

PROPERTY OF NEWFOUNDLAND
LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
PLEASE RETURN



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 56

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Monday

8 June 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE:
I am sure, Mr. Speaker, hon. members on both sides of the Legislature wish to join with me to request that the House send the appropriate message for another great attainment in the athletic prowesses of Newfoundlanders and send our congratulations to our provincial dart team. I have two significant notes. The team of Sam Morgan from Ramea, and Patricia Farrell from Codroy Valley have won the Canadian mixed doubles. Patricia went on later in the week, Mr. Speaker, to win the ladies singles national title and, in so doing, knocked off the fifth rank female dart player in the world.

I think it is a significant contribution to athletics in the Province and certainly an event worth noting in that they are the first Newfoundlanders to win national championships.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Burgeo Bay - D'Espeir.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there is a team from the

district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espeir involved in this very historic event, I would like to take the opportunity from this side of the House to offer our congratulations and to second the motion to send them a telegram congratulating them for their great achievement. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Before calling for Statements by Ministers, I would like to welcome to the galleries Mr. Clyde Wells, a former member of the House and the new Leader of the Liberal Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I would like to welcome to the visitor's gallery forty-two Grade VII students and their teachers, Ray Murphy and Wit Kelly, from St. Anne's School in Dunville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to inform hon. members that an additional one hundred and ten new projects have received approval.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, these 110 new projects, involve a total provincial contribution of \$765,112,000. These projects will create 266 new jobs.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker. On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. A cameraman is taking pictures in the gallery there and it is not permitted in the House.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. What is so alarming about showing the people of Newfoundland what we are doing here for a change. Admit the cameras.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would like to inform the House that I had a phone call from Marilyn Boone just before the proceedings started and she asked me if it would be alright for somebody to take pictures outside the actual House itself. I said I did not see any objection.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

But I certainly did not give any permission on your behalf for pictures to be taken of the inside of the House or of the proceedings.

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, just let me say that we have approved 110 new projects with a total provincial

contribution of \$765,112,000. These projects will create 266 new jobs, 51 of which will be student positions. Mr. Speaker, I will be tabling a copy of the 110 projects that are approved.

In keeping with Government's commitment to have these projects approved as expeditiously as possible, I would like to note that 254 projects have been approved under this program over the past four weeks. These projects will provide 529 new jobs, including 94 student placements. Of the \$5 million allocated for the program, Mr. Speaker, \$1.5 million has already been spent.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that these 529 new jobs in the private sector are in addition to the 1,095 jobs that were created under the Public Sector Employment program, for a total of 1,624 jobs so far.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of this wage subsidy the provincial government is offering through the Private Sector Employment program, many businesses in the Province will be able to expand. This kind of growth potential has generated a new optimism within the private sector.

I would also like to note, Mr. Speaker, that officials of my department have been contacted by many people in the business community, in all sectors of Newfoundland, wishing to express their appreciation to government for this type of co-operative job creation initiative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for making a copy of the statement available to us. I am not sure what it is the government thinks it is achieving by this series of announcements.

MR. MORGAN:

Creating jobs.

MR. SIMMS:

Advising the House.

MR. SIMMONS:

Much ado about nothing!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, we are very much on the record as supporting the initiative which marries up private sector dollars with public dollars. We, on this side, support that initiative wholeheartedly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is very little else in this statement we can support. We are concerned, as we were earlier, about the government overheating the economy with so many of those jobs at one time, more of the mega project approach, I suppose. They should all get on planes up in Fort McMurray and rush home now to get those jobs.

Mr. Speaker, that minister, who has youth on his side, can do better than this for the youth of this Province, which are facing -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

- a crisis of terrible proportions. The best this government can do is put up the Minister of Youth - he should be called that - and pander on this point day in and day out. Where is the programme that will address those many thousands of youngsters' need out there for jobs?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Where is the programme that would get them working? It is not in 100 or 150 or 200 jobs, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would my hon. friends on my left please keep silent when the hon. member here is trying to respond to the Ministerial Statement.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the minister talks about optimism. I say to him, there is very little in this statement for the youth of this Province to get optimistic about, very little indeed. He must be prepared to come in here with an initiative that will send out a signal to those people who are being devastated. A whole generation is being destroyed because of the lack of action on this government in the area of job creation, particularly for young people. This will not do it.

This is nigh on an insult to these people, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

Two hundred students have jobs.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Still, he talks!

Mr. Speaker, the only note of optimism the youth of Newfoundland received in the past few days is the fact that this party has a new leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

They can heckle all they want, because perhaps they do not take the problem of youth unemployment seriously. Is that the problem, Mr. Speaker, that they do not have the message over there? They have a job and that is all that matters. Well, I have news for them, Mr. Speaker. We have a programme for youth. We have a programme for youth employment, and they can heckle all they want; we will implement the programme as soon as the people of Newfoundland give us the opportunity, and that is going to be sooner than you would like to think, much sooner!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the minister for his statement, at least inasmuch as it presents us with the tables so we can see where jobs are being created.

But, I would say, as I have said before, coming into the House every week or two to make a statement adding up these jobs is becoming a very tedious exercise that not only the House of Assembly, but the people of this Province are being subjected to. The propaganda value, I think, is what the minister has in mind when he comes in with this statement, rather than a genuine attempt to put information in front of people.

The minister has told us today there is \$3.5 million remaining in this private sector programme. I today call on the minister to make some of these remaining funds that are waiting for applications available for public sector programmes, namely, the problem of family violence and the lack of moneys being put into transition services in this Province. I call on the minister to make money available and say, finally, that when the minister speaks of new optimism in the private sector, what we see here is a continuous attempt to privatize the notion of optimism in this Province. It is about time, when we are seeing cutbacks in social services, health and education, that the minister and the government stop this dogmatic obsession with the private sector. Start dealing with human services in this Province and start putting money into job creation programmes to take care of people who are hurting.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

At this stage I would like to welcome to the galleries Mr. Abe Wornell, a former member of the Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, in view of a May 24, 1987 article in The Sunday Express entitled, "Marystown Shipyard Teetering on the Edge of Disaster", I feel it is necessary for me to report to the House on the current situation at the shipyard. The yard, contrary to what The Sunday Express would have us believe, is looking to a period of stability that will carry it through the next several years. The article is yet another example of irresponsible journalism which is detrimental to the economic well-being of both Marystown Shipyard and the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:
Based on recent announcements and the content of the article, the headline is totally inappropriate and it causes unnecessary concerns to the shipyard's employees, suppliers and customers. The article emphasizes the negative aspects and conveniently makes little or no reference to the role the shipyard plays in the economy of the Burin Peninsula. The

Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and the employees of the shipyard are working together and will continue to work together to enhance the long-term potential of that shipyard.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that the present outlook for the shipyard is extremely positive and certainly not teetering on the edge of disaster. It is currently constructing two middle distance trawlers for the Department of Fisheries. It is involved in numerous repair contracts, most notably the oil rig Bow Drill 3. Contract negotiations are ongoing with Fishery Products for the construction of seven trawlers, a project which will provide approximately 515 person years of employment over the next three years. This degree of stability is rare in the Canadian shipbuilding industry at this time.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I had the pleasure of addressing the recent annual meeting of the Canadian Shipbuilders Association here in St. John's this past week, and to the person, they complimented the government and that shipyard on the degree of proficiency that it has attained, and the order book which is presently has which is comparable to any other facility in all of Canada.

One of the most complimentary things which came out of the whole issue was the fact that they wished that their provincial jurisdictions look the same interest in their shipyards as this government does in Marystown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

With respect to its long-term potential, the shipyard has recently completed a technology transfer programme with Moss Rosenberg, Verft of Norway to enable it to acquire the knowhow and experience required to develop systems, procedures, personnel and expertise to the standard expected by offshore developers. Through this agreement, the shipyard will attain a position as a qualified fabricator and bidder for offshore and defence contracts.

In conjunction with the technology transfer programme, Moss Rosenberg and the shipyard have formed a joint venture company called Vinland Industries to qualify for the award of contracts relating to the construction of Hibernia production facilities.

Vinland recently pre-qualified and submitted a bid to Chevron on a module package for an offshore production platform to be located in Angola. In this regard, it is noteworthy that Marystown Shipyard is the only fabricator in Atlantic Canada to have pre-qualified for module construction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

The Canada - Newfoundland Offshore Development Fund Agreement has also recently been used to provide a \$20 million offshore fabrication enhancement programme. A sum of \$2 million is being made available immediately to assist the shipyard in upgrading its engineering and managerial capabilities and to commence engineering studies to identify specific areas where its physical facilities need to be improved in order for it to qualify for Hibernia fabrication

work. The remaining \$18 million for expansion and physical upgrading of the shipyard's facilities has been approved in principle, pending the results of the engineering studies and a decision to proceed with offshore development.

The shipyard has also recently been awarded by public tender, a \$4.6 million contract from the Canadian Coast Guard to convert Hull 37 from an offshore supply vessel to that of a search and rescue vessel.

In view of the foregoing, I am appalled that **The Sunday Express** would attempt to catch our attention by suggesting that 'Marystown Shipyard is teetering on the edge of disaster.'

Mr. Speaker, **The Sunday Express**, by this headline on Marystown Shipyard - and there are many other examples which can be highlighted - has shown itself to be far from a responsible newspaper. They demonstrate with the publication of every issue they are committed to sensationalism as a means of attaining sales. The press has a very grave responsibility to ensure that the public is fully and accurately informed. **The Sunday Express**, under the guise of being a legitimate weekly newspaper, deals in half-truths, unsubstantiated conclusions and uses sensational headlines to gain attention. It is an unseemly blemish on the face of legitimate journalism.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight that the significance of this kind of reporting has not been lost on the Town of Marystown. In a letter to the editor dated May 29, 1987, the

Mayor of Marystown leaves no doubt about the town's "shock and major disappointment" over the article.

The Mayor goes on to say, "The headline, is hardly appropriate when the people of this Province know that in the past few months there were major announcements made as it relates to Marystown Shipyard. The feeling is that your headlines are written to get attention and to sell papers and have little regard for the well-being of the industry, or the people of the area." He went on to say, "It is very disappointing and downright discouraging when you pick up a newspaper and read an article that the press have quoted you in only to know that some of these quotes were not even part of the interview".

Mr. Speaker, this kind of reporting is not in the economic interest of our Province. We should all join with the Mayor of Marystown in an effort to ensure accountability on the part of the owner and management of The Sunday Express.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, the Marystown Shipyard is a major economic contributor to the Burin Peninsula. In addition to that, of course, it is making and it will continue to make a big contribution to acquiring and transferring technology which will serve us well in the future. For

those reasons and many others, we on this side hope that the minister is right when he says the yard will succeed. We hope he is right. We want to believe the minister with everything that is in us because that yard must succeed.

It is an integral part of an offshore development and as I have said, of course, it contributes so much to the economy, particularly of the Burin Peninsula. It helps attract to the Province industry from other parts of Canada and has the potential to attract business from outside Canada but for a reason that I will come to.

Mr. Speaker, as with all the statements that ministers bring into this House, one has to scrutinize them with the proverbial grain of salt. To say it differently, the fact that the minister says something does not make it the truth. Take, for example, his third paragraph where he talks about trawlers, middle distance trawlers and so on. Of course, if he were telling the full truth to the House he would point out that that is the result of a fisheries restructuring agreement literally forced on this administration by a federal administration three or four years ago, at a time when the Premier was going around saying that fish plants would have to close in this Province. That is what he was telling them on national television at that particular time.

Mr. Speaker, the management of the yard is to be congratulated for the many initiatives it has taken to get the yard ready, geared up, for the offshore development. Now, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has been many things but

thank God he has never been manager of the Marystown Shipyard.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is a shareholder.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the management has done its homework well and they have seen to it that a number of men have gone across the water to Norway to acquire skills that will serve them well when and if the offshore comes. Mr. Speaker, let us hope they will get a chance to utilize those particular skills in the not to distant future.

Mr. Speaker, the present Prime Minister, when he was campaigning for office back in August, 1984, made a commitment, a commitment that if implemented would impact very possibly on the ability of the Marystown Shipyard to compete with out-of-country yards. Of course, you know I am talking about his undertaking to remove that exemption on fishing trawlers over 100 feet. The implication of that exemption right now is that fish companies, including FPI and National Sea, are going off to Korea and to other parts to get their ships built because they can get them built much cheaper.

MR. TOBIN:

Why did you not do it while you were in Ottawa?

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, today's Prime Minister made a commitment that he would change that. He has been there two and a half years, of course, and we are still waiting for the change.

