



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 50

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Thursday

31 October 1985

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

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:
I have two matters but they are separate and individual and I would like to deal with them one at a time. The first matter of privilege involves a statement made by the Premier yesterday - two statements, actually - to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to the effect that, "Oh, we are aware of your strategy as developed by caucus." The other statement had words to the effect, "I have my own CIA." I wonder if the Premier would give his assurances that neither he nor any government connected individuals are bugging, spying, eavesdropping, Mr. Speaker, or otherwise trying to prepare themselves for the obvious assaults that are hurting them, Mr. Speaker, in this House. I wonder if we could have that commitment from the Premier, not that it is going to help him very much if he is eavesdropping.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, let me just clarify for the benefit of the hon. members opposite and for all members of the House and for the people of Newfoundland, my CIA comes from members within the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and

Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of privilege, I must rule there is no point of privilege.

MR. BARRY:
I wonder if, Mr. Speaker, the Premier would indicate whether when he gave a statement Tuesday in this House when the brewery workers were present to the effect that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) was in Toronto on brewery business, I wonder if he is aware of the fact that the Deputy Minister of Labour, as I understand it, contacted the brewery workers' union and informed them that that was not the case, that though the minister was in Toronto he was not there on brewery business? Was the Premier intending to mislead or was he merely mistaken again?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
This is ridiculous. We are taking up this time now, Mr. Speaker, on a matter for Question Period. It is not a question of privilege. I will answer it, if I am asked, in Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I do not think there was any prima facie case of breach of privilege. I would like to mention to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) that he did raise a point of privilege which I intend to rule on, but I would like to see the Hansard of yesterday before bringing in that ruling.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, that may be difficult because I am not sure that the comments of the Premier were carried in Hansard. They were comments that were made to the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk), I think, when the Hansard mikes were off, but I am not sure of that.

MR. SPEAKER:

I can assure the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that I will look into that matter fully.

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. I wonder if the Premier would be prepared to stand in this House and indicate just what will be the cost of a barrel of oil from Hibernia, what will the international price needed in order to ensure that Hibernia can be economically developed, and what will be the revenue to government if current prices prevail while Hibernia is producing? And will he confirm that that will in fact be considerably less than the \$200 million a year that he stated would be a reasonable estimate in his Rotary speech back in February?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Did you ever hear the like? We are now entering into negotiations with the Mobil group of companies with the federal government for a full-scale development plan, the amount Canada benefits and

Newfoundland benefits, the various royalty regimes and taxations that are going to apply. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) must know, or should know, but I am now coming to the conclusion that he does not know, and therefore I am very happy that the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is handling this matter now and not the Leader of the Opposition because we would be led down the garden path pretty fast if, in fact, his question is one that he asks legitimately, that the price of a barrel of oil and the amount of revenues that we are going to get are all subject to negotiation depending upon a whole range of factors, a whole range of variables. One does not know the answer to that. It depends on how much the Province and the federal government want out on the front, as to whether the price then would be too low from an international price point of view or if we do not want so much out in the first year or two, the number of jobs that we have, the number of spinoff industries. That is all subject to negotiation between the three parties involved. These negotiations are ongoing and when they have been completed we will be in a much better position to definitively and specifically give the Leader of the Opposition the answer. But, at this point in time, that is a completely hypothetical kind of question which cannot be answered without the negotiations which are now ongoing.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The Premier is going to have to be prepared to answer those questions before the Accord and Petroleum

Royalty Bill comes before this House, Mr. Speaker. I would like, as a supplementary, to ask the Premier whether he begins to realize that when he is dealing with the Government of Canada that every day is Halloween and the effect is trick rather than treat. Will the Premier confirm that the statement made by Ms Carney yesterday, the policy announced there, will result in less revenue to the Province than under the previous royalty regime that would be in place, particularly considering the fact that the Petro-Canada back-in has been removed? I would like the Premier to indicate does he agree with Ms Carney that that back-in was unfair in light of the fact that the Newfoundland regulations put the companies on notice before they went out there that they were subject to as much as a 40 per cent back-in and in light of the fact that participation through such a share being held by the Province was a very important way for the Province to obtain revenue? Is he satisfied with the new Tory business approach of going out and allocating acreage on the basis of cash bonuses and work commitment? Did he not have that rammed down his throat, the taking away of the back-in, by the Prime Minister when he was down in the United States promising this to the U.S. oil companies and the Premier did not even know about it when it was raised in this House at the time?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, you know, the Leader of the Opposition is getting awfully excited every day. I cannot help it if the Leader of the Opposition is now in a

position on the opposite side of the House that he does not have any say in what goes on as it relates to the offshore. He tried for a number of years, and some of his cohorts tried and some of his friends tried to pretend that he was the one who brought in the petroleum regulations when he was not, that I happened to be the one at the time. I cannot help that. I cannot help it that he resigned from Cabinet because he could not have sway all by himself and not have a collective decision made by Cabinet. I cannot help that.

All I can say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, as the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) indicated last night and again this morning, is that from the policy statement that was issued by Ms Carney last night, we are very, very excited about our future, and not only as it relates to the Hibernia development getting underway next year. I know the Liberal Opposition does not want to see it go ahead, but we have such exciting prospects offshore, Mr. Speaker! We do not have to own something to control it. We do not have to own the Mobil group of companies or be in there to control it. We are excited by what Ms Carney has said. It will provide our Province with a great deal of exploration and development over the next number of years. We are looking ahead to a very promising day early next year when we will see the Hibernia development going ahead and ongoing exploration off our shores. You know, I am sorry if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and members opposite want to put a damper on all of this, but we are moving ahead, Mr. Speaker, and we are going to deliver on what we said we were going to deliver on in April

1985. Make no mistake about it!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, the Premier is taking the same approach that he has criticized previous administration for in this House. The Premier is prepared to go into negotiations and to give away, Mr. Speaker, revenue, something which he said, he would not do, in order to try and ensure political survival which is impossible, Mr. Speaker. He is a dead duck and it does not matter how much revenue from the offshore he gives away.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier whether he would answer this question: Will he confirm that there will be less royalties available as a result of the change in energy policy brought in by the Government of Canada, not just a back-in but also considering that Ms Carney has said that she is willing to make other royalty concessions, as did the Premier in his speech to Rotary last February, and would the Premier not admit that he made a terrible mistake in terms of negotiating strategy when he opened the door and permitted Mobil now to take the position, Mr. Speaker,

'Oh, yes. We are prepared to go ahead and we are prepared to put in concrete platforms, but only after we get concessions on royalties and taxes from this administration.' That, Mr. Speaker, has put the Premier in a totally untenable position which is going to cost this Province. Now deal with that question and

stop your silliness.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I mean, the hon. member can try as hard as he likes, Mr. Speaker. It was like the Kruger deal, when we were supposed to give it all away. It was like the St. Lawrence deal, when we were supposed to give it all away. I cannot help it if the Leader of the Opposition, since he joined the Liberal Party, is in that syndrome of giving everything away. We have left it out of our vocabulary, now he has picked it up again since he went over there. We do not intend to give away anything. We do have, within the provisions announced last night, the liberty to negotiate a separate deal outside of what was announced last night. That is in the deal. That was in the policy announced by Ms Carney last night. We do not necessarily apply to that, that is to be worked out. Newfoundland is protected under the policy.

MR. BARRY:
The back-in?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Newfoundland is protected under the policy, we can negotiate. I am sorry, I am very sorry that the Leader of the Opposition feels the way he does about it. The Leader of the Opposition, and this is the sad part about it, has fears alright, fears that we are not going to give it away. His fear is we will not give it away and, therefore, he will remain on the other side of the House until eternity. That is the problem the

Leader of the Opposition has. There are no giveaways here. We are going to negotiate a deal on Hibernia which is going to give us revenues and which is going to give us jobs. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) did not think we could get the concrete platforms and we got them. The Leader of the Opposition did not think we could get an Atlantic Accord like we got, and we got that. And now, Mr. Speaker, thirdly, we are going to get a development plan which is going to be good for Newfoundland in the short, medium and long term, which is going to mean jobs and revenues for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, notwithstanding the Liberal Party, notwithstanding the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, could we have it quiet over there?

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries related to the bankruptcy or the closure of the Ocean Harvesters plants in Harbour Grace, Port de Grave and Old Perlican. In his Statement yesterday, the Finance minister (Dr. Collins) said that the six-month period, which was actually ten, 'afforded the necessary lead time for the Province to assess the overall viability of Ocean Harvesters Limited over the longer term.' Presumably there was a written report as to whether the bankruptcy was caused by poor management, poor equipment, lack of financing or some other inadequacy. Would the minister

table the report that obviously must have come to him, or would he now inform the Legislature as to the reason for the closure of those plants?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is pretty well public knowledge that there was an announcement made around March last year that there would be a number of months of reassessment for the Ocean Harvesters operation and that, at the end of that period, a report would be made to government by the receivers, by the bank and, I believe, by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. That report was received by government around the end of September. It contained a number of recommendations and a number of possible scenarios, none of which, under the present circumstances, Mr. Speaker, indicated that the Ocean Harvesters company, as we know it now and as presently structured, with its present debt load, had any short-term or long-term viability. As to whether or not that report will be tabled at some future point in the House, Mr. Speaker, that remains to be seen at the present time. But that is basically the bottom line as recommended in the report.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the question that I asked the Minister of Fisheries was would he tell us the real reason - it was not in the

Statement of the Minister of Finance yesterday - as to why those plants are not economically viable. Now, if he is not going to table the report, which I believe he should - after all, it is a matter of some consequence to the public of this Province - would he now give us the reason why those plants closed? That was my basic question to him. He has given no answer. I am told that the **Harvest Star**, which is a trawler owned by Ocean Harvesters Limited -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is owned by the government.

MR. TULK:

Yes, it really is owned by the government, but under Ocean Harvesters - has a quota of 5,400 metric tons of fish, Northern cod, I believe, or most of it is Northern cod. I am also told that if there were another 3,000 to 4,000 tons and another licence issued to that company, it could have perhaps been viable.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Perhaps.

MR. TULK:

That is right.

I am asking the minister to confirm or deny whether in fact that is the case. I understand that the **Harvest Star** did not even catch its quota of 5,400 tons because it was not given the necessary operational capital by the Bank of Nova Scotia and the provincial government did not live up to its share of the bargain in providing the operational capital during those six months when it was under assessment. Would he confirm or deny whether in fact it was a lack of stock, a lack of raw material that caused Ocean

Harvesters plant to go under?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I will try to deal with the four or five questions that were all wrapped up in the one question posed by the hon. gentleman from Fogo (Mr. Tulk). Every piece of information, Mr. Speaker, available to the government as a result of the six or seven month assessment period, indicated that the crucial problem facing Ocean Harvesters Limited, Mr. Speaker, was the debt load. The debt of the company was such that whatever the scenario, whether you access more fish, whether you did something with management, or you did a whole range of options that were considered and recommended to us in the assessment reports, the whole bottom line was that you could do what you like but with its present debt structure the company is not viable. There was no way in the short-term or in the long-term, whether you put in more money, restructured the debt or tried to access more resource, whether you did all those things or a combination of those things, the present debt structure of the company was such that in the short-term or in the long-term, doing any of those things or doing all of those things, could you expect to have a viable operation. So the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that the horrendous debt of the company dragged the company down. The company had a severe shortage of working capital. In fact you could say, Mr. Speaker, that they had no working capital. So with all those things combined, Mr. Speaker, it was a financial problem. It was not a problem of

access to more resource, it was not a problem of not enough resource. Obviously they could use more resource, because the inshore fishery this year was very, very bad; the contribution to the company's bottom line from caplin this year was not as good as last year; the crab resource is down in that area as it is in many areas of the Province, all that kind of stuff. But whether you access more resource or not, the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that because of the horrendous debt load that that company was carrying, the recommendation given to us was that there was no scenario where the company could be made profitable with that present debt load.

As it relates to the **Harvest Star**, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman indicated in his question that the reason why the **Harvest Star** did not operate was because the Bank of Nova Scotia and/or the government refused to provide enough working capital for the vessel to operate. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not correct, that is absolute not correct. As a matter of fact, **The Harvest Star** made four or five excellent trips, brought back pretty close to capacity loads all the time. The problem was a problem that resulted from the **Harvest Star** having run aground a couple of years ago, did some severe damage to the engine, to the couplings and to the alignment, and the vessel completely gave out on its way back to the fishing grounds after four trips, I believe it was, and then had to be taken and put on dry dock in Marystown for repairs. So there was no question, Mr. Speaker, of the receiver or the Bank of Nova Scotia or anybody else cutting off funding for the operation of the

Harvest Star. That is not why the **Harvest Star** did not continue to fish until its quota was taken. No such statement, Mr. Speaker, as far as I know - unless there is something I do not know - could be further from the truth.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the minister has just stated the obvious to us. We know why Ocean Harvesters went under. Obviously it was because of its debt load. But the question for him is, what caused the debt load that of that company to get where it was?

MR. PECKFORD:

They borrowed too much money, I guess.

MR. TULK:

I guess that is probably the case. Let me ask the minister this question. In view of all of that this company has now got a debt load. We know that is what put the company under. As I said that is stating the obvious. But what caused the debt load to occur in the first place? Was it poor management? Was it a lack of stock? Was it poor equipment? Just what is the problem with that plant?

