very, very serious matter. Anybody who represents any part of an inshore fishing district in Newfoundland knows that, as the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) outlined in his resolution and in his comments, that the problems that relate to it just have to be changed.

There is no way in the world that we can have our unemployment insurance system not really react in a very meaningful way to a very, very large group of people who, I suppose, in a very substantial way contribute more to Newfoundland than any other given group. If you do not have

fishermen in this Province, the persons who make a primary resource, who produce a primary product, then you do not have any wealth. You take the fishermen, the farmers, the miners and the foresters out of our Province, then all the rest of us basically live on the wealth that those primary producers produce for us. The largest single producer of primary new wealth in this Province is our fishermen group. They are more important than any other one single economic group in Newfoundland and Labrador.

We have identified yesterday in a make-works programme of \$9.5 million responded to a very serious inshore fishery this year, \$9.5 million yesterday just for fishermen and plant workers in response to a crisis situation, not to mention the \$35 million that we have put in place for other workers in the Province and also for fishermen and fish plant workers, if they chose to apply. Also the \$2 million that we put in place this year for Summer students and a lot of that \$2 million programme went to the sons and daughters of fishermen and fish plant workers around many parts of rural Newfoundland. Over the last little while we have spent, I guess, as a Province \$7.5 million on job creation and if you combine that with the \$40 million odd that the federal government has put in, over the last seven or eight months we have done an awful lot, both levels of government, to try and create employment for persons who are in somewhat dire circumstances because of conditions that are beyond anyones control, such as whether fish comes to shore or not.

In our discussions with Mr. Cashin, Mr. Crosbie and Flora

MacDonald, we discussed certain different options to the unemployment insurance system. The unemployment insurance system is certainly that, it is an insurance scheme that you can contribute to, depending upon your level of earnings, and your amount of contribution and your level of earnings will determine your benefits. Unfortunately, it works the opposite way, too. If you have very limited earnings, you pay in a limited amount and you take out a limited amount.

In the case of Newfoundland fishermen, we discussed with Flora MacDonald the possibility of some other option to guarantee fishermen some stability in their income levels. Whether that would be a guaranteed income, whether it would be a new system of UIC, whether, as I said, it would be some kind of format where you would be guaranteed a wage, irregardless of whether the fish came in or not, is yet to be decided.

There is a Royal Commission that Ms. MacDonald has appointed which has a date of March 31 on which it has to report back to the House of Commons. That commission, the Fourgette Commission, is looking at alternate ways to use UI or a programme such as UI to accommodate the real needs of fishermen. One of the most crying needs of fishermen is the fact that in the UIC system they are not treated exactly the same as other workers. For some reason when the system was developed, you had fishermen being treated differently from anyone else.

In our case, Mr. Speaker, we have always said if you were going to treat fishermen differently, then it must be different in a positive

way, not in a negative way. And certainly, when you have UI fishermen cut off early in May when they have not earned any money - in the district I represent, where you have twenty or so inshore fishing communities, when a fisherman has his UIC cut off on May 15 and does not receive any earnings, possibly until the last of June, possibly until July, when the trap fish actually comes to shore - not all fishermen have salmon licences, not all fishermen have lobster or caplin licences - therefore, you have a very large gap in time when these primary producers, the persons who produce most of the wealth that keeps the rest of Newfoundland going, are at a real hardship level. They cannot draw UI, through no fault of their own, they do not have any fish earnings, and that system is certainly unfair.

The same thing happens late in the Fall. When you have your UI requirement satisfied and you have your ten or twelve or fourteen weeks, or whatever the situation might be from time to time, but you have satisfied those conditions, you have your ten weeks satisfied, as the conditions are now, and suddenly, in September or October, the fish stop coming and you do not have any income, how do you buy groceries at the end of the week? How do you get your kids ready for school? How do you do that when you simply have no other source of income because the UIC system treats you differently and says that if you were in the construction trade, if you were a clerk in a store, if you were in any other occupation - oftentimes not as important an occupation because you are not producing any real, new wealth for the Province - then you could get your UIC

benefits after waiting two weeks, but you cannot do it as a fisherman. Mr. Speaker, that system is just absolutely unfair to the fishermen in this Province and it has to change.

Hopefully, the lobbying that we do will help and certainly I hope that this resolution will be passed unanimously by the House of Assembly here today. If it does, it will certainly become part of a submission which this government will make to the Fourgette Commission to make sure that these kinds of changes are implemented in the new UI programme that may be there, whether it is guaranteed income or whatever.

I know that the Fishermen's Union is preparing a submission to this commission for Ms MacDonald's and the federal Cabinet's consideration in the House of Commons, I guess, eventually. The Newfoundland Fisherman, Food and Allied Workers Union are very, very supportive, recommending this kind of change, so that a fisherman can be treated exactly the same as all other workers in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up a lot of time, but I just want to say, as the minister responsible for job creation programmes in this Province, and as a member who represents a fishing district, these kinds of changes just have to be made.

I congratulate the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) for having the insight to bring in this kind of resolution and, hopefully, by passing the resolution through this House of Assembly, it will have some effect on the commission's report to the federal government and hopefully,

the federal government's ultimate decision to change this process, which is unfair to the most important primary new wealth producers in this Province.

Thank you.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, I refer members opposite to the Liberal Caucus Committee Report on the Inshore Fishery. What needs to be said on this matter was said by fishermen through us in this report.

MR. PEACH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PEACH:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is surprising, Mr. Speaker, to see such an important resolution as this put forward by my colleague and then to hear the members of party opposite. They are supposed to have gone all around this Province this Summer, concerned with the plight of the fishermen and publically, through the media, attempting to express their concerns. Yet, none on them are prepared to get up and support this resolution which affects fishermen not only in the Labrador area, but, as is said in the fourth part of the resolution, does affect fisherman living in many areas of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I do have some concerns about this resolution. However, I am sure if we look at

the resolution in its entirety, we can see that the member who put this motion forth has in it the overall intent of making UIC benefits equal for fishermen in the same way that there are equal for other workers in the Province. With that particular overall intent, I can very easily say that I do support wholeheartedly this resolution.