Mr. Speaker, two final points. The center of Page 2 contains the key wording which will ultimately decide the future of this yard and

decide the future of many other enterprises in this Province. The minister at the end of that second paragraph talks about a pending decision to proceed with offshore development. That decision is already well behind time and the Premier and the Government House Leader, the Minister of Energy (Mr. Ottenheimer) are noticeably silent, conspicuously silent on that whole matter about which they raved so much in passed times.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is another signal, a very important signal right at the beginning and the end of this press release. It is a signal that will not be lost on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. Listen to this sentence, Mr. Speaker, "Under the guise of being a legitimate weekly newspaper, it deals in half-truths and unsubstantiated conclusions." Or listen to this one, "The press has a very grave responsibility, etc., etc.," Where did we last hear that, Mr. Speaker? We hear it every time you have a government on the run, a government that has run out of gas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

The last tactic, Mr. Speaker, is to attack the press, to tell the press how it should be doing its job, to censure the press. I suppose the next thing they will be doing --

MR. TULK:

Is it **The Evening Telegram** next? They have CBC.

MR. SIMMONS:

Well, they have CBC and they now have **The Sunday Express**. I suppose the next step is to put out their own publication. The

next step is to withdraw advertising because the press is saying something they do not agree with.

Mr. Speaker, the Province would be much better served if these people were less preoccupied with censuring the press and telling them what to do and got on with the job of governing which they were elected to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This statement by the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett) is not one we would welcome. We would welcome any attempt by the minister to solve what in his own mind might be a serious problem relating to the flow of information in this Province, but we do not welcome a statement that uses the kind of language that is in this minister's statement today.

To berate and malign a commercial newspaper in this Province, to try and bring to a debate on what is a very important and obviously a very complex issue, namely the future facing the Marystown Shipyard, to bring to that debate the tone that the minister has intervened with today, which is one that is normally found only inside this Chamber - as embarrassing and as shameful as it sometimes might be - I would suggest, as one member of this

House, that the minister should not go outside this Chamber and use the same kind of language to berate and malign what is a commercial publication trying to do a job and having, no doubt, great difficulty in being able to have access to ministers and proper information that the government would like to have communicated.

There are too many examples in recent weeks and recent months of ministers of this government simply being unavailable for media or other members of the public to contact. Now, if the minister wants to come in and challenge information that is being put forward, that is one thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. LONG:
I would say finally, Mr. Speaker, from my own position as a member representing a district in St. John's, I know that the situation facing the Newfoundland Dockyard here in St. John's, with the transfer of ownership from CN to Marine Atlantic, has raised many serious questions about the future of the dockyard. This dockyard happens to be in certain circumstances in competition with Marystown.

AN HON. MEMBER:
You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. LONG:
They are both in competition with too many ships yards existing in this country. There is an incredible complex set of international forces that will

determine the future of any of these institutions in these communities.

I would personally like to commend the effort of **The Sunday Express** in reporting, not only on the Newfoundland Dockyard story, which they did last week, but for the previous week's article on Marystown and their attempts to bring forward some decent, meaningful information to help people understand what is happening in a very complex set of circumstances. I would say that the minister should be ashamed of himself in coming in here today and try to gratuitously denounce the efforts of these hard-working journalists in this Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege before we get into Question Period, if I might?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, on a point of privilege.

MR. BARRY:

I am half afraid to raise it after the most recent comments in the House. I would like for this not to be taken as censorship of the press. I would like for it to be taken as an attempt to correct and to ask for a correction, which I think we are all entitled to do in this House.

On page 3 of **The Evening Telegram**, under the heading, "Reception a who's who of provincial Tory party", there is a quote attributed to me. The paper is right in recognizing that I attended this function. The paper is wrong, Mr. Speaker, in

attributing the quote it did. I did not make the quote. I am reported to have said, when asked why I was there, "Because this is the only place in St. John's to be today."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I have to say I did not make that remark.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Sorry. Sorry. Mr. Speaker, I did not even think that remark. I was home all yesterday evening. If the writer had wanted to call and check to see if he had made that remark, there was no trouble to find me. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, as they report correctly on the second page, or partially correctly, they have me as being in attendance on one occasion, I was in fact in attendance on a number of occasions, at the Liberal Convention, for the record, Mr. Speaker.

I can understand why the press might be confused in identifying it as a Tory function, because, Mr. Speaker, patronage has been so liberally lashed out by members opposite over the last few years that this type of governmental function, I think, the general public tends to attempt to identify as a partisan function.

MR. MORGAN:

Is there not a Tory Prime Minister in Canada?

MR. BARRY:

Was there not a Liberal Premier of Prince Edward Island in attendance?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Exactly, exactly. QED, I rest my case, Mr. Speaker. Yes, there was a Liberal Premier in attendance and participating.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could, without interruption, I would just like to make a brief remark and sit down so we can get on with the business of the House.

Mr. Speaker, it is an insidious process that has been ongoing. The press, however, have a responsibility and they should know better. They have a responsibility to distinguish between partisan political functions and matters of government, occasions of government and governmental functions. All members of this House, on both sides of this House, and even our Socialist member down in the corner, I am sure, received an invitation to be in attendance because that was not a Tory Party function, it was a governmental function, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

I am entitled to be there and nobody is entitled to read anything into that, Mr. Speaker, however mischievous they want to be. We have had one paper roundly condemned and chastized today. I will say The Evening Telegram occasionally makes mistakes. It has made a mistake in this case and I would like to see it corrected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

On that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, we certainly concur. The hon. gentleman says he was quoted as saying, 'Being at the Prime Minister's Conference was the only place to be.' He did not say it was the only place to be and therefore that should be corrected.

Perhaps the reporter was reading his mind, but obviously the reporter can only report what is said, and we certainly agree. The hon. member for Mount Scio - Bell Island says he did not say it was the only place to be, then it was not the only place to be. He may have thought it. Obviously, none of us can know what the hon. gentleman is thinking, fortunately for some.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no prima facie case of breach of privilege. The hon. member took the opportunity of correcting what was quoted.

Oral Questions

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), the Minister also, of course, Responsible for the Status of Women.

Now, the minister will be aware of the statements made by the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) with regards to working mothers in this Province, so I do not need to repeat the statements made. We are not talking about a line that may have been taken out of context. The statement was a litany of insults to and aspersions on the working mothers of this Province. The minister probably sent the working mothers of this Province to work this morning with a guilty conscience that somehow or other by going to work they may be contributing to the possibility of their children becoming delinquent.

Does the Minister Responsible for the Status of Women agree with and support the views expressed by the Minister of Social Services?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, if some members were not so preoccupied over the weekend with trivial matters, they would have realized that on this important issue of state the government's position is quite clear when it comes to support of women's issues in this Province. We take a back seat to no one, in particular the Liberal Party of Newfoundland when it comes to women's issues, who are as

dinosauric as any other political party could possibly be when it comes to women's issues. We, in this party, are very adamant. We have a record which substantiates what we have done for women in this Province, whether it comes from the matrimonial property laws, our support for day care, our support for transition houses, and our support of their membership on government boards where we have discretionary powers so to do. In a whole range of areas, Mr. Speaker, our government philosophy, our government policy as it relates to women's issues is very clear and is very progressive.

This government does not support the concept or belief in the idea that there is somehow or other a connection between the amount of time that women spend outside the home working for pay, as it relates to working at home sometimes without pay, we can find no correlation which somehow or other substantiates the idea that working mothers contribute to juvenile delinquency. That is our official government position and it has not changed. Our record on women's issues, as I say, Mr. Speaker, is very progressive and is something that we on this side are very proud of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether the minister agrees or disagrees with the minister's statement so I will try again with this

question: Is the minister prepared to continue to serve in a Cabinet with the Minister of Social Services, the minister who is responsible for providing adequate day care services in this Province, after that minister has expressed his views with regard to working mothers, and, indeed, all women in this Province, and the children of working mothers in this Province? Will he still continue to serve in Cabinet with a minister who stands by and expresses those views?

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, I just want to make absolutely clear government's position, which I just stated. Our government's role when it comes to day care is also extremely progressive, for example, the new centre, on which we spent close to \$700,000 to have, a government day care centre in the new Confederation Building Complex for government employees. That government day care centre is supported very enthusiastically by the Minister of Social Services, Mr. Speaker, a man who sits in Cabinet, who very often, in many, many ways and very strongly supports day care and improved day care services in this Province. One comment that that minister makes, notwithstanding, does not take away the record that this government has as it relates to day care in this Province, Mr. Speaker. We are going to continue to have it, as it relates to the education of day care workers, such as the \$.5 million dollars that was found for the Cabot

Institute to do a day care two-year programme to teach the workers who will enter the day care system as instructors and support staff to be as educated as they are anywhere else in Canada or in North America, with the support of the Minister of Social Services along with the total support of the ministry. Government itself will continue to do progressive things in the field of day care.

MR. FLIGHT:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
Would the minister indicate to the House whether or not he has insisted that the Minister of Social Services apologize to the women, and the children of working women in this Province? Since he represents women in his role as Minister Responsible for the Status of Women, has he insisted that the minister issue an apology to the women of this Province?

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, anybody who was in the Legislature last Wednesday knows that the Minister of Social Services was speaking on the private member's resolution of the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons). He was not speaking directly as a government minister or on his government responsibility. As it comes to day care in this Province, Mr.

Speaker, I can only say that this government's record is excellent as it relates to any other government in Canada for the provision of those services to the women and children of this Province. That notwithstanding, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate the comment was made, that somehow or other some persons opposite, for their own narrow, political motives will try to make it somehow or other perceived that this government on this side, which runs day care in this Province, is somehow or other not supportive of day care. That is totally inaccurate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, that answer is not good enough. That is just not going to wash.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge): In her capacity as Attorney-General, she is painfully aware of a specific comment attributed to the minister, and it is this, 'I wish mothers would stay home and look after their children. If they did, we would have fewer juveniles in correctional institutions.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the Minister of Social Services' comment, not anybody else, the minister, in his right as minister, to stand here and make those comments. I ask the Minister of Justice does she agree with those statements made by her colleague and has she demanded copies of the studies which will verify and rationalize those statements that he made?

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, I have made my views on this subject known publicly over the last four or five days. There is absolutely no research anywhere, there are no studies to show any connection between mothers working and the criminal behaviour of their children. There are studies and there is very good research showing that quality day care given by care givers other than parents, in the home, outside the home, through a variety of models, is very beneficial for children. The definitive study was done over a period of twenty-odd years in Michigan with a controlled group and another group of children who had the benefit of high quality, preschool programming. The second group, which had quality day care, fared much better by a number of measures - happiness, success in school, and success in the work place later in life. So there is absolutely no evidence to show any connection between mothers working or fathers working and the criminal behaviour of their children. There is very definite research to show that child care provided by other than parents, supplementing parents' care, mother's care and father's care, is very beneficial to their children.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Justice undertake to provide her colleague, the Minister of Social

Services with all available studies showing his words - not the words of anybody else in this Chamber, but his words as Minister of Social Services - to be absolutely false? Will she do that? Has she demanded a public apology from this minister for the slur he sent across this Province and cast upon all mothers who go out to work every single day?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I have made my views known fully inside Cabinet and to the general public, and I welcome this opportunity to state them in this House of Assembly. There is plenty of evidence, as I say, to support the value of publicly funded child care, provided by care givers other than parents, to supplement the care of fathers and mothers.

MR. FUREY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, if the minister who stated those words linking working mothers to their children getting on a direct path to prison will not publicly apologize or resign, will this minister, who is a good and honourable champion of women's rights, leave the Cabinet?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I am part of a government which has an excellent

record when it comes to providing services for children and women. Our record of accomplishments speaks for itself and our goals for the next few years speak for themselves. I will continue to be part of a Peckford administration which has as a central plank in its platform advancing the interests of women -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:

- supporting the women of this Province in making choices that are best for themselves as individuals who have needs for self development, who have abilities, talents and skills to contribute to the paid labour force of our Province, to the economic and social building of the Province, choices which are in the best interest of their children and their families and, when women chose for themselves to enter the paid labour force, to support women by providing opportunities for meaningful labour force participation, opportunities equal with those provided to men.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

My question is to the Minister of Justice. While I obviously respect and admire her for her stand on women's issues in this Province, I say to her that she cannot have it both ways. She cannot continue to serve in a government in which serves that minister who says the working mothers of this Province are contributing to juvenile

delinquency. So I ask her, in defence of the women of this Province, would she do either one of two things: Either say to the Premier of this Province that the Minister of Social Services, who spoke as the Minister of Social Services when he spoke in this House last Wednesday, has to resign or otherwise I, the Minister of Justice, will resign? Which one is to go?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, I field the questions referred to me that relate to the criminal justice system -

MR. TULK:
It relates to you.