Let me go on, then, and ask the minister, if he is going to put that company up for sale, if he hopes to sell it, what does the government intend to do to see that those plants in the future are successful? I mean, he has not told us what caused the debt load, he has not told us what is

going to happen in the future in order to see those plants viable. Can anything be done? Are we looking at another case of the government washing its hands of three fish plants and 3,000 jobs?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. BARRY:

It is an all plants closed policy.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I will try to answer the question raised by the hon. gentleman and then deal with the Leader of the Opposition before I sit down. Mr. Speaker, what caused the debt load? Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously there are a whole number of factors that caused the debt load of this company to rise above manageable levels. Number one, there was a very ambitious capital expenditure programme undertaken by the company two or three years ago which the company principals say was warranted but some of their financial advisors say was not warranted. So there was a very ambitious capital expenditure programme undertaken by the company.

The acquisition of the Harvest Star, Mr. Speaker, was thought to be a good investment and no doubt in most circumstances it would have been. The fact of the matter is that for a couple of years the Harvest Star was, according to reports that we have available to us, very inefficiently operated, lost a lot of money. Can that be blamed on management? I do not know, Mr. Speaker. All I know is that it happened. You can talk to, I suppose, a dozen people in any walk of life around that particular area and they will give you a dozen reasons. All I know

is that there are a number of instances cited which indicate that the company embarked on a very ambitious capital programme that came back to haunt it in years following when the fishery became constrained, when interest rates took off and all those kinds of things happened. Over the last number of months, the last year or so, they have been finding the effects of those business decisions I am sure they probably made those decisions in good faith, but have they since come back to haunt them on the bottom line of their operations.

Mr. Speaker, back in 1981 the sales of that company, for example, were about \$17 million. So far this year they are about \$3 million. So there are a whole bunch of factors have to go into the equation and be looked at in the context of the whole global situation facing Ocean Harvesters before you can arrive at objective conclusions.

As to the comment made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, tied in with the last part of the question from his colleague, this government has supported an all plants open policy.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I think the hon. minister is straying from the answer to the question.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As to the last part of the hon. member's question, I believe is was what are we going to do about it, what we are going to do about it, Mr. Speaker, is what we said we would do in our statement yesterday. We

are going to use every means available to us to attract another investor, to attract another corporate entity, to interest them in the assets of Ocean Harvesters. This government will leave no stone unturned, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that that happens.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
I recognized the hon. member for a final supplementary a minute ago. I have seen the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) getting up on a number of occasions, so I now recognize the hon. member.

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

My first question is for the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett). I heard from the news last night, and from other sources that we have also been able to access, that there is a public information officer, or a public information specialist, whatever the new category is, employed with your department. It is also our understanding that this individual is the wife of the former member for Burgeo - Bay de Esprit, and we also understand that this individual was put in the job without any public advertising for the position, or any competition whatsoever. My question to the minister is, what is your explanation for this particular situation?

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I am glad to know that the hon. member was home last night to be able to watch television. I was not, I was on the road.

My explanation is very simple, Mr. Speaker; I needed such a person in the department. Mrs. Andrews had applied to the Public Service Commission for a position with government. I do not know if one would have become available sooner or later or not, but I was aware of the fact that she had applied and I was aware of her very high qualifications. She worked for eighteen years with CBC, which they neglected to mention last night. She was the Executive Secretary to Mr. Keith Morrow, who was then the Regional Director of CBC for the Maritimes. She has a resume that long, Mr. Speaker, and is a very highly qualified person, one who could fill the position. And since the position was only temporary and not a full-time position, it meant that it was not necessary for me to go through the Public Service Commission, therefore, I hired the lady because she was qualified to do the job.

MR. FENWICK:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Temporary or not the position was not advertised, there was no competition for it, and it was filled that way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, Oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

My next question, Mr. Speaker, is on the same individual. I understand the same individual is also on the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board and while I recognize that this is a federal appointment, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) if he had any hand whatsoever in the appointing of this individual to it, and would he know of any qualifications she might bring to the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I have no authority to appoint people, nor have I ever been requested to nominate somebody, or to have any say in the appointment of anybody to a UIC or federal Appeals Board. That is, I would say, totally federal jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementery, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I did recognize the hon. member for a supplementary. I have now recognized the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. FENWICK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, there was only one supplementary. In most cases there have been two or three.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have recognized the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, are you recognizing me?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No. No.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. FENWICK:

I have just one more supplementary and that will be all.

MR. EFFORD:

I defer to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Since the hon. the member for Port de Grave has given way, I recognize the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

My next question is also on a public information officer, or an information officer specialist, and in this case I would like to address it to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle). It

is my information that there is another position in that department almost identical to the one in Social Services which has also been filled without competition, without advertising. The individual who occupies it is an individual by the name of Bill Norman whose chief claim to fame is that he was on the executive of the PC Youth Association. Could the Minister of Municipal Affairs please inform me whether that is accurate or not?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no need for preamble in asking what is really a second supplementary.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the question. Would the minister answer, please?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that particular matter under advisement because I am not aware of how the hiring of Mr. Norman was done. I will report back.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage on a supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS:

In reference to the answer that my friend the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) gave to the first question, I do not want to

zero in on the particular case, but he said something that the House will find of interest and I would like him to clarify it. His closing remark was that because of the particularly high qualifications of the individual he was discussing there was no need for him to go to the Public Service Commission. Can we, Mr. Speaker, extrapolate from the implication in the minister's statement that they only use the Public Service Commission when there is a question of basic qualifications for the job, or would he care to take the opportunity to correct the record before it has other implications for other people who are applying?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot quote myself verbatim but what I intended to say was that it was not necessary for me to go through the Public Service Commission because the position is a temporary one.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

I do not know why all the applause today. It is not my birthday.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

I guess it is because they have so little to cheer about and applaud about. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries and it is a supplementary, I suppose, to a question asked by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) a few minutes ago and it concerns the announced bankruptcy of Ocean Harvesters. Last year when the restructuring agreement was being negotiated, Mr. Speaker, members on this side, and others, expressed some fears as to what effect that kind of a conglomerate might have on the private sector, that it have the effect of maybe injuring or lessening the prospects of the privately owned plants to continue to operate. Is the minister satisfied now that the bankruptcy of Ocean Harvesters may not be a forerunner of what very well might happen to other plants now owned by private companies?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I have had extensive discussions with the present principals of Ocean Harvesters over the last several months, since I came into this portfolio, and I have had extensive discussions with the Independent Fish Processors Association. Mr. Speaker, anybody who knows the principals of Ocean Harvesters know that they are not backward about coming forward with their thoughts, and never once has it ever been indicated to me that there was any shred of indication that the financial difficulty surrounding Ocean Harvesters had anything to do with FPI or any activities of FPI or the presence

of FPI in this Province.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the original fears that were expressed by the independent operators back in the days when FPI were born - and I have tried to meet with them on a regular basis, probably every month or so - have been laid to rest. As I understand it their interaction with FPI is excellent. FPI does good marketing work for a number of them. I have had no complaints or no expression of fears from either Ocean Harvesters, any of the independents, or the Independent Processors Association, since the first days that I have been in this ministry, concerning FPI.

MR. W. CARTER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I have two tablings, if I may. The first is The Twelfth Annual Report of the Newfoundland Liquor Licencing Board. I also have six Special Warrants to be tabled under the provisions of Section 28 (2) and (3) of The Financial Administration Act. These relate to funds for FPI, forest fire suppression, the salmon hatchery

in Bay d'Espoir, the special sawmill assistance programme, the Canada Jobs Strategy programme, and certain residences in Labrador.

Petitions

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of approximately 3,600 residents of Central Newfoundland - and I say Central in the broadest possible way - who support a brief prepared by the Town of Grand Falls regarding the white paper on the reorganized vocational school system. This, of course, being the final day for representations to the department with respect to that white paper, it is a very appropriate time to present the petition. The prayer of the petition reads as follows: "We, the undersigned, support the town of Grand Falls in their brief concurring with changes in the vocational school programme, the revision of existing courses and recommending the inclusion of such programmes as aquaculture, forestry and the selective aspects of health care and the offering of first and/or second year level university courses.

"We also support the establishment of a board of governors with broad representation consistent with the size of the board."

I want to indicate too, Mr. Speaker, at the beginning, my total support for this particular

petition and I want to commend the town council on the initiative they took by appointing a committee to circulate the petition. I think they have done an excellent job. The petition, Mr. Speaker, represents a broad spectrum of the population of the central portion of the Island of Newfoundland. The petition was signed by people in some twenty-five different communities ranging from the Baie Verte area in the West through the Grand Falls area into the Lewisporte area and South to communities in Bay d'Espoir.

I also point out, Mr. Speaker, that the brief itself, which the petition refers to, has also received support in the form of letters and other documents from twenty-seven organizations that represent important segments of the public ranging from development associations, school boards, town council, chambers of commerce, service clubs and church organizations. These twenty-seven organizations also cover a broad geographical area, Mr. Speaker, from White Bay and Baie Verte all around the Exploits central region down to St. Alban's, including Springdale, Green Bay, Harbour Breton, as well as Gander Bay and Lumsden.

I want to point out specifically, Mr. Speaker, that these representations, both in the letter of support to the brief and in the petition itself, includes the public from nine provincial districts. They include Baie Verte - White Bay; Green Bay; Windsor-Buchans; Grand Falls; Exploits; Fortune-Hermitage; Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir; Lewisporte and Fogo, all in varying degrees, of course.

Mr. Speaker, the brief which has drawn such heavy public support in this petition, and from those twenty-seven organizations that I mentioned, was recently submitted to my colleague, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power). In fact, it was done yesterday by the Mayor of Grand Falls. The brief includes a number of points, including a few that I would like to highlight at this time. One of the main points, Mr. Speaker, is that the Department of Career Development set up the proposed regional community college system within the overall time frame set out in the White Paper.

Another important point, Mr. Speaker, is that the administrative headquarters of the Central Newfoundland Regional Community College be located in Grand Falls. The brief has also called for an autonomous board of governors, of course, which would be representative of a cross section of the people in the Central Newfoundland area but small enough, of course, to operate efficiently.

The brief recommends, as well, Mr. Speaker, that the Grand Falls campus initially offer a large enough selection of courses to enable students to enroll in a full first year university credit programme and that it also offer a part-time credit programme, university non-credit and certificate courses, and trades and technical courses as set out in the prayer of the petition.

Two other points, Mr. Speaker, are among those that I want to bring to the attention of the House at this time. These are that existing programmes and equipment in the Grand Falls District

Vocational School be revised and updated to reflect current and future training demands and that an immediate start be made on retraining and upgrading instructors in order to give them an opportunity to keep up with those changes.

Mr. Speaker, obviously if we are to keep up and provide the types of training programmes needed to prepare our young people for the future, there will have to be an infusion of money into the reorganized vocational school system in order to provide the necessary materials and to be able to attract the necessary and highly trained technical and university faculty that will be required. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, there is any doubt that an expenditure of such funds would be looked upon in the future as money well spent.

So may I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the wide support for this particular brief is very evident both in the large number of people who have signed the petition and in the number of organizations that have joined forces with the town in seeking to have their recommendations and their brief implemented.

It gives me pleasure, Mr. Speaker; to table the petition along with some supporting documents and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I am not sure I caught all of the petition, I think I did. I think -

MR. PEACH:

(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

I will take lessons now from the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) when he reaches the front benches. One of these days he might do it.

Mr. Speaker, members on this side of the House can support the concept of adding the matters such as aquaculture, forestry, certain health care courses and certain university courses to the projected changes in our vocational system and trades college system.

However, I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that there is a very real problem - and the minister should address this - in the manner in which this process is being carried out.

We have only recently learned that this paper did not draw upon the collective advice of those who are presently within the system. Basically, it was drawn up, as I understand it, by the minister with one or two advisers.

AN HON. MEMBER:

One.

MR. BARRY:

One adviser. I think there was a real danger there, not that the minister should be afraid of discarding hidebound ideas that might be there, that might be held by those now within the system, but I am sure there are a lot of good, innovative and creative ideas from members of the existing system.

I know there is a very real concern - because I have spoken with a large number of them - on the part of existing vocational and trade school instructors that the minister risks throwing out the baby with the bath water. A lot of what is good or what could be made good within the existing system may be threatened if the minister does not, before this White Paper process is completed, draw upon the collective wisdom of those now involved within that system.

I would suggest to the minister, in all seriousness, that he give serious consideration to the calling together of some form of conference of those with a view to having more detailed input that has been possible to date from those within the system.

AN HON. MEMBER:

We had one one weekend.

MR. BARRY:

I know there was a meeting in Grand Falls one weekend. We had a member of our caucus out attending it. But the concern is there that there has not been adequate input from the members of the vocational system who are now there. So I would ask the minister to give that consideration.

With respect to looking at new courses, I have written the minister with respect to suggesting that course in agriculture be added to the curriculum for Bell Island. There is a great interest in, and there are lots of jobs being provided right now by that farm that the Bell Island Development Association has going. What they want is to give young people some experience with the academic aspects of agriculture so that

they might become more interested, more knowledgeable and involved and, in a small way, start providing jobs which are desperately needed on Bell Island.

The minister asked me what about -

MR. SIMMS:

The petition itself, do you support the recommendations contained in the brief to which this petition refers? For example, they want the administration of the community college to be located in Grand Falls.