I guess there is probably no other time in our fishery that is any more appropriate for such a resolution as this as this year. We realize that we did have in many parts of our Province a failure in the inshore fishery however, there were many parts of our Province where the fishery was good this summer. If I can take my district and break it down into parts, there were areas where the fishery was good but in other areas, a complete failure. There have been reasons put forth for failure of the fishery this summer but I do not want to have to repeat those because it is not pertaining to the resolution but it is a great concern. Over the past number of weeks I have been in close contact with my constituents, as I always am, and I have talked to many of the Fishermen's Committees in my district, I have talked to probably one hundred fishermen between Carbonear and Lower Island Cove, discussing some of the concerns they have had with what is going to happen come this early fall. We are know into the end of October and there are still some fishermen, but I might say very few in my district, who do not qualify for UIC Benefits. However, I guess it is fair to say at the same time we have to realize that many of the fishermen and fish plant workers in my district, although they qualify

for UIC, I guess we have to question what type of benefits they qualify for. Their earnings were relatively low and, therefore, their earnings over the winter through the UIC Benefits will be very low. There has been in some parts very little income from the caplin this year. We all realize in Conception and Trinity Bay that over the past number of years fishermen have relied heavily on that and this year was basically a failure.

Whenever we speak of fishermen we also have to include the fish plant workers which, in the majority of cases, happens to be women. I know from going around my district that many of the families who are relying on the fishery rely on two incomes, not only two incomes in the summer, Mr. Speaker, but also two incomes in the winter. The wives who draw their UIC Benefits are very dependent on that and it forms an integral part of their income. This year these people as well have very low UIC stamps and if it had not been for a day or so ago, federally and provincially, we were able to get a \$9,200,000 program in place to help the plight of many of those people, I am sure that they would have experienced many hardships this winter.

The dates and the times in the petition presented by the member for Torngat, I think, are the important parts of it as well because it was only this past Spring that fishermen had to have the time extended by a programme so that they would not have been cut off their benefits by May 15 because the season was very late starting and, as well, the ice conditions, in many parts of Trinity Bay, in particular, and

along the Northeast Coast, made it virtually impossible for our fishermen to get started. I guess we are all concerned at that time of the year. Fishermen are getting ready to go fishing but when their benefits run out. What do they do for some source of income? They still have to live and maintain a reasonable standard of life and to support their families with very little or no income.

I do not think there is any doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the May 15 deadline is not one that is appropriate to many parts of our Province. It is most years pretty close to impossible to get started fishing at that particular time.

Then, of course, this past couple of years the Fall fishery has been basically a failure. This year, I guess, we were probably somewhat lucky in Conception Bay and out in the Carbonear area in that the month of September was a relatively good month. The weather was good, very little wind, tides were good and many of the fishermen that I represent were fortunate enough to get three and four weeks in during the month of September. Although they had, I guess, a rather dismal outlook up until that point in time, I have found that most of them during the month of September did get enough fish and fair quantities of fish to qualify for UIC. So, from that point of view, Mr. Speaker, I think it is necessary that our fishermen and people working in the fishery, if the season is short - and I think the wording of that petition which indicates the end of the designated fishing season in the respective areas, I think that is a key point in the resolution - that when that particular time of

the year comes, I am sure there should not be any need for fishermen, any more than anyone else to have to wait until a certain date, November 15, to partake in UIC benefits. They should be treated as the other workers in construction and various other fields.

As for the special programmes that have been put in, particularly this year, for the beginning of the year, hopefully the fishermen and the fishermen's committees will put in their proposals under the jobs strategy programme and the special allocation to the fishery will enable the people who have very low unemployment stamps to get them increased so that their income during the Winter will be much greater.

Whenever we look at the fishery - and I am sure we all realize that this last number of years, in particular - we have looked at one particular part and that is at fishermen qualifying for UIC benefits. I sometimes, Mr. Speaker, have some very great concerns over that because it should be that our fishermen should not have to rely on UIC benefits but that the fishery would be so lucrative that they would make a very reasonable living.

I realize that somewhat a little off the intent of the resolution, but I have a very great concern, Mr. Speaker, that not only do we have people who do not qualify for UIC benefits or that they are low, but I think we have to be concerned with the fact that a shortage of fish has caused a great concern for the fish plant operators. That has an ongoing effect. We all do want our inshore fishery to be viable

beyond this present year. Many of our small independent plants around this Province have great market problems at the present time. Their market problems are such that, as a result of not having the product to put out into market, if they are to fulfil the commitments that they have made, pretty well all of the plants out in Conception Bay and Trinity Bay are very small, I guess, independent operators who seek their own markets.

I just take the one plant in the Carbonear district, that of Earles Fisheries. They have expressed to me over the past number of weeks a great concern that their markets next season will be in jeopardy because they cannot put the product into the market this present year. So I am sure that that is something that we should be very much aware of and very much concerned with.

I hope that within the next number of weeks that we will be successful in persuading our federal people to permit the catching of some of the quota that is out there that has not been caught, mainly because it has not come to shore this past Summer. Some of that quota can be taken and brought into our fish plants so that those small independent plants can meet their market commitments.

Mr. Speaker, I would want to go on record of supporting this resolution. I think we have to realize that all workers in our Province qualify for UIC benefits after ten weeks work. For the next number of weeks, I think, up to forty-four, as my colleague has indicated, if they cannot find suitable employment they can draw unemployment insurance.

This, Mr. Speaker, should - no question - be extended and afforded the fishermen and the fish plant workers in our Province as well. As I already said the November 15 deadline and the May 15 cutoff date is not at all adequate. Not only, as my colleague has said, is the Coast of Labrador needs to be treated fairly. Under the present regulations they are not treated fairly in this regard. Other areas of the Province and the area that I represent, the Carbonear district, is no exception.

I think all of us can single out our own districts and realize within our districts that there are problems even within the districts with regard to getting fish at certain times of the year. I can only cite one community in my district, Lower Island Cove which has had a reasonable amount of federal and provincial dollars put into it to upgrade their breakwater, their wharf, their stage and so on. Over the past years, granted, a lot of it came from the federal make-work programmes, but it has served a very worthwhile purpose.

But that particular community is one that, it is pretty well impossible at any given year to begin fishing before the middle of June. So, Mr. Speaker, what do those people do when their unemployment benefits are cutoff at the 15 of May?

At the same time, in that particular community of Lower Island Cove, it is pretty well most years impossible to continue fishing beyond the end of August. So we are talking another couple of months that they have to rely on whatever other sources of income they can find.

So I think it is very important, Mr. Speaker, that our fishermen in the Province be treated equally with other workers and that members opposite should stand up and applaud the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) for bringing in this resolution. They should get up and thank Ottawa and our provincial government for putting in place over the last couple of days this great make-work programme to fill in in the short term for the people who are in some dire straits.

It is all very well to say, Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Rompkey had said the other day after getting all of the praise that he received from Mr. Crosbie at the opening of our marine institute, the next morning he was on the air waves saying that this was a great programme but it was too late. Well, I can assure the members opposite that the fishermen in the Carbonear district are very happy to see this come in place and they do not consider it to be too late. In fact, if things stay on schedule and we get this in place and get some of the programmes approved, I understand in the next couple of days, that it will probably be the earliest time on record that those programmes ever got started. So I am sure that the members opposite when they get up to make some comments rather than again attempt to get up to present their brief or their document that they spent this Summer going around the Province and have made a number of attempts to -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) blueberry picking (inaudible).