MS VERGE:
- and I have responsibility, as Minister of Justice, for adult correction. I suggest that that question be referred to the Premier who can speak on behalf of the government as a whole.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
My question is to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, and it is in connection with an answer he gave to my colleague, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), when he said that the Minister of Social Services, last Wednesday when he made these serious statements that affected all parents, was talking

as a private member and not as Minister of Social Services. The question I want to ask the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, is: Does he believe that the Minister of Social Services can do a Jeykll and Hyde performance and be one thing outside of the House and a totally different character in government?

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, I just do not know how you can answer silly frivolous questions like that. - they are simply not serious questions, as I outlined in the answer to the earlier questions, Our government's role and our government's policy, our government's position and our government's performance on day care and child care and women's issues is quite open to the public. It is something that we are quite proud of. We are going to continue to do more, with the support of the Minister of Social Services as well, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member of Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Well, I will ask the Minister of Career Development one very quick, clear question. Does he agree with the statements made by the Minister of Social Services in the House of Assembly last Wednesday afternoon?

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Career Development.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, the member must need a hearing aid. I have said at least on half a dozen different occasions that I do not agree with the statement that there is some relationship between the amount of work that women do outside of the home for pay and juvenile delinquency. I do not believe in that statement, no.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Career Development says that they will take a back seat to no one. That is the problem: Charlie is in the driver's seat on this one, that is the whole problem right here, and we have to get him out of that particular seat, Mr. Speaker, before he does any more damage.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put a question -

MR. PATTERSON:
You are frightening the baby in the gallery. Sit down.

MR. SIMMONS:
That is because we need more day care.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

I want to put a question to the Premier on this very important issue. We hear the Minister of Career Development and the Justice Minister say that there is no correlation between working mothers and the incidence of young offenders. We hear the Minister of Social Services say there is. Today, and additionally outside of this House, Mr. Speaker, we have heard all kinds of statements from those three ministers which tell us they are on a very different track. Now it is obvious to the public I say to the Premier, that he has on his hands a very serious split on a very fundamental issue. Would he indicate to the House and to the public how he intends to resolve that particular split?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, that is something for me to decide upon in my own time, and I do not intend to debate that with the Leader of the Opposition today.

I want to reinforce, though, something that both the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Career Development have said, that obviously the Opposition are not looking at the facts of the situation as I see them. The budget of the Department of Social Services in 1979, when this administration took power, was \$45 million. Today it is \$111 million.

MR. SIMMONS:
That is not the question here.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Hold on! Let me answer.

Day care and homemaker services were \$350,000 and they are \$650,000 today. Support for family services was \$31,000 and it is now \$482,000. Transition

houses, zero in 1979, \$381,000 today. That is our policy, Mr. Speaker, and it is to do more. We are not doing enough, even though we have gone from zero to where we have gone. There is no connection empirically able to be ascertained between working mothers and the rate of juvenile delinquency. There is no connection.

Our programme, our policy, is absolutely clear. We were the administration and the party that brought in the Status of Women Council. We are the party and the government that brought in matrimonial property reform. We are the party and the government that brought in affirmative action for women. We are going to continue on that course more and more in the future than we have in the past.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. They brought in the Status of Women Council, they made the appointment, and I say to him that that appointment is now calling for a resolution of this problem. The President of that Status of Women's Council, appointed by this administration, says that what happened last Wednesday and Thursday in this House is an insult to working mothers, to their children, and to their spouses. If he wants, Mr. Speaker, to parade before this Chamber the Status of Women Council, let him tell us what he plans to do.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Does he have a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, yes I have a question. I have a question, and I thought the Premier gave us a fair amount of the answer in his first response. Will he go a step further? He says he will resolve it, and he says, in his time. I submit he does not have much time on this particular one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask him: When will he resolve it? He has undertaken, and I thank him, to resolve this matter, which is a recognition that there is a problem, and that is a new sign from him, that there is a problem. He has undertaken to resolve it. Can he indicate to the House when he will resolve the problem? Can he also indicate to the House whether, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services, subsequent to his statement last Wednesday, has offered the Premier his resignation from Cabinet, and also, Mr. Speaker, can he, the Premier, indicate whether he has talked to the minister about this particular subject?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the best way we can prove to the women and at the people of this Province that we are serious about what we have already done is to do more, to do more in day care and homemaker services, to do more in transition houses, to do more in all of the areas that we are responsible for beginning and starting since

1979. And that is what we want to do, Mr. Speaker, continue to enlarge these programmes which we have increased 100 per cent and increase them another 100 per cent over the next few years and, through our policies and through our programmes and through our money, let our money and our policies speak for where we stand on these issues, as we have in the past and we intend to do.

MR. SIMMONS:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

We support all that, Mr. Speaker, more, more, more, but the question is how can an arsonist look after the fire brigade? How can the minister who does not believe in those things be put in charge, I say to the Premier, of administering those programmes, of expanding them, of improving them? That is the concern that women of this Province and all of us have about this particular issue. How can the Premier justify to this House, to the mothers, to the children who were insulted by the minister, having this minister continue, particularly in this particular portfolio? His personal philosophy, he has demonstrated, publicly flies in the face of what the government professes it is trying to do. It flies directly in the face of that, Mr. Speaker.

It has been said that the minister was speaking in a Private Members' debate on Wednesday. On Thursday, in answering questions, he was speaking as the minister. How can the Premier justify the continuance of this minister,

particularly in this portfolio?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, what we have to do as a government - I am not going to get into an argument over this minister or that minister - to prove to the women of the Province and the people generally - not only the women, there are a lot of men and other people out there who believe very strongly in what we are trying to do as it relates to women's issues and day care - is to do more than we are doing now: We have to put more money into day care, more money into homemaker services, more money into transition houses. Mr. Speaker, that is what we have been doing consistently from 1979 to this moment. There has never been a stagnant budget in these areas of government. Every year there have been increases and there will be.

And, by the way, Mr. Speaker, just as a total recognition of that, it may come as a surprise to some that since 1979 to 1985, and here is a startling figure which demonstrates the concern that women have and ministers, like the Minister Responsible and the Minister of Justice, there have been 25,000 people added to the labour force of Newfoundland and Labrador. From 1979 to 1985, 25,000 people to the labour force - that is the latest statistic - and 21,000 of them have been women, 4,000 have been men.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That means, Mr. Speaker, that the whole demographics of this whole society has changed. Are we are not sensitive enough to recognize that and therefore do more than we are doing now? Well, obviously we are, Mr. Speaker, by the increases of 100 per cent and 150 per cent in these programmes, in that they have to be enlarged and expanded, and you have to have a day care centre here on the government premises and other day care centres around the Province. We must enlarge and expand, because in the last five to six years the increase in the labour force of 25,000 individuals has been 21,000 women and 4,000 men. Obviously we have to respond to that reality.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, my question goes to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). In view of the fact that this year's caplin fishery is in very serious trouble because of problems in the marketplace, problems that should have been anticipated by the minister and dealt with, what steps is the minister taking to avert what appears to be a total disaster with the caplin fishery this year?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for his question. He indicates that the problems should have been anticipated, and in fact they have been anticipated, Mr. Speaker. It has been known and

acted upon by my department, for the last number of months and weeks, that there has been an increase in the amount of caplin available to the Japanese from Iceland and other sources, and that there would be pressure on the Newfoundland producers and the Newfoundland fishermen this year.

I indicated to a question, I believe it was from the hon. gentleman from Port de Grave in this House only last week, that I had been in constant contact with both sides in those negotiations. I have maintained daily contact, practically, with them since that time. I believe, if it has been arranged, that shortly after Question Period today I will be meeting face to face with some of them again. So this minister and this department, Mr. Speaker, are doing everything possible that we can do by staying on top of the situation and helping out wherever we can to resolve the problem in terms of caplin production to the best advantage of the fishermen and the processors of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much if the fishermen of this Province, who are now waiting to commence the caplin fishery, will agree that the minister has done all he should have done.

I am asking the minister now: In light of this years problems -

maybe it is too late now to correct the problems this year - what will the minister be doing in the future, for example, to put a proper marketing and regulatory system in place to prevent a recurrence of what happened this year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, in terms of the hon. gentleman's preamble, the fishermen may or may not be on the same wavelength as the hon. gentleman, but certainly the representatives of the fishermen - I cannot deal with 25,000 or 30,000 fishermen, that is impossible and impractical - I think would agree, both factions out there, that I have been in very close contact with them over the last number of weeks and have offered to assist wherever we can.

Now, secondly, on the substantive part of his question, he will also realize that in this House, again I am not sure if it was in response to a question from the hon. gentleman only last week, I indicated to him that we are putting some very stringent monitoring operations in place this year as a result of requests from the fishermen's representatives and the processors' representatives. I have committed this department and this administration to putting those in a legislative framework for implementation in 1988, if that is deemed to be appropriate, following our experience from this year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all that is brand new initiatives, and in addition to that we are staying on top of the discussions and I will

be meeting with some of the people involved later on today. I do not know what more one can do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. CARTER:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. W. CARTER:

I am aware of the monitoring programme that the minister is putting in place but I am not sure that is going to be enough. What is the minister going to do, for example, to eliminate the chaos that is in the marketplace this year? That is where chaos starts, in the marketplace. Will the minister, for example, give some thought to establishing some kind of a marketing board to ensure that next year this problem does not happen?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, this minister, this administration and this government are open to every and all possibilities, whether it is marketing boards, whether it is using the full force of bilateral trade negotiations between Canada and Japan, whatever the mechanisms are we are open in totality to try to use those to the advantage of the fishermen and the processors involved in caplin in Newfoundland and Labrador. One fact we will never get away from, Mr. Speaker, no matter how much we want to, is the very fact that there is only one importer for female caplin in this world today, and that is the Japanese. Now, we have been trying to diversify, and I have been criticized from time to time

for trying to diversify into other market niches and other market potential for caplin, and I am going to continue with that, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is there is only one importer for female caplin, roe in the whole world today and that is the Japanese, and wherever there exists a monopoly, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have the same problem for a long, long time that we have today because, unfortunately, rightly or wrongly, whether we want to believe it, whether we want to accept it or not, they are calling the shots. But we will try everything in the world to make it as difficult as possible for them to call the shots.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier whether he is now disregarding the time-honoured parliamentary tradition of collective Cabinet responsibility? Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that this minister has been guilty of running off at the mouth. Now, what is the Premier going to do? Does he subscribe to this time-honoured tradition of Cabinet responsibility? How are the people of this Province to know when the minister is not speaking as minister? Does the minister not always speak, when he speaks here, as a minister, inside or outside of the House? What is the Premier going to do about this? How are the people of this

Province to know when ministers are speaking on behalf of government or when they are just running off at the mouth?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I think I have answered that question. It has come up on a number of occasions already in Question Period and all I can say to the hon. member is that we are going to continue to expand our programmes in social services relating to day care, relating to transition houses, relating to all those things which are important to reflect the reality of the situation, which is that the female participation in the work force is going up and the male participation rate in the work force is going down. Because that is a fundamental reality of our society and of all societies in the Western world, and will no doubt inevitably be true of even all of the world, we have to devise and design policies to respond to that. That is what we are doing. We have had 100 and 150 per cent increases in budgets in those areas and we are going to continue to do that until we are responding to, in a full way, those kinds of new needs that have come up in the last few years.

MR. LUSH:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
That is fine, Mr. Speaker, but is the Premier going to keep a

minister who's views articulated in this House are diametrically opposed to the state of views of government. Is he going to keep them?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am sure the minister will respond to the views that the government is articulating, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to table the report of the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Assembly dealing with the financial year which ended March 31, 1985. I would just like to take a few seconds to say that in spite of the fact that there is a minority report on one item, I would like to thank the committee members for the co-operation and spirit of good will that they have exhibited throughout what I feel have been very productive hearings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I cannot resist, number one, welcoming the hon. gentleman's tabling the report, and I could not resist when he said that although it is a majority report, on one item there is a minority report. I would assume the hon. gentleman probably is signatory to the minority report, and unfortunately the hon. gentleman has had some experience with minority reports. I probably should not have said that.

o o o

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I present a petition today from forty residents of Bay St. George protesting the thirty-five positions that have been cutback, around the Province, in the Department of Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, the government has failed to respond to the petitions presented thus far and the concerns expressed from all over the Province by people who are appalled that the government could

make such a move, cutting back services that people of this Province desperately need, and in an area where the people who need it most, who are in need of the service, who are in need of the help of rehabilitation, who are in the need of child care services, who are in the need of further development in the field of foster children and foster parents, all of these services, Mr. Speaker, that are so desperately needed and by the people who need them most. It is not frills or anything, Mr. Speaker. These are people who day by day have a difficult time getting along and making a living and putting food on the table.