MR. BARRY:

That was the part that I missed. In January or February of this year I said in a policy speech in Gander that it was time for government to look at the establishment of a series of regional colleges. I see this White Paper as a step towards that. I can see where regional colleges will develop.

At that same time in the Lions Den of Gander, which has a great interest and is a competitor to Grand Falls with respect to the location for such a college, I suggested that it is not unhealthy to encourage a good competition between the two centres. I want to see more from Grand Falls. I want to see more from Gander before I am prepared to recommend that government take a position one way or the other with respect to the location. Perhaps, in light of the fact that the minister fought so valiantly to get the forestry center removed from Grand Falls, maybe that requires some special consideration for the minister with respect to the location of the regional college.

But, it is something that the two towns, I think, should be encouraged to show their stuff, get out and compete for this regional college and I am sure the minister and government will end up making a wise decision. If they do not, the people will let them know.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is in favour of the petition as presented, which means that the community college must be centered in Grand Falls. However, I guess, the important point is that the petition has been presented because there are certain persons in the Central Newfoundland region that are keenly aware and keenly concerned about what might happen in a community college system for that part of the Province.

The member who presented the petition, and did so, as he usually does, very eloquently, is outlining the needs of the Central Newfoundland region, and not just Grand Falls because this community college system for Central Newfoundland takes in many, many communities. As indicated in the petition, anywhere from Bay d'Espoir to Green Bay, to Lewisporte, to the whole Central Newfoundland area and Gander Bay as well, there has been support for a community college system in Central Newfoundland.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is not really correct when

he says that we have not had full input when we identified the white paper. I gather he was quoting me when I was in Grand Falls on Saturday at a meeting and there was great concern as to who had written or composed or directed the white paper. I said, at that meeting, that it was myself and my Assistant Deputy Minister who basically compiled the paper because some parts of it were very contentious as it related to laying off instructors, reducing courses, or reorganizing certain colleges in relation to the community college system. So because of its contentious nature we did it, which is our job as politicians and as senior bureaucrats to be able to give direction. We were not dictatorial in our approach, Mr. Speaker, and said this is the opinion of one or two senior people, get it approved by Cabinet and have it implemented without having full input.

I doubt if any paper like this has ever gone out to the public of Newfoundland so that every single individual, every organization, every trade school that we now have, every adult education group and every status of women groups so as to have input into what will eventually become a new community college system for this Province.

How can you be any more fair than that, Mr. Speaker, than to say that you want to make something better, you want to make some changes and you go out and you ask as many people of the 560,000 that are capable in Newfoundland to give you some feedback? We have done that. We have found in Newfoundland all kinds of responses, and the responses have been excellent. I am surprised myself that in the last month or

six weeks we have had so many interested groups in all parts of Newfoundland sending in submissions, very detailed, very substantial submissions which I am sure took a lot of time to do. Those submissions sent in to government are all unanimous in their agreement that there must be changes made to the vocational school system if we as a Province are every going to get our full share of whatever job opportunities might grow up in Newfoundland.

The principles that we have in the White Paper have also received unanimous agreement in this Province. The principle of decentralization, of allowing persons in all parts of Newfoundland to have equal access to educational opportunity as inexpensively as possible. So that a person is in Port aux Basques will be able to, in this new system, to have university-type courses taught in Port aux Basques, close to home and at less expense. The idea of decentralization is accepted by everyone.

The idea of transfer of credits between all our college systems and all our vocational schools is accepted so you do not have the unfair system, as we saw, the Premier and I, the other day up at the new College of Fisheries opening, that in certain times you could do an English course at one college, the College of Trades or the College of Fisheries, and you could not go to university and get credit for that almost identical English course which was taught at university. The idea of transfer of credits is unanimously accepted by everyone I have spoken to in Newfoundland.

The reduction in certain training areas, the idea to bring in new courses - Mr. Speaker, I will conclude in a minute - the idea of instructor retraining, of sabbaticals, of industry interface so that you can have instructors from our school system going out in industry to learn what is really happening, the idea of local boards who will take initiatives in an area about certain courses such as forestry courses for Central Newfoundland, agriculture courses or anything else and, finally, the idea that we will be very flexible, as a government, in trying to make sure that we adapt a new system to accommodate the needs of all the young students in Newfoundland. We intend to do that.

This government has made a very high priority of post secondary education in this Province. Mr. Speaker, I am almost losing weight chasing the Premier around this Province announcing new educational deeds, whether it is the \$5 million fine arts degree granting programme in Corner Brook, whether it is up to the Institute of Fisheries or Marine Technology opening a \$40 million building, whether it is Friday night opening a \$7.5 million School of Music, and next Spring we are going to have many more announcements about post secondary education in this Province. We are going to make it better. We are going to make it more responsive because the young people of Newfoundland need and deserve it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

By leave? By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay, nay!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of some thirty-five fishermen from McCallum. I will read for you the prayer of the petition:

"The mandatory requirement to use larger than five inch mesh nets for gill nets for fishermen at McCallum is grossly unfair and should be changed immediately. The fact is half the fish we catch are redfish, haddock and hake, and if we are forced to use five and one-half inch mesh size, we will not be able to catch these species and our income will be cut in half. It would be impossible for us to make a living here anymore. All our catches of cod using five inch mesh size have been passed and graded as large. Every fisherman in McCallum have five inch mesh size nets and we cannot afford to buy a new fleet of nets.

"We, the undersigned fishermen of McCallum in the district of Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir, desperately request the House of Assembly and the Premier of the Province to make immediate representation to Ottawa to have this decision reversed in time for the 1986 fishing season.

In support of this petition to the

hon. House, we subscribe our names."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about that.

Mr. Speaker, those people in that area of the South Coast, the McCallum area, are the only people who fish continually with gill nets, and it is a problem that the federal Department of Fisheries has been aware of for the last five to six years. Every once in a while, it rears its head. Someone from the federal Department of Fisheries goes in to McCallum and advises those people that they can no longer use the five inch nets and they must go to the five and one-half inch gill nets.

Now, the fishermen in that area say they are concerned about the fact that all around them, up and down the coast, people are fishing with trawls, and we all know that trawls are not very selective. They can catch the now famous tomcod and conner and other species, but with this five inch net they are talking about, they are catching the hake, redbfish, and pollock, and the cod that they are catching are a large size. So they do not think it is a really serious problem with the depletion of the stock. The larger size they are taking is a good cash crop for them, really. With the current situation in the inshore fishery, the fishermen of McCallum are lucky to be catching any fish at all.

The last time that federal Fisheries came in was about two months ago, and they told the fishermen to take up their nets. Now, after I phoned the various officials in the federal department, the director told me,

'Go ahead. We will let them fish on for this year and we will have a meeting with them sometime in December.'

What the fishermen are concerned about right now is the fact that their fishing season will be coming to an end. It will start again in March, and if they have not been given a decision by the federal Department of Fisheries, they are not able to go fishing again in March. Since traditionally they have fished this way, they are asking that they be allowed to continue in their traditional lifestyle.

If they are forced to go to a larger net size, they will not be able to catch the type of fish they are now catching, the hake and redbfish and pollock, and they are going to be deprived of a livelihood.

Also, if they are forced to change their method of fishing, there is going to be a cost involved. And, this year, with the situation in the inshore fishery, of which we are all aware, I am sure the cost to those people would be unbearable. On my last visit there about three weeks ago, they were telling me that those of them who qualified for unemployment insurance at that time were eligible for \$110 a week.

I feel there should be intervention from the province. I realize that it is a federal problem, but these people are asking for the Province to intercede with Ottawa in order that they can carry on a lifestyle that has been established down through the years so there will not be another community that we will have to move out and resettle.

If they are not allowed to carry on in the lifestyle that they have established, it is going to be another case of problems for the Department of Social Services. What are they going to do with these people?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Well said! Well said!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this petition.

I want to compliment my colleague for the passion and the humanity which he shows in presenting this petition. If I were a fisherman in McCallum I would be proud to know that a man of his stature is in here fighting on my behalf to try to beat some sense into the heads of members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, this petition is contained on one small page, it is the briefest petition that I have seen during my short stay here. But I would like to draw to the attention of this hon. House some of the words that are contained in this petition to see what our people are saying.

In the first paragraph, Mr. Speaker, the words 'grossly unfair'. That to me is an impassioned pronouncement. That is a pronouncement on the situation as those fishermen see it out there in McCallum. The size of those gill nets is being interpreted by a group of

fishermen as being 'grossly unfair'. Mr. Speaker, this is so true of so much that we see in this Province around us today. The unfairness is so obvious that the people are picking it up and when they present a petition to this hon. House the first two words which pop out of the first paragraph of the petition are that something is grossly unfair.

That, Sir, is pronouncement upon all of us that a situation could exist in this Province when the size of a gillnet is perceived as being grossly unfair.

In this petition, Mr. Speaker, I look at the common sense of the common man, the common sense of the fisherman. Half their catch, they say, is redfish, haddock, and hake. Yet they are required to have a mesh which is bigger than five inches. The common sense of the fishermen can see that a five and a half inch mesh is not adequate for them to catch half the fish that they are after. Yet some bureaucrats in Ottawa, who probably does not even know the difference between a redfish and a codfish, dictates that they must use a mesh which is too big to catch half the fish that they are trying to catch.

Then I go further down into that same paragraph, Mr. Speaker, and I see the words 'it would be impossible for us to make a living here anymore.' Surely members can hear the plea.

This plea is coming from one of our small Newfoundland outports and the people are saying it is impossible for us to make a living here anymore. It is impossible, not because there is a shortage of redfish and haddock and hake, it is impossible because of the

regulations. It is impossible because of the bureaucrats again. This is why it is impossible.

If we did not have this silliness, this lack of knowledge, this lack of concern, if we did not have this lack of concern and this lack of knowledge of the fishery, it would not be impossible for those people to make a living. But because of bureaucratic nonsense a group of people in McCallum are saying to this hon. House, it would be impossible for us to make a living here anymore, Mr. Speaker.

Can you hear the plea that they are making to this House? I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that it is not falling upon deaf ears. I see noses buried in the newspapers, I see heads stuck down, people completely uninterested, completely unconcerned about the people of McCallum. Is it any wonder that the bureaucrats get away with this nonsense when this hon. House sits back and listens to this impassioned cry that comes out from McCallum and says, 'It is impossible for us to make a living here any more. What a cry! What a cry!'

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member has now spoken for five minutes.

MR. DECKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, first of all, that I have no problem whatsoever in supporting the principle of the prayer of this petition. I would assume that the prayer of the petition and the words so eloquently referred to by the hon. gentleman for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) are the prayer and the words of the fishermen whose names prepare on the attachment.

MR. WARREN:
I am doubtful. I am doubtful.

MR. RIDEOUT:
I would assume that is their prayer, because the words that the hon. gentleman so eloquently referred to are words typed on a piece of paper and signed by three gentlemen opposite. The attachment has thirty-five or forty names on it.

MR. BARRY:
Ah, you do not understand.

MR. RIDEOUT:
I am not saying -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I did not open my mouth while I was listening to the hon. gentleman. All I said was, 'I assume that that was their words, so eloquently put forth by the gentleman for the Strait of Belle Isle.' 'That is their plea, that is their cry', he said. Well, if that is their plea, if that is their cry, if those are their words, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support that, because I support the principle of this petition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me also say that I agree that the common sense of the common man is very often overlooked by bureaucrats, bureaucrats everywhere, I suppose. But the further bureaucrats get away from the fishery the further they get away from the way of life in rural Newfoundland and Labrador, and then more often than not the common sense of the common man, and the common wisdom that has been born and grown by generations in this Province, living under the conditions we have, is forgotten, and the closer you get to the Ottawa Valley, Mr. Speaker, the more difficult that becomes.

And those regulations that the hon. gentleman so eloquently brings in here today on behalf of his constituents were regulations that were put into place two or three years ago by another administration, by another government. Having said all that, Mr. Speaker, I will take a copy of the petition since I do not think one has been sent to me. I will support in principle the prayer of the petition, and I will ask that hopefully there may be some more compassion in Ottawa today, in 1985, than there was when those regulations were bought in three or four years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition that may be familiar to people. This one is from the District of Fortune and it has three live signatures on it.

There is a total of 220, the rest being copies. I present the petition reluctantly because I was hoping that the member for the district, who has received the original, would have presented it. Since he has not, I assume he is not supporting the prayer of the petition. I will give the prayer of the petition:

It is essentially the same as the one presented from Red Bay, in that the individuals protest the high rates charged for diesel oil generated electricity. Again, it is a request for equality among all the people of the Island part of the Province who are being nailed for this oil generated electricity from the diesel plants despite the fact that the argument against them was that they were higher-cost operations.

Mr. Speaker, without going into the arguments again, the only element I would like to add to the debate today is that it is my understanding that in order to lower their rates to the point where they would be the same as other individuals on the Island would require something like \$5 million, which is in the area of 10 per cent of the profits of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, well within our means of doing it. I would say that in honest justice it should be done, and I would be interested in hearing the member for this particular area respond to the petition.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to

respond to the petition, and I would also like to be able take an opportunity to look at the petition, as well.

MR. BARRY:

I will let you have a look at it sometime.