MR. PEACH:

Yes, I think we all remember when Captain Morrissey Johnson ran in

Bonavista-Trinity-Conception and defeated the incumbent Liberal there at the time, that incumbent Liberal did indicate that he was going to go back to Lower Island Cove and go blueberry picking. So I do not know how successful he has been this past Summer. But, Mr. Speaker, those make-work programmes are very worthwhile and I am sure that they will fill a major gap in the fishing industry, considering that we have had such unfortunate circumstances prevail during this past Summer.

MR. HEARN:

How many blueberries does it take to make a quintal?

MR. PEACH:

I am not sure how many blueberries it would take to make a quintal, probably somebody could pass that along to me.

Mr. Speaker, I sort of got the feeling here that many of my colleagues are sort of itching to get up and are chomping at the bit. Some of them do not represent fishing districts but I am sure that they have the fishery at heart and they understand the problems quite well because it is a concern of all members on this side of the House that we do make sure that we protect one of our very valuable natural resources, that of the fishery.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can only again say that I support this petition in its entirety. I commend the member for Torngat for having the insight to bring it in and present it into this House and to have all of the Province at heart, not only the Labrador part that he represents. As he indicated I have many people in my district who go into the Labrador area to prosecute the Summer fishery. As

a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, Earles Fisheries operate out of three or four places on the Labrador Coast. They have taken over several plants there when some other people have moved out. It is a great concern of them as well since in the Spring of the year fishermen are coming to them trying to get assistance for supplies and so on before they go down to the Labrador Coast and take part in the fishery.

So I think, beyond doubt, this inadequacy should be changed and that our regulations concerning UIC benefits should be made on an equal basis to all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and not only to people who do not take part in the fishery.

So having said that, Mr. Speaker, I will now give leave or give way to somebody else to make some comments.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

May I have silence, Mr. Speaker, please!

Mr. Speaker, I have here a report on the inshore fishery written and presented by the Liberal Caucus Committee, and anything I will say in this debate is contained herein. I recommend it to the government. I would like to table this. I recommend it to the hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms

Verge), the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), and the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) for reading.

MR. MITCHELL:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening)
The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:
Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to be able to support the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) on this very important resolution, despite the omission of any debate from the members of the Opposition.

It is very ironic that they would stand in this House so often and complain about the situation in the fishery, and particularly about fishermen, yet today we have no input whatsoever from the gentlemen on the other side. They keep showing us a report which they commissioned this Summer and had done throughout the Province. For the information of members of the Opposition, I have read the report. I do not think that it is very hard for anybody in this Province to be able to list some of the problems with the fishery.

Since the beginning of time, and the beginning of the fishery in this Province, we have had problems. I think that anybody with a grain of common sense will admit to that. This report does point out some of the problems, but the ironic thing about it is it does not give solutions. Today we have a resolution before this House which does deal with a solution to a problem in the fishery and I find it actually embarrassing as a member of this hon. House not to have meaningful debate from members of the other

side.

I must say, for the benefit of my colleagues who probably did not get the report, that they did mention the fact that revision should take place as far as UIC regulations are concerned.

At a meeting in Summerford, the fishermen there told this committee that there should be a revision, that there should be something done as far as UIC is concerned. Yet today we see them sitting there and what are they doing about it?

MR. WARREN:
Nothing.

MR. MITCHELL:
We have a great resolution before this House and they are making a total mockery of our parliamentary system in this Province.

MR. WARREN:
Shame! Shame!

MR. MITCHELL:
I would like to go on record so that this House and this party can say that the Liberal Party have made a mockery of their own report and their own commission for which they went around this Province getting information. The pages are not numbered, but it says, in the case of demonstrated need, the revision or relaxation of all pertinent UIC regulations for the coming Fall and Winter. They do support it, so I am at a loss as to why they would not want to support this very important resolution today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. MITCHELL:
Well, it is not what we say as

politicians, it is what the people of the Province have to say, and I believe that the people of this Province would welcome this resolution to change the UIC Act in this Province.

When the UIC Act was brought into this Country it was a safety mechanism so that people who lost their employment had something to fall back on. It is a safety mechanism. I believe that, as has been noted by other members from this side of the House today in the debate, we have to treat all Canadians equally. I cannot, for the life of me, be able to stand here today and say that fishermen are any different from any other Canadians. I think, as far as the UIC regulations are concerned, that they should be treated equally. If a person's employment is terminated, his income is taken away, then that safety mechanism should be in place so that they can have an income to be able to support their families and to be able to pay their necessary bills in this country.

Now, there is a lot to be said for UIC. I think one of the big problems, when we talk about socialistic problems that affect our society, is how it effects our production. Sometimes I have had grave concerns about some of our social policies as Canadians. When we look at the UIC programme, we wonder how it will have an effect on the fishermen of this Province? Is it going to be a situation where they are going to rely on UIC and not on the fishery? Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that that is the case. I believe that the fishery in this Province and the fishermen and the fisherwomen have been very hard working people. If we look at the history of this Province I

do not think that there is anybody who has gone through more hardship to make a living than the fishermen.

I can probably relate a little bit to this in my own district because the district that I represent, which is on the Southwest Coast of Newfoundland, normally has a different traditional fishery than most other parts of Newfoundland. That fishery is a Winter fishery. I have seen those fishermen get up at three o'clock in the morning and battle the ice and frost and wind to go out in their small boats and to make a living at the fishery. They have suffered a lot of hardship. But I believe given the opportunity and given the right fair play in the fishery that they will make a living at the fishery. I think that the fishery can be very strong and very viable in this Province. That leaves another topic to probably be debated, as far as the fishery is concerned, down the road. I do have my own views on ways that the fishery could be improved.

As far as classifying different people in different categories as far as UIC is concerned I think it is drastically unfair. We had some examples of the member for Torngat Mountains just a little while ago who read letters of correspondence from the federal minister in Ottawa, the hon. Lloyd Axworthy at the time. He was quoted by him, saying, "Well, twenty weeks is quite satisfactory, you know, for other Canadians and across the Country so we cannot see why it is not satisfactory for the people in Torngat Mountains."

You know, one of the big problems that we have had, as a

bureaucracy, I suppose, is that when regulations are made sometimes those regulations are made by people who do not have a fair understanding of the geography and the nature of the situation on which they are making rulings on. When we look at the situation in the Northern Labrador area where you have a fishery that takes place June 15 and it ends in September, if anybody in their right mind can stand up here and tell me how that particular group in society, which is the fishermen in that area, could obtain twenty weeks in the fishery, it is beyond me to understand.