This government has decided that in order to save several hundred thousand dollars they are going to cut back thirty-five positions. Mr. Speaker, it is obviously a government that has decided that social conscience is not needed when you are governing if they are going to cut back in an area where there is more needed instead of less. This government has taken that position and it is a position that we will oppose, will continue to oppose from here until they are out of government, which I expect will be shortly, as soon as the Premier decides to pull the plug.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to keep presenting the view that social services and the area of social services in this Province are desperately needed and more services are needed, more money is needed, and more positions are needed. The government is failing to recognize this, maybe because they have been there for so long, Mr. Speaker. It is just like, 'Well, we will get rid of a few here and a few there.' They go around and they appoint these patronage positions at a great

expense of money. Yet they will go and they will cut back thirty-five positions in an area, if you are a government in a province with 25 per cent unemployment, would be the last thing that you would think of cutting back. It should be the last thing you cut back, cut this government thinks it is the first thing you should cut back, and they have been continuing to do so.

We had rumors just a while ago of twenty-four or twenty-five more cutbacks that were going to appear. We get a minister, in public, who is responsible for day care, saying working mothers are raising delinquents. The Premier defends that position and says that there is nothing wrong with saying that. In this Province, how can somebody get away with that who is responsible for advocating day care? I do not know. The Premier has to answer to the people of Newfoundland for that. He does not want to, but when he gets around to it, he might. Well I do not know. I think he is suppose to be accountable, in this House of Assembly, to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. And I would wish one of these days, Mr. Speaker, instead of giving us these many great words of rhetoric, that he do his job and make his ministers accountable for what they say and his government accountable.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that I have the opportunity to rise in my place this afternoon and support the petition so ably presented by my colleague for Stephenville. And it is a continuation of a number of statements that we have had to make and have been forced to make because of the Minister of Social Services's (Mr. Brett) attitude towards his department and towards the people of this Province. The petition, Mr. Speaker, very clearly states that the people in this Province are dissatisfied with the recent cutbacks in the Department of Social Services and the effect that they do have on child care and social workers, and the overload that it is causing the individual social workers in the districts and regional offices throughout the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Last week, in supporting petitions previously presented by my colleague and other members of the Opposition, on this side, I could not understand why the Minister of Social Services was having these cutbacks at this time when he said that in 1987 we have as many people depending on the social service system as we did in 1986, but at the same time he sees fit to cut back thirty-five people. But now we understand, not the press understands, now the people of this Province understands why the minister is doing what he is doing. We can see exactly why the statements were made by the Minister of Social Services last week in the House of Assembly, last Wednesday and again last Thursday, and again repeatedly over and over this weekend to the press in regard to working mothers of this Province, the statement he

made that the correctional centres are filled because the parents of this Province deem it necessary to go out to work. Any Minister of Social Services who would make those statements either in the House of Assembly or publicly outside of the House, Mr. Speaker, is a minister who is not competent of doing his job at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

I think today that was backed up today, although somewhat sheepishly, by the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, by the Minister of Justice and even by the Premier himself. Every question that was put to those three ministers today they circled around and evaded a direct answer: Was the Minister of Social Services competent of doing the job? Was he a responsible minister? These were the direct questions that were put, and neither one of them, although they said they did not agree with the statements, answered directly. But they have to speak out because it is necessary to satisfy every parent. Not only the mothers of this Province but every parent in this Province has to ask the question: What do we have for a Minister of Social Services? And anybody who can sit in Cabinet and go along with the Minister of Social Services, who has expressed his attitude outside of Cabinet, and tell us that he has a completely different attitude inside of Cabinet, is just as bad as the minister himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Jekyll and Hyde.

MR. EFFORD:

Jekyll and Hyde, an old story, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we now understand why the Minister of Social Service cut back on the thirty-five people, because the minister had on that particular day a totally different perception on what was going on in the Department of Social Services that he did the day before. It is very, very inconsistent, Mr. Speaker. And that further backs up our demands on the Premier, our demands on the government opposite, that that minister, as some people suggested, should not only apologize to the people of this Province - no, that is not enough, although he must certainly apologize to every parent in this Province - but the most serious thing to be done is he has to be taken out of that Department of Social Services - and not, as was suggested to me today, possibly be put in another portfolio. No, there is no portfolio, no Cabinet post within any government, any place in our democratic society which a minister with an attitude of the Department of Social Services could fill. And there is only one way that the Premier can send a clear message out that he is responsible to the people of this Province and the only message he can send out - he has to increase day care, he has to increase services - is to do something about this problem, Mr. Speaker: Clean up the Department of Social Services, provide a better day care system, increase the status of our youth offenders and the places they have to stay, Mr. Speaker, and provide better services right throughout, from the bottom right to the top of the Social Services Department

immediately - not next week, not next month, but immediately - demand the resignation of the Minister of Social Services, and put a person there whom the people of this Province can build up some confidence in, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I support the principle of the petition presented by the hon. member in that there has to be an improvement in social services in the Province. That is why the budget rose from \$104 million to \$111 million from last year to this year and we are in the process of improving social services.

o o o

Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- before we get into Orders of the Day, I would like to, at this time, move that the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) be the Deputy Chairman of Committees, because we have been without somebody in that particular capacity and it is high time that we move to fill that vacancy so that we can provide for the smoother running of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is moved and seconded that the hon. member for LaPoile be Deputy Chairman of Committees.

All those in favour 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye!

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against, 'Nay'.

Carried.

Orders of the Day

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Order No. 14. The adjourned debate on Bill 19.

MR. SPEAKER:

The adjourned debate on second reading of bill 19, "An Act To Amend The Emergency Measures Act."

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to move second reading of the bill, and to respond to a couple of concerns that were put forth by the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert). He said a couple of days ago, when debating the bill, that the Department of Municipal Affairs would be trying to make the Emergency Measures Organization a political organization. That, of course, Mr. Speaker, does not deserve any comment, because a comment like that is really only an insult to the Emergency Measures Organization itself. It will not be a political organization and never has been a political organization. Because any council in the Province, Your Honour, which asks for a plan to be set up by the Emergency Measures Organization, that individual

council is given every consideration by EMO and that will not change.

He wondered what the rationale for the move is, to transfer EMO into the Department of Municipal Affairs. I think we have already gone over what the rationale is for that move in great detail, and it is because it is considered that the transfer of EMO to the department would supply a clear message to councils all around the Province that the Department of Municipal Affairs is directly involved in emergency planning and response.

Those are about the only comments that were made with respect to the bill, Mr. Speaker, and it gives me pleasure to move second reading.

On motion, a bill, 'An Act To Amend The Emergency Measures Act,' read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 19)

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Municipalities Act." (Bill No. 9).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 9, "An Act To Amend The Municipalities Act", is really a routine type of Bill that brings forth a number of housekeeping amendments. The Bill, as I said, includes some housekeeping initiatives that we have to deal with, and, generally speaking, these amendments come about, Mr. Speaker, as a result of small problems that have been encountered by municipalities while trying to deal with town or

community needs.

In some cases, the housekeeping amendments come about as the result of resolutions that have been put forward by the Federation of Municipalities over the years. One of the amendments to the act which has a little bit of significance, especially for the Labrador portion of the Province, would be Clause 5 of the Bill which will now permit a council to use the credit union for banking purposes. A council will now be able to use a credit union for banking purposes. That is not normally a problem in areas where banking services are readily available to communities, however, in relatively isolated areas in the Province where a bank is not available, where a bank has not been established and a credit union is, the right or flexibility is now there for the town to avail of a credit union to do its banking. The department ran into that problem some time ago in West St. Modeste and decided to address the problem. As I have said, there are a number of housekeeping amendments. Some of them have very little significance, but that is one amendment which will have some significance for councils along the Labrador Coast and in isolated areas of the Province.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Bill 9, "An Act To Amend The

Municipalities Act", as the minister says, there is no doubt that there are a lot of housekeeping items. I have been in touch with the Federation and have gone through some of these things, and they agree with the minister that some of it is housekeeping. However, as I said in the last Municipal Bill that went through, whenever the minister recommends a Bill to this House I think it should be discussed because we have heard the minister say some things that have not always panned out in the way he said them. In September of last year we heard him talk to the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities and he set up a committee to recommend municipal funding for this year. Now, as you know, this committee was set up but apparently its recommendations were never followed. I ask the minister if he will table in the House the recommendations of this committee that was set up by people in his department, the Department of Transportation and, I believe, the Department of Environment, and the list he took up to Cabinet, because from what I can understand, when that list went up to Cabinet they threw away the list and it was handled by Cabinet meetings the last two days the House was open, before Easter. The minister scurried away when the House closed and people in the Department of Municipal Affairs, the officials there, did not know what the recommendations were, they only heard the various members opposite going out and announcing goodies in their districts. If the minister did not blatantly ignore those recommendations, then let us see the list that was made by this committee that was set-up to establish municipal funding,

grants and guaranteed loans. Let us see him table in the House the recommendations of this committee which was set up to give us a priority list. This would give us a lot more faith in anything that his department put forward. If this list was made available, we would then have some idea that yes, maybe he is trying to do a good job and take the political pork barreling out of it. When the list was published this year, I took it upon myself to have a per capita breakdown, or a per person breakdown done per district. I am sure the minister is aware of this, as I pointed it out to him before, but it works out that in each Liberal district only \$20.10 per capita was needed for municipal funding, but in each Tory district it averaged out to \$70.60. So, to me, this seems to be a good reason why the undertaking the minister had given to the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities should have been carried out, and I think their recommendations should have been made public and tabled in the House of Assembly.

I tell the minister that we have on the Order Paper in this House right now a recommendation that could solve his problems as to the distribution of municipal funding. I have talked about this to the Federation and they agree in principle that the recommendation is good. I recommend it, and I will just read a couple of the 'WHEREASES' for the minister.

"WHEREAS one of the major recommendations of the Federation of Municipalities' brief to this government in 1986 was a call for longer term capital development commitments to municipalities; and

"WHEREAS there are many communities in this Province that have water, sewer and road systems that are old and in need of repair; and

"WHEREAS there are many communities in this Province that do not have yet proper water, sewer and road systems; and

"WHEREAS there are communities in this Province that have, in the past, been forced to install expensive sewer systems that their tax base cannot now support, and these communities are constantly seeking extra assistance from the Department of Municipal Affairs; and

"WHEREAS the distribution of funds by the Department of Municipal Affairs is largely based on a political rather than a practical or need basis; and

"WHEREAS there is no mechanism to ensure that there is fair play in the distribution of money from the Department of Municipal Affairs;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government institute a five year municipal capital funding plan so that the municipalities of Newfoundland and Labrador who themselves must submit to this government a five-year plan, will receive direction about their capital funding requests and be able to plan effectively and realistically; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the government create a municipal funding corporation to oversee the funding of municipal capital works according to objective criteria established by this House and, pending the formation of such a board, that government abandon obtaining block funding in the

House of Assembly for municipalities and instead obtain approval from the House of a specific list of municipal projects."

Now, that would solve the problems, Mr. Speaker, of funding for municipal areas in Newfoundland and it would get the minister off the hook for the promise he made last year to have a committee of civil servants set up to give him a list which he does not intend to listen to. Now, that, to me, is a serious situation and I think it is one that the minister should take under consideration. I strongly recommend that our resolution be adopted by this House and it would solve a lot of the problems. We hurl allegations at the minister for political pork barrelling and things like that, but if he took our recommendation and our resolution which was tabled here, I am sure it would solve this problem of distribution of municipal funding.

Now, there is another problem that I would like to refer the minister to. Because of their tax base, many rural communities are indeed in jeopardy right now, and with the cutbacks that the government has imposed and with the freeze that the government has put on municipal funding for the next few years, there is one area which I think should be included in this bill and it should be the taxation of Crown corporations. Example: Terra Nova Tel versus the Newfoundland Telephone Company. I think a federal policy currently exists whereby a Crown corporation has to pay municipal taxes if a private company operating under the same circumstances and providing the same services should be required to pay taxes. I think

this is an established federal policy, and, in the case of Terra Nova Tel, we have a lot of rural communities in Newfoundland being serviced by Terra Nova Tel and they do not have to pay taxes, yet Newfoundland Telephone has to pay taxes if they operate in those areas. I would be much happier to vote for this bill if this was one of the recommendations being put into this bill at this time. I am sure the minister will agree that rural areas have a really serious problem in collecting the taxes which are needed to provide services. Because the minister has put a freeze on funding from his department, it means a cut in the amount of funding that rural areas are able to come up with.

There has not been a study of municipal government and municipal funding done in Newfoundland since 1971, and since that time there has been some rather dramatic changes in the municipal set up in Newfoundland. For this reason, the Federation, I would say, have recommended that there be a commission set up. I know last year in the Estimates Committee I recommended to the minister that a royal commission be set up to study municipal funding and Municipal Government in Newfoundland, financing in particular. The minister stands in this House every year and says that \$200 million or \$250 million is needed to put in the infrastructure for municipal funding, yet he has now frozen this amount at \$25 million for the next three years.