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, because it may raise a matter of procedure in the House. Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that this is a petition that the hon. member has brought from the town of Fortune? It is a copy of a petition. The three signatures that the hon. member says are on it are certainly on it. I cannot decipher who they are, but there are two from St. John's and one from the hon. member himself. I do not know, but I would assume that of those two, one is a person by the name of Flynn, the other is a person by the name of Howse. It is a very easy thing for somebody to bring in a petition like this and to get somebody outside the district to sign it. So it is not really a petition from the town of Fortune. It is a copy of a petition from the town of Fortune signed by two residents of St. John's and the hon. member.

Now there are certain rules, Mr. Speaker, and this is stretching the rules. This is not the petition that had been sent in by the town of Fortune. This is a copy of it and it has been altered by those particular signatures.

One-upmanship is fine and grand and all the rest of it but this is really an abuse of the privileges of this House. Under the rules, a petition has to be signed by the petitioners. The petitioners who presented this petition have not signed it. The people who signed it are the hon. member for Menihek

and two other people.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is out of order. If we are going to do that, it is very easy, Mr. Speaker, to use procedures like this from time to time to embarrass hon. members which the hon. gentleman is trying to do.

I think if this is allowed to go on it is just going to curb procedures in the House.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek, to the point of order.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I heard the President of the Council point to one single rule that is violated. It has three signatures on it which are real actual signatures. It is a copy I fully admit. I did admit in my introduction that it was. That is because the original petition has not been presented by the member. I believe it is within the rules of the House and it should be accepted.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the tradition and practice of constituents, electors, or citizens being able to petition their representatives in Parliament goes back a long, long way. It is very important that that tradition be observed in the broadest possible terms, that

the spirit of this not be impeded by the narrow technicalities, the pettifogging technicalities raised by the Government House Leader.

Mr. Speaker, what is the problem? How much time is it going to take? The substance of the petition is there. The Government House Leader, Mr. Speaker, must know that the ordinary citizen is not even aware of the fact that in this day of the photocopier that an accurate copy is not adequate.

MR. TOBIN:

It is an insult.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is an insult! You are an insult to the House. Sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we have members who cannot control themselves. The gopher contingent, Mr. Speaker, cannot control themselves in this House.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that unless there is a question with respect to the accuracy of what is presented there should be no pettifogging technicalities that exclude the people of this Province from petitioning their representatives in Parliament.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, if the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is going to try and limit by legal technicalities the form of petitions because the ordinary person is not aware, Mr. Speaker, of the technicalities that have to be met with in order

to satisfy the Government House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman wanted authority, look it is here. Standing Order 91 (a), "A petition must be either printed or written and if more than three petitioners sign it, at least three signatures must appear on the page containing the prayer of the petition."

The hon. gentleman indicated, no doubt it is in the record, that his secretary signed it. What he has done, Mr. Speaker, he has gotten a copy of a petition and copies are not admissible here in the House because a petition has to be signed. So in order to get around it the hon. gentleman signed it, his secretary, and somebody else. But it also says under Standing Order 90 that the member must sign, you know. So the question is whether it has got to be the member and three people, so in that case it would be out of order. But the point I am making is what the hon. gentleman is doing he is trying to one up the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews), it is cheap, it is petty, it is not in accordance with the rules, the petition that was sent in by the good people of Fortune did not need signatures from St. John's to give it validity at all. I do not think that they would appreciate it. The petition that was brought in here and signed by the people of Fortune for somebody to get up and add names to it is altering it and you know what an affront and a breach of privilege of the people concerned. Whoever circulated that petition did not intend the hon. gentleman to have his secretary sign it, and somebody else sign it. That happens to be a petition from the Town of

Fortune and the people from the Town of Fortune can talk, they do not need the people from St. John's to talk for them, neither do they need the member for Menihek to talk for them, they have a member in this House who is quite capable of doing it, has been elected once and elected again and he will be elected over and over again, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I have heard enough discussion on this matter. The petition, it is obviously and has been said this is a copy. There are three names here, one the hon. member's signature and two others from St. John's. I am going to study this a bit more in this context for the future and I am not ruling this petition out of order because of that. But it is certainly out of order in the sense that a petition should be addressed to this House and this particular petition is not addressed to the House.

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have ruled on that point of order.

MR. FENWICK:

May I make a point of order then?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I do not want to challenge your ruling because - well maybe I will challenge your ruling, I am afraid I am going to. We have presented tons of petitions in this House

from both sides of the House in which there has not been a specific reference to this House. And they have been ruled in order time and time and time again. So, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the ruling of the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is out of order.

MR. FENWICK:

I am challenging the ruling of the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour of sustaining the ruling of the Chair please say "Aye", contrary minded "Nay", the motion is carried.

Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 10, Mr. Speaker, that is the motion on factory freezer trawlers.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure this afternoon to introduce this motion. All hon. members of the House are aware, and I guess most of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are aware of the present application by National Sea Products to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans in Ottawa to licence a factory freezer trawler for the prosecution of the East Coast fishery, specifically to access

fish from the Northern cod stock off Newfoundland and that this application not only contains an application for one specific factory freezer trawler but to enlarge that licence for a number of other factory freezer trawlers over time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when National Sea made the application to the Federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Nielsen), the first thing that we did through the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) was to try to get a copy of the application before we made any comment on it, and secondly, to try to get some reading from the federal department as to how they were disposed towards it. We had assumed, while we were getting a copy of the application, that obviously the application would be rejected out of hand because it violates a provision of an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland.

However, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans at the time decided to take the matter into consideration and refer it to an advisory committee. At the same time we were after getting a copy of the application to show that it was not just one factory freezer trawler that National Sea were interested in. Because National Sea have since been making the argument that this is no problem, that this one factory freezer trawler is just going to take fish out of our existing quota and therefore not impacted upon the amount of fish offshore for Newfoundland and so on.

After getting a copy of the application, we saw that they were not only talking about one factory freezer trawler, but many factory

freezer trawlers, that they were talking about the Northern cod stock, that they were also talking about other species of fish, over time to be taken, including, perhaps, caplin and squid offshore. Therefore, when those two matters came together, our full knowledge of the application and two, consideration being given to it by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, we began to register our opposition to the application and to its being considered.

After we registered our opposition to it, Mr. Speaker, and after some time had passed, it became obvious that the National Sea interests and other corporate interests in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and even the North Shore of Quebec were beginning to line up behind National Sea in lobbying the federal government to approve such an application. Obviously it was in the best interests of some of these corporate interests to support National Sea, because in supporting National Sea and factory freezer trawlers, more particularly, through National Sea it would give the other small fish companies and larger fish companies in Eastern Canada an opportunity to make an application for factory freezer trawlers as well.

It is a known fact, for example, that the Georgetown fish plant in Prince Edward Island has been closed down for lack of resource for perhaps a couple of years, and that the only way that this fish plant can get re-opened viably and consistently over a long period of time is to access additional fish, and really the only place that that fish can come from is from the Northern cod stock. are other smaller

operators Nova Scotia who are just waiting this application to be approved that they, too, can make the case to have a factory freezer trawler.

Now, Mr. [redacted], as a result, therefore, made our opposition known to Federal Minister of Fisheries (Nielsen) and to others in the government at Ottawa. We decided, because we saw the lobby group that was lining up National Sea - not because of National Sea but they see a chance later on for the factory freezer trawlers - it was necessary for the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to organize its opposition to this application being considered. There were so much support coming from other places in the Province that we felt it to muster as much support as could, in the Province about the Province, to show out of the story.

So, Mr. [redacted], we began by calling all the various groups in Newfoundland to support us in our motion against factory freezer trawlers for wise, prudent, and rational reasons. It became obvious, even before we asked various organizations in Newfoundland to support that a lot of misinformation had already been laid in the corridors of power in Ottawa. We heard it from Mr. Cummings of National Sea and others who lied in many of their statements that we were against the fact that the Newfoundland people, the Newfoundland fishing industry was against quality fish. All of these impressions came out of various statements that were made by interest in Nova Scotia, including National Sea.

So obviously there was great momentum building in Ottawa and Eastern Canada that somehow Newfoundland was being romantic and idealistic about this whole matter and that they accepted hook, line and sinker the argument that somehow the quality matter was the big, important matter and that the East Coast fishery would not be able to continue to compete unless it got this great quality fish that you could get from the factory freezer trawlers which you could not get from the wet fish trawlers that we were using. Obviously we then decided that we had to muster and organize support for our position and we went to the various community leaders and provincial organizations around the Province. We were highly successful in getting the support of just about every single Province-wide organization. The Newfoundland Federation of Labour has come out in our support. The Federation of Municipalities has come out in favour of our position. The Rural Development Council has come out in favour of our position, and many other provincial organizations as well. The Fishermen's Union itself, which represents all of the fishermen and fish plant workers in this Province, came out in our support. We have in the last month of so had telegrams and letters from just about every council and every rural development association, and from many individuals. So that was the first thing we did.

At the same time as we called upon the people of Newfoundland to get behind us, that this was not a partisan issue, it was a Newfoundland and Labrador issue superseding or overriding political considerations, we decided that we would do some

research and produce a document which supported logically and rationally the position that we had taken. So we produced that document and we made it public and we have sent it to the Prime Minister, to every member of the federal Cabinet and to every MP in the House of Commons. We also sent it to all the leading newspapers in Canada who are either bit interested in this matter, all of the newspapers in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Quebec and even Ontario, to the Globe and Mail, to the Toronto Star, to the Ottawa Citizen and so on. That has been done and I think we got a fair amount of publicity on that to explain our position.

Unfortunately, very often with the press and with other people, they do not carry the reasons, they just carry that the Premier of Newfoundland is opposed to something or whatever, and they do not get into all the logical, rational, sound reasons, that we are not against progress, that we are not against good quality, that we realize that you have got to have all these things.

What it comes down to, and it is contained in the resolution, Mr. Speaker, is the issue of factory freezer trawlers is an issue of distance. It has nothing to do with technology. It has nothing to do with quality. It has nothing to do with any of those things. It has to do with distance. Thankfully, we are closest to the resource so we can utilize the technology which will give us just as high a quality of fish and at the same time provide the maximum number of jobs on shore for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. It is an issue of distance. So when people talk

about foreigners being over here when they should not be, I agree to an extent that they should not take our fish stocks. It is a question of distance and that is why they have factory freezer trawlers. Why are the factory freezer trawlers over here from Europe? Because it is a question of distance. To come and go back from Europe to the Grand Banks, you need to have something to freeze your fish to keep it in good quality. That is why the factory freezer trawlers are needed.

The long and short of it is that we do not need them because we are close. Nobody will recognize that simple little piece of geography, that we are closest to the resource and therefore have no need for this factory trawler technology. If we were further away and had a need well then we would use it because the need would be there.

So, Mr. Speaker, we produced that document and we have distributed it far and wide. The Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, as another string to our bow, met with the Atlantic Caucus of MPs for the government side and explained our position to them, briefed them on our booklet and explained our position.

MR. BARRY:

All of the Atlantic MPs?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, all of the Atlantic MPs in Ottawa. We have briefed them on our position and they have a copy of our document and the two minister went through it, explaining each of the reasons, not the least of which, by the way, outside of quality and

distance and all the rest of it, is that we need it because we still have a lot of our plants with not enough fish in them. We have fish plants closed down today, talking about enough fish. And not the least of it was the whole issue of La Britannia, the ship that France has down in St. Pierre and Miquelon, which is a factory freezer trawler, and Canada has said, 'You cannot use the factory part of that trawler because you have to be on an equal footing with the domestic bottoms and all the domestic bottoms are wet fish trawlers.' Well, as soon as Canada changes its views on that and allows domestic bottoms to be factory freezer trawlers, well then they do not have the equal footing principle to rely on anymore to keep France from using a factory freezer trawler.

Then France is going to say to Canada, 'You told us equal footing. Equal footing was wet fish trawlers. Now you are into factory freezer trawlers. We want to be on an equal footing so therefore we are going to have factory freezer trawlers.' And they have ten of them.

So the issue goes even further than just a question of distance between here and Nova Scotia, the fact that we traditionally fish the resource, the fact that we need it and all the other good reasons. It also goes into international politics as it relates to the ongoing relationships between Canada and France over St. Pierre and Miquelon and their rights to fish the resource off the Grand Banks. So it becomes a fairly important issue.

So, Mr. Speaker, we called upon Newfoundlanders and Labradorians

to support us, we produced a brochure at the same time, then later we briefed the Atlantic MPs and then, thirdly, just yesterday or the day before, I communicated to the Prime Minister and to all of the ministers in the Federal Cabinet the support that we have received from all the provincial organizations, from councils all over the Province, to demonstrate to the Cabinet of Canada that this is not just a party issue or an issue just about the Government of Newfoundland, that this is as big an issue for the Liberal Party, for the New Democratic Party, for the Federation of Municipalities, the Rural Development Council, the union and everybody else, it is a total Newfoundland and Labrador issue. So we have taken that third step of communicating back to the Prime Minister and to the ministers in the Federal Cabinet on the matter. Now the fourth step, Mr. Speaker, is to have this resolution passed unanimously by this Legislature so that we can communicate this to the Federal Minister of Fisheries and also send copies of the resolution to all the members of the Cabinet of Canada and to all the members of the House of Commons.