When we look at the fishery in Newfoundland it is very easy to see that there is quite a bit of diversity as far as the fishery is concerned. There are hardly two areas of Newfoundland that have the same type of fishery. I have often said that the fishery in Newfoundland is broken down into different types of fisheries. You have your inshore fishery, which is the cod trap fishery. It lasts just for a short period of time. Then you have the hook and line fishery, which is another inshore fishery, which lasts for a short period of time. Then you have the outer trawl fishery, which basically takes place during the Winter months on the Southwest Coast. Then you have the major with trawler fishery which takes place in the offshore. So you have four distinct types of fisheries and no doubt from time to time we are going to have failures in the fishery and we have to be able to deal with them. Like what is happening right now with the fishery response programme which is going to be implemented, \$9 million this year to help fishermen who had a very poor season, and those things

will happen. I do not believe for one moment that we should turn around and not support a resolution that the UIC Act for fishermen be any different from any other Canadian or anybody else who is in the workforce in Canada.

We look at the special response programme that I just talked about a few minutes ago and by changing the UIC Act so that it is brought in line with the national act so that when anybody's employment is terminated, they can go on UIC, I believe that that is what should happen in this particular case, as far as fishermen are concerned. Then we would not need to be able to have all the different programmes to support fishermen in times when they have to wait for their UIC in order to qualify. But as I mentioned earlier, there are going to be times when we will have to have special programmes to take care of situations like what has happened this year in the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see more participation in this debate by other members, especially members opposite, and probably from the NDP Party. We have had situations where we have people on the other side of the government complaining about the government not doing anything.

Just recently we had the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), I believe it was, in Labrador, out to my district doing a little bit of campaigning and telling, well, I will not say telling fibs, but I will say misrepresenting the truth

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I am pretty sure, judging by what happened last week, that what the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) just said was clearly unparliamentary.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased that the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) who is so sensitive to parliamentary niceties would take such offence at the phrase 'misrepresenting the truth.' I leave it to Your Honour's judgement as to whether 'misrepresenting the truth' should be retracted. I do not offer an opinion on it but it is nice to see that the hon. the member for Menihek is so staunch in his defence of the rules.

MR. FENWICH:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

The word I objected to was not 'misrepresenting the truth', but, I think, I distinctly heard the word 'fibs' in there as well, which I think if you actually say there is a fibber behind would indicate some sort of lying going on, so that was the word I took offence to, although the other ones sound very close to unparliamentary as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order. I heard the hon. member say 'misrepresenting the truth,' but I do not think there was any point of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Would the Speaker, just as a point of clarification, tell me what is the difference between the member for LaPoile saying, 'misrepresenting the truth', and, 'not telling the truth', except for one added word?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I do not know what the hon. member's point of order is -

MR. TULK:

3408.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

(Inaudible.)

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is out of order.

The hon. the member for Lapoile.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans on a point of privilege.

MR. FLIGHT:

I apologize to the hon. member for the second that I will take of his time. I will not take long. I have a commitment in my district tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, which will

mean I will not be in the House and I just received a copy of The Evening Telegram. I want it to go on record. I want to refute a paragraph in the paper attributed to me. Mr. Speaker, it says this:

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:
"Opposition member, Graham Flight -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

What is the hon. member's point of privilege?

MR. FLIGHT:
I am getting to that.

MR. SPEAKER:
A statement is not a point of privilege, but carry on. I will just hear that briefly.

MR. FLIGHT:
I am reported in today's Evening Telegram, Mr. Speaker, in the speaking yesterday to the petition concerning the water situation in the central Newfoundland area as saying, "Opposition member, Graham Flight, M.H.A. for Windsor-Buchans said Simms and Twomey are responsible for the disasterous situation in the area."

Mr. Speaker, I want it to go on record in this House that I did not say that. It would have been irresponsible if I did say it. These two gentlemen acted responsibly from the moment the situation was brought to their attention. I do not believe it is right Mr. Speaker. I will certainly talk to The Evening Telegram but I do not believe it is right for that to stand on the record.

I have got Hansard. I have read Hansard and it is not there. As the members will recall that when I did speak, I took the first minute of my five minute speech to congratulate the members referred to for the way they did handle the situation when it was brought to their attention.

Mr. Speaker, I want Hansard to show that I did not say that and I will attempt, if I can, to get a retraction from The Evening Telegram.

Whether or not you consider it a point of privilege, I believe that I owed it to myself and had a right to place this situation on the record.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
To that point of privilege, there is no point of privilege. The hon. member did take the opportunity of correcting what was said or what he believes was on the record. He believes he was misquoted in the paper and he took this opportunity of pointing that out to the House.

The hon. the member for Lapoile.

MR. MITCHELL:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think I made reference that I would not accuse the member of fibbing and that is a lot different. But I did say that he was misrepresenting the truth and that is another debate. I would like to probably be able to challenge the -

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. FENWICK:

On page 107 of Beauchesne at the bottom it says, "deliberately mis-stating the truth" is under the list of items that are unparliamentary. I clearly heard the member say at that point that I deliberately mis-stated the truth. It seems to me that that is also unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, I did not hear the hon. member saying, "deliberately mis-stating the truth" so there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Lapoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to have more time actually in the debate to be able to debate this issue a little more because one of the things that I have had to contend with as a member for Lapoile district over the last few months is a lot of the things that have been happening as far as my district is concerned.

We have tried to put a lot of emphasis and initiative into creating a good atmosphere to bring employment into the area and to build the area. Meanwhile, we have a white knight running around-

MR. FENWICK:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the

member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker is there a relevance rule still in effect on this debate? What he is saying does not seem very relevant to unemployment insurance resolution that we are discussing today.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. member is not strictly restricted to a very narrow discussion. I think the hon. member was in order in what he was saying.

I would like to point out to the hon. member that his time has elapsed.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am very surprised that the Opposition are not speaking today. I understand they had a caucus this morning, and apparently it was quite a rough caucus, in which they berated their Leader, especially for his behaviour last week. Now, why they should suddenly have decided not to speak at all is quite -

MR. DAWE:

It is a real blessing.

MR. J. CARTER:

Well, it is a blessing, certainly. It is quite beyond me why they will not speak. I think they did succeed in tabling their Summer's ravings, all under one cover. It has not been

distributed yet. Perhaps, it is not fit to distribute, it should be censured first.

I am not surprised that the Opposition seems to have lost heart, because, after all, their House Leader's first name is Beaton. If my first name was Beaton, I think, I would have a little bit of an inferiority complex. And my namesake across the way, fortunately we are not related. Carter is an occupational name; I imagine our forebearers trucked stuff on the streets. And there was not just one of us, there were probably a lot of truckers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

I do not know where that leave the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening), what his forebearers were, but the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), I guess his forebearers were bakers. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that the behaviour of the Opposition for the last week, actually words fail me to describe it, therefore I have to turn to some sources. I am quite willing to table it.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would remind the hon. member that we are debating the resolution brought in by the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), and the amendment to same.