So I would recommend that there be a study of the complete municipal government setup in Newfoundland as to amalgamations, funding, etc. As he is no doubt aware, the Federal Federation of Mayors and

Municipalities have made recommendations to the federal government as to how some fundings should be obtained to provide the infrastructure that is needed to enable the cities and towns of Canada to do the needed repairs to their infrastructure to bring them into the Twentieth Century. So I would seriously ask the minister if he would consider looking at the establishment of a royal commission to study municipal government in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, as I have already acknowledged, I have talked to the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities and they tell me, yes, indeed a lot of this bill, bill 9, is housekeeping. A lot of recommendations have been put forward by that group, and it is good to see that they did include the credit unions in the section dealing with finances so that smaller areas are able to use the services of this facility.

The next one is short-term borrowing. They have made certain changes in that which are not too earth-shattering, but I think it points out the serious problems that many areas have in this Province in that they have to borrow to operate, to keep going. And unless the minister and his department are able to come forth with some ideas to recommend what in actual fact the direction is that his department is going to take over the next few years, there is going to be a lot more borrowing than even the minister is now aware of, and there are going to be a lot of towns which are going to find themselves in the same position that the Premier mentioned, and the Minister of Finance mentioned in his budget, 'we are going to go bankrupt unless we can get some funding

from Ottawa.' So, unless the minister can provide some ideas, he is certainly going to find himself in that position, that the towns will become an embarrassment to the Province as the Province expects to become an embarrassment to the federal government. So, I guess this is maybe the policy that is put forward by the various departments when they talk about funding in Newfoundland at this time.

Now, the final clauses in the act are concerning local service districts. I notice that in this act the local service districts are given more power, but there is no provision made for more funding. As I am sure the minister is aware, the local service districts in Newfoundland are now sorely pressed, as is every municipal area in Newfoundland. The local service districts who have very little power to tax are now given more authority over the impounding of animals in these areas. I would strongly suggest to the minister that some provision be made to provide more funding to the local service districts in Newfoundland.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the bill is a housekeeping one. It does tidy up the act, but we do not think it goes far enough. We think our resolution, which would take the bugbears out of municipal funding, should be adopted; we think there should be a Royal Commission set up; we think provision should be made to allow rural areas to tax Terra Nova Tel the same way that Newfoundland Telephone is taxed. As this is now a federal policy, I feel that the minister could very easily implement this and it would relieve some of the burden of providing funds to operate the

smaller towns in Newfoundland.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, just three comments on the bill, since it has twenty-one sections in it and twenty-one different amendments or repairs, so to speak, to the Municipalities Act.

The first one is about the credit unions, Mr. Speaker: I think it is quite an interesting observation that the municipalities have, up to this time, not been able to use credit unions for their banking purposes. I would suggest that that was a considerable discriminatory situation to be allowed to exist for this period of time. As a matter of fact, if we were serious about supporting the rural parts of our Province and the institutions which serve it best, perhaps what we should do is ask for the municipalities to use credit unions first and commercial banks only when credit unions are not available in a district.

I guess we should thank the Bank of Montreal for pulling out of the South Coast of Labrador, thus making it necessary for the people of that area to set up their own credit union, and, therefore, only having credit unions on that coast, they were in a position where they had to use those in order to do their banking business.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs would be

well-advised to perhaps look at that for his next omnibus amendment to the Municipalities Act, and instead of saying that a bank can include a credit union, what he should say is that municipalities should use credit unions, and only when they are not legitimately available should they use the commercial banks.

Other comments: Mr. Speaker, in Clause 7 this amendment would exempt real property owned by the local School Tax Authority from municipal property tax. I think this is an interesting change to see here and it also, I think, brings to the surface the simmering dispute between the School Tax Authorities and the municipalities. Perhaps I should rephrase that, the dispute between the municipalities and the School Tax Authorities or between the School Tax Authorities and the government, in the sense that the municipalities are very upset that they are in a position whereby their tax base, their real property tax is shared with the School Tax Authority in all areas of the Province. This has been a source of concern by, I know, the larger cities in the Province. It also has been a source of concern by the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities who see that this ability of the School Tax Authorities to tap the same income sources as they have puts them in a difficult position since it makes it very difficult for them to raise the revenue they should.

One of the suggestions I would make to the Minister of Municipal Affairs: If the provincial government is not intending to abolish the School Tax Authorities, which are a duplication of the procedures we use to raise revenue, if they are

not intending to do that, then perhaps the appropriate thing would be to borrow a leaf out of the book of other provinces and eliminate the School Tax Authorities and allow the municipalities themselves to raise the revenue, and, therefore, individuals would only get one tax bill which may be broken down as municipal services and school services.

Mr. Speaker, in the areas in which we do not have incorporated municipalities, perhaps just one School Tax Authority could remain in existence in order to cover those particular areas.

So, I would suggest to the Minister of Municipal Affairs that this may be an appropriate change to make when he brings in his bill to amend the Municipalities Act for 1988, or whenever the next session will be.

The third comment, and the last one I would like to make, is with reference to Clause 14. This amendment provides that a person must reside in a community for at least six months to be eligible to run for council. At present, the residency requirement is thirty days. I would suggest to the minister that although I can see the argument for the particular change, if I recall correctly, the Yukon, in one of its previous provincial elections, had a very difficult time enforcing a thirty-day residency provision to vote in the Yukon as a territory. Perhaps this provision may, in turn, also be looked on as an unconstitutional taking away of an individual's right to run for council and perhaps we should have a look at that again. After all, all our council elections, or virtually all of them, are held at

the same time, in a four year or five year cycle, and the only ones that are the exception are the community councils, which are a different circumstance, and perhaps it is not necessary to have a six-month eligibility for it.

I suggest that to the minister, because if there was an individual who wished to run who was living in a community for, say, four or five months, they may issue a court challenge and we might have some messy court proceedings to deal with in a situation that, quite frankly, does not deserve to have that much attention paid to it. I just mention that to the minister.

Other than that, having looked at the other amendments, there is nothing else there that seems to be particularly contentious. I should remind him that there are two I would strongly suggest he look at: that the credit union is given preference rather than commercial banks for municipalities and, secondly, that he look at the suggestion of using the municipalities where they exist to collect the assessment that the School Tax Authorities would ordinarily collect so that we could cut down some of the overhead which I think at last going around cost us, if I am not mistaken, something like \$3.5 million. I think that is what the Minister of Education said. If we could cut that amount down considerably we could, perhaps, cut it in half, and \$1.75 million be given to the municipalities to do the collection on behalf of the school boards, and the other half be an absolute saving for individuals concerned.

With those comments, Mr. Speaker,

I will resume my seat.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in moving second reading of the bill, and in doing so to respond to a couple of the comments that the hon. gentleman for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir has made today, and continued to make over the last couple of months, with respect to the allotment of capital funding by the Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, he keeps referring to a priority list and if he can have access to the priority list that the Capital Projects Board had forward for consideration. As I explained to him on a couple of different occasions, what the hon. gentleman is asking for, of course, is a Cabinet paper which he cannot have access to. It is sufficient to say that the Capital Projects Board dealt with not only a priority of \$25 million which was approved this year, but dealt as well with quite possibly \$100 million in priorities. Unfortunately we did not have the funding to address all of these needs.

It is sufficient to say, Mr. Speaker, that the department, ever since 1979, has had an increase in grants and capital that has been made available to the municipalities, up to 176 per cent. I think that speaks very well for the government's commitment to municipalities in the Province. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can make all the reference he wants to pork barrelling and what have you, but I think we have shown over the

last couple of months that there is no pork barrelling going on. One must consider the fact that there are, as I have repeated before in this House, 112 municipalities in districts represented by Opposition members and a full sixty-two of those have water or water and sewer servicing completed, leaving only 50 municipalities in districts represented by gentlemen opposite without some start on the water and sewer service.

On the point that the hon. gentleman brings forward on taxation of federal Crown corporations, we cannot, as the hon. member is aware, under my department tax federal Crown corporations. I understand from the Minister of Finance that there are reciprocal arrangements being made between the Minister of Finance and the federal government in which we will be able to get involved in reciprocal taxation which will prove to be a net benefit to the Province. Mr. Speaker, with those couple of points I move second reading of the bill.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Municipalities Act, read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, presently, by leave." (Bill No. 9).

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on said bills, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mitchell):
Order, please!

A bill, "An Act To Amend The House Of Assembly Act". (Bill No. 24).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Development And Tourism Act". (Bill No. 4).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Rehabilitation Act". (Bill No. 15).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Return Of The Business Of Fishery Products International Limited To Private Investors". (Bill No. 34).

On motion, clauses 1 and 2, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall clause 3 carry?

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to this bill, "An Act Respecting The Return Of The Business Of Fishery Products International To Private Investors", which is, of course, a piece of legislation about which we on this side of the House, at the time it went through second reading, indicated we felt it was

a black day for the Province, and we still feel it is a black day for the Province. It is the kind of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that will be looked back on, probably ten or fifteen years from now, as a turning point in the history not only of this government but of the Province, as well, since the legislation itself takes the major fishing company, which is also the biggest company in the biggest industry that we have, and turns it over to private investors, Mr. Speaker, turns it over to private investors who, for the most part, are investors who live in Canada, live in Europe, and a small proportion who live in this Province itself. On that basis, Mr. Speaker, it is, I think, a backward direction, given the kind of directions that both we as a party would like to see, that Dr. House and his Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment would also like to see, since the honourable Doctor has also indicated to us, and I think to the House and all members of the public, that the privatization of FPI is not the kind of legislation that should be brought into this House at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for us to spend some time debating the philosophy of it and the contents of it and the way in which it is being put in place and, quite frankly, the folly of saying on the one hand with Dr. House and the Royal Commission that we want to have more control of our economic destiny, we want to have an industry that we have some ability to direct and we have some ability to control. Indeed, if one listens to the Premier of this Province one also hears somewhat the same thing. If I recall correctly, last week, when the Premier came back from Ottawa,

he, at that time, indicated to us that the Accord would have a series of First Ministers' Conferences and at these conferences the subject of the roles and responsibilities in the fishery would be on the agenda, and, Mr. Chairman, we hear from the Premier that this is a significant accomplishment for us as a Province, that we are talking about the roles and responsibilities with regard to the fishery, and that as a result we may, in the future, have more control over the fish stocks, the season in which fish can be caught and cannot be caught, the allocation for inshore fishery versus offshore fishery, and so on.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, what we are hearing from the Premier is that we are in a situation whereby we will have, hopefully, additional control over our fishing industry. That is why I think it is more than passing strange, to use an expression I have heard in this House before, that we are at this time in Committee on a piece of legislation that takes the largest fish company, which catches over half the fish caught in this Province and lands it and processes it, and we are turning it over to private individuals, primarily private individuals who will not only own it from a Canadian point of view but also by Europeans and so on. So there is a major inconsistency here when the Premier of our Province on the one hand says that he wishes us to have greater control of this industry and then on the other hand he takes the major avenue for control of this fishery and essentially scatters its ownership to the far corners of the earth. So, it is with a certain degree of bemusement and puzzlement in our

direction that we cannot understand why this particular action is being taken, why it is being done.

In addition, of course, Mr. Chairman, there is another problem with it, and that is that the ownership of Fishery Products International was not only turned over to the private sector - because of that fact we are debating a piece of legislation which is sanctifying something which has already happened in the past - it has already gone primarily to individuals who are no longer resident in this Province.

If the total ownership were added up, and it would be appropriate for the Minister of Fisheries to be here at this time to tell us how much it is, but it is my understanding we are talking maybe 15 per cent of the ownership of Fishery Products International, and that 15 per cent or so is a pitiful amount even if one were to endorse the concept that the ownership of Fishery Products International should be privatized. Certainly on that front it should have been privatized so that individuals normally resident in this Province should have been the major shareholders.

It is our information, in talking to stockbrokers in this Province who handled the sale of Fishery Products International shares, that perhaps as much as 25 per cent or 30 per cent of the shares of FPI could have been owned in this Province since there was a demand by Newfoundlanders and Labradorians for at least that much of them. That it was not, I think, is a reflection of several things, one of which was that the

people who were doing the privatization only allocated a certain limited amount of money to it. Their information to us, Mr. Chairman, was that there was about 30 per cent or 40 per cent of the shares sold in this Province, which had been asked for by individual investors throughout the Province. When we first saw the plan to privatize FPI, back sometime, I think, around the end of February, there was a promise made by the Premier of this Province that the shares would be available in the commercial banks across the Province and, therefore, the small investor down in Fortune, or Marystown, or up in St. Anthony would have the opportunity to buy into Fishery Products International and, therefore, it would be our corporation, a company that we, ourselves, would have a degree of ownership of, a feeling of responsibility for, and, in the case of the long future, when it made profits, we would share in the profits.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is very strange that this promise made by the Premier, solemnly made at the end of February, that we would indeed go forward in this manner was totally dropped once it was clear that we could sell them to people in Europe, sell them to Americans and Canadians, and in other parts of the world. Since the Minister of Fisheries is here for this debate on the clause by clause study of it, I think it would be appropriate for him to stand in his place and explain to us why that particular provision, this privatization into the hands of ordinary Newfoundlanders, which is so loved by Socreds in British Columbia but is, in fact, a ruse in terms of ownership and control, this plan was not even followed,

given the fact that it was just a matter of trying to set it up. As I understand it, there was really nothing in the way of any concrete initiatives made to have these shares of Fishery Products International made available through the local banks.

I believe there are four stockbrokers in St. John's, I think there is also a stockbroker in Corner Brook, but other than that, in the rest of the Province individuals who wish to purchase stocks on any of the stock exchanges have a very difficult time and, therefore, the offer of selling them through the commercial banks would have been, I think, a major advantage for the people of this Province. But, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be appropriate for the Minister of Fisheries to answer that question, to tell us, if he can, why the provision to allow ordinary Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to buy these shares was thrown out so unmercifully, and why did we then end up with - what is it? - 85 per cent or more of the shares of our largest corporation being owned by non-resident Newfoundlanders? That is a situation, I think, which deserves some sort of an answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Chairman, most of the views of

the Opposition, I think, are well known to the House and to the public of this Province. With respect to the privatization of Fishery Products International, we do have some reservations as to the wisdom of privatizing that giant fish company at this point in time. We know, for example, that it has had one or two good years, but one fine day does not a Summer make. We are not convinced, Mr. Chairman, that because it did have one or two good years the time was ripe for its privatization.

In the course of the debate leading up to the privatization of FPI, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), I believe, mentioned that the proceeds from the provincial share from the sale of FPI, amounting to, I believe, around \$40 million, would be earmarked for development of the inshore fishery. We have not heard too much about that since. I wonder can the minister, before this debate ends, enlighten the House as to what has happened to the \$40 million in proceeds that has now gone to the government from the sale of FPI?

We had, and still have, some reservations as to the need to provide a management share option whereby 53,500 common shares of that company are available to thirteen or fourteen of its executive members at the cost that they were first offered, \$12.50. We all know that FPI shares have drastically increased; in fact, I believe they are selling on the market now for almost \$16.00, which shows there is a very substantial windfall profit there for the thirteen executive members of FPI who were given the right to exercise that option.

Another matter, I think, which should be mentioned before this debate ends, is the Fisheries Management Plan. For example, one of the reservations that we had about the privatization of FPI was what effect it might have on the inshore fishery in terms of quotas and in terms of the Funk Island Banks and the Northern Grand Banks, and to what extent, for example, would the Governments of Newfoundland and Canada be committed to make substantial quotas, or at least to maintain existing quotas to that new company in the 2J+3KL management zone?

We believed at the time, and we still hold the view, that maybe a commitment would have to be made. For example, it would hardly make sense that a company would purchase that large company for the amount of money involved without some kind of a firm undertaking from the two governments that substantial quantities of groundfish, especially, would continue to be made available to them.

We know that the fisheries plan that was introduced in Ottawa, I think it was last December, did recognize the problems that were evident, in that the, I believe, 95 or 99 per cent of the total offshore harvest in the year 1985 and again in 1986, was concentrated on the Funk Island Banks and on the Northern Grand Banks, with a very small part of the total offshore harvest being directed towards the Northern waters. We all know why that is, because, of course, the large offshore fish companies felt that they could probably make more money and incur less cost by fishing in the more civilized fishing areas. We all know that

the Northern waters are involved with ice and and ice reinforced vessels are needed. They are involved in longer periods at sea and more steaming time and, of course, all that means money. So we know that the larger companies would refer to direct their effort to the banks that are closer to their home ports, such as the Funk Island Banks and the Northern Grand Banks.

Mr. Chairman, we can see this year, I believe, evidence now of the folly of that policy on the Northeast Coast, for example, in my district of Twillingate. And I think in Fogo and Bonavista North and a large number of fishing districts in this Province, so far this year there is not a sign of groundfish. Up until last Friday in my district, I do not think there has been 1,000 pounds of groundfish landed. I think the same can be said for the districts of Fogo and probably Bonavista North, or maybe other districts too. But certainly I can speak with some knowledge of what is happening on the Northeast Coast.

AN HON. MEMBER:

There is fish in Petit Forte.

MR. W. CARTER:

There is fish in Petit Forte. Well, Petit Forte is not depending on the Funk Island Banks for its resource, where the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland which, of course, includes Twillingate district and Fogo and Bonavista North, that area depends almost entirely on the migration of fish from the Funk Island Banks and the Northern Grand Banks to the inshore waters.

We all know that last year we saw a dismal failure in the inshore fishery. Most of the oldtimers

will attribute that failure to the fact that you cannot catch a cod fish twice. If you catch it by the large draggers on the Funk Island Banks or the Northern Grand Banks, then it makes sense that you are not going to catch it in Notre Dame Bay or Bonavista Bay or White Bay in a longliner.

Mr. Chairman, there were some concerns expressed by members on this side as to the effect that the privatization of FPI would have on the long-term survival of the inshore fishery especially along the Northeast Coast. Now at the time we know that the management plan that came down from Ottawa did, in fact, recognize that problem and offered to make sure that there was a dispersal in the effort of the offshore companies. I believe it was one-third of their effort on the Northern Grand Banks, a one-third effort on the Funk Island Banks, and a one-third effort on the Hamilton Banks, the Northern Banks.

Before the minister adjourns this debate and before we pass this Bill, will the minister give the House an assurance that we do have observers on board of those vessels? The surveillance component was promised, by the way, and I believe mentioned by the minister in Ottawa as being a must. I think he recognized the need to keep a close eye on what is happening out there and to make sure that the directions issued by Ottawa with respect to the dispersal of the effort would be rigidly and properly enforced. I would like the minister to give the House an update as to the status of the surveillance on the large vessels. Do we have inspectors, for example, on the large offshore vessels ensuring

that the federal government's directive in terms of the dispersal of the effort is being rigidly adhered to?

So these are two things that I would like the minister to address, Mr. Chairman, and I repeat them. What has happened to the \$40 million that the Newfoundland Government recovered from the sale of FPI? We know that we have, I believe \$66 million into that company.

MR. FENWICK:
\$48.5 million.

MR. W. CARTER:
Is that the total that came back?

MR. FENWICK:
Yes, that is the total that came back, less brokers fees.

MR. W. CARTER:
So there will be a write off of several million dollars, I presume. We did recover our total investment in that company. Be that as it may, I guess that is something we cannot do very much about. But certainly I believe the Newfoundland people are entitled to know what has happened to the return that came from the sale of the company. Is it, in fact, now being directed towards the redevelopment of the inshore fishery?

Maybe, Mr. Chairman, the minister, in closing off the debate, could give the House a brief update. I do not expect him to go into any long drawn out explanation, but certainly maybe a brief update as to what has happened to the commitment that was made sometime ago with respect to the restructuring of the inshore fishery.

We all know that this year the inshore fishery in most parts of Newfoundland at least so far, thus far it appears to be heading for a pretty rough times again. I think the people would like to know exactly what the government will be doing with respect to its restructuring and just what part will that \$40 million play? These are the two questions, Mr. Chairman, that we would like to have answered.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mitchell):
The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will attempt to respond to some of the questions raised by gentlemen opposite. For the benefit of the Leader of the socialist group in the House, with leave of the House, I spent well over an hour, as members will recall, introducing this Bill during second reading and then in closing the debate attempted to answer the debate in principle because that is what second reading is all about, the debate in principle. That has been, of course, accepted by the House. Detailed debate and discussion on each clause is what this particular procedure is about. Of course there have been some legitimate questions raised particularly by the hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) which I will try to answer and by any others as they are raised.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, anybody who invested in FPI, and I have heard the Opposition and other people say this before, the former Leader of the Opposition

when we debated this matter in **On Camera** mentioned it, but anybody who invested in FPI on the grounds that there is any long-term commitment by the Government of Canada who, at the present time sets quotas and controls the allocation of quotas to everybody including offshore companies, anybody who invested in this company on the pretense that there is any long-term commitments are, you know, it is abominably stupid to even suggest it. I mean, the Prospectus is clear. I am sure that major investors and small investors would not have invested in this company on the premise that there is some insidious under the table suggestion that quotas are determined for a long period of time.

There are three or four pages, seven, eight, nine and ten, in the prospectus that make it absolutely clear that quotas are given on an annual basis, annual, no commitment to five years, three years, ten years, fifteen years, on an annual basis. It also makes it absolutely clear in the prospectus, Mr. Chairman, that there have been problems with the stock, with the growth of the stock in 2J+3KL vis-à-vis the inshore fishery.

It even goes so far as to point out, Mr. Chairman, that there was a reduction in the offshore allocation. So there is no hint, there is not even a tittle of a hint in this document that there is any long-term commitment to FPI, to NATSea, to anybody that they can expect next year the amount of fish that they got this year. In fact, this document goes out of its way to be fair, open and aboveboard and suggests the opposite, that there was a reduction last year and that, if

the problems continue, there could be further reductions or there could be increases, depending on the scientific advice. Let us put that to bed once and for all. There is no commitment, there is no insidious signal, there is no signal of any sort in this document that investors read, I would assume, and scrutinized, I would assume, before they put a cent into this company, that there is any long-term commitment to quotas. That was the number one, point raised by the hon. gentleman.

Secondly, he mentioned the inshore fisheries agreement and debt restructuring. We have exchanged, as per the commitments between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland, official proposals on an inshore fisheries agreement. We did that a number of weeks ago. We will now get into the process of detailed negotiations on exactly what is going to be in the agreement and what particular projects are going to be in the agreement. We have some that we are very high on and the Government of Canada has some that they are very high on, so obviously it is a matter of negotiations as to what is in and what is out. We are now at that stage of negotiations and we have exchanged documents.

On debt restructuring, the department has finalized a debt restructuring position and that position has now been, as per my public commitments, given to the representatives of the fishermen, i.e., I have to say unions now, I suppose, for their particular input. I committed to do that and I have now done that. In fact, I had a face to face meeting with both groups just a couple of weeks

ago and they will be getting back to me on how they feel about the particular options that I have identified as per my public commitment to address the problem of debt restructuring for inshore fishermen. So that is ongoing and is now, I suppose it is fair to say, in the final stages of being concluded. Government will then have to take a final decision on it. So that is where that is, Mr. Chairman.

Yes, I can say to the gentleman from Twillingate, there is 100 per cent coverage now on all foreign vessels and all domestic vessels in the offshore fleet operating in Canadian waters, 100 per cent coverage for the first time in our history. So that commitment by the Government of Canada has been kept.

I can say to him as well that we have in force the implementation of the one-third/one-third/one-third rule, and that both the major companies have in fact harvested their one-third in 2J and are now moving into 3K and 3L. So it has worked. They screamed, they said it could not be done, but they were forced to do it and it has, in fact, worked and it has been implemented and enforced by the Government of Canada.

I think those are the questions that were raised by the hon. gentleman from Twillingate.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Do you wish to speak?

MR. MORGAN:
I wish to speak, yes.

MR. FENWICK:
Well, I will defer to the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:
It is not very often that happens, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:
I thank the hon. member for Menihek.

I want to have a few words to say because this is an important piece of legislation. It is the appropriate time to comment on what we see happening to Fishery Products International and what we see happening with regards to the offshore fishery, in particular, which is the mainstay or the flagship activity of FPI.

I must say this past week I was thoroughly upset and disturbed with FPI, to the point where I have now telexed Mr. Siddon pointing out my concerns to him, particularly the fact that a member of the House of Assembly cannot reach any officials of FPI to discuss matters with them, people like Mr. Young, Mr. Steve Pike, or anyone else.

I refer to a problem in my area. In Bonavista and in Charleston there are plants owned by FPI, plants they tried to sell in Charleston unsuccessfully. But the plant in Bonavista is an inshore plant and last week FPI landed their new trawler loaded

with fish in Catalina, Port Union. We saw fish being trucked from Port Union all the way to St. Anthony when, in the meantime, there are two plants sitting next door, Bonavista and Charleston, with no fish and with a score of workers employed in the plant. It is not logical; it is not common sense to see fish trucked all the way from Port Union on the Bonavista Peninsula to the tip of the Great Northern Peninsula to be processed. It is not making any economic sense; it is not making any sense in the name of quality. So why is it being done?

Well, the bottom line, I determined after my own investigation, without getting even the courtesy of a reply to my telephone calls to Mr. Young, but prior to the privatization, I should say, if I called Mr. Young's office, I would get a reply within ten minutes. If I called Mr. Pike, I would get a reply within maybe a half an hour. But now, to ignore the calls from a member of the House of Assembly is a bit much. So I have no choice.

If I am going to properly represent my constituents, and I intend to do that for years to come yet hopefully, then I am going to speak accordingly. I find it very disturbing that the Chief Executive of the management team and the other management team members cannot find time to respond to a call from a member of the House of Assembly when they are talking about genuine problems involving their plants.

Do you know what? Last Monday morning was my first call. I called Tuesday, I called Wednesday, and I called Thursday. I have yet to get a response to my

phone calls. So I felt I had no choice but telex Mr. Siddon, with copies going to all concerned, on the matter that I wanted to discuss with Mr. Young and his officials. Why would they have plants like Charleston and Bonavista, which are still part of the overall FPI family of operations, why would they not have fish going into these two plants and still see fit to have it trucked all the way to St. Anthony, which is still owned by the same company? I quired Mr. Siddon in such a way. What is the difference between the Bonavista plant and the Charleston plant and St. Anthony plant? I answered my own question in a Telex. None. Bonavista is an inshore plant owned by a trawler company. Charleston is an inshore plant owned by a trawler company, FPI, and the St. Anthony plant is an inshore plant owned by the same company.

So why have resource-short plant fish landed by FPI's trawler under the programme with a brand new freezer vessel in Catalina, ignore the two plants neighbouring and truck it all the way to St. Anthony? It is not making any common sense. I demanded an explanation. I was hoping to be able to discuss that whole matter with Mr. Young.

I have to say today if that is going to be the line of communications or the failure of communications in the future by a large company of that nature, I do not know where to turn to. If the management wants to ignore me or the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) or any member of this House or member of Parliament, if they want to ignore us in having us involve in any discussions that involve our fish plants in

respective districts, where do we turn to?

AN HON. MEMBER:

You need control, boy.

MR. MORGAN:

I do not know who to turn to. Before I could go to the Government of Newfoundland or the Government of Canada, but now who do I go to, the thousands of shareholders? That is impossible. Do I go to a majority shareholder? Well, who are the majority of shareholders? I do not know.

So it leaves a clear impression with me that the management of that company. Maybe it is just a matter of poor communications. I certainly hope it is. Because if it is a new attitude on the part of the management of FPI, I am thoroughly disgusted with it. If the attitude is we do not need to discuss and work with politicians and deal with the problems in respective areas of the Province, it is a very sad day. But I tell you there is going to have to be a good explanation received by me from Mr. Young as to why he or any of his senior staff could not return a call to me, as a member of this House, after calling every day last week. The problems is still not resolved.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I want to say as well I am not at all convinced that Fishery Products trawlers this Winter - I have yet to see a report on the surveillance or observers placed on board to carry out surveillance on their fishing activity. There are reports from inshore fishermen in my area that FPI trawlers have indeed fished close to the Cape of Bonavista again this Spring. They were not supposed to do that.

Right now in Bonavista South the inshore fishery has had their cod traps in the water for about ten days, and so far they have not caught enough fish to make a meal of fish and brewis. It is a total failure so far in Bonavista South.

I know it is early, but the old fishermen are saying, in Bonavista North the same way, I assume, but the old fishermen are saying, the old experienced fishermen, "Here she comes again, Jim, boy, here she comes again, another failure." They have been saying for years that there was a need for a curtailment of the offshore fishery. Well, I was never fully supportive of Mr. Siddon's compromise that was made by the dividing up of the three spawning areas and try to even up the fishing activity in these spawning areas, the Hamilton Bank, the Belle Isle Bank and the Fogo Bank, and also the tip of the Northern part of the Grand Bank.

What the fishermen in my area were demanding and I agreed with them at a meeting with the Deputy Minister of Fisheries for Canada and I agree now, was to have a total ban on offshore fishing in the Fogo Island Bank area for at least a year, maybe two years, to totally ban the offshore fishing. Bonavista Bay, Trinity Bay and a good part of Conception Bay depend on that migration of fish from Fogo Island Bank into these inshore grounds and into these bays and coves.

I am not convinced that the dividing up of the offshore effort was enough, that there should have been, as the fishermen were asking for, a complete ban of activity this past Winter on the Fogo Island Bank. Maybe it is too late. Maybe the dumping of over

10,000 tons of fish by FPI in the past three or four years each year - I am using 10,000 tons as a conservative figure, small 'c'. It is more like 20,000 tons of small fish dumped in the last number of years by FPI, a totally irresponsible activity! The same management are there today. The same management of the trawler fleet are there. Mr. Etchegary and them are all there.

Until I see the report from the so-called independent, non-biased observers on board vessels, see from them what they are saying about the activity of the trawler fleet this past Winter, I am not sure the same thing did not occur again, that they did not bring in all of their small fish, that they did not stop from dropping their fishing gear a few miles off Cape Bonavista, just off the inshore grounds. If that is the case, and if we are going to see a reoccurrence of last year's failure, the last three years of failure, in fact, I think we are going to have to take a tough stand as a government and as a people.

I know it is not going to sound good to the ears of the plants in my friend from Burin's (Mr. Tobin) district or my friend from Grand Bank's (Mr. Matthews) district, and even my colleague, the member for Trinity North's (Mr. Brett) district where the offshore plants are operating. But the inshore fishery is vital to the overall economic well-being of this Province.

We may have to do a little sacrificing of the offshore for a year or two. We may just have to do that. It will be a big battle, there is no question about that, to see it done. But if we see a

reoccurrence of last year's failure in the inshore cod fishery, the fishermen of this Province will not accept anything less this Fall.

I will make a projection. They will accept nothing less than a total ban of fishing in the Southern spawning areas of the 2J+3KL Northern cod zone. I will support them, because when I go out and talk to inshore fishermen, who earn as much as maybe \$4,000, \$5,000, \$6,000 or \$7,000 year, maybe a maximum of \$10,000, and then you see that income dwindling down to maybe even less than \$10,000, down to around \$4,000 or \$5,000, and I see these inshore plants where they ship their fish having to close their doors with no fish to process, that means they are going to have a real economic burden on their hands to maintain a viable activity.

So we are going to have to be very careful with regards to FPI in two aspects. We have to monitor their attitude, as I mentioned first. We are going to have to monitor, in a very strict way, the activities of their trawlers. Maybe I am all wet. Maybe the observers, when they make the reports, will say everything was fine this past Winter, the trawlers acted so properly, they did not fish near shore, they divided up their fishing activity as per the request of the federal government, and everything is bright and dandy. But I do not think so.

I want to say one thing further, which has been haunting me the last few days. I went to a meeting two or three weeks ago in Terra Nova with my colleague and friend, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening) and the Minister of

Development (Mr. Barrett). The minister was with me at the same meeting.

The Chairman of this group read a lengthy letter from Mr. Siddon, the federal Minister of Fisheries. I have yet to see the letter. I have requested a copy of it. He wrote to the Joint Councils on the Bonavista Peninsula in response to correspondence dealing with the French - Canada deal or the French - Canada fiasco. Do you know what?

In that letter, which was read at the meeting that night, I picked up a paragraph or two or three sentences which left no other question in my mind, but a clear answer, that Mr. Siddon was indeed intending to trade off Northern cod stocks to resolve the deal of the French dispute in 3Ps. It is in his letter. He would not dare tell the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) of our Province that, or the Premier that, but indirectly he tells the people of the Bonavista Peninsula through the Joint Councils in that letter. My friend will agree. He was at the same meeting where the letter was read. I have asked the council, who know I am upset because of the letter, but so far I have not received a copy of it, but there was no copy to the MP, no copy to the MHAs, no copy to any politicians, but the letter tells the people how they had to try to resolve the 3Ps dispute around St. Pierre and Michelon, they may very well - not may very well - they were going to - I wish I had the letter here today to read into the records of the House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Did the minister get it?

MR. MORGAN:

I am sure he did not receive a copy because I asked the councils that. There was no copy to anyone in politics in the Newfoundland provincial level or the federal level.

So that letter to me gives me great concern that the whole attitude has been changed as a result of the pressure from the Newfoundland people and the Newfoundland government, in particular, led by the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). The Opposition, of course, all agreed that this was a bad deal, what they were talking about to open up negotiations to resolve the 3Ps dispute on the St. Pierre and Michelon boundaries, but I am afraid that it is all a charade.

Mr. Crosbie came down leaving the impression that no Northern cod was given away and no Northern cod will be given away. I can hear him now, but Mr. Siddon is saying the very opposite. Mr. Siddon is indeed saying quite clearly there will be Northern cod allocations from 2J+3KL to resolve the dispute and that is what we thought was not going to happen.

I am very concerned with the present ongoing negotiations. I do not want to see one of these days when suddenly we hear announced by Ottawa that they have reached a deal with France and as a result of reaching a deal that 5,000, 7,000, 8,000, 10,000 tons of Northern cod has been allocated to the French fleets for the next five years. They are talking about a five year allocation. If that is so, of course, we all know what the effects are going to be.

So, Mr. Chairman, on the issue of

jurisdiction, I have to say and I have to say - I was hoping that the new Liberal leader would be in the House sitting as a member so that he could answer back in debate but that is not possible today, but I will say it. I have great respect for the new leader. He is a fine gentleman, a fine man, but I disagree with his policy position, on his comments made this weekend with regards to the jurisdiction over the fisheries because he left the clear impression that we would not know what to do if we got jurisdiction. That is not true at all because we would not have the money, I agree with him, we would not have the money to do all the surveillance of the 200 mile limit. That is a federal issue anyway, the surveillance.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN:

No, no. And dealing with foreign allocations, we have always said that. I recall when I sat down as Minister of Fisheries and presented a major document in Ottawa on jurisdiction, it was only after the focusing of Cabinet, and that document is now available, and that document said then that we could not carry out surveillance. We were not asking for any control or jurisdiction over surveillance of the 200 mile limit. We were not asking to have any say over dealing with foreign allocations, have a say, yes, but not the final decision making, not jurisdiction over dealing on international matters. That is a role for the Government of Canada to play.

But we did say that we wanted control over the licensing of our fishermen. Now, where else in

Canada would you see a situation where our most important industry is at the present time controlled by the Government of Canada? Can you imagine the wheat or farming industry in Western Canada being totally controlled by Ottawa, and the local government and local people not having any say on who can go farming, how much they can farm, or what kind of farm equipment they can use?

Right now, in our bays and along our coastline, we have no say over what type of fishing gear fishermen can use; we have no say as to when they can start fishing and finish fishing; and worse of all, we have no say over who can go out and prosecute the fishery. Now that is a very, very important aspect of the fishing industry. I say to the new leader that that is what he should support this government on, having us have more say.

The former, former, former Minister of Fisheries, I have often heard him say, and I agreed with him, that we had no control over our destiny as it pertains to the fishing industry. He was right on and he is still right today, because the same kind of situation prevails today. Ottawa controls practically everything to do with the fishing industry except we have a little say on the licensing of plants, a little say over the quality control programme, and we have a little say, through consultation now, in the present government, and it might not always be there, a little say on the seasons established in the fishing industry. But other than that, we have no say whatsoever.

I am sure the member for Twillingate will agree with this,

and the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), the fishermen of the Province never did accept the scientific evidence and the decision making of the federal level of government under both stripes, today and in the past, on quotas for herring, and quotas for mackerel. They never did believe them on the salmon fishery. They are so wrong on the salmon fishery. They have been talking about the Atlantic salmon stocks totally wiped out and everybody was inclined to agree with them. They were going to give up the commercial fishery. If it was not for the present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and the government and the efforts of Mr. Goudie and myself and the member for Twillingate in trying to stop the federal government from wiping out completely the commercial salmon fishery in Newfoundland because there were not enough stocks remaining there, only enough remaining stocks to be able to accommodate the great sportsmen from the U.S. and others coming in to do sports fishing on the rivers. What do we see today?

A few days ago in Portugal Cove one man with 100 fathoms of gear told me that he had ninety-odd salmon. One man in Newman's Cove on Saturday morning with 50 fathom of gear had thirty-seven salmon, and big ones, not the small run of salmon, ten pounds and more. If the Minister of Fisheries had gotten his way, the season would have been opened two weeks before, because every fisherman will tell you that the salmon along the Bonavista Bay in the East part of the Coast are all gone past when the season is open, and the same in Labrador. That is another example of us having no say and no control and we need that kind of jurisdiction.

So I say again to the new leader that I think he should reassess. He has good expertise in fisheries in his caucus in the member for Twillingate, and he has got others, the member for Fogo and others. I would say, after sitting down and discussing this whole matter of jurisdiction of the fisheries, he may very well change his position on that, because I think, as a Province, we are going to have to have more say over an industry which is so vitally important to the overall economic well-being of our Province.

So, Mr. Chairman, I will not carry on any longer. I will say that on the privatization of FPI, I am left in a dilemma out there because I have two plants which were always known to be somewhat like losers. FPI did their best to sell one plant in Charleston. It is not sold. It is now owned by FPI. When I get upset, which could very well be the member from Burin next week, with decisions of the management - for example, tomorrow morning if Fishery Products decides to close, take as an example, Gaultois, Harbour Breton and then they come along and say, 'Well, look Charleston is a loser. We are closing Charleston.'

Where does the member for Gaultois and Harbour Breton and Bonavista South, go to take our complaints and our fight? We take it to Mr. Young and his management! They would say we are just the managers here. So that concern, Mr. Minister, is bothering me because I am afraid that if it ever came to that and if we disagreed with some decision that the FPI management team were making or in the process of making or have already made, we have no recourse

as to where to fight or where to take our pressures, our representations to try to get the problem resolved to the satisfaction of our constituents. That is a very important matter, I think, that I would like for someone to address before this debate closes.

I will say something else as well and I am always known to call a spade a spade. A quote was made no longer than three weeks ago in a major meeting of the fishing interests in the Province. When I say fishing interests, I mean processing companies with their own dollars in the industry. These are medium sized plants, medium sized companies, family-owned operations, and a quote was made that FPI, and I quote, 'We do not give a damn about the inshore fishery.' Do you know something? That quote is coming true because I find situations now in the East Coast where Fisheries Products International, who can afford to do so, is making better deals with fishermen to get their fish. Now this is good for fishermen.

What does it mean to the medium sized independent processor, if he loses his supply of raw material because FPI can pay more money for it or FPI can give better deals to the fishermen. It could be a bait service supply, a better price on fuel, or a better price for their fish. The price for their fish can be controlled somewhat by the union but there can be indirect arrangements with fishing vessel owners, longliners. FPI can afford to do that and they are doing it, and taking away fish supplies from independent plants where, if they lose a supply of fish, will end up closing their doors or coming into the Minister

of Fisheries and asking for a government guarantee. They do not want to do that. They want to survive.

So I am concerned about the attitude, number one, I should say the new attitude, because it is new of FPI management towards politicians, at least, towards this politician. I am concerned about their attitude towards independent medium and small-sized fish companies in the Province. I am concerned about the possibility of that company making decisions which we, as individual members or fishermen or plant owners or plant workers, disagreeing with and they do not know where to go, they do not know where to turn. That kind of a situation, I think, should never be. We must always have some recourse as politicians and as individual members to take our case, our representation to someone other than the people who make that final decision as managers of a company.

Mr. Chairman, having said that, I will close my remarks by saying that maybe some of these concerns I have can be removed. But I will hold my reservations on some of the issues I put forward until I see some concrete, tangible evidence to remove my concerns.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman,

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mitchell):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, first of all, it

being the first time on my feet since you assumed the Chair let me, Sir, congratulate you on your election as Deputy Chairman of Committees. I assure you of our co-operation when you occupy the Chair.

I had not intended to rise because my colleague and friend from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) has covered well both in Committee and in the second reading debate the matters that we wanted to raise in this. Others of my colleagues have also done so.

But the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) has the ability to bring me to my feet on occasion and he has done so today on two or three points. First of all, we welcome him to our midst in terms of his concerns about FPI. It is the kind of thing that we predicted would happen. We are surprised it is happening so quickly. We admire his courage in stating publicly what has happened in that respect. I am sure we can assume from that we will have his vote against the premature privatization of FPI.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, he quotes the new Leader of the Liberal Party or, more to the point, he misquotes the new Leader of the Liberal Party. He will know from his colleague that the media is not something that his colleagues quote except by way of dissecting. That aside, if he wants to talk about the statements of the newly elected Leader of the Liberal Party, he should at least quote them correctly and he should put them in context.

The statement that stood out for me of those that the Leader made on this subject was that colourful and telling phrase, the dog chasing the car, the cracky barking after the speeding vehicle. The cracky is not really given much thought to what he will do if he catches the car. That was the context, I submit to the gentleman for Bonavista South, that was the context. It was not that we were against extra jurisdiction. It was rather that the new Leader of the Liberal Party, and we share unanimously his view on that point, was asking, in effect, what Newfoundland is asking generally, what is the Premier's plan in terms of jurisdiction? That plan ought to be laid out before the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. We ought to be given, Mr. Chairman, some indication of what additional jurisdiction the government is looking for and what it would do with that jurisdiction if it got it. And what it would do would have to embody a plan that spelled out the cost that would flow therefrom, the revenues that would flow therefrom. The Newfoundland people and this House have not been told what the cracky will do when he catches the car, have not been told what areas of additional jurisdiction we are looking after. There are some vague references to licensing at some point, but in particular, and I submit that this one 'in particular' is the case, because the government has not done any cost assessment, has not sat down and said, if we get this additional jurisdiction we will need this in terms of surveillance, in terms of monitoring and these costs will flow from those additional responsibilities. What the new Leader of the Liberal Party was

saying, in effect, I submit to the gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), is that if you want additional jurisdictions certain consequences flow from that, including, certain cost consequences.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman for Bonavista South also fudges, I suggest, somewhat the issue of existing provincial jurisdiction in fisheries matters. He knows full well that the provincial government of this Province has complete jurisdiction once that fish comes out of the water in terms of plant licensing, plant operation therefore, in particular of quality control, and if the government has come lately to that issue, as he suggested, then he must, as a former minister, take some responsibility for that.

On the matter of plant licensing, I suggest to the member for Twillingate that he, the member for Bonavista South, is the world's reigning expert. Indeed, if expertise correlates in some way with the number of licenses you give out, then the gentleman for Bonavista South is the world's reigning expert on that issue. Because if there is a proliferation, Mr. Chairman, of processing plants around this Province, the gentleman for Bonavista South must take some of the credit and, therefore, some of the blame.

There is one other point that needs to be made, Mr. Chairman, since we are talking fisheries and additional jurisdiction, and that is the abomination, the empty ritual that we were put through insofar as the constitutional discussion was concerned on this issue. If there is anything emptier not to mention naive, more

naive than putting into a constitution a number of items for discussion, then I do not know what it is. How completely naive, Mr. Chairman, instead of as men of honour, those eleven people, agreeing on certain agenda items for the next constitutional meeting, put time frames in it, say it will be discussed once a year until such time as the matter is resolved to the satisfaction of the parties concerned. To write that kind of a thing into a constitution suggests a fair degree of naiveté on the whole matter of constitution framing. But that is not what brought me to my feet, it is the welcome news that the gentleman for Bonavista South is at least thinking about opposing this privatization bill. If he does that, we will admire him for his courage in so doing. It was his misrepresentation of the statements made by the new leader of the Liberal Party, and I think I have spoken to that. If he wants an easy hook to hang it on, think of the dog chasing the car and think of what the dog might do when it catches that car. In particular, scrutinize well, we say to the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries, the costs that are involved and inform us of what your analysis is so we can make a more objective judgement on the subject.

On motion, clauses 3 through 5 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Shall clause 6 carry?

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Chairman, are you going to recognize me?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Speak up, boy.

MR. FENWICK:

Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Before I recognize the hon. member for Menihek, I would like to say that he does have thirty minutes to speak in the debate. Also, I think you have to be relevant to the clause you are speaking on in this debate. You are speaking to which clause now, clause 6?

MR. FENWICK:

I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, I am going to insist that in Committee of the Whole the relevancy rule is not as strictly enforced as it is in second reading.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

When everybody is the first time around, so to speak, I go somewhat on the theory, although people may not always agree, that I prefer to give a liberality rather than a restriction. That may come from my days in the Chair, I am not sure. It is quite clear, and the first time around I made no reference to it, but it is quite clear in Standing Order 44 (b) 'Speeches in Committee of the Whole House must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.' As I said, the first time around for everybody, for all sides, I did not make that point. That does not mean it is not still a rule of the House. I only make it now because the hon. gentleman for Menihek is perhaps not aware that it is a rule. But it is a rule there in black and white, Standing Order 44 (b).

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

In listening to the comments made by the member for Bonavista South, which I endorse, quite frankly, because it sounds like he is opposing the legislation now, it did not seem to me that he was particularly relevant to the clause itself. Also, of course, he was given thirty minutes to speak whereas you cut me off after ten minutes of speaking, which, I understand, was a mistake on your part, because I was entitled to thirty minutes the first round.

So I would like to suggest that this will be a continuation of the first round. If you want to be a little bit more strict on your relevancy rules after that, we will be glad to do what we can to oblige. But considering that the member for Bonavista South was wide-ranging in his comments, as was the member for Twillingate, as was the Leader of the official Opposition, I would suggest it would only be fair that I would at least get another twenty minutes of general comments in.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Chairman, further to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

A mistake was made in that the hon. gentleman was told he only had ten minutes. That was noticed when everybody else had thirty minutes. There was some confusion

over the ten-minute rule, which is one with which we all concurred and which obviously applies to Committees on Supply, and it was thought it applied to Committee of the Whole on legislation whereas it does not. So it is thirty minutes. The hon. gentleman has lost, in a sense, twenty minutes.

I think in fairness, to reconcile the situation whereby each side has thirty minutes where the relevance rule was not, let us say, applied or enforced - it does not mean it is not a rule, it does not mean we have buried it - the hon. gentleman should have, if you wish, twenty minutes of irrelevance, and I do not mean that in an unkind way, but twenty minutes where the relevance rule, perhaps I should better say, will not be applied.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

He will have to speak on FPI and not on the Third International or the Fourth International, obviously, but after twenty minutes the rule will then be applied for all. Does that seem to be a fair way of reconciling the anomaly?

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

The gentleman for Waterford - Kenmount loves to play Santa Claus, appearing to be giving out goodies and so on.

Now, let us be clear that what he is giving here is not a goodie.

The tradition has been, Mr. Chairman, when we start the discussion, the debate in Committee, i.e. on Clause 1, it has been generally regarded as the general debate as long as we are on Clause 1, not as a matter of leave or as a matter of gift-giving or nicety on the part of the gentleman for Waterford - Kenmount. The tradition has been, very clearly, that when we are on Clause 1, we treat it as the extension of the debate in principle, if you like. That is, I guess, what the minister means when he talks about the first round, that on Clause 1 we allowed a fair amount of leeway in the debate as long as we are on Clause 1. Once that is done, and once we put the question on Clause 1 and we move through the bill, we have tended to require as a Committee that the debate then be relevant to each clause before the Committee at that particular time.

I would submit two things: First that we continue that great tradition, that we have a fairly wide-ranging debate, if members so desire, on the first clause, which is the name of the bill. Secondly I would suggest, as the minister has suggested, that fairness be applied here, keeping in mind that the gentleman in the Chair inadvertently cut the member for Menihek off after ten minutes when he should have had thirty minutes. I would suggest we allow the twenty minutes of irrelevancies, if that is the case, but then we insist on the impossible, that after twenty minutes the member get relevant, Mr. Chairman.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Chairman, briefly, and perhaps then what we would suggest, because it is just about six

o'clock, is that the hon. the member for Menihek adjourn the debate. I do not think there is any great difference in what the hon. Leader of the Opposition and I are saying, except he still believes in Santa Claus. I will not comment on his general statement with respect to the first clause. I will not argue against it, but I do not want to say yes, either, because it is a difficult way to sort of make principles. I am not arguing against it, and in a sense it does not have to be decided now. I think we are all agreed, if the hon. gentleman will adjourn the debate, that when the matter is next called, then he has thirty minutes to speak, obviously, as has everybody, twenty minutes where the rule of relevancy will not be applied. Then everybody will have gone through that incubation stage and we will, as adults, observe Standing Order 44 (b) which says, "Speeches in Committee of the Whole House must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration." I say that without prejudice to the initial remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

So, if the hon. gentleman would move the adjournment of the debate, when it is called again he will have twenty minutes of irrelevancies.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order the Chair is going to rule that since members on both sides of the House had the opportunity to speak to this bill and not have the relevancy rule enforced the Chair is going to allow the hon. member, when it sits again, to have his twenty minutes to debate and then the relevancy rule will be enforced.

The hon. the member for Menihek,

MR. FENWICK:

Just one comment, Mr. Chairman. I think everything I was saying was relevant to the bill itself, but that is beside the point.

I will, at this time, adjourn the debate, Mr. Chairman.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, I apologize for getting a little confused there, but I picked up the wrong book when I left the table. I have the relevant information now.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bills No. 24, 4, and 15 without amendment and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

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

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