I guess some of us here in the House remember when the Prime Minister of Canada said on a number of occasions on television that apparently I did not realize that fish swam, and because fish swam therefore they were a Canadian resource and all the rest of it. Of course, as I said in this House many times before, I had to point out to the Prime Minister that the Northern cod stock, which was the one we were talking about, did swim; the problem was that it swam from offshore Newfoundland to inshore Newfoundland and that, therefore,

obviously, we should have first crack at it. It is really strange. Just imagine if the tables were reversed and the Northern cod stock was off Nova Scotia or off New Brunswick: Do you think in your wildest dreams, knowing what we know about the history of this country since 1949 to now, that we would suddenly be able to move in and take some of that fish and bring it back to Newfoundland because we were a fishing province, too?

MR. SIMMS:

Not on your life.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Not on your life. Right up until 1976 or 1977 the Northern cod stock was an exclusive resource for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, and it was after that time, after 1977, that the federal government began allowing people from the other Eastern provinces to take a part of that Northern cod and today their quota is between 30,000 and 40,000 metric tons. We are the poorest Province in Canada, with the highest unemployment rate and lowest incomes - whatever is high and bad we are, and whatever is low and bad we are that, too - yet there are those Up-along, some of the newspaper writers, especially, who have never been to Newfoundland, trying to tell us that somehow we are greedy or selfish. I mean, it is an incredible series of events when you come to look at it, because there are those who think of this as concerning as surplus fish. What surplus? There is no surplus. It is a figment of somebody's imagination.

And so we want, Mr. Speaker, through this House, with the opposition parties to support this resolution, which is presented in

a manner which I think should be acceptable to all hon. members.

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 time greater effort against the Northern cod stock and therefore more fish taken from Newfoundland; - which it has to inevitably mean.

And that is where I take issue with Mr. Cummings and National Sea, they keep saying it very coyly in their statement, "This specific application, "This specific trawler", instead of dealing with the whole application when the whole application says more than one trawler. It says that we are going to be back looking for three or four. that is in their application, that is a part of their application, not just this one but many more to follow.

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

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

WHEREAS Canada should take more effective measure to terminate

overfished foreign vessels within 200 mile limit and undertake jurisdiction to include entire Continental Shelf, including the Flemish Cap; - we do not even have all of our Continental Shelf under the jurisdiction of Canada where there is a lot of fish, and because not in our 200 mile limit but within the area which we have total jurisdiction over, any country in the world can come in and make agreements and take all this fish. Now if we had all the fish as on the Nose and Tail of the fish, as well as what we have the Northern cod stock, we might be able to do a little because we would have sufficient ourselves to say to other nations who are better off than us, yes, you can have some of fish as well, we could suit. But here we are now and do not even have all of the fish of our Province under the jurisdiction of Canada. So how do we expect somebody in the position that we are in, who need all fish and more, to suddenly see it being eroded and added away to other places which are better than we are and who are further away than us and who have never historically had that to do with this resource?

WHEREAS the vision in the 1983 Federal/Provincial Restructuring Agreement specifically prohibits factory freezer trawlers being used to harvest Northern cod; - this is what I did not think the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans was going to consider the application were very careful in that restructuring agreement, and, you, Mr. Cummings and National's comments not withstanding, that does not apply to Nova Scotia. That is why that

provision was worded the way it was, it did not say Newfoundland, or Nova Scotia, or British Columbia, or New Brunswick, or PEI, the provision says, "Factory freezer technology will not be used to harvest Northern cod" - full stop. Factory freezer trawler from anywhere to harvest the Northern cod. That is why it was worded that way. It did not say factory freezer technology in Newfoundland would not be used to harvest Northern cod, it did not say factory freezer technology from PEI, it said, factory freezer technology from anywhere. That is what the provision means, everybody knows what it means, and that would be a very unfortunate circumstance.

This is not some small-time agreement, this is a major restructuring agreement; this is a major agreement between the government of Canada and the government of Newfoundland. It had to pass by Order-in-Council of the Cabinet of Canada and an Order-in-Council of the Cabinet of Newfoundland, and we even went further and put it into legislation in Newfoundland. It is the law of the land in Newfoundland, it is in the legislation, and it is an Order-in-Council agreement by the Government of Canada, so obviously they would have to go back and amend their Order-in-Council. I do not know about it legally, because it is only an Order-in-Council agreement. If there is any substance we can lay our hands on from a legal point of view we will use it, but that should not be necessary. It just retards good federal/provincial relations to enter into this and if for no other reason, and there are many, many others, as I have mentioned, it cannot be approved because it violates a

federal/provincial agreement.

So, Mr. Speaker, we want to see unanimous support for this resolution so that we can once again use this string of our bow to strongly demonstrate to the federal government, to the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Nielson), to the Prime Minister, to everybody in the Ottawa bureaucracy that the Government of Newfoundland is speaking with the full support of the political parties in this Province, with the full support of the union, with the Fisheries Association - I forgot to mention them earlier - Rural Development Councils, the Federation of Municipalities, and everybody else. I think it would be extremely unfortunate if we are faced with the day when suddenly this license is approved and then suddenly you have France back trying to get their factory freezer trawler used and other applications then coming from all over the place. It is going to be a sad, sad day. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) was in Scandanavia a little while ago and found out they are very, very concerned about the quality of factory freezer trawlers. When you have one, two, or three hundred people out 200 miles or more from shore for a week or two, or longer, on a factory freezer trawler, there are morale problems and the question of quality becomes a very important one. They are not moving now in Iceland or Norway to build any further factory freezer trawler ships. As I understand it, only about 4 per cent of the whole catch in Iceland is landed by factory freezer trawlers, and they are very concerned, because most of the fish that Norway and Iceland have going into the United States market is wet fish landed by

trawlers. Because we are Canadians and we are supposed to know something about the fishery, if somebody on the East Coast of Canada who is head of a fish company suddenly makes the point that this wet fish trawler technology fish is bad quality fish, well, that is going to hurt the Scandinavians' fish in the United States just as much as it is going to hurt ours, because just about all their fish is wet fish trawler fish as well. So the Scandinavians are very concerned about what National Sea is saying because it is going to hurt their markets as well, because just about all their fish that goes into the United States is not from factory freezer trawlers at all.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the reasons. The resolution goes through the main reasons here. And like all Newfoundlanders, and as everybody has said from time immemorial, I suppose, as it relates to Newfoundland's future, the future must be based upon our renewable resources. The renewable resources are the centre of our economic and industrial policy, and around that, from time to time, will rotate the offshore and the mineral industry. The forest industry is renewable so it should be in the centre with the fishery, and our agriculture and our tourism. These are renewable resources, they form the core of what is our economic future. They are the core and around them rotates the other non-renewable resources, like minerals and like the offshore, which can, from time to time, inject new money and jobs into the core of what is Newfoundland and Labrador.

And that is what we are hoping to do now with the offshore. The offshore is not the panacea to

Newfoundland's future, but the offshore can assist in bringing in revenues and construction jobs to further stimulate the core economics of fishery and forestry. So we need to have access to that raw material which is off our shores to allow us to continue to have our economy based, to a large extent, to that which has been natural to us for the last 300 or 400 years, the fishery.

In fact, Fishery Products International, the new fish company, have done their numbers. They inherited three bankrupt companies, North Atlantic Fisheries, Fishery Products Limited, and the Lake Group of Companies, each one of them having so much debt. They have now restructured themselves. We have a good management team in there, and they are confident in their own minds that given half a chance, now that that debt load has been taken off their shoulders and they have been given some equity, they can have a very viable, profitable company based upon wet fish trawler technology and not factory freezer technology.

It is Fishery Products International which has won an award in the United States based upon wet fish trawler technology, and it is Fishery Products International which is today, out of the Burin plant, producing secondary processed fish which goes directly on the supermarket shelf and which they can hardly keep supplied. The Americans have gone crazy over this fish product out of Burin. And, by the way, everybody told me years ago it was a dream, that I was absolutely foolish when I suggested it. I was laughed at by just about everybody.

And how many are working there now?

MR. TOBIN:

Just about 300.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There are almost 300 working there now. But this is secondary processed fish from wet fish trawler technology. Because we are close to the resource, we do not need the factory trawler technology. It is an unnecessary technology for us because we are so close to the resource. So it all comes down to a function of distance.

The big problem here is the potential that this kind of application has. It is not this application itself, if it was that one trawler, but if you look at that application it contains provisions for more trawlers and what impact is that then going to have on the rest of the fish companies in Eastern Canada. Will they not want a freezer factory trawler also? Will not France want to use the La Britannia off St. Pierre and Miquelon? Will they not want their factory freezer trawler? Then you will get all the Europeans saying 'We have it made now offshore, because they have come along with us now with factory freezer technology.' So what does that do? What impact will that have upon the resource that is going to be left to swim inshore for the inshore fishermen, and what impact will it have upon FPI, upon what resource will be left there for them and their wet fish trawlers? Will they then be forced into factory freezer trawlers and then several fish plants close down over a time because now the fish is being processed at sea, unnecessarily but forced into it by the trend of events of the time because of that

original by the federal government this particular application is a sort of watershed history of the fishery in Canada because if, in an affirmative is given to application what you are seeing a new course taken on the coast fishery which will inevitably lead to the demise of much inshore fishery and a rest, again, offshore fishery founded upon then a technology altogether and you are having a 30 per cent or 35 per cent unemployment rate in inland instead of a 19 per cent or 20 per cent unemployment. I mean, that is what happens over time. There are risks, and so on about it.

How does it fit in with regional economic development policy? We mentioned in our booklet. How does that fit into regional economic development, as espoused in the policies that have been agreed by the federal government and all the provinces, that we proposed to build upon our strength. Well, our strength is going to be taken away. Our fish are going to be taken away by another technology which, because they are going away, they have need of. That is not building upon our strengths, that is taking away from strengths. So the whole national economic development philosophy that all provinces in Canada and the federal government have agreed to is being violated with the approval of license.

There is a case to be made, with very little expansion, that one section of the constitution, which was made two or three other parts at the time were successful getting into the

constitution in the way it is in there, on equalization payments and regional disparities. If you look at that section of the constitution dealing with regional disparity and equalization you will see that what will happen in here, if this license is approved, flies in the intent and the spirit of that clause in the constitution. So it would violate the whole philosophy of regional economic development as espoused in this country and agreed to, and it would violate the spirit of the constitutional provision put in there on regional disparity.

So, Mr. Speaker, this application has very, very serious repercussions for the future of our Province and for the future of rural Newfoundland and for the future of our fishery.

I know that the Liberal Opposition wish to put an amendment in and I have indicated to the Leader of the Opposition we would be opposing that amendment. I will not read it. He was good enough to give me a copy of it when I asked for it and so I will leave it to the Leader of the Opposition to make the amendment. But we see it as totally unnecessary and, as a matter of fact, it tends to undermine that there is a government in Newfoundland who will agree to their amendment. But we will allow for the Leader of the Opposition to make the amendment and to read the amendment and speak to it.

Mr. Speaker, what we are asking for, nothing more, nothing less, is for a unanimous resolution to go forward from this House so we, as a government, can have that as another string to our bow in our arguments to the federal government and to others who

support National Sea to ensure that this license is not approved and further therefore, to ensure that we do have an opportunity over the next few years, as we restructure our offshore fishery, as we try to make our inshore fishery more viable, that we have the opportunity to have the raw resource there necessary to bring about that viability that all of us are looking towards and which we are working very hard on.

So I would ask for the support of the Liberal Opposition and the member for Menihek in support of this resolution, for it not to go on too long so that we can move on with this other string in our bow so that the people of Canada, and the people in Ottawa, especially, and the bureaucrats and some of those who are working against us, will know that we are all strong in our support against this application and that we should not get tied down with methodology and all the rest of it. Do you support this application by National Sea or do you not? That is what it really comes down to. In supporting the application of National Sea you are supporting an end to Newfoundland and Labrador as we know it. By objecting to it you are supporting the opportunity that we have to make our fishery and this Province more viable and more prosperous in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to say we have three questions for our late show. One is from the hon. the member for Gander. He is dissatisfied with the answer given by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs on

his question regarding the annexation of Seal Cove and Foxtrap. Next is one from the hon. the member for Menihek who is not satisfied with the answer he received from the Premier on the proposed Elections Act. And the third is from the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, he is dissatisfied with the answer given by the Premier on the Province's offshore energy position.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we were first notified when we came into the House this afternoon that the Premier wished to have this resolution go forward. Despite the short notice, we agreed. The Premier also asked us, at the same time, whether we would support the resolution? And we said, Mr. Speaker, that we would support that resolution provided the Premier would agree with the proposed amendment which I transmitted to him. That amendment read, and I would like to have this amendment added - I will table it in a second - to the final resolution;

"And Be It Further Resolved that this hon. House communicate its opposition to National Sea's application by striking an all party Select Committee of this House to (a) meet either in the Province or Ottawa with the Prime Minister and/or his Cabinet - and I have added these words as I mentioned across the House to the Premier - or members thereof. And (b) take whatever steps are necessary to see that this important issue is resolved in favour of the Province's fishermen and plant workers."

The Premier indicated across the floor of the House initially that this amendment would be acceptable. Subsequently, Mr. Speaker, presumably after receiving advice from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), the Premier indicated by a note that he would not accept this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am proposing that this amendment go forward in any event. And, Mr. Speaker, if we do not have the support of the Premier for this amendment as he has indicated, we are opposed to the resolution that is put forward as it now reads by the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the reason we are opposed is because the Premier is playing silly, petty partisan political games with one of the most important issues facing this Province.