MR. J. CARTER:

It is a wide-ranging debate, Mr. Speaker, but I agree with your sentiments.

I would have to say that the

resolution that is being debated today is an attempt to rectify a very unfair situation. It is just not fair, and you cannot make chalk of one group and cheese of another. It is not fair that ordinary workers in society should be eligible for unemployment insurance based upon their length of work and the amount they have earned, and that another group should have certain dates set around them when they are not eligible to claim unemployment insurance.

By the way, while I am on that, the self-employed fisherman can get stamps but the self-employed farmer cannot. While we are speaking of unfair things -

MR. W. CARTER:
Unsavoury.

MR. J. CARTER:

Unsavoury things, yes - while we are speaking of unsavoury and unfair things, this point should be made, and I do not think I can be any more relevant than I am being, Mr. Speaker, while we are on unemployment insurance I think it is very unfair that a person is penalized while they are on unemployment insurance for earning the extra dollar.

Now, the Socialists and the Reds across the way may be surprised that I would be in favour of universal cash payments, depending upon a person's income. But I am not. I think it should always be worth one's while to earn the extra dollar. Now, I do not know the unemployment insurance rates off by heart, but let us suppose that your unemployment insurance works out to \$100 a week. If it does you are allowed to earn \$20 a week without any penalty, but the minute your income goes over \$20,

your benefit is reduced by precisely that amount. In other words, if you earn \$21, your benefit is only \$99, if you earn \$22, your benefit is only \$98. People are not fools - even fools are not that foolish - they can do their sums and they realize it is not worth their while to work. Therefore, there are many disincentives built into the unemployment insurance scheme. The unemployment insurance scheme is anything but satisfactory and suitable, and I hope that in the course of this debate the Minister of Energy, the member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn), will get into this debate because he has facts and figures in his possession that he has dug out over the years, pointing out the amount of money spent per capita on various social programmes and various make-work programmes and the benefits received. And it is his thesis, and I think it would be very hard to disagree with him once he quotes his figures, that it would probably be a lot cheaper and a lot more effective if Canada as a whole were to institute a negative income tax. That is to say, that you would establish a reasonable income for a wage earner to receive and if they received less than that, then they would qualify for extra income, enough to bring them up to the standard level that had previously been worked out.

Of course, it would be different for each family, depending on the number of dependents and perhaps on some other variables as well, but it can be made fair, it can be seen to be fair, and it would work. In fact, I do not have the wording for an amendment worked out in my mind, otherwise I would be inclined to move it myself, but there are lots of other speakers

on this side of the House who will be speaking in this debate and I do think it would be well worth while considering an amendment something along those lines. Because we are addressing the Unemployment Insurance Department, if you like, it would be well worth our while to work out a carefully thought-through amendment to this resolution. And I am not trying to detract from the member's resolution, I just do not think it has gone far enough. I think we could address this element of universality and perhaps drag in the idea of a negative income tax.

By the way, it is not a new idea. I am not espousing anything new, in fact it is quite an old idea, it has been kicked around for a long time. And I might add that some very responsible, very highly-placed, very well-informed figures have said that it should be done and the sooner the better. The amount of money that is spent on our social programmes would be more than enough to cover a comprehensive programme like this. So I would urge those members who have not spoken to perhaps get together and put together an amendment to this resolution. And I would be very surprised on two counts: I would be very surprised if the so-called Liberal ravings that have been tabled have covered this particular aspect, and I would also be very surprised if the more sensible - I use the word loosely - of the members across the way would not get involved in this debate. I am sure that -

MR. TOBIN:

The member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter).

MR. J. CARTER:

Yes, the member for Twillingate, and the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight).

MR. TOBIN:

He has already tabled the document, so he has spoken.

MR. J. CARTER:

That is true, he has spoken. But he could speak to the amendment, and I am sure we could think of an amendment that would be allowed.

MR. DAWE:

We would allow him to speak, by leave, anyway.

MR. J. CARTER:

I would certainly let him speak, by leave. But for some reason or other they have decided to be silent. Now, I realize, Mr. Speaker, they have a lot to be silent about, they have an awful lot to be quiet about. In fact, it is a very refreshing change to have silence reigning supreme over there, and I would hope for the rest of this session -

MR. DAWE:

The member for Twillingate is hiding behind the report to ease the shame of not being able to speak.

MR. J. CARTER:

I would wonder if it is fit to be printed. Perhaps it is not fit. I think perhaps a committee of this House should look at it. There may be certain loose phrases that would cause young people to blush.

MR. DAWE:

It is certainly causing the member for Twillingate to blush.

MR. J. CARTER:

To recapitulate, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the present situation is

fair. I do not think it is fair for fishermen, but more than that, I do not think that the present system which is in place for fishermen is fair to self-employed farmers. I do not think that the present scale of rates are fair or right or sensible. I think there is an awful lot wrong with the present scheme. I realize, too, that this scheme was not thought through from the beginning. It began as a scheme that only covered a very small number of workers in a very small number of industries, and it was gradually broadened and broadened until they have tried to cover everyone. Well, in trying to do everything they have left a number of people out and I think it is very unfair. So I would just hope that the federal government will listen. In fact, I am assured by certain well-placed people up there that they are prepared to listen, that they realize there are things wrong and all they are looking for is an excuse to perhaps change their policy.

I am very happy to see that the Opposition are silent, especially about last week. If I may comment about their behavior last week - I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, that words failed me -

MR. FLIGHT:

Relevance, Mr. Speaker, relevance.

MR. J. CARTER:

This is very relevant - their behavior last week was unclean, dirty, soiled, filthy, grimy, clarty - now, there is a good word - dusty, dirtied, smutty, sooty, retchy, thick, turbid, dreggy, slimy, filthy, mucky, slovenly, untidy, blousey, draggled-tailed, dowdy, slipshod, unkempt, unscoured, unswept, etc.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER:
With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I take my seat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to refer the Premier, the Cabinet and members opposite, as well as the people of the Province, to the Liberal caucus report on the inshore fishery which contains an infinite amount of wisdom in comparison to what we just heard. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:
It is impossible, Mr. Speaker, to think that when a resolution of such importance to the fishermen and fisherwomen, as we have to say now, of Newfoundland is on the Order Paper being openly debated in the House that members opposite refrain from participating in the debate, especially when some of them represent fishing districts.