MR. J. CARTER:

That is not true.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I have written the Premier and indicated our opposition to factory freezer trawlers. I have sent a copy of my letter to the Prime Minister, to the Federal Fisheries Minister (Mr. Nielsen), to our representative in the Federal Cabinet, Mr. Speaker. I had indicated that from my discussions with people around the Province, I cannot find anybody in favour of factory freezer trawlers, Mr. Speaker. Nobody. There is nobody on this side of the House in favour of factory freezer trawlers.

But Mr. Speaker, neither are we going to be part of a sham and a charade where we have a Premier who is trying to find another battleground, Mr. Speaker, after turning into a wimp, after turning into a lap dog, Mr. Speaker, once a Tory Government was elected in Ottawa. We now find the Premier, as he sees the confidence of the people of this Province eroding in his administration; as he sees that he is on a slippery down slope that is going to see him turfed out in the next election; he is desperately trying to find another battleground. Well, let me tell the Premier, Mr. Speaker, this is a battle that should be fought in Ottawa, not in this Province. There is no opposition in this Province to the position being taken by government. But, Mr. Speaker, the Premier does not have the courage to go to Ottawa and fight the battle there. No! He would rather fight the battle through silly little press conferences and press releases, Mr. Speaker.

Has his Telex machine on the eighth floor broken down now since we have a Tory Government elected in Ottawa? Why is he afraid to have a Select Committee go with him to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, or to have members of the Government of Canada come here to hear our position? It is because, Mr. Speaker, he is afraid to let members of this House see how weak he is when he comes face to face with his blue-blooded buddies in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, he rolls over and plays dead, whether it be on factory freezer trawlers or on any other issue of concern to this Province.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier delayed responding to the National Sea application? The

Fisheries critic for the Opposition (Mr. Tulk), Mr. Speaker, had set out our position in Opposition to factory freezer trawlers within days, I think it was the same day or the day after, of the National Sea application becoming public knowledge. The Premier said, 'I have to get the application to study the details of it.'

Mr. Speaker, if the Premier opposed the application in principle, as he subsequently said he did, why did he need the details? Mr. Speaker, opposition in principle should be opposition in principle, and no details are necessary. Details were not necessary for the Opposition to set out its position in opposition of factory freezer trawlers. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, had first to try to determine whether he could afford to raise a whimper about factory freezer trawlers -

AN HON. MEMBER:
That is right.

MR. BARRY:
- or whether he would be summoned to Ottawa by the Prime Minister and hauled over the carpet for stepping out of line. And, you know, Mr. Speaker, by his waiting so long, it gave the federal Fisheries minister the opportunity to give that application serious consideration.

If the Premier of this Province had opposed that application as quickly as did the Liberal Opposition, it is likely, Mr. Speaker, given the new era of consultation and co-operation, that the federal Fisheries Minister (Mr. Neilsen) would have rejected it out of hand. Mr. Speaker, the Premier, by his cowardly delay, Mr. Speaker, while

he tried to check out the lie of the land in Ottawa, silently acquiesced, Mr. Speaker, and let the federal Fisheries minister refer this application to the Advisory Committee.

MR. W. CARTER:
Where is Mr. Crosbie in all this?

MR. BARRY:
Yes, that is the next question. Where are our federal MPs? I think there might be one, Mr. Speaker, who has indicated that he supports the Province's position. But, Mr. Speaker, we have not seen Mr. Crosbie, the Province's representative in Cabinet, take a stand against factory freezer trawlers, nor, Mr. Speaker, have we seen a former federal Fisheries minister from this Province (Mr. McGrath) -

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

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

MR. MITCHELL:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) that I can table a letter from the MP, Mr. Joe Price -

MR. BARRY:
That is the one I mentioned.

MR. MITCHELL:
- in support of the Premier and this government in their stand on the freezer trawler issue.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

That is not a point of order.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I understood there was one MP, and that was the one to whom I referred.

Now, I would be delighted for the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) to take it upon himself, Mr. Speaker - and we could expect a report back from him once he contacts Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Morrissey Johnson and Mr. McGrath - we will be delighted to await the report from the member for LaPoile once he has contacted these federal MPs and requested a similar letter from them. Because, Mr. Speaker, the former federal Fisheries minister, Mr. McGrath has indicated to a radio station in this Province that he is not supporting the Premier's position. Mr. Crosbie is taking the position, he is supporting the federal Fisheries Minister, which presumably now is the acting federal Fisheries Minister from the great fisheries port of White Horse, Mr. Speaker, the deputy Premier, Velco Lips Nielson I think he is called. You know something, when you look at Mr. Nielson, I can understand Mr. Peckford's reluctance to bring a select committee of this House up while he goes nose to nose, chin to chin, toe to toe, belly to belly with Velco Lips Nielson, with his blue-blooded brother, Mr. Nielson; I can understand why he would not want to have any witnesses to that battle, Mr. Speaker. The office of the Premier of this Province might never survive, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

It might be irreparably damaged, Mr. Speaker, if members of this

House of Assembly happened to be witness to that confrontation.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Maybe that is why they had to renovate.

MR. BARRY:

That is a good point.

Mr. Speaker, we would like to hear further from members opposite. If there is this great era of consultation and co-operation why is this a problem, why are we having a problem? Has that new era been somewhat less than a year, eh? Did that era last less than a year, eh, Mr. Speaker? Is that what has gone on? Is that what has happened, Mr. Speaker? Has consultation and co-operation been suddenly revealed for what we have been saying it is all along, the same consultation that took place when the federal Forestry Minister invited the provincial Forestry Minister up to talk about the relocation of the federal forestry center and when the provincial minister comes back he tells us he had a wonderful cup of tea, Mr. Speaker, the best meeting he has ever had with a federal Cabinet minister. When he was asked, 'Well, what about the federal forestry center? Did you raise that?', he said, 'Oh, I did not want to disturb the great tenor of the meeting. I did not want to interfere with these great vibes that were going between these blue-blooded buddies that were sitting together behind their conservative curtain,' Mr. Speaker.

We could go down through the entire list of these great little meetings that were held, these little tea parties. The Boston Tea Party, Mr. Speaker, pales in comparison to what members opposite provided in the way of

historicals when they went up for first meeting with their counterparts because one after other they were told, herhe good little boy or girl, ap on the back of the head, e there now. Have a cup of it do not rock the boat. Do e nasty now', pat pat pat (top of the head, 'Do not nasty. Remember consultat] co-operation. We have you into that. That is your mode.

Now the cation was after a federal da was made then the provinciaster or premier was informed it. That was the definitiorconsultation. And co-operatwell, well! Yes, co-operati Mr. Speaker, co-operati making sure that the blue vative curtain was pulled arthese meetings so that the al public, members of this HI would say members of Parliawould not know what went on the scenes when these kislue-blooded buddies got toge closeted behind their Corive curtains, Mr. Speaker. is why we find the Premier o Province unwilling to going with that non-politmendment. There is not a pal word in that proposed ant.

The Premiks about bringing a Select Coe, to show unity of oppositiortalks about that underminivernment in this Province. Speaker, we have to go furthderground than the Bell Islan mines go in order to under that crowd over there. Te on their bellies, Mr. Spealhey are on their backs and are as low as they can go.

SOME HON. S:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

You would need those giant excavating machines that they have up in the Labrador iron mines, Mr. Speaker, in order to get under that crowd there.

Now, let us picture this, Mr. Speaker, the Premier is saying that he wants another string to his bow, he wants a unanimous resolution to go from this House. Now, just ask yourself, Mr. Speaker, would representatives, a committee representing every party in this House, would not that have more clout, would that not be more symbolic of unity of opposition to factory freezer trawlers than a piece of paper that the Premier is going to send up to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, the Premier would not even carry that resolution, if it were passed, up to Ottawa, he would mail it up and it would probably be mailed via Hong Kong, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I ask members to get up and deal with this question, where is his new era of consultation and co-operation gone now? Where is it, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back to that delay of the Premier in opposing, why was the Premier so tardy, if he was opposed to factory freezer trawlers in principle, why did he not state that when the matter of factor freezer trawlers being applied for first became known? Now, Mr. Speaker, you know what is happening here, we all know what is happening, the people of this Province know what is happening, members opposite and the Premier are desperate to try and find an

issue to reverse their decline in popularity, Mr. Speaker, to reverse that political slide that it taking place. Mr. Speaker, with any poll taken in this Province, members opposite would not even be found on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

That is the problem, Mr. Speaker, they have done their polls. I am sure they have done their polls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I am sure they have done their polls, Mr. Speaker. I am sure they have done their polls and those polls have terrified them. The polls were done months ago.

MR. TOBIN:

Look at the results.

MR. BARRY:

The poll was probably done about six days after the election, I would say, Mr. Speaker, and that poll established probably 75 per cent support for the policies of the Liberal Party. Seventy-five per cent of the population six days after the election responded in that poll that they supported the Liberal Party in this Province, and that is what has members opposite terrified. They are desperately looking around, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

Even the member for Grand Falls

(Mr. Simms) I think indicated another couple of days and they would have all been gone. I mean he was almost gone anyhow. There was no question that he would have been gone. As a matter of fact, most members have said the same thing over there. Another couple of days, they told us, another couple of days it would have been all over. Now, they have been afraid to say it within the ear shot of the Premier but they are also saying, Mr. Speaker, that there will not be another election with the same leader. They are also saying, Mr. Speaker, that they are desperately looking around now for a new leader. I think the member for Grand Falls might have certain personal aspirations still. He is looking for the leadership look.

MR. SIMMS:

Not at all.

MR. BARRY:

He is looking for the leadership look but as I told him before, Mr. Speaker, his campaign suffered drastically when he went up to the Federal Forestry Minister and did not raise the forestry centre.

I think that the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor), at that point, came into the lead. There are a couple of others over there, Mr. Speaker,-

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. TOBIN:

We have before this House, Mr. Speaker, a very important and

significant resolution which was put forth by the Premier of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, we saw yesterday evening in this House the utter arrogance and contempt that the Liberal Party have for the fishing industry, the fishermen and fisherwomen and the plant workers in this Province. We witnessed that utter contempt, Mr. Speaker.

Today we are putting forth a resolution that deals with saving the jobs of Newfoundlanders.

MR. PATTERSON:

They do not care about that, boy.

MR. TOBIN:

We have the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, who is speaking to this resolution, talking about the member for Grand Falls almost getting - what did he say? - would have been gone in a couple of days.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

Talking about the member for Mount Pearl, Mr. Speaker, being ahead -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:

Could I have silence, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, talking about the member for Mount Pearl being ahead in a leadership race over the member for Grand Falls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:

I submit to Your Honour that the jobs for Newfoundlander put forth in this resolution which this government is fighting for far succeeds, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER:

Exceeds.

MR. TOBIN:

- the ambition of a jealous Tory -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Exceeds.

MR. TOBIN:

Exceeds. Succeeds. It does not matter, Mr. Speaker. Far exceeds the ambitions of a jealous Tory who is now talking about the leadership of this party. But I submit to him that he is totally out of order, and, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, Your Honour, that you should advise the member that he speak to the resolution that is there and not to the fooliness of a leadership contest in this Province.

Mr. TULK:

Oh, my, look key aide to the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Reply to it! No, we are not going to waste the time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has a certain amount of leeway to speak to the resolution. He is in order.

MR. B

Mr. S I wonder if there is stillity on gophers in this Provit was there one time, I wonit is still there? We will check that out, Mr. Speak

Mr. S if I could get back to myks. The problem with membebsite and the reason they interrupt is what they hear now they know it is true most of them have indicat to us at one time or anver the last few weeks.

MR. T

Boy, say, you are on a winni

MR. B

Mr. S they saw that they were to be wiped out with anothw days, and they realir. Speaker - being desper cling onto power Mr. Speaknat there is going to have a change at the top befor next election. They are asperately looking, at the ime as they have a changadership, they realize they ng to have an issue, they ag to have something.

MR. TI

Mr. S knows all of that.

MR. B

Mr. S knows that.

They ng to have something, Mr. S that they can use to try ar up emotions. The same t they tried to label everyh this Province who questihe adequacy of the offshcl as traitors. Now that totally failed, Mr. Speakenergize the Province, to geProvince to rise up, united no opposition to

members opposite in whom all wisdom, of course, resides; now that they have failed to get everybody marching, Mr. Speaker, to that single drum of the offshore, they are desperately looking for another drum, Mr. Speaker. Desperately looking for another drum. That drum, Mr. Speaker, is to try and make a political issue out of factory freezer trawlers, to try and pretend, Mr. Speaker, that there is someone in this Province who is not opposed to factory freezer trawlers.

Mr. Speaker, why is it that we have to have this battle? I have not seen very much blood spilled yet, you know, I have not seen very much in the way of confrontation between the Premier. Have we seen the Premier go up to talk to Mr. Mulrone? Have we seen him call down the federal representative for Newfoundland in the Cabinet to consult, like bringing back your ambassador, call back your federal representative for consultation.

MR. FUREY:

(Inaudible) press release.

MR. BARRY:

That is where he is taking the battle, he is taking the battle to the House of Assembly. Who is in opposition in the House of Assembly to factory freezer trawlers? Is it the Mace? Are the clerks or the pages, Mr. Speaker? Has somebody found out that the clerks and the pages are not prepared to oppose factory freezer trawlers? Are there mice around here somewhere, Mr. Speaker? I know where the cockroaches are but are there mice as well?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Are the mice battling the Premier so that he has to come in and charge in full armour, Mr. Speaker, launch onto his white charger the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), launch onto his white charger and charge into the prey across the House?

MR. BAIRD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

Mr. Speaker, it seems that something has gone wrong with our colleague over there the Leader of the Opposition. Maybe we should get a doctor in to examine him, he seem very frustrated. He is certainly not acting in a normal manner, so maybe he has some problem.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order. I did for a moment think that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was not debating the motion but then he did come back to it.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

It was not a bad suggestion though, Mr. Speaker, by the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird), and what I propose, Mr. Speaker, is that Your Honour, and I know Your Honour has a little psychiatric training during the course of his medical training, I am sure, but maybe he has lost a little of his expertise, maybe we should get

somebody who is fresh into the profession. Let us bring in a psychiatrist, Mr. Speaker, and let us line up the members opposite and line up the members on this side of the House and by the time it is finished, Mr. Speaker, there will be fifteen members on this side still declared competent to carry on the business of this Province. We would be looking at either empty seats, Mr. Speaker, or a lot of white jackets.

If that is the level that they are going to bring this debate down to, to carry on with the nonsense of wanting to charge into battle into the House of Assembly on factory freezer trawlers, are you sure that is not the cartoon page I was looking at here?

Mr. Speaker, what have members opposite come to to allow themselves to be used as pawns in this petty partisan political game by the Premier?

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible)

MR. BARRY:

The member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) is picking it up. For the record, Mr. Speaker, we agree with opposition to factory freezer trawlers and we are prepared to communicate that opposition. We want to do it in person, Mr. Speaker, because that is the most forceful way of getting that opposition carried to the floor of the House of Parliament. Let us have every member of this House up in the gallery looking down as there is a vote on that!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Come on, come on! Let us go and

never indexes.

MR. BA

I am sorry. Speaker Bosley will probably put us out of order if we proceed hard, but if we could be controlled, I would be prepared to go up there and stare the federal Fisheries Minister, the federal Prime Minister, the Newfoundland representative in the federal Cabinet, us all go up. Let us pay our way, Mr. Speaker, and go

SOME MEMBERS:

Hear,

MR. BA

Let us look for any money from the purse for this. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to pay my own members on this side of the House. Let us go to Ottawa and bring everybody up, Mr. Speaker, to oppose factory freezers.

SOME MEMBERS:

Hear,

MR. BA

But let, Mr. Speaker, play these political games where the Privants to appear to be the front on a new issue for this House when we all know he is nothing but a political wimp, a lackey ever since his blue-buddies have been put into power.

Now, on the record, we oppose factory freezer trawlers. The Liberal Party of this Province opposes freezer trawlers.

We agree, Mr. Speaker, that the clause in the Liberal restructuring agreement is a commitment that binds the Government of Canada. We will

support, Mr. Speaker, the Premier taking court action, if necessary, against the Government of Canada on that point. We would support that. Mr. Speaker, we would ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Verge) to stand up and support the Premier's interpretation because we agree when the Government of Canada deals with -

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, listening to the Leader of the Opposition, I was wondering if he is soliciting that we hire at 40 per cent to go to Ottawa and defend us.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I think the hon. member is not in his place.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I think that that is one of the longest speeches that I have heard from the member for Placentia since I have been in this House, one of the longest speeches, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Get in your own place 'Bill'. You cannot even find your own seat.

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. PATTERSON:

I do agree with the Leader of the Opposition. He was never here when I made speeches because I was party whip, he was down in his law office. He would struggle in here in the evening at five o'clock with his briefcase. He would sulk in the corner. He would go out and never did he ever tell me where he was going. So that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, he is over there with the Liberals. Again I would ask him, would he want 40 per cent of the take to go to Ottawa and defend the freezer trawlers?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. BARRY:

No, but the speeches are getting longer. One of these days the member is going to get up and give a speech.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the gopher patrol are out in full force or is it, Mr. Speaker, that Halloween is already started in the House. Mr. Speaker, I guess it is almost five-thirty. I guess Halloween is about started.

Mr. Speaker, we agree with the proposition, the seven arguments that are put forth, by members opposite in opposition of factory freezer trawlers.

First, that their introduction would violate that agreement. Mr. Speaker, the irony of the Premier having to fall back upon an

agreement put in place by the previous Liberal Government of this country, when we have this so-called era of consultation and co-operation.

We agree, Mr. Speaker, that it is mistaken as well as dangerous to assert that factory freezer trawler technology is necessary to ensure a top quality product to export markets.

Mr. Speaker, it is only a marketing gimmick but that marketing gimmick could hurt this Province if National Sea, with a factory freezer trawler, then starts to advertise fresh frozen right out of the ocean. That would put a lot of pressure on other companies to follow up, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You were not worried too much about the fishery when you (inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

But we know who is coddling who, Mr. Speaker, and it is members opposite and the member for Placentia in particular.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. PATTERSON:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is trying to portray himself now as a great Dan O'Connell, the great labour leader of Ireland. We know his attitude toward labour. We remember when the doors of this building were barred against the fishermen from

the Burin Peninsula.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point order, there is no point of .

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, that landslide victory in Antigua, I know why the member gotten bold enough to get up and give three lengthy speeches today.

Mr. Speaker, we agree that the introduction of factory freezer trawlers would result in significant net loss of onshore processing jobs and a bright future for many Atlantic communities. And where is the great regional development philosophy of the Government of Canada that we suppose to be cheek to jowl with the Premier and his colleagues here? Where is it? Is it Mr. Speaker, the paper that is taken on when they are prepared to threaten our Newfoundland industries by giving sanction to the introduction of factory freezer trawlers?

We agree, Mr. Speaker, that the unnecessary rationing of distant water technology such as factory freezer trawlers would negate Canada's natural strength of being located adjacent to its marine resources. We agree with that, Mr. Speaker. I think it was the President of the Provincial Development Commission said in a letter yesterday that this Province is a factory freezer trawler moored on the Grand Bank, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Right on!

MR. BARRY:

The issuance of a factory freezer trawler, we agree also, would prejudice Canada's position in any arbitration and the meaning of key language of the 1972 agreement between Canada and France under mutual fishing relations.

We agree also, Mr. Speaker, that the introduction of factory freezer trawlers would imperil the market driven strategy encouraged by the enterprise allocation system.

And we agree that any policy support of factory freezer trawlers would be an economically inefficient policy.

Now we say to the Premier, if he is serious about needing another string in his bow, do not settle for a piece of paper saying there is united opposition to factory freezer trawlers, let us have an all party Select Committee go to Ottawa or let us have all members of this House pay their own way and go to Ottawa and express their opposition in no uncertain terms.

Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

MR. TULK:

Right on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

This being Thursday at 5:30 a motion to adjourn is deemed to be on the floor of the House.

Five questions were submitted to me for debate at 5:30, one by the hon. member for Gander, two by the hon. the member for Menihek, one by the hon. the Leader of the

Opposition, and one by the hon. the member for Fogo. I now call on the hon. the member for Gander in connection with the annexation of Seal Cove and Foxtrap.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In questioning the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) - the sequence was something like this - I reminded the minister of a meeting in Seal Cove where over 200 people were in attendance and where the minister is reported as having made certain statements regarding the annexation of Seal Cove and Foxtrap. The minister answered, and his answer was that he did not make those statements. That somehow, obviously, there must have been some misunderstanding.

He pointed out that he had corrected the reporter from the newspaper that obviously made a gross error and he had written a letter to the newspaper concerning this. There was a large mistake that was made here, that he did not, in fact, tell the people or give the people in Seal Cove the impression that he had in Cabinet tried to maintain the position that Seal Cove should be on its own. Whereas, and then he was forced to by a collective decision carry out in his department a directive that was different from his own wishes. He did not say that in the meeting.

However, Mr. Speaker, in talking to so many of the people from that area, I am determined that they got that impression. I can only assume that something else must have happened. The people in Seal Cove and Foxtrap were somehow given the impression that the minister was saying one thing to

them and saying something else to Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, at that time I thought that this was probably a breach of Cabinet secrecy and, as well, a breach of Cabinet solidarity, that great tradition of British Parliament, that in fact the minister was having a disagreement with other members of Cabinet concerning a matter which he had to implement through his own department. However, the minister says that he did not say that.

The reason I am dissatisfied with the minister's answer is I think the minister perhaps has some lapses of memory as to what goes on or, indeed, what he said. There were three instances, just a few minutes after I outlined the situation. In one instance, when I was trying to obtain a copy of a list, the minister said, and he is quoted in Hansard as saying, that it was very difficult to come up with entire lists. Now, I know that that is a lapse of memory on the part of the minister because that list has been existence for three and a half months.

The minister also said it is very difficult, sometimes, to come up with that information on a moment's notice. Again, Mr. Speaker, a lapse of memory by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) because in actual fact it was not a moment's notice, it was three and a half month's notice. So a very, very obvious lapse of memory on the part of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the third lapse of memory. He indicated, and it is in Hansard, that an itemized list was printed in The Evening Telegram. Mr. Speaker, I checked

and nitemized list has ever appear do not know whether it ipse of memory or a dillu:

Mr. S I come back to the originint. There was a meetin Seal Cove. The minisended the meeting. I will all because I did not speak, but large numbers of the als at that meeting got mpresion that the minist forced, by Cabinet, to doing that he really did not wo.

In fi my brief statement, Mr. I would tell the minist I will accept the fact e did not say these wordsaid in the House that he dday those words and I accept however, he obviously gave impression to these peoplchis, in fact, was the situand in doing so I feel that : using his Cabinet positihide behind the fact that I not at that time reallgo get out and did not reallalize that that partining was going to be printin The Evening TelegMr. Speaker, I was very ofied with that answer.

MR. D

Mr. S]

MR. S]

The h Minister of Municipal Affair

MR. D

Mr. S I am again extremely pleasave the opportunity to speakis particular issue. Altho have taken the oppor on two or three differasions now to set the recoright, I am again pleasepeat what I said at

that meeting, what I said yesterday during Question Period, and what I will continue to say, Mr. Speaker, because what I am saying is the absolute truth. And that is the nice thing about the truth, Mr. Speaker, you do not have to go charging back through copies of Hansard to find out what you said, or to look at previous correspondence or anuthing else, all you have to do is tell the truth and that will be borne out in time.

My greatest regret about that meeting, of course, is that the television cameras were not present, or the electronic media, because we would have been able to go back and find out exactly what was said. What I said at the meeting was quite clear. I cannot help it, Your Honour, if a member of the press decided to take out of total context what was said at that meeting. However, that is the privilege of that individual.

Mr. Speaker, just to again refer to what kind of mistreatment you can get from the press, I notice in looking at today's Evening Telegram that there are two articles in here which are totally false, totally untrue, one dealing with me and one dealing with the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight. The hon. the member for Grans Falls (Mr. Simms), the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands got up in this House a couple of days ago to present a petition on behalf of the people of Grand Falls with respect to the issue of the Grand Falls water supply. I listened to him for five minutes, say what he had to say, I listened to the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) support his petition, and then I listened for about five or ten minutes to the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr.

Flight) totally support what the Minister of Health said and what the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) said as well.

In The Evening Telegram today, Mr. Speaker, or yesterday's Evening Telegram, came out and said, "Opposition member, Graham Flight, MHA, Windsor-Buchans said Simms and Twomey are responsible for the disastrous situation in the area."

Mr. Speaker, I sat in this House a couple of days ago listening to the member for Windsor-Buchans and he said absolutely nothing which resembled that. I went back through Hansard and could not find anything that even resembled it but still the press chose to say that the member for Windsor-Buchans said that Mr. Twomey and Mr. Flight are responsible for the disastrous situation in the area. Completely untrue, a total fabrication, and the same thing applies to this particular issue, Mr. Speaker, of which I have been quoted.

MR. SIMMS:

There was no retraction on yours in the local paper down there, or was it?

MR. DOYLE:

No, there was no retraction by The Evening Telegram on what I had to say. So, Mr. Speaker, the next day, just to elaborate a little bit further on that meeting, when this particular item appeared in The Evening Telegram I called the editor of The Evening Telegram, Mr. Finley, and he knew that I was quite upset over the reporting that had appeared in the paper. I told the Editor of The Telegram I was very upset about it and I demanded that he print a retraction. He

called me back about fifteen minutes later saying, "I will not print any retraction. I have spoken to the reporter and the reporter says it happened that way." Because I actually called the Editor of The Evening Telegram to express dissatisfaction, the next day he wrote a column in The Evening Telegram again stating the misquote that had been made by his reporter the day before that. So that is a callous disregard for the rights of people, Mr. Speaker, that is a callous disregard for the rights of individuals in this Province. I can state again that I have been misquoted by The Evening Telegram, what I stated at that meeting in Seal Cove is clear for everyone to hear.