Now, many of them do not know much

about the fishery, anyway. Some of them do. I hope, as we go down the line, that the people who do know something about it will have the intestinal fortitude to stand up and speak on the resolution and not follow the directions being given to them by somebody who knows nothing about the fishery and does not have a care about the fishery in Newfoundland, except where it can lead to some political good on his behalf. I think that is very, very unfortunate, Mr. Speaker.

The resolution itself talks about UIC benefits. A few days ago, in discussing other problems in the fishery, we mentioned or alluded to the regulations which I think, and all members in the House expressed the opinion, are unfair. However, we find that fishermen in Newfoundland do not have the same rights to unemployment insurance as people in other fields, in many ways, number one, the most important of which is the time frame which is spelled out here. No doubt about it, the average, hard-working Newfoundland fisherman is the hardest worker in the Province. That will be disputed by no man at all.

MR. FLIGHT:
What about the miners?

MR. HEARN:
Miners or anybody else.

Any hard-working fisherman, the old-time, solid fisherman, who gets up at two o'clock in the morning, who fishes all day, who gets home, perhaps, ten or eleven o'clock in the night, who gets two or three hours sleep all during the fishing season, who has no regular hours of work, just go to it day and night, when the time

comes in the Fall, when he has to haul up his boat, he has to sit for months and wait for his UIC cheque. Whereas, other people, in other fields, whether it be miners or forest workers or people working on Canada Works programmes, when they finish work today they can go to the post office, pick up a form, apply for UIC, wait a couple of weeks waiting period and draw benefits for forty-two weeks or until they go to work again.

For the fishermen, in many cases, especially along the Northeast Coast, the Southeast Coast, who fish basically from May or June until September perhaps, the UIC benefits end the middle of May. Many of these people have no earnings at all, certainly in the last three or four years when the fishery has been late, until the end of June. So there is at least a month and a half with no earnings when all the Summer needs are in place. They have to buy paint for the boats, repair their engines, and buy near gear, etc., and they have no funds whatsoever to help out in that manner.

Then when the Fall rolls around, if it is a poor fishery, bad weather whatever, the fishery could easily end by the end of September and they then wait until the end of November before they receive any benefits. They still have a waiting period and it is usually Christmas Eve or close to it when they get the single week cheque. This is entirely unfair, Mr. Speaker, and certainly the resolution addresses this.

There is another matter also. In areas in the Province of Newfoundland there can be a poor fishery, such as we have had this year, where many fishermen were

able to obtain only two, three or four stamps. I talked to one fisherman along the Southern Shore, one of the best fishing areas in the Province usually, an area that usually has an extended season from late May certainly up until, in some years, late November. This year one fisherman in particular and a hard-working fisherman had made the grand total of \$154 the Summer. He had received one stamp, one small stamp, and he told me that he was not the worse in that area. Many more people were in the one, two, three or four stamp range.

If I am in another field, if I am out working as a carpenter and I get three or four stamps, I can then perhaps go to work as a logger or as a miner or go to work with some firm in St. John's or go to work anywhere and pick up another five, six, or seven stamps - whatever I need - and I qualify for UIC. If a fisherman gets three stamps, he cannot go out and pick up seven working stamps to get his UIC. He has to have at least six fishing stamps in order to be able to combine with other stamps to make up the ten. If he does not get six, he has to get ten working stamps. That in itself creates a problem because many of the fishermen have been told, whether it is factual or not it would probably have to be tested, that if they have had a poor year, if they have gotten fewer than six stamps and went out to work and got ten stamps working on construction, that that meant they obtained most of their earnings on some other work and not the fishery which meant they were not longer considered fishermen. They were now in the part-time category.

A full-time fisherman who had a

bad year, if he went to work at some other job and ended up getting stamps and drawing UIC on working stamps, would probably be relegated to the status of a part-time fisherman and could end up, according to once again rules and regulations with which I do not agree, losing several specialty species licences that he might have, caplin, herring, etc. That is a very, very serious thing for a person who has had a bad year. Those are concerns that certainly have to be addressed. I cannot see members opposite sit and not discuss, debate and support a resolution that tries to do something about problems such as this, Mr. Speaker.

The make-work programmes that were recently announced, despite the fact that we hear too little too late, it is perhaps the earliest time ever that programmes were brought in to help fishermen obtain stamps enough to qualify for UIC and plant workers also who, in areas where we had no fish of course, we had little or no work at the plants.

These programmes are very beneficial because they do two things: There is income during the Fall and they help the people qualify for stamps so they can draw their UIC during the Winter and into the Spring. But once again, even though the stamps are obtained on work programmes, they will be classified in the fishing categories - the fishermen at least - and their UIC will end in May, whereas plant workers or other workers their UIC will be extended until the forty-two weeks run out or, of course, until they start working again.

However, if we take advantage of these programmes, perhaps, we can

eliminate some of the problems that exist in the fishery. Perhaps we can eliminate the need, somewhat at least, for UIC benefits.

In many areas with poor planning people are desperate to get jobs so they grab an application form, whip down anything at all - a third slipway, whatever, the fourth fence around the graveyard - just so that they can have work so that they can qualify for UIC. This is not what they want to do, but sometimes with no guidance, with no leadership, this is what they end up doing.

If proper planning is put in place and if some of the members opposite, as I suggested earlier, would show some leadership and go out into their districts in the Spring and the Winter and help them get organized, show some leadership, identify their needs, come in and meet with both governments, and try to put in place programmes to help them, they would not have to run around in the Fall getting a list of problems and coming in and put the blame on government.

However, if these programmes can be used to strengthen the fishery out in the area, to improve facilities that will mean easier landing, perhaps, greater areas for processing, greater storage areas, whatever, they can help fishermen increase landing, increase their incomes, lengthen the season for the workers in the fish plant and so on and so on. We can take advantage of work programmes instead of saying, 'okay, they are a necessary evil,' they can become a necessary good that can have a very positive effect especially in fishing areas.

However, it all boils down to the fact that if we run into a year such as this when the fish do not come to shore, it does not matter what kind of programmes we have in place, what kind of UIC benefits we derive, because UIC benefits as make-work programmes, only supplement income. Nobody can live on the amount of money you make on either UIC or Canada Works programmes. If we run into years, such as we had this year, then, unfortunately, many areas in the Province are going to end up in a very, very sorry state. What can be done about that is certainly beyond the power of this government and even the members opposite because we cannot make fish come to shore. But, perhaps, we can put in place some mechanisms that will make sure that at least we have a much better chance of having a better fishery in the Province, that we will have a better chance of having more fish come to shore, and that we will have a chance of accessing more of that fish that comes to shore by supporting the resolution that was earlier introduced today by the Premier in relation to factory freezer trawlers.

That resolution contained a lot more than just an objection to the issuance of a licence for a factory freezer trawler. That resolution pointed out some of the severe problems that are faced in the Newfoundland fishery and some of the problems that must be addressed by members on both sides of this House and the population generally in the Province.

If we do not take such corrective steps, Mr. Speaker, then the fishery in the Province has only one way to go. If we allow others to take away our resource, bit by

bit, from 10,000 metric tons to 30,000 metric tons to close to 40,000 metric tons that we are aware of, of the Northern cod alone, if we start seeing that gradually disappear, we are going to have less and less fish to go into the plants around the Province.

If we ourselves do not move to access more of the fish that is available, as we are doing with the announcement by my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) in relation to the middle distance fleet, if we do not move to access more of the fish that is there, then we are going to be told, 'well, you fellows are not making any effort to catch it. What do you want it for?' We have to put in place, as this government is hoping to do, a solid programme that will address all major problems within the fishery so that, hopefully, in the immediate years ahead we will not need to be calling upon Ottawa for bail out money in relation to make-work programmes for the fishermen and we will not need to be putting resolutions on the Order paper talking about UIC benefits in many parts of the Province.

I suppose there never will come a day when we can say that all plants in the Province will be working year round because of geographic conditions. All fishermen, especially inshore fishermen, will not be able to fish all year round. But we do have many areas in the Province where the fishermen can fish year round and we certainly have many areas in the Province where the fish plants, even the small ones - and I am not talking about the large plants, the Fishery Products plants or National Sea plants -

even many of our small inshore plants, as some of them do, can operate year round if fish can be allocated and if the proper means of catching is put in place. This, in turn, will provide markets and will provide many jobs for the people of the Province.

Just today I was told by a person from another country, a person very involved in the fishery, a person who has travelled the world and is very familiar with fishing facilities and the industry generally in the world, he said something which is not news to any of us who know or care about the fishery, that there is no place in the world - the Faroe Islands, Norway, Finland, Russia, anywhere else - no where in the world that has the potential that Newfoundland has. As I said, that is not news to any of us.

The big problem is, perhaps, up to now we have not properly developed that potential. That is one of the aims that we have, to address that problem to make sure the rich potential we have is addressed by government and that plans are put in place to access the great resources we have and, not only a primary state. The example down in Burin, in the district of my hon. colleague from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), of what can be done in relation to secondary processing, that is only a drop in the bucket in relation to the potential that Newfoundland holds in relation to secondary processing.

We have also seen, in recent years, with some faith on behalf of the government, some hard work on behalf of the Premier and some of our people in government, plants that were due to go on the block - my own plant in Trepassey

being one of them. We were told some years ago Trepassey has to go. It is now one of, if not the brightest light in the whole Fishery Products chain. The plant in Grand Bank that was not to reopen - if it had been left up to the member for Fortune - Hermitage it would never have reopened - certainly not only has it proven that it can become a viable plant but apparently the efficiency in that plant is better than any other plant in the whole system. So, with a little bit of faith in our people out there and a few dollars placed in the right place, we can put our fishery back on a solid foundation.

Today, the announcement on the moves on Harbour Grace upset the Opposition but, of course, whatever announcement had been made the Opposition would be upset. However, if they had to read the paper clearly it did not say that government was hauling out. All it said was that government no longer could put money into the situation as presently exists. There is only so long that you can throw good money after bad. There comes a time when you have to have a second look and, undoubtedly, not undoubtedly at all, in fact it is spelled out in the paper, government certainly will take a second look and, hopefully, before the season starts again in the area, the plant will be back on a firm footing.

Perhaps to the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), who was extremely upset, we should say, 'What would you rather have? A plant that is not working, that is losing money, into which a continuous amount of money has been put, or is it better to take a second look, give the plant a

new lease on life and perhaps become a viable entity that will provide a lot more jobs for the people in his area?'

I know a number of my colleagues want to speak on this important resolution, Mr. Speaker, and once again, as I sit down, I must express disappointment with the Opposition members to let such a glorious chance go by without letting us know how they feel about the most important industry in the Province.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, after listening to that debate, I agree with my colleagues and I recommend this Liberal Caucus Report in the Inshore Fishery to members opposite.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, the people of Francoise, MacCallum, Grey River -

MR. FLIGHT:
'Fransway' is it not?

MR. TOBIN:
Do not go telling me about Francoise. I call most of them by their first name and I can tell you something, I will be talking to a good many of them in the next twenty-four to forty-eight hours and let them know where their

member stood on an important issue to the people.

Mr. Speaker, we have just seen the biggest traitor that has ever represented people. We have seen the people -

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Fogo, on a point of order.

MR. TULK:
I do not mind the hon. gentleman going on but the word 'traitor' in this House is a word that should be withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

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

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker I have clearly indicated to this House that the member for the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir has betrayed the people of that district by not standing and supporting them as it relates to this government's position on them receiving equal rights in unemployment insurance. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that he has betrayed the people.

However, if what I said is unparliamentary, I have no problems in withdrawing the words that are unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member has withdrawn.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I do not think that that is quite good enough that he

can 'withdraw words that he said.' The word that he used was 'traitor' and he should stand in this House and say that he will withdraw the word 'traitor.'

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I understood the hon. the member to say that he was withdrawing.

MR. TOBIN:
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:
Withdrawing what?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Whatever was offensive.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member has withdrawn the comments he made.

MR. TULK:
Withdrawn what?

MR. TOBIN:
Now, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

MR. TULK:
Now, Mr. Speaker!

MR. TOBIN:
Okay, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that

the leadership that the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) has shown today, particularly to the new member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) who has just deserted the constituents that he was sent here to represent, Mr. Speaker, it is a disgrace. The people will listen when I tell them about the resolution that went before this House today and that their member stood up and said, "I stand with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker."

MR. J. CARTER:
Which ones?

MR. TOBIN:
Yes, the ones that I do not care about.

MR. J. CARTER:
Which one is the traitor? Where is the traitor?

MR. TOBIN:
I can tell you that the Dunfords and the Greens and the rest of them in Francoise will not agree with that. I happen to know those people rather well, Mr. Speaker. When I grew up in Trepassey, they were over there fishing.

MR. J. CARTER:
Phone them. Telephone.

MR. TOBIN:
Most definitely. When I grew up in Trepassey the fishermen from MacCallum and Francoise and all of these places up in that area were over there fishing, trying to make a living, Mr. Speaker, hard working, sea-faring fishermen from that great district to have the representative that they sent to this House, back in that election, to stand up today in total disgrace, uncaring for his constituents and say-

MR. FENWICK:
Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Menihek on a point of order

MR. FENWICK:
I am not use to defending Liberals in the House but it seems to me when the hon. member says that he is uncaring, he is imputing motives to him and I believe that is unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! There is no point of order. The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would suspect the reason why the great socialist took the floor that time was because he lacks the same type of courage when it comes to representing some of his constituents.

MR. FENWICK:
Point of order.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, the member is obviously implying that I am not willing to speak to this, yet that is not true. I am willing to speak to it as soon as I am recognized by the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. The hon. the member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I did see the great socialist checking with the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) and I would not be at all surprised if it was not a request for permission to speak in the debate. I watched the conversation that took place, then the hon. member left and went back to his seat and stood up and said he was going to speak.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can look after his friends who sit down there next to him but the fact of the matter, and what I have said that has irritated all of them is that the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) has, without question, deserted the people, these great fishermen from that district, by standing up here.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) who I will say that I do have respect for, that he will stand in this House and speak on the interests of the fishermen. What is wrong with this resolution, Mr. Speaker, that they are all so quiet? Why are they all so quiet about this resolution that is going to give, if it is passed in this House, the fishermen of this Province - and I know about fishermen, that is where I came from, Mr. Speaker, that is my background. Everybody belong to me, my brothers, cousins, and everone else are still fishing.

AN HON. MEMBER:
They are not allowed to speak about the fishery because their Leader does not know anything about it.

MR. TOBIN:
I happen to represent a district

that is very familiar with the knowledge of the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) as it relates to fishing matters in this Province.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, back a few years ago the fishermen of that district certainly paid tribute to the Leader and the knowledge he had as it related to their plight and their job in the work force of this Province.

I am at a loss, Mr Speaker, as I sit in this House today and see my colleagues support the resolution that was put forth by my good friend and colleague for Tornгат Mountains (Mr. Warren). The Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) stood in this House today and he talked about this and he made reference to this government, in conjunction with the federal government, spending approximately \$10 million. That is not chicken feed, Mr. Speaker - \$10 million. To do what? To enable fishermen and fish plant workers to qualify for unemployment insurance. That is the policy of this government. That is what this Minister of Career Development in conjunction with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), and indeed government as a whole, stood for, to enable these people in our Province to qualify for unemployment insurance. And today, Mr. Speaker, we carried it a little bit further. We asked this House for support for a very good resolution. We asked this House to support that fishermen qualify for unemployment insurance as equally as others. Is that too much to ask the hon. gentlemen opposite to stand and support? Not one gentleman opposite has taken his feet and said, I support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) can smile all he likes. It is indicative of his attitude towards the hard-working, caring fishermen of this Province.

MR. J. CARTER:

He does not care. Scum, pure scum.

MR. TOBIN:

The smile on his face changed once before when the fishermen of this Province spoke and it is unfortunate that the Liberal Party in this Province has a Leader that will sit back and laugh at a resolution that, asked what, Mr. Speaker? That asked this House of Assembly to treat the fishermen of this Province equally.

MR. J. CARTER:

He laughs at that.

MR. TOBIN:

Well, it is evident and it is obvious.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Now, if we had the cameras, hey!

MR. J. CARTER:

Now who is the traitor?

MR. TOBIN:

I am at a loss to know why the members opposite betray the fishermen of this Province.

MR. J. CARTER:

They are traitors.

MR. TOBIN:

The member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) is over there going through the book all day, very, very itchy because I honestly believe that the member for Twillingate wants to stand in this House, Mr. Speaker, and support this resolution.

I do not think a man who has been associated with the fishing industry in this Province and the fishermen in this Province for so many years, Mr. Speaker, should have to be told to sit in his seat by the Leader of the Opposition, who could not care less about the fishermen, the fisherwomen and the plant workers in this Province. I do not think the member for Twillingate should be expected to sit in his seat and not stand to support this resolution.

MR. WARREN:

I believe the hon. member will support it.

MR. TOBIN:

I believe he will as well. I will be disappointed if he does not.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education, my good friend and colleague, made reference in his speech to the fishing industry in this Province. He made reference, Mr. Speaker, to the great district that I am proud to represent, the district that this past year, particularly as it relates to the inshore fishery, had some good points. There were some parts of it, Mr. Speaker, that were not that great a success. But there are places, particularly in the Placentia Bay area of the district, the bottom part of the district, places like Petit Forte, Mr. Speaker, that had one of the best years ever. The fishermen down there had really good catches and a really good Summer. In all that general area, particularly as it related to the trap fishing industry, the trap fishermen had a very successful season. But as the gill-netters got involved, Mr. Speaker, and the hand-liners, then the season was not that much of a success.

So I happen to believe, Mr. Speaker, unlike the hon. gentlemen opposite, and this party happens to believe that the fishermen in this Province should be treated equally as it relates to qualifying for unemployment insurance.

MR. WARREN:

And not for one area either.

MR. TOBIN:

I think the resolution clearly addresses that:

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House of Assembly make representation to the federal government that fishermen qualify for benefits immediately at the end of the designated fishing season in their respective areas".

I think that that adequately deals with that, Mr. Speaker. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the fishermen in this Province are a group of individuals that I am very proud of.

I have to go back again, Mr. Speaker, to the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) who represents some of the finest fishermen in this Province. I know because I know a lot of them personally. I grew up with them. To see his conduct today as it related to his representation of these people is appalling, to say the least.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries recently, on behalf of government, made reference to a middle distance trawler fleet. As we all know there has been and there are problems in the inshore fishing industry in this Province.

The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) on the advice of some

professional people, in conjunction with his colleagues in Cabinet, has now gone to pursue the middle distance fleet. They have done that, Mr. Speaker, I am sure, taking into account the success of the Glen Clova over the past two or three years, I guess, that she has been operating, and also looking at the fact that the deepsea fishery product is not there necessary to serve or sufficient to supply all of the fish plants in this Province with the necessary product.

So I believe that this government, under the leadership of the Minister of Fisheries, as it relates to his department, is taking some very positive steps, some very aggressive steps and some very bold steps. In the end, I believe, it will benefit the fishermen and, indeed, the fishing industry in this Province.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, again, as the Premier put forth his resolution today related to the factory freezer trawlers, he was met with the same resounding grins and laughter from the Opposition as we have been met with this evening as we tried to put forth a resolution asking this House to support the fishing industry in this Province or to support the fishermen to treat them equally.

Factory freezer trawlers, Mr. Speaker, we all know would be detrimental to this Province. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that if factory freezer trawlers are to come on stream that places like Grand Bank, Fortune, Marystown, Catalina, Trepassey and all of these places, all of these production lines will move to a very healthy industry located on land, Mr. Speaker, to the great

Atlantic.

Mr. Speaker, it is now 6:00 o'clock so I will adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member adjourns the debate.

It being 6:00 o'clock and it being Private Members' Day, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 3:00 p.m.