I will repeat it again. At that meeting I stated that if I had my way from a strict political point of view Seal Cove would be on its own, but the decision had not been made based upon politics, it had been based upon good, sound judgement and the commissioner's report which was put forward by my department of which I supported. I recommended it and I will stand behind that because it is the truth and that is all I can say about it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) is not satisfied with the answer from the Premier on the proposed Elections Act.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

This is about the Elections Act.

I w the other question. Mr. in a sense we were jammed the end of Question Peritme and that is why I want bring it up again becao not even think the Premia chance to answer it as f I would like to see him t so I really want to go osame issue again.

We areally far apart on it becaemember back in early 1979 the Premier was running for up for the PC Party and a list of things that he w accomplish. On that list the new Elections Act which control spending, which divulge where the moneyrom, would divulge the amourspending and so on. Quitey, I thought that was an e: idea. I still think it excellent idea but unfow we are talking about the e1985, well I guess next year be almost seven years sincarticular time.

Sincethat promise has been repea two separate Throne Speect I have been able to checkps others. There was a construk back in 1982 or 1981 r to look into it and to dpiece of legislation. That ttee reported in Novem December, I am not sure exact month, of 1983, almostears ago. The Cabinet now i a draft piece of legisfor almost two full yearsid y it and yet it is not Order Paper for this partill.

Mr.Spwhat I want to do, in the of minutes I have, is to inwhy I think there is a need and I am going to use figurwe have extracted from the f the Department of

Justice where individual members of this House and other candidates must file their financial returns. I will give you a couple of examples.

In Burgeo-Bay d' Espoir, the losing candidate who now has a government sinecure, but I will not go into that again, spent \$20,699. Fortunately for the present incumbent of Burgeo-Bay d' Espoir, he had access to some funds as well and spent \$14,000 and took the seat away from that individual - one of the few instances, by the way, where there was relative parity. To give you other examples, the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) spent \$18,398 and defeated a Liberal candidate who spent \$3,255 - totally unfair.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

I assume the hon. member will table this information.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, if he had been here at the previous time he would have found that it has already been tabled and it is already entered into the record.

MR. J. CARTER:

I am never sure what you have tabled and what you have not.

MR. FENWICK:

Going on, Mr Speaker. In the district of Ferryland the member who is here, the present incumbent spent \$16,675 to defeat an NDP

candidate spent \$1,000 and a Liberal spent \$2,900. Now clearly it's not fair to have that race in spending. I will go in the district of Green where the incumbent we all know spent \$10,625 to beat an NDP candidate spent \$600 and a Liberal spent \$2,500. I can go on. member for Harbour Grace \$13,000 and the Liberal

PREMIER ORD:

Mr. Speaker point of order.

MR. SPE

The hon. Premier on a point of order.

PREMIER ORD:

Just clarification here, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the NDP Party, the NDP candidate for Green B not in the district for the election.

MR. FEN

Mr. Speaker, I am assuming that is not a point of order.

MR. YOU

Further, that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPE

The hon. Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOU

The hon. member reads out that I spent \$0 and my opponent spent \$0. Mr. Speaker, I can bring facts in this House where a candidate spent that in Upper Cove alone on cars.

MR. SPE

Order, please.

To that point of order there is no point. The hon. members took the opportunity of explaining

their positions.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Just by summarizing because I only have a minute or so, in Menihek the PC candidate spent \$16,660 and the NDP candidate \$11,687.

Mr. Speaker, it is the totals that are critical. The total amount of spending by all the PC candidates was \$574,000; by Liberal candidates it was \$281,000; and by NDP candidates it was \$69,000. What it clearly shows is that without some control on this kind of spending the government will continue to spend more and more and continue to buy the elections, not literally, but be able to put as much resources into it as they can.

The question I have for the Premier, \$570,000 plus the central campaign which is probably \$500,000, we are talking about \$1 million here, who donated it to the PC Party? That is my question. I am not getting any answers and I am not getting them because the Premier has backed off from a promise to put in an election's act that he made six years ago and has refused to do it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), you know, 'Fools creep in where angels fear to tread.' It is like the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) was just saying, who paid for the people who were down with this union and that union and stayed in the Hotel

Mortier for weeks and weeks and weeks and then you show a sum of \$100 or \$2,000 when we can prove that there were thousands and thousands of more dollars. Our problem is that we are to honest. We actually show what we spend. There are some other people who do not. We pay for people who we say we are going to pay for, not like others who are still around trying to collect it.

Mr. Speaker, the leader of the NDP Party is correct. I forget how many are on that list now when I was running for the leadership. I forget the number.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Seven or eight.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
No, it was more than that. Fifteen or sixteen.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Seventeen I think.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Or seventeen commitments I made or that I wanted to do if I became Premier and I have kept every one except one. The only one I have not kept to this date is the Election Act. Every other single item has been implemented.

MR. BARRY:
Forty thousand jobs.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Yes. But it was not in that list by the way. And the Leader of the Opposition was right and savoured it at the time. We are right behind the 1000 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
He went down to Burin Peninsula West and got defeated and then went in in 1979 on my coattails. That is what the Leader of the Opposition did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Of course going in on my coattails, what other way would the hon. member want to go in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Oh my! Oh my! The great exponent of the fishery, the Leader of the Opposition. He went down on the Burin Peninsula West, here he was already Minister of Mines and Energy and could not get himself re-elected. He has got some affinity with the fishermen and with the ordinary person in Newfoundland and Labrador. If I was Leader of the Opposition I would be so embarrassed I would not be able to come in this House. Awful! Awful!

MR. DOYLE:
If I had run against him on Bell Island he would not be here today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
That is right but we wanted to get the weakest person we could -

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The member for Harbour Main will probably want to run in Bell Island the next time because he sure as hell will not be running in Harbour Main with the way he did the last time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Why did the Leader of the Opposition not go down in Burin-Placentia West last time where he started? Why did he not go to a good rural seat? He was too busy -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) majority of votes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes when you were on your own. What was your majority when you went in on my coattails? What was your majority last time compared to when you went in on coattails?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You did not do so well on your own as you did when you were on my coattails did you? No sir, that is what you did not!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Anyway, the member for Menihek asked me a question and he is

dissatisfied with the answer and I will try to give him the answer again. On the Election Act, there was a select committee, as the member said. They reported. The matter is now before Cabinet. We are deliberating over it and trying to make up our minds which way we want to go on a number of the provisions because you can go two or three different ways. As soon as we get that completed we will be presenting it to the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is not satisfied with the answer given by the Premier on the offshore energy position.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

By the way, 'Peter', we will bring in the Elections Act for you after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

We are on reasonably familiar terms but I am almost convinced I am supposed to be referred to as the member for Menihek and not as 'Peter'.

MR. BARRY:

Sorry I apologize, 'Peter', the member for Menihek.

MR. SPEAKER:

Carry on.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We have, Mr. Speaker, a matter to be brought up.

MR. PATTERSON:

(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

That is his fourth speech and they are getting better.

MR. CALLAN:

Now are you going to give a speech on resettlement?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could get back to the matter at hand for a moment here, although it is hard. I think Halloween has set in, Mr. Speaker. I think the Halloween mood has hit this House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier why is it that we spent so much time preparing the offshore regulations and we consulted with so many experts in the field of resource taxation. I remember Andy Thompson and Michael Cromlin, and, Mr. Speaker, so many other people who had spent a lot of time making a contribution, advising us to the best way to go. We came to the conclusion that in order for the Province to get the maximum benefit from the offshore, we would have to have a combination of ways of getting revenue, one of which would be to have participation by the Province. In other words, for the Province to have the right to go in and take a share in the venture so that it could receive profits, could receive revenue, as a partner in the venture.

Mr. Speaker, that was only one way. We also had a base royalty,

a sliding scale royalty, their taxes, and we even had provision for awarding acreage on a public tendering system and taking cash bonuses up front, Mr. Speaker.

But it was pointed out by everybody we talked to, the Norwegians, the experts I mentioned and so forth, that if you relied upon going to public tender, Mr. Speaker, you often did not have sufficient information about a particular acreage to know whether you were getting full value just by going out and accepting a cash bid at a particular point in time.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier really has to tell the people of this Province and tell this House why did he permit Mr. Mulroney to force him to back away from participation. We realize it is not the right-wing Tory philosophy, Mr. Speaker, that is employed here. It is, Mr. Speaker, a pragmatic approach to revenue collection.

Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Mulroney was speaking in the United States to the U.S. oil industry, promising to give back the Petro-Canada back-in, why was it when we asked the Premier the same day whether he was aware of what Mr. Mulroney was saying, the Premier got up in this House and said, we have been trying to communicate with the Prime Minister's Office, we have been trying to find out what is going on and we will report back to the House. The Premier has never reported back to the House on that. We now find him being totally meek and mild and letting Mr. Mulroney and his Tory buddies in Ottawa ram this down his throat.

Let us accept that the back-in might have been unfair in changing

the of the game in other
parCanada after the oil
coment out there. But did
the ever attempt to point
outMulroney that there was
a t situation in this
Proecause we had the
New regulations and the
oiles had accepted those
rule game when they went
outthey went out their
dri the understanding that
thee would be entitled to
parn.

Willemier have the courage
andesty and the decency to
admiby losing that back-in
we st revenue that would
otheome to this Province
and: badly needed in this
Prov

SOMENBERS:

Hear

PREMFORD:

Mr.

MR.

The Premier.

PREMFORD:

Now,aker, first of all, as
is t of the Leader of the
Oppo:Mr. Barry) and for the
bene:the press again, the
Leadthe Opposition, number
one,ack to 1973 and 1974
and about the oil and gas
regul that were brought in
at t. He tries so hard.
Some presses got sucked in
by i facts do not bear it
out, ey still got sucked in
by itries to link himself
so tnebody in history is
goingite that the Leader of
the Con had something to do
with l and gas regulations.
He is now in 1974 and 1973
beforot defeated in 1975.
Aftert was Mr. Crosbie, who

was Minister of Mines and Energy,
and after Mr. Crosbie it was me.
It was during the time that I was
Minister of Mines and Energy that
the regulations were actually put
together and approved and the
Leader of the Opposition -

MR. BARRY:

You had them in a draft form.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They were not even in a draft
form, Mr. Speaker, they were not
even in a draft form. And I like
the way the Leader of the
Oppostiion (Mr. Barry) is trying
to get -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It was up into 1977 before they
were even approved by Cabinet,
four years after.

MR. BARRY:

Table the documents.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He had nothing to do with them
whatsoever, Mr. Speaker,
whatsoever. I can tell the Leader
of the Opposition, if he wants
into that, good stories from the
people of Mines and Energy about
the hon. Leader of the Opposition
as it relates to the regulations.

MR. BARRY:

(Inaudible) stories.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, a lot of good stories. But
in any case let us get away with
that myth, the Leader of the
Opposition trying to take credit
for something he had nothing to do
with. That is number one, Mr.

Speake:

Number 11 the Leader of the Opposition with reality, not 1973, 1974, not even 1977, will it with 1985 when we signed Atlantic Accord? He wants to ignore the Atlantic Accord at what he is trying to do now is up a situation that when it is brought in in legislation is going to be so embarrassing that he is trying in some strength now and socialism before this is presented in this House while this session is going. I just refer to the Leader of the Opposition know he hates it, I know his stand to listen to it, to provisions that are in there, provide that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador establish and collect resource revenues as if these resources on land within the Province are in the Accord and bring into the Law of Canada to establish any rate we want.

MR. BARI

Without back-in.

MR. SPEAK

Order, 1

PREMIER ROY:

We have power to establish royalty revenues, royalties, the corporate income tax, a sales tax, and payments, rentals and licenses, other forms of resource revenue and provincial taxes in general application, consistent with the spirit of this Accord, to be established from time to

We have everything we want, Mr. Speaker. The problem is that the Leader of the Opposition will not admit it cannot accept it and

therefore he has to go back to this intellectual concoction that we had back in our regulations in 1977 by a 40 per cent back-in before Petro-Canada had their 25 per cent back-in. It was 40 per cent, by the way, after the companies had realized three and a half times on their investment. That is a lot different than Petro-Canada and 25 per cent moving in for zero.

But that was 1977 and 1978! We have now accomplished, through the Atlantic Accord, all the things that we want. We can establish revenues and taxes and any kind that we want. We can get our 30 per cent or 40 per cent or 50 per cent, we can get any level of money we want. It is here in the Accord.

We do not need a 40 per cent back-in. We can charge, from time to time, whatever we want to charge, whether it is 20 per cent, 30 per cent, 50 per cent, whatever we want we can charge, Mr. Speaker. That basic, fundamental right to establish revenues, that is what the Leader of the Opposition cannot accept because, you know why, he never thought in his wildest dreams we were going to get in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And then to add insult to injury, the Development Fund of \$300 million, and then to do more injury to the Leader of the Opposition, we are able to get this phase out of equalization where we are given back 90 per cent of it and it goes for over thirteen years, all the while we are getting oil revenues, on top of being able to establish

revenues at any level we want. We can go anywhere from zero to one hundred. We have that kind of right.

The Leader of the Opposition may try but the word over the next six or eight months - it will not just be a concept of the right to establish something - for the next three or four years the people of Newfoundland will not see it as a concept of me against the Leader of the Opposition, or the PCs against the Liberals, they are going to see tangible benefits of it in jobs and revenue so that when we call the next election it will be fifty-two to zero.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It is moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn. All those in favour 'Aye'. Those against 'Nay'.

The House stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow.