

PROPERTY OF NEWFOUNDLAND
LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
PLEASE RETURN



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 57

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

9 June 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
I wish to make a statement with respect to government policy on the subject of the recently reported issuance of exploration permits by the French Government to French companies. The way I will do it will be by reading two brief communications, one from the hon. the Premier to the Prime Minister of Canada, copied to the Right Hon. Joe Clark and the Hon. John C. Crosbie, and the second one, a letter to the Hon. Marcel Masse over my signature and copied to the Hon. Mr. Crosbie.

The Premier's letter to the Prime Minister reads:

"We view with utmost concern today's report of the awarding by France of petroleum exploration permits in the disputed waters around St. Pierre/Miquelon. If these reports are indeed true, I would urge Canada to express its objections to the Government of France that this action is inconsistent with current efforts to resolve the Canada/France Maritime Boundary dispute in this area. Canada must take every step necessary to protect our national interest in this important matter.

"I would appreciate being advised

of the status of this matter and Canada's intended course of action as soon as possible."

Then a letter to Hon. Marcel Masse, Minister of Energy Mines and Resources, signed by myself:

"Dear Mr. Masse:

"The Provincial Government understands that an Agence France press report states that the French Journal Officiel" - that is like our Gazette - "of last Saturday's date indicates that exploration permits have been issued to two French companies by the French Government in the disputed maritime area off St. Pierre et Miquelon.

"The Provincial Government is of the opinion that there exists an understanding between the Government of Canada and the Government of France that neither country would issue exploration permits until jurisdictional matters in dispute have been satisfactorily negotiated.

"I would appreciate learning whether this understanding is still in effect. The Provincial Government views with apprehension this unilateral action by the Government of France and urges the Government of Canada to take immediate diplomatic action to protest this issuance of exploration permits.

"Please advise me as to what action the Government of Canada has taken or intends to take in this matter."

We have copies of this for distribution to all hon. members.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for making available, a few minutes ago, copies of letters to which he has just referred. I say to the minister that in the letter from him to Mr. Masse the phrase occurs "have been issued" and I wonder if we can read into that that it is a first issuance from his perspective as opposed to a renewal or an extension of a permit which, according to some sources, was now reissued because it had run out. Again I am not alleging that to be the case, but I understand it may well be the case.

It does raise the question of what government's earlier involvement was in this matter, if it did go back a year or so ago, but that is a question that we will come to later.

What I would like to do, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the official Opposition is, first of all, say to the minister and through him to the Premier, that we endorse whole-heartedly the initiative that has been taken here by the government and the initiative which, according to press reports, has been undertaken by the Government of Canada, if it is indeed true, as we understand, that there was an issuance for one year, last year, to these same companies and that yesterday's action as notified in the *Journal Officiel de la France* was a extension for a five year period of those. We also understand that last year the diplomatic route was taken and that it worked, in that there was no activity out there,

no exercise of the permit by Total, and Elf Aquataine.

We believe firmly that the diplomatic route is the appropriate one to take. If at some point it becomes exhausted, obviously the appropriate authority, the Government of Canada, External Affairs in particular, would have to look at what other options are available. But that is another situation altogether.

The point we want to emphasize is that from our understanding the diplomatic initiative worked last year and we have no reason why it will not work this year. At the very least it ought to be tested, and that is indeed the case.

Mr. Speaker, let me say also on behalf of my colleagues that we are delighted to see that the Premier, if I may judge from the tone of his correspondence to the Prime Minister, is not using the ranting and roaring approach here and for that we commend him. Perhaps at long last he has gotten the message that there is some merit in the logical approach in dealings between governments. Perhaps he learnt it after the way he has gotten so terribly burnt over the FFT issue where, despite all the ranting and roaring, he did not get his way at all, over transfer payments, Mr. Speaker, his ranting and roaring stand on the railway and on the Canada/France agreement of some months ago. So, we do hope that this letter sends the signal that I interpret, that the Premier has come to the conclusion that the fight for the sake of fight approach is not necessarily the one that is going to serve this Province best.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this incident, the gazetting of the issuance of those licenses, underscores once again the absolute urgency of getting the negotiations and, indeed, the arbitration procedure in high gear to resolve the outstanding issues between Canada and France insofar as the offshore is concerned.

One other comment that needs to be made in this context, Mr. Speaker, is that we have not seen or heard a lot about the much touted Atlantic Accord in recent times. It was an issue of some import in the last session, it died on the Order Paper, and we have not seen or heard much of it since.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Your time is up.

MR. SIMMONS:
I suggest the Speaker will know when the time is up.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding we do hope that we will get before this session ends some indication of when the government will be proceeding on the Atlantic Accord legislation. Directly to the point that the minister has raised in his statement, and with this I conclude, I would hope that the minister will undertake to keep the House informed as to what response he gets from Mr. Masse and, in turn, the Premier gets from Mr. Mulroney on this important issue.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
It is quite a curious situation we have here, where we end up hearing from the news media, and actually from a member of Parliament, in Ottawa, that we are in a situation where permits have been given to two French companies to start drilling in disputed waters.

It raises, I think, the question of how cordial, to use a semi-French word, the relationship between Canada and France must be at this time if, indeed, this action is taken yet our own federal government seems to know virtually nothing about it and, if it does know anything about it, it has not informed our own government about it, all of which is a very curious situation.

I am assuming that the temperate language of the two letters is a temporary phenomena awaiting the revelation of what the exact circumstances are. If, as may be the case, the federal government did know about this prior to this time, I would suggest that I, for one, would have no qualms whatsoever to hear the Premier go off on his usual energetic diatribe against these kinds of actions, since this obviously is a major escalation of what is now, I think, a long-term water border dispute.

From our perspective as a party, both federally and provincially, we would be very much concerned if this is the kind of consideration we are getting from France now after, hopefully, the relations between the two countries had advanced to a point where we are

on better grounds.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would, I think, say that we are very concerned about the situation and we await further information to find out whether our government federally did know about what was going on. If it did not, I would anticipate that their response would be quite vigorous in terms of protecting our own interests, and hopefully we will not see oil rigs from France moving into the disputed area in order to start drilling.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, today I wish to announce that 1,250 jobs will be created this Summer as a result of projects being carried out by my department under the Canada - Newfoundland Forest Resources Development Agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
These jobs, Mr. Speaker, involve activities in all parts of the Province, mostly in our expanding silviculture programme and in the building and reconstruction of some 100 kilometers of resource roads.

We will be spending at least \$12.5 million under the cost-shared agreement on a number of forestry projects and programmes, including more than \$7 million on silviculture. The silviculture programme clearly illustrates the dramatic progress we are making in forestry in this Province. For

example, this year alone, we will plant some 12 million tree seedlings, more than half of the 23 million that we planted in the last ten years in total.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this year's planting will also be more than double our best year to date - that was in 1985 when we planted 5.8 million seedlings. So I believe we are making exceptional headway. Most of the planting this year will be carried out in twenty-five separate projects this Summer, with another five or six projects being carried out in our Fall planting programme. The silviculture programme also includes preparation of sites for later planting and thinning of overstocked young stands. In total, over 16,000 hectares will be silviculturally treated, in some form or another.

I might just add as an aside here, Mr. Speaker, that I have heard in the last couple of days some comments about the amount of planting we have been doing, and some member opposite referring to 13 per cent. What he failed to realize is that Newfoundland has if not the highest, certainly one of the highest in naturally regenerated tree processes in all of Canada. He forgot to take that into account when he made his comments, which he read, of course from, a report.

To be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, also, is that the 1,250 jobs that I mentioned are not the complete total. As I announced earlier, another 200 jobs are being created by my department as part of the Provincial Employment programme in co-operation with the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the number of people working this Summer, as a result of our forestry silviculture and other programmes, should reach a total of at 1,450 and in fact, depending on project schedules adopted by various contractors, there may well be some more.

All of this activity, Mr. Speaker, creates jobs that would not exist if this government was not committed to carrying out improved forest management in a way that creates productive employment.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the minister for the courtesy of providing me with a copy of his statement earlier. We welcome the announcement. I want to tell the minister, speaking for this side of the Legislature, that we welcome any announcement from any minister that indicates that 1,400 jobs will be created in this Province.

In support of the minister, I have heard, both inside and outside of this Legislature, criticism of the fact that jobs created in silviculture are part-time jobs when we are talking about full-time jobs. Everybody wants full-time jobs, but, of course, anyone who understands forestry, Mr. Speaker, will know by the very nature of the industry and by the very nature of a silviculture programme it must be, by and large, short-term jobs.

So, again, I would say to the

minister we welcome the announcement.

I am glad, also, particularly in light of happenings, events this past few days, to know that the majority of the jobs created will be with Abitibi-Price, Kruger, or private contractors and, therefore, one would feel confident that the kind of political patronage that we have seen practiced in other government sponsored jobs this year will not be practiced in employing people for these jobs announced by the minister today.

I would suggest to him, and I do not understand why it is not so, that any jobs which are the responsibility of a line department, such as the Department of Forestry, I can think of no reason why those jobs cannot go through the Public Service Commission, thereby avoiding criticism if, indeed, there is the possibility that it would be seen as being used for political patronage.

Mr. Speaker, when the minister wound up his statement he was obviously still smarting over the fact that he got an 'F' from the environmental report card relative to the Province's performance in silviculture and forest enhancement. I would think that he is hoping now, and I hope with him and we hope with him, that the announcement today of the increased activity in Silviculture and forest enhancement will reduce his 'F' to a 'D', and let us work it all the way down to an 'A'.

With that, again, Mr. Speaker, speaking for the Opposition, we welcome the 1,400 jobs and we commend the minister on the announcement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Just two small points, Mr. Speaker: The first one, I think, refers to the minister's comments about the amount of land needing replanting. He indicated that even though we only replaced 13 per cent of the cut, I think that is what he was saying, the rest is reseeded naturally. What the minister, of course, failed to say in his explanation is that it reseeds even more naturally and better than we possibly could want and, quite frankly, we end up with very thick stands of very small trees which have to be thinned and, as a result, we require more work in the thinning area than we do in replanting. I just thought I would point that out to the minister, although I think he is quite aware of it, it is just that he should have indicated that that is one of our major problems.

On job creation, which is, it seems to me, the other theme of this particular Ministerial Statement, he talks quite highly about the 1450 jobs that are created, 1250 I believe with contractors primarily, and another 200 on the job creation kind of projects. I find that it is nice to see that many people working, Mr. Speaker. It is certainly pleasant to know that we do have some primarily federal money coming into the Province in order to create at least a major portion of those 1250 jobs, but I think we should still remember that in terms of job creation the report

card for this government as a whole was a solid 'F' - I think that is probably the only grade it got on that - when our unemployment rate still hangs up on the 20 per cent range despite the fact that the Canadian rate has dropped and ours usually tracks the Canadian rate. The other thing, of course, is that despite that fact, 1000 people in this last year have actually left the Province going down the road looking for employment. So, on that basis I think the employment record of this government is an 'F -' if that is possible, despite the fact that some of these federal/provincial agreements are creating a few jobs, even if they be only of a temporary nature during the Summer.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Questions

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the absence of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), and the answers given by the Premier yesterday and his statement made on t.v. last night, seem to indicate that the Minister of Social Services is trying to evade his responsibility of appearing in this House and answering questions put by the Opposition.

Let me say to the Acting Premier, and all members on the other side, that it is not going to work, that we are not going to -

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I think that this has probably gone far enough. I was not in the House last Wednesday, but I have a copy of the Hansard of last Wednesday and a reasonable reading of the minister's statements would indicate that he did not intend to say the kind of things that the Opposition is accusing him of. Since the new Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Wells), a very honourable gentleman, is in the Chamber and in earshot of my voice, I would ask one of the Pages to give him a copy of last Wednesday's Hansard so that he may read it and perhaps influence his caucus to show some manners and decency. Any charitable reading of this Hansard would show that the hon. gentleman was trying to develop the argument, and was interrupted in the course of it, of course, that abandonment of children is one of the worse things that can happen to them. I think all hon. members realize and would accept the notion that our most precious resource is our children. To try and pervert and twist what the hon. gentleman said is an abuse of the privileges of this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, the hon. member has not made a prima facie case.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

I would like to ask the Acting Premier, Mr. Speaker, in light of the statements made yesterday concerning the amount of money that is put into day care by this Province - it ranks number ten in all of Canada: \$4 per capita in Newfoundland; \$21 per capita in New Brunswick; and \$31 in Prince Edward Island; and Nova Scotia - would the Acting Premier tell us if he agrees with the statements that the Premier made yesterday and does he think that the Minister of Social Services must have given the wrong information, which again shows further dereliction in his duties as Minister of Social Services, to the Premier when he gave the Premier figures saying that we are spending an equal amount of money with any other province in Atlantic Canada?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, first I should point out that the hon. Minister of Social Services is attending a conference of Ministers of Social Services. That is the reason he is not here. As a matter of fact, I believe it is a meeting on day care.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

It shows how committed the hon. minister is to day care.

MR. SIMMONS:

Let us hope he learns something.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I am sure the hon. minister has an open mind. I am sure he will learn something, and I am sure others may well learn from him as well. I am sure these are all learning experiences.

However, with respect to the hon. gentleman's more specific aspect of the question, the hon. the Premier yesterday, in answer to a question on the same subject, I think, pointed out that whereas in 1979 day care expenditures were \$150,000, they are today \$650,000. That is quite a considerable increase. Support for family services, and obviously that is very related, went from \$31,000 in 1979, the first year of his administration, when he became Premier - not of the Tory Administration but the first year that he was Premier - to \$482,000, and that there were no transition houses in 1979 and today there is \$381,000 spent in that area. Obviously everybody will agree that there should be more spent for day care, more spent for social services of various kinds, for family services, for transition houses, in all of those social areas there should be more money spent, but obviously the Province has to have more money in order to spend it.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

Let me cite a quote from what the Premier said yesterday, when he said that the present government takes a back seat to nobody in this country on day care services, which statistics very clearly show

that we ranked number ten in all of Canada in money spent on day care.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister how can he justify the Minister of Social Services, representing social services and day care in this Province, up speaking in Nova Scotia, in light of the statements that he made in this House last week, and over and over again in public, and in light of the fact that every woman's association, the Nurses Union and everybody in this Province have called for the minister's resignation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the government's position, the government's policy with respect to day care services, was articulated clearly, unequivocally, forcefully yesterday by the Premier, by the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) and by the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), and that is therefore the record and I cannot articulate it any better than they did. Hon. members might say I perhaps could articulate it less well. They articulated very clearly what the policy of the government is with respect to day care, and that is from the Premier and from other ministers, so that is quite clear.

With respect to the amount of money, I think what the hon. gentleman probably is getting at there is that there is not enough money, there should be more money, or that other provinces spend more money on day care - I presume he means per capita - than Newfoundland does. I mean it is

unfortunately true that in many areas of social endeavour, as in other areas, Newfoundland, because of its financial position, cannot spend the money it wishes to. I will not argue with PEI, because there is a question of maybe interpretation. But our per capita incomes are lower, and this is historically since Confederation. This is not a Tory phenomenon, it is not a Liberal phenomenon, it is largely due to historic and geographic circumstances. One can argue politically, sure the Tories would do a lot better or the Liberals would do a lot better. Only the Socialists would say that by the abolition of private enterprise and a total revolution of the masses and the dictatorship of the proletariat, only they would argue that there is a total panacea. The Liberals might argue that they have policies which would help alleviate it and we would argue that our policies are excellent, but nobody sees a panacea there.

The fact is, when one makes comparisons, and everything has to be seen in context, and sees what was spent in 1979 and what is spent now, the government's dedication to day care and other social programmes is evident. And I remind the hon. gentlemen it is 'By your actions ye shall know them.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:
In light of the fact that the Minister of Social Services is

representing the government and the Province on social services, and the minister just very clearly stated that he does not agree, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies does not agree, the Minister of Justice does not agree with the statements made by the Minister of Social Services, is he now saying, as a Cabinet representative, that he does not agree and that the Minister of Social Services must resign because he cannot represent the Province on his own views when the government has a totally different view than he has already stated?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, very much the same question was put by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons) to the hon. the Premier yesterday, and the Premier's position and the government's position as articulated by him was very clear. He pointed out concretely, through its expenditures and making comparison back to 1979, the dedication of the government to day care and stated exactly what the government's policy is. And the government's policy is as so stated.

MR. EFFORD:
Resignation!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
I do not intend to resign, no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer), the Minister of Energy, when did the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador first become aware that permits were being issued by the Government of France in the disputed area off St. Pierre and Miquelon for oil exploration, and what was known by government at that time? In other words, what did you know, before this last development, and when did you know it?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Newfoundland was not aware that the Government of France had issued these licences. Apparently it became public when it was printed in what corresponds to the Gazette in France, I think of last Saturday's date, and we became aware of it or some of us became aware of it last evening. We were not aware of it before, and indeed we cannot get a copy of Le Journal Officiel here, but no doubt it is in it. But that is my understanding of when it became public and, to the best of my knowledge, the federal government knew nothing about it either - to the best of my knowledge.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. There are indications that there was a permit or permits issued last year and what we are seeing now are renewals. So the minister, I understand, is saying he and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador knows nothing about that, nor does he believe the Government of Canada knows anything about that.

Well, what about the reference in the minister's letter, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that he believes, he is 'of the opinion' - I think 'impression' would be a better word; of the impression - 'that there exists an understanding between the Government of Canada and the Government of France that neither country would issue exploration permits until jurisdictional matters in dispute have been satisfactorily negotiated'? Would the minister tell us what does he know with respect to this understanding? Is it contained in a formal document? Has the minister seen anything expressing this understanding? Where or how did he arrive at the opinion that there is such an understanding between the two National Governments?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, to refer to the earlier part of the question, there is, in my communication to Mr. Masse, and the Premier's to the Prime Minister, as well as a protest a request that we get all

the details and that they inform us exactly what the position is. I do not mind saying, as I already said, we knew nothing about this before last night, some of us -

MR. BARRY:

About any permits?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

- about permits which were issued, whose issuance was made public in the French Gazette of last Saturday's date. Now, since then, in endeavouring to get to the bottom of it, we have heard opinions - but we still do not have the facts - that, number one, about whether it is exploratory and not drilling or drilling as well, and, number two, whether it is a renewal or something new. With respect to the renewal aspect - again, all of this unfounded; we do not know yet, it is not fact, just different opinions we have heard - whether there were permits given last year by France and then an agreement that they would not be implemented or acted upon, not that they were necessarily cancelled, we do not know. I quite frankly say, until we hear back from Masse or from the people in Ottawa with the full details, we do not know and it is not fruitful to speculate.

With respect to understanding, let me refer to my letter to him: 'The Provincial Government is of the opinion that there exists an understanding between the Government of Canada and the Government of France that neither country would issue exploration permits until these jurisdictional matters...have been satisfactorily resolved.'

Again, it is only my opinion, that this understanding is probably an oral one and that it is not a

written one. Again, I do not know, that is what I want to find out, if it is written or oral and what its specific terms are, if there are more terms to it that we both agree not to explore, and what its date is and whether it is regarded by one of the parties, say, Canada, as still continuing or whether they regard it as no longer being valid. We do not know and that is the reason why we want to get this information from Ottawa. From the contacts that we have had there only this morning, to the best of my knowledge this came as a total surprise to Ottawa as well. To the best of my knowledge it was a unilateral action by France and that Ottawa was not informed.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. BARRY:

In light of the fact that there is in excess of 20,000 square kilometres of disputed territory involved here, some of that territory coming within thirty miles of the Newfoundland coast, which would clearly fall within the area claimed as Newfoundland's Continental Shelf, and in light of the fact that there is an overlapping with permits already issued by Canada, we understand, and presumably Newfoundland has been involved in these, to Texaco, Gulf, Mobil and Petro-Canada, would the minister tell us what action has he taken? Has he spoken with the Minister of External Affairs? Has he spoken with the Deputy Minister of External Affairs? Has he spoken with the Minister's Executive Assistant, if the minister was not available? Has he spoken with

anybody in authority? I repeat the minister's own words, "By their actions ye shall know them." Is there any action from that side of the House to protect Newfoundland's territory and Newfoundland's right to the Continental Shelf or is this merely an exercise in futility? Is the minister just going through the motions by sending off these letters? Has he at least sent them by priority post?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, not by priority post but by FACTS which is simultaneous. It arrives ten seconds after it leaves here.

MR. BARRY:

Who did you write to?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I will answer the question in my own due time, in my own due way, and will not have it dictated to me. When it comes to priority post, it was not priority post or homing pigeon, it was by a simultaneous means of transmission whereby it goes out and ten seconds later one was in the Prime Minister's office, and the other went out and ten minutes later was in Mr. Masse's office.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Ten seconds.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Ten seconds, that is correct. So, with respect to the hon. gentleman's overall contention or concern, let us call it a concern, that probably the provincial government is remiss and cannot be counted upon, cannot be relied upon to protect the Province's

interests in matters concerning the Continental Shelf, I do not think that there is much evidence of any such laxity on the part of this government. Certainly this government has been very diligent in that whole area with respect to both to fishing rights and with respect to the offshore as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Answer the question, Gerry. Who did you speak to?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Yes, I will answer the question. If the hon. member will take it easy I will get to all parts of his question.

There is only one other part that I recall, when he was speculating, Oh, probably they did not speak to anybody and they are just sending off letters to make it look good. No. I was speaking this morning with Mr. Crosbie. I could not speak to Mr. Clark, he is in Iceland; the Premier could not speak with the Prime Minister, he is Venice. I was speaking with officials, but I am not sure just which ones because up there there are so many either deputies or associate deputies in the various departments, Energy and External Affairs. So I can assure the hon. gentleman and the hon. House that this is being pursued with diligence.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, just to follow up on

the matter that my colleague from Mount Scio - Bell Island was just pursuing, the minister tells us that the message took ten seconds from here to Ottawa. That is not the problem, Mr. Speaker. The problem is the time it takes to get the messages back from Ottawa, and it seems in this case it took a year or more. Will the minister indicate to the House whether the provincial government had any knowledge about the issuance of permits or the possible issuance of permits to Total and Elf Aquitaine a year ago? Is he telling the House that the information, which he admitted came to his knowledge in the last twenty-four hours, was the first indication that he, as Minister of Energy, has had of this whole question of the issuance of permits in the disputed area to French companies for the purpose of drilling and/or exploration?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, with reference to the issuance of these specific permits, which was made public by the French journals on Saturday, the first time the Government of Newfoundland learned of it was last night, and to the best of my knowledge the first time the Government of Canada learned of it was last night or today - to the best of my knowledge.

Now with reference to the other, I cannot say what specific date, but I can recall the question of permits being issued by France to French companies, objections from the federal government and the provincial government, and then an agreement that they would not be operative or that they would be

cancelled, or they would not be operative or whatever.

I think it is in relation to that that there was an understanding between France and Canada that no permits would be issued. That is as I recall it. With reference to these specific permits, the first we learned was last night, and I am quite sure the first the federal government learned was at the same time and learned through what was published in the French thing corresponding to the Gazette. I believe, as well, that there have already been diplomatic representations made by Canada to France. I cannot say that as a fact, but I believe that already diplomatic representation has been made by Canada to France on this question of issuance.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I watched the minister over an extended period of time and one can tell when the minister is skating, and he was skating at length, Mr. Speaker, in the sequence of questions between my friend and colleague from Mount Scio - Bell Island and the minister.

Mr. Speaker, the minister now is beginning to come clean on this. His memory is bouncing back, so let us give him time, because now he remembers something that he did not admit to at all in the first line of questioning. The impression given earlier by the minister was that this was the first thing yesterday, no item of information before yesterday and

today's letter. Now, Mr. Speaker, he tells us something else.

Will he tell us just a little more, now, about last year's events? Will he tell us - this was the first question put to him on this subject today - when he became aware? He might not be able to nail it down to the minute or the day but roughly when did he become aware? Was it a month ago or was it twelve months ago? To help him, will he indicate whether it was before the blowup over the Canada - France fish deal back in January or February? Was he aware before that incident about the issuance of permits last year? Was he aware before that time, and can he nail it down to an approximate time frame as to when he became aware of that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I could not say what time because for years the question has been there with respect to this, let us call it, disputed area as to licenses issuing from Canada, licenses issuing from France. There was a period of time, I think, when both had some licenses issued. Then it is my understanding there was an agreement that no licenses would be issued by either. That has been something that has been a situation for some years, but I cannot say how many without looking it up or having somebody look it up. This situation, the dispute, has been there for years, and then there was an agreement, at the least an understanding, that neither country would issue any further licenses, and that, I think, has been operative for a number of years, but I would have

to check to see the date of that understanding, and that this is the first instance of a breach of that understanding. That is why I have asked him, number one, to confirm whether there is such an understanding, and I believe there is, and, number two, whether it is still operative. I assume we will have this information by the tomorrow. But it is not fruitful for me to speculate until I get the actual facts.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, this gets more interesting by the moment. The minister's letter talks about the government being 'of the opinion.' Now he alleges there was a breach of understanding, which I suggest to him is much different, much more pointed than an opinion on the part of himself or the government. Mr. Speaker, will the minister now tell us what exactly he knew on this earlier subject of a year ago? When he knew it? And, Mr. Speaker, since this is my final, why did the government not make this information public at the time? Was there some particular reason why this was not made public at the time? I understand he cannot undo the past, but will he now undertake to table, to make public any information, I have in mind in particular any protest that the government of this Province launched at the time it first became aware of this possible breach of understanding, as he phrases it?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the only breach of this understanding is the one which was referred to in Saturday's Gazette. That is the only breach of the understanding. The understanding was that neither country would issue permits. Neither country did issue permits then, and any that had been issued were no longer operative. The first breach of the understanding that I am aware of is the one referred to by the French Government's Gazette of last Saturday's date.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) and it has to do with the joint project between the Provincial Government and the Sprung greenhouse interests. I would like to ask the minister if at present, or in the future, government is contemplating or has given to this joint venture, exemption from municipal taxation for the operation itself?

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I give the hon.

member more credit to know the tax structure in this Province at least a little better than he does. The provincial government does not have the power to give municipal tax exemptions. They would be given, if they are to be given, by a municipality, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I am quite surprised that the minister does not realize that he has powers under his act to give exemptions for agricultural producers from municipal taxation, and in fact he has already given a number of greenhouse producers that exemption.

My question to the minister - I wish he would stop prevaricating - is: Have you now or will you in the future give the Sprung joint project exemption from municipal taxation before the operation is put in place?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hon. member, I did not understand his first question. Yes, my department can recommend to Municipal Affairs, which is a little different than what the hon. member has said, property tax exemptions for land use for agricultural purposes, Mr. Speaker. We have not considered the Sprung project for this recommendation yet because the

farmer themselves apply, the agricultural user would apply to my department for such an exemption and it would be considered at the time of application.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary.

MR. FENWICK:
My final supplementary is this: Given that there are a number of producers who have already received exemptions when they have asked, I am asking the minister now, knowing exactly what this operation is since he has been deeply involved in it, will this operation receive exemption from municipal taxation when it applies for its application?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, first of all I do not know if they are going to apply. Another little different twist to this is the greenhouse operations now that get exemptions get exemptions on their production facilities, not on their business or their storefront operations, I guess, where they sell their flowers. Mr. Speaker, when the application comes in for this greenhouse operation it will be considered the same as everyone else - if it comes in, Mr. Speaker.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a short question to the minister, since the Premier is not here, on the youth unemployment situation.

I would just like the Acting Premier to indicate what are government's plans to deal with the situation that has seen the youth unemployment rate go from 25 per cent in 1979 up to 37 per cent now, and continuously seems to be going in an upward direction? Is there a specific plan that the government is going to bring in and deal with over the next one or two or three or four years? Is there a specific plan instead of rhetoric? Are there specific programmes, such as other provincial governments are doing? Are they going to be bringing in specific programmes to deal with this catastrophe that presently goes on?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, there will be a number of programmes which the government has in operation which the hon. gentleman should be familiar with. There is a salary subsidy programme which is of assistance to young people, whereby 50 per cent of the salary is made available. Then, of course, there is the provincial employment programme in which 40 per cent of the applicants have to be under twenty-five years of age. There is a youth entrepreneur programme, whose details have been announced in the House, which is specifically designed for young people. Then, of course, there are certain federal - provincial 50/50

cost-shared programmes.

I would have thought the hon. gentleman would have been familiar with them, but I will ask the minister responsible to send a brochure or a description of all of these programmes to the hon. gentleman so that he can communicate it to the young people in his district, who, I am sure, would like to know that information.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Petitions

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition today on behalf of eighty people in the Stephenville - Bay St. George area concerning the cutback in Social Services of thirty-five positions. These are petitions that have been circulated all around the area of the West Coast and are continually coming into the office, streaming in. They are giving indications that they are against the government's action to cut back the services in the Social Service Department and the responsibility the government is evading.

Mr. Speaker, I saw the Deputy Premier responding to questions on

youth unemployment. I can see why we are going to need a lot more petitions, Mr. Speaker, because obviously they think that on the youth unemployment situation, the status quo is fine and we do not have to deal with that problem. The programmes they have are fine. There is no sweat. There is no problem. The young people out there are fine and there is no problem whatsoever. We have everything there folks. There is no problem, we will have it all solved.

Well, that is the same attitude that prevails in the area of Social Services and it is obviously the same attitude that prevails when it comes to day care and child care as the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) has already indicated to this House of Assembly in this last week. It is unfortunate that we see this government undertaking such a scheme and a programme to cutback services to people who, at the very least, cannot afford it, and who have to suffer the consequences of a government that is running out of steam and has decided that the only way to save money is to take it out of people, and services away from the people who can least afford it and who deserve it and who need it most, especially senior citizens and people who are disabled. These are the people that are being hit, these are the people that need more help instead of less.

This government has decided in their wisdom they do not want to bother to improve the programmes or provide the adequate capability to service the programmes that they bring in. If you read the Social Services Report, Mr. Speaker, you will find a number of new programmes that this

government has supposedly brought in since 1979. Well, if you look at the money figures that are on the other side, Mr. Speaker, you find the same amount of money. That \$25,000 figure that was in 1979 is the same as it is now. The same types of figures have been occurring all along.

Organizations around this Province that are trying to help disabled people, that are trying to help the mentally handicapped, are continuously seeking to get status and to help get improvements in financing and so on. What does this government decide to do? It decides to take away thirty-five positions and to cut back its budget. People who in this Province need it most are suffering and we see the government deciding to cut back.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to keep presenting these petitions as they come in because this is an issue that will not go away. It is an important issue for the people of the Province. It is time that this government responded not only to the cutbacks in Social Services, where they should be making improvements, Mr. Speaker, it is also time they responded to the youth unemployment situation which is a catastrophe in this Province and which should be responded to with immediate action, programmes and plans.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad case indeed when we see thirty-five positions in Social Services being cut back where day care is being affected, child care and so on. These children are going to grow up and they are going to face the youth unemployment situation in this Province. If it continues, with this government letting it continue, we will see a drastic

situation. They are not even getting a chance to get a job.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Before the opportunity passes, Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in support of the petition so ably presented by my friend and colleague from Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward). It is one of a number of petitions that he has been bringing to the attention of this House on behalf of petitioners who feel aggrieved about a very important issue. The issue is well known to this Chamber, the issue of layoffs at a time when there is an increasing need for the very services that are being dispensed with by the minister.

That alone, Mr. Speaker, is a comment on the judgement of the minister, on the kind of advice he is getting and on the kind of advice he is bringing to the Cabinet table. Mr. Speaker, this is the same minister who has been much in the news in the last few days with his rather, I suppose, colourful is a term that would too much dignify the nature of his remarks, but colourful in a very despicable way, colourful remarks about day care and about working mothers.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how long it is going to take the government to get the message on this particular issue. The Premier yesterday gave the most encouraging signal to date to the mothers of this Province, to the

offspring who were implicitly insulted at the same time and to the spouses of those working mothers who were insulted at the same time. The Premier gave the most encouraging signal yesterday when he said we will wait and see.

Knowing his kind of politics, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that when he says wait and see, he means wait and see what is the extent of the public reaction, the public furor, and then he will take what he thinks is the appropriate political course of action. It is encouraging that he would send that signal but it is also the despicable that he is going to make his decision on that basis alone. Because, you see, Mr. Speaker, the heart of the matter is this: Here and now we have a minister who has clearly lost the confidence of those whose advocate he is supposed to be at the Cabinet table.

How can those people, Mr. Speaker, those members of women's groups, people who generally believe in the so-called women's issues, which I submit are societal issues of particular import to women in many cases, how can he now, Mr. Speaker, be seen to be the convincing advocate of their cause at the Cabinet table, given the way he so despicably burned the bridge last week?

DR. COLLINS:

A point or order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, when presenting

petitions one has to refer to the number of petitioners, the subject of the petition and comments thereto. As far as I have heard, this petition had nothing to do with the minister and day care. It had to do with the employment of social workers in the Stephenville area.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, it is very difficult to assess just exactly when a member is speaking directly to the subject.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has been uncomfortable on this issue because I know something of the gentleman that he is and I know that he does not subscribe to the views. What must rankle him and every other member in that administration is that they have to sit and bite their tongue on this particular issue, an issue that is so insulting to them that anybody in his right mind would suggest for a moment that working mothers ought to have some guilt complex for so doing.

Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) yesterday talked about collective responsibility. I just want to come to that for a moment in concluding.

The minister must, Mr. Speaker, to subscribe to the government's objectives and decisions or he has got to withdraw from that ministry. He cannot have it both ways. This suggestion that somehow he can go around and peddle his own Neanderthal views, his views from the way distant past, which,

according to the Premier, are in conflict with the objectives and decisions of the government and the aims of the government, this suggestion, Mr. Speaker, has no place in our system of government. It has no place here at all.

He has got to support the government's stance on an issue or he has got to withdraw from that ministry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
That is the second reason, Mr. Speaker, why he cannot continue in that Cabinet. In any event, he has lost the confidence of the people whose advocate he is supposed to be. I just do not know why the respectable woman and men in that Cabinet just sit by, Mr. Speaker, and let their political fortunes be dissipated, but more to the point, let their political integrity be chipped away at by the insidious statements of the minister. I do not understand it for a minute. It tells us volumes, Mr. Speaker, about the backbone or lack thereof of other people in that particular administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Very briefly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, the government's position and programme with respect to social services and with respect to child care has

been articulated by the Premier and by other ministers. It is clear and unequivocal. The policies and programme, as articulated by the Premier and other ministers yesterday, and the programmes as delivered, are quite clear to all. We are proud of the programmes and policies put into effect by this administration.

MR. SPEAKER:
Are there any further petitions?

MR. LONG:
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a petition to present on the same issue on behalf of sixty persons from the West Coast. The petition reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, would like this petition to be presented to the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador. The prayer of our petition is as follows:

"The Department of Social Services has recently cut back thirty-five positions around the Province within its department. The Bay St. George Foster Parents Association is very concerned about the layoffs as it will critically affect the services that are needed for our children and all those whose lives are enriched by the services of social workers.

"Children who usually come to live in our homes are children who have either been abused mentally, physically, or sexually. The

social worker is the link between the child and the system. Their services to the children are vital to the well-being of the child. As a Province, we must have increases of services by approximately 150 new workers. As citizens we feel that we cannot permit this reduction of services.

"We ask that the petition be presented to the House of Assembly and that the Minister of Social Services act upon our concerns."

This petition was signed by residents of Corner Brook and was presented to myself when I was out there this weekend for a regional conference of the New Democratic Party. As we have seen, these concerns are being brought forward from people in the Port au Port, Stephenville - Bay St. George area, there are people in Corner Brook who are also circulating petitions and are quite alarmed about the implications of the cutbacks in social workers to their region.

Also, the people that I met with and spoke with in Corner Brook on the weekend were quite clear in their own minds on how the cutbacks of social workers related to what have now become the infamous remarks by the Minister of Social Services as it related to the issue of day care. Indeed, as the cutback of social workers is related to the whole attitude of this government in terms of providing services for people in this Province who are suffering from the ills of unemployment, economic difficulty, people who through no fault of their own find themselves on social assistance, and are suffering from the social ills that are produced by economic difficulties, alcoholism and family violence.

These people were really clear in the presentation that they were making. The cutback of social workers represents only the thin edge of the wedge, we might say, of what is happening consistently across the Province and what is being demonstrated by this government, and that is a complete lack of respect for its own workers, its own government employees, and certainly a complete disrespect for the difficulties that ordinary people who are hurting as a result of economic difficulty, the situation that ordinary people in this Province find themselves in.

It is difficult to listen to the ministers the last couple of days who have been here defending the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) on this issue and also defending the Minister of Social Services when questioned about his remarks and insisting that they are proud of the record of this government when it comes to the issue of child care. The Premier was here yesterday insisting that the only response that could be given to these questions was to say that we need more. In fact, Mr. Speaker, what I would submit, as others in this Chamber have been submitting and indeed many others across the Province is that what is needed in the midst of this controversy and this debate that is raging across the Province is only one thing, and that is the resignation of the Minister of Social Services.

I think the petition I am presenting today and bringing forward to the Legislature is simply more evidence of the lack of faith that the people of this Province have in the Minister of Social Services. I would suggest that being told today by the House

Leader that the Minister of Social Services is away in Ottawa representing this Province at a meeting of Ministers responsible for child care, it is an absolutely shameful situation and indeed gives more weight to the argument that it is a matter of some urgency that the Premier call upon this minister to submit his resignation.

I certainly felt when I heard the House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) say that this is what the minister is doing when he is not in the House the last two days, that the immediate thing that is needed is to call this minister home and stop the embarrassment that I am sure this Province is being subjected to when we have national news reports playing it across pages of newspapers elsewhere in the country, playing it on national T.V. that our own Provincial Minister of Social Services, responsible for child care, is now sitting around the table with other ministers who have that responsibility for child care, engaged in a very difficult and complexed debate on how to introduce a comprehensive programme to provide child care services across the country.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LONG:

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 find it necessary to rise in my place today as the critic for Social Services to support the petition sent in by the sixty people I think it was from the Corner Brook area. I do that for two particular reasons: One of the reasons is the questions that the official Opposition have been asking the different Ministers of Career Development, the Department of Justice, yesterday the Premier of the Province, and today the Acting Premier. The type of answers that we have been getting back from those ministers, and ministers of the Cabinet that the Minister of Social Services sits in is every indication in every answer they give, they give it in a roundabout way, but they are trying to say and trying to put the impression forth, Mr. Speaker, that they do not agree with the Minister of Social Services.

Now that goes back to the very issue and the very statement that we are talking about in those petitions when the people of this Province, the hundreds and hundreds of people who continuously send in petitions around the Province because of the recent cutbacks in the Social Services Departments, regional and the district offices around the Province. All around Newfoundland this is taking place, not only on the Western part of Newfoundland but on the Eastern part and Central as well, and it has caused a great impact, not only on the people who are dependent on social assistance, but on the social workers themselves. There is no way that a social worker can cope with the number of case loads that she has in one day or a week or a month with the emphasis that has been placed on social services caused by the lack of

a creation of jobs by this present administration.

The reason why we have the same number or, as the minister has indicated, even more people in 1987 depending on social assistance than in 1986 is because of the problem that this administration is having creating anything other than a ten week syndrome for all the people of this Province. The pride is lost that the people used to have in years gone by where they could at least go out and get a seasonal job or at least go to the fishing boat and catch some fish and earn at least a decent living. That has been taken away from them by this government over the last ten or fifteen years, even moreso since 1979 because these people have lost all touch with reality. For that reason, we have more people year after year depending on social services. If that is to take place, then we must have more people working in our Social Services Department.

We have been continually this week, and for the last two or three days, been given false information. I gather now the reason for it being that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) is passing along the wrong information to the members of Cabinet and to the Premier because he does not know what is taking place in his department. The statements that this minister has made in the last three or four days, and last week, further goes to prove how incompetent the minister is in performing his duties. Today in Question Period we could not get the facts and figures out because of the heckling from the backbenchers and the ministers on the other side. I want to point out very clearly,

Mr. Speaker, how this minister is falling behind the rest of Canada in performing his duties as Social Services Minister.

In Newfoundland we put in an average of \$4.66 per capita into day care. The next nearest province to us is New Brunswick with \$21, Prince Edward Island with \$31 and Nova Scotia with \$36. How can any Minister of Social Services stand in his place in Cabinet, in the House of Assembly, in front of the news media, and tell the people of this Province that he is performing his duties and he is increasing day care with the need for day care around the Province of Newfoundland? They will come back and say the Transition House in St. John's they have spent \$300 million on. They will give us different figures for urban areas, but the main problem, Mr. Speaker, the main problem is out around rural Newfoundland. There is not enough in the urban areas, but it is even worse out in rural Newfoundland than even it is in the urban areas.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one way to resolve this problem. I think if you look at the face of the Premier today and you would look at the expression on the Premier's face last night when he answered the questions on TV I think he already knows the answer. Why he does not come out and demand and tell the Minister of Social Services that his resignation must come immediately, the people and we on this side cannot understand. We know, the Premier knows, every Cabinet Minister has admitted in a round about way, Mr. Speaker, there is only one way to service the people of this Province, to give them the social sector that they need, to provide

better working conditions for all the people in the social services sector, in the district offices and the regional offices around this Province, to give better day care, is to demand the resignation of the Minister of Social Services and put somebody there at least who has the competence to fulfill the job.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I will go by the rules laid down by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), this is a petition signed by forty-one individuals. It is also from the West Coast, from Stephenville and Corner Brook, Benoit's Cove and a few other places, looking at the signatures. It also has my signature on it, Mr. Speaker, so it is in order. It also has my wife's signature on it, which I am quite pleased to see. It is virtually the same prayer so I am not going to repeat the prayer of the petition of the previous one.

I would just like to enter into the record an anecdote that was relayed to me by a social worker working on the West Coast which I thought illustrates in a way that I cannot possibly do better, the problem that now exists. This individual, whom I will not name and will not tell you the town because I do not want any repercussions on this individual, but the person is a child welfare officer who is now working in this

community alone but was, prior to these cuts, working with another child welfare officer. At that time they were handling a case load of 300 individuals. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to think of that, 300 individual cases of young children who were either abused sexually or physically, who need the help of these particular officers. Now that the other welfare officer is gone this individual is just totally frustrated -

MR. TOBIN:

A social worker.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes, this social worker is totally frustrated by having a job of such dimensions that this individual cannot possibly cope with the number of situations that arise.

She told me one case where she was investigating a particular case where an individual she suspected of being abused or neglected, she was talking to the child and asking the child, 'In this circumstance, what happens when your mother goes away to do the shopping?' She thought that she might be just left at home with no baby sitter or no care. What she found out was that she was being sexually abused by her father.

MR. TOBIN:

Did she discuss a case like that with you?

MR. FENWICK:

She did not discuss any particulars whatsoever. What she was trying to express to me - and that is why I did not release any name - is the incredible degree of frustration being experienced by the social workers who are forced to have to cope with a load that is just much, much, much too heavy

for them to be able to possibly service properly.

Mr. Speaker, it speaks a lot about this government opposite that they have cut thirty-five positions here and have seen fit to give themselves brownie points on job creation by putting in place a \$5 million private job creation programme.

Mr. Speaker, I see nothing wrong in creating jobs in the private sector, but surely a government has an obligation to do the services that the government is set up for. It has an obligation to protect the young people of our Province from abuse, both sexual and physical, and it should do that job first. When we have adequate physical facilities set up like that, if there is a surplus left over, if there are other things that we can do with it, maybe we can move into other areas. Quite frankly, I would consider it irresponsible in the extreme this government should have made these cuts knowing the kind of impact that it has on the social workers there but, even worse, knowing the impact it has on the clients of these individuals who looked on them as one of their only refuges in the times of need.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in presenting this petition to the Page to bring it to the Minister of Social Services and tell him it is time now to respond to those needs that are out there, bring these people back on and let us get back to a first class social welfare system for the foreseeable future.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of the petition presented by the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) and I guess it goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, in support of all of the other similar petitions presented in this House with respect to the subject matter.

I made references a few days earlier on this particular topic about the case load ratios which was also touched on by the member for Menihek. When I asked for the information on what the case load ratios were, client to worker, the information was not forthcoming and none of the government members who spoke or took the time to speak or had the interest to speak on the subject provided any sort of information along these lines. I guess it is statistically available anyway, but I would suggest, if the true facts were known, the case load on the social workers is staggering. The work load is staggering on them and in effect, what that does is lessen the service to each individual client and I think that is quite obvious. If, as the petitions are saying, the thirty-five layoffs in the Department of Social Services will actually take place and have taken place, then that would only lessen the service to the individuals and the community generally.

I find it more than just a little strange, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Social Services is now attending a conference of Social Services ministers at which child care has to be a major topic, that he can be sent forth by the

Premier and the government to represent the views of government when he does not share the views of government, nor do government members share his views, if we can believe what they have said in this House and what they have said through the public media. I find it just a little hypocritical on the part of the Social Services Minister to say, on the one hand, 'Yes, I support the idea of more money going into child care and more attention being paid to that form of social services' but, at the same time, saying we need to put more money into child care, while, at the same time, he is saying more mothers should stay home. To me that is a contradictory position for the Minister of Social Services to have.

He suggests, in saying that, that mothers, because they love their children and want to provide for them well, lack in conscientiousness when they go to work and do not stay home.

Every group that I have spoken to, and every group that I have heard, and every individual that I have heard, are just appalled that the minister would not only hold that particular view, but express it publicly, and when criticized in this House and elsewhere for holding that particular view, he rose in his place again and reiterated the fact that he was not apologizing; that he holds that view; that it is a correct view, despite the fact that at least two of his colleagues in Cabinet have publicly condemned him for holding and expressing that particular view.

I do not think there is any choice, in the structure of our democracy and for the fairness to

the people we all represent, on the Premier's part but to - if the Minister of Social Services is not willing to come forward on his own initiative and tender his resignation on the basis of his expressed beliefs, his expressed personal philosophy and his expressed philosophy as the minister, as any decent member of the House of Assembly would do under similar circumstances, then it is incumbent upon the Premier to demand that the minister tender his resignation. I do not think there is any other choice in this matter, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

O O O

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Just before we get into the regular Orders of the Day, I wonder if the House would join with me. On behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), I would like to inform the House that a prestigious award has been won by a local book publishing company. Breakwater Books has just been informed that it has been singled out over a number of other entries for an award by the Canadian Historical Association for its Folklore - Folklife Series, which consists of thirteen volumes of cultural work.

The award was made at the annual

meeting of the Learned Societies of Canada which took place at McMaster University on June 6. The thirteen volumes of work were done by distinguished writers, most of whom are of Newfoundland origin.

I request that the hon. House send a message of congratulations to Breakwater and the writers for the contribution they have made to the cultural enrichment of our Province and the nation. Thank you.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:
We are, of course, pleased to be part of this message of congratulations. We are very proud of Breakwater Books and of the local authors that have contributed to this particular series. Perhaps the Minister of Education would agree with me that there is a need for more support for local publishing companies and local authors if we hope to continue with the same level of activity and perhaps increase the level of activity in this regard in the Province.

I know that there are a lot of publishing companies that we, in Newfoundland, are very proud of, that need help to stay in existence and to keep publishing Newfoundland works. It is our duty to do that. I would like to suggest to the minister, and he

could pass it along to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, that there are perhaps special programmes needed and special concerns.

For instance, a lot of our older people feel a desire to write about their experiences in Newfoundland in the early years of this Century. This is a tremendous source of Newfoundland history and folklore that is, as yet, largely untapped. Perhaps there should be a special programme in existence to encourage local publishing companies to publish this kind of very interesting local history.

I would finish off by also pointing out to the Minister of Education that he, in his capacity as Minister of Education, can greatly influence the direction of this marvellous work by making special allocations within his department to ensure that school libraries across this Province are enlarged and built on by being provided with local Newfoundland works that are published by Newfoundland publishing companies. In the past number of years there have been cutbacks on the amount of monies going into school libraries and this would be a tremendous contribution, not only to the young people of the Province who are going to school, but would be a tremendous contribution to the publishing industry and to local authors as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to have a few words to add our party's message of congratulations to Mr. Clyde Rose and Breakwater Books on the fine accomplishment that his enterprise has received - national recognition for the Folklore/Folklife Series.

I would also like to second the comments made by the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker), in particular, as he spoke to the need for libraries in this Province to have some subsidy with which they can purchase locally published books. The cutbacks which have been happening in school libraries and public libraries are in large part as a result of the expense of importing American books and text books. When you speak to any publisher in this Province they will tell you of the amount of progress that could be made in Newfoundland culture and in the appreciation of Newfoundland literary culture, in particular, from having some system whereby public libraries and school libraries would be guaranteed to purchase local books when they are published, which would go a long way to help not only the publishers but also the writers.

I would like to commend the efforts of the government in bringing in the Publishers Assistance Programme in the last couple of years, but say that there is still more that needs to be done, both in providing funds to the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council and also to provide some direct funds to writers in

this Province. We have a long way to go before writers in this Province are going to be in the position of being able to survive financially and continue to practice their craft. We would hope that the message from the minister today would be a signal that this government will extend the commitment in the coming years to providing more support for the literary community in this Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, the following bills were read a third time, ordered passed and their titles be as on the Order Paper:

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

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

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

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 34, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mitchell):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

This is an opportunity to get back in with the sliding rules of Committee debate here: We have gone from ten minutes to thirty minutes to ten minutes, now we are back to thirty minutes, and then

we will be back to ten minutes again. It is a very interesting way to do it. This, as I understand, Mr. Chairman, is the opportunity to have my last twenty minutes of general comments on the particular legislation.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes.

MR. FENWICK:

I am quite pleased to be able to speak to it now because after listening to the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), I think we have confirmation from a former Minister of Fisheries that virtually all of the fears that we foresaw when this ludicrous scheme of selling FPI was first envisaged back at the beginning of the year have indeed come to pass. If I recall correctly, the former minister had a number of comments to make about the fact that he cannot even get a call returned now from Fisheries Products International, that indeed it is very difficult to get any kind of co-operation out of them. I would suggest to hon. members of the House that this is typical of a corporation which feels no social responsibility anymore towards the circumstances in which it previously found itself, in other words, it is now acting in its own best interests. And for the member for Bonavista South to be appalled because he was not getting replies to his calls and that nothing was being done, I think shows a naiveté on his part, that he did not realize that once you set a corporation loose, you do privatize it, that you are in a position where it starts to act in its own best interests, and I think that is exactly what happened.

By the way, it is not an isolated

incident. I attended on April 13 or 14, I forget the exact date, a seminar, which was later run on cable, in which we had a discussion of the whole question of the privatization of FPI. In talking to the organizers of the conference it turned out that the people of FPI, when it was a Crown corporation, were very co-operative in doing whatever they could in order to give information to the people planning the seminar, to provide speakers for the seminar and so on, but once FPI was at the brink of being privatized, this co-operation dropped remarkably and after that time period it was virtually impossible to get even a phone calls answered. So, I think the member for Bonavista South is suffering from the same syndrome as everybody else is.

The fact of the matter is, this is now a private company and it will behave as a private company, it will act in its own best interests. And those best interests may, in some instances, coincide with the best interests of us as a Province and the individual communities in which it operates, and in many other instances, as a matter of fact probably in greater instances, it will act in the best interests of its own corporate self.

So I think, probably a lot better than anything I could have said, that the remarks from the member for Bonavista South reinforced this change in FPI. It is now a private corporation and it is on its own.

Mr. Chairman, going back to the kinds of complaints that we brought up when the plans were initially announced to privatize FPI, if we go back and look at

them we will see that a lot of them have come true and that perhaps in the future a lot of the other serious concerns we have about it will, and as we get into detailed debate on each clause, we will be able indicate the kinds of concerns we feel that arise from each one of the clauses there.

But getting back a bit, since we have a bit of general latitude for the next fifteen minutes or so, why was FPI privatized? This is one of the great riddles that have to be answered by this particular government, by the way, and which I think will have to be answered by this particular government for a long time to come. Because I foresee, in years to come, that there will be a lot to be held accountable for while FPI continues to go on its merry way. What were the reasons given by the minister when he started? Well, it turns out that he gave only a very small number of reasons, the most important one being that we could get a good buck for it. In other words, we could sell FPI and we could get a lot of money for it for a number of reasons.

When you examine the number of reasons, it becomes quite interesting to see why FPI as a company went on the stock exchange for \$12.50 a share and quickly moved up to \$16.00 or \$18.00, where it is fluctuating at this time.

One of the reasons was that there was an increased demand for fish in the United States. Now this, I think, is a very interesting reason for the value of the company to rise, because it implies that Fishery Products International, or our own fishing industry, has done something to promote fish in the United States

and, therefore, broaden the market. But when we look at the actual circumstances, Mr. Chairman, we will find that the Eskimos in Greenland or the Inuit in Greenland - I assume they are called the same thing - probably had more to do with the increase in the price of fish and, therefore, the success of the privatization of FPI, than did the Chairman of the Board, the Chief Executive Officer, or any of the other board members or the administration of the company itself.

Because, as all members of the House probably know by now, a number of studies were conducted on the Inuit of Greenland to indicate that they had a very low incidence of heart disease, very few heart attacks, and generally were quite free of this kind of disease. When it was examined, when they tried to figure out why this occurred, they actually found that the high level consumption of fish by the Inuit of Greenland had contributed to the fact that they had a low incident of heart disease.

One very excellent article was done in **The Evening Telegram**, I think, several months ago by a member of a scientific fraternity in which it was pointed out that actually the oilier the fish is, probably the better it is at preventing heart disease. So these studies on the Inuit in Greenland have been widely disseminated in the United States and have led Americans to the conclusion that it is appropriate for us to eat more fish in order to protect ourselves from heart attack. It is probably that sort of a reason which has led to the increase in the consumption of fish in the American market,

since, of course, we are heavily dependent on marketing our fish in the United States as we have been at least since Confederation, since 1949 or so, although prior to that we were more of an international trading nation in terms of salt fish and so on.

The point, Mr. Chairman, is not that the amazing amount of promotion that was done by FPI, is not that the federal government's promotion programme, which was cut back a number of years ago, were successful. It is not anything we did in terms of being extremely aggressive marketers and so on, it is an external factor which was one of the major reasons for the increase in the demand for fish, and then eventually the increase in the price. With an increase in price, of course, came an increase in profits for FPI.

Now, there are a number of other reasons, too, for FPI's successfully being sold. One of them was, of course, the Chernobyl nuclear disaster. It seems that even though that was a major disaster for the people of Western Europe and Eastern Europe, it turned out to be, remarkably, a situation which increased the demand for North American fish, if we can even imagine it. What happened, of course, was that people in Europe were suspicious that the fish that was being caught close to the European shores was contaminated by nuclear contaminants and that they would suffer as a result of eating that. Given that, as a result there has been an increased demand for North American fish, which was quite quite fortunate for us. Perhaps we should have saved that disaster for another year, because we already had the Eskimos in Greenland promoting our fish quite

adequately. If we had waited maybe a year or two, we would have used them a little bit further down the line. Fortunately, we are not into planning nuclear disasters, nor would I suggest we should be.

The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that these combinations of events coming together have created an unprecedented demand for fish and have driven the price up substantially, even to the fishermen, fortunately, and in the process made FPI an attractive entity to be marketed early this year.

However, the basic problems that FPI and, indeed, the entire offshore industry was beset with, are those problems settled? I would suggest they are not. Before I suggest that they are not, I am not trying to denigrate the real substantial efforts by the management of FPI, nor am I trying to denigrate the efforts of the employees of FPI, nor the fishermen in terms of increasing the quality of fish. Because I realize, from my contacts in the industry, and especially through the union, that a lot was accomplished there.

Essentially, the economics of it are not much different than they were back in 1982 or 1983 when we had major problems. Indeed we are a bit more efficient, but we are not that much more efficient as to account for the industry turning itself completely around.

We still have, if you listen to some experts, many too many fish plants, although FPI, of course, has reduced the number of fish plants it owns by a considerable number, turned them over to other

entrepreneurs. But we still do have in this Province a large number of fish plants. There are economists who look at it and argue that the economies of scale are not being achieved in a lot of these small plants, and they would argue, then, that the price of processing the fish is therefore too high and somebody, either the fishermen on one end or the price on the other end, has to be adjusted as a result of it.

None of these economists have suggested what we would do if we were to close down these smaller, less efficient plants, and, unless they do, I would suggest that their advice in terms of closing these plants would be rejected.

But we still do have problems, as the Fisheries Minister will readily admit, in our industry. Our industry has not become highly efficient. It has not become tremendously productive. We have had some increases in the quality of the fish being produced and being processed, but not to the level that the Fisheries Minister would find acceptable, nor would we find acceptable, nor, quite frankly, anyone. We still have a bit of a way to go, although some companies are obviously better than others.

Mr. Chairman, what I am suggesting is that we still have major structural problems in our industry. We have not gotten over the hump. What has happened is there has been a tremendous increase in the demand for fish which has risen the price up, which means that marginal fish plants are now able to do a lot better. Because they have such a high price at the end, they can, therefore, afford to pay more for the fish at the wharf, they can

therefore afford to pay a bit more in terms of salaries, and they can then get away with less efficient production techniques.

I would suggest, however, that if fish farming increases at the rate that we expect it to increase, and I think the minister himself would be the first to admit that it is a mushrooming market, if that were to occur, if we were to see a lot more farm fish on the market, we would eventually, I would suggest, get to the point where we may actually have to compete the farm fish with the fish that we catch ourselves and, in that circumstance, we may start seeing a surplus of fish on the market and a downward pressure on the price. Hopefully, this will not occur precipitously.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

We will have to start farming.

MR. FENWICK:

Exactly. The Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) says we will have to start farming. He is quite right. I think everybody in this Chamber would agree that fish farming is not a nice little industry to develop to provide additional employment, it is a matter of life or death for us as a people now to be involved in it, because we have to compete with fish farmers in Scandinavian countries and, I would suggest, in the rest of the Atlantic Province, and so on.

What I am trying to suggest, Mr. Chairman, by these general comments on it is that we have these problems and these problems continue to exist. In a sense, the offshore industry's problems are masked by this tremendous demand for fish so that the

decision to sell the plant at this time, which is essentially the argument my colleagues from the Liberal Party are making, is still a decent argument, and if we did not have more basic intrinsic objections to selling it, we would support their opposition to it on the basis that the timing is much too premature, given the unsteady nature of the industry. As my colleague from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) says, "One swallow does not a Summer make." I think that is the actual comment he uses.

MR. SIMMS:
One thrush.

MR. FENWICK:
One thrush, or whatever. But the point is quite adequately made that a successful year does not mean that the industry itself it out of the woods, so to speak, or on solid ground. The point about it is, Mr. Chairman, that we have a situation here where it was privatized very early and, in my opinion, that was a mistake, even apart from the basic mistake of not selling it at all.

Getting back to our original objections to the selling of it, which are primarily of a practical nature although they are certainly reflective of the ideology of our party, and that is we do not believe that if the fishing industry is the industry that will eventually provide the massive amount of employment we need to cure our unemployment problems, and if it is the industry that we must be best at in the world in order to be competitive everywhere, and if this is to occur in such a way as to give the best, the greatest possible return to us as a Province and to our communities that rely on it, then it is critical that we have some

control over the industry other than the small amount of regulation of the processing of it, which is our lot in terms of the jurisdiction on fisheries. So, it is a little bit more than strange that we have two major thrusts occurring in the fishery over this last six month period, one, the selling of our largest company, or our section of it, which is 26 - whatever it is - per cent of it, and the other is what the Premier considers to be a major accomplishment in getting fisheries roles and responsibilities on the agenda with the other First Ministers. I think anyone objectively looking at the industry would be quite amazed to see a government that stands up and in one breath says, 'We need more responsibility and more jurisdiction over these things that are going on' - in other words, the licencing of fishermen, the seasons, the total allowable catch, who can catch it, and so on, all of which are objectives that we should be moving towards. It is remarkable that that would be one thrust of this government and, at the same time, they take the 26 per cent share we had in the largest fishing company in the Province and we divest ourselves of it. I think anybody could be quite legitimately accused of being somewhat confused to see these totally divergent actions on the part of this one government, and it is difficult, in my mind, to see why we, as a Province, are trying to go off in two separate directions at the same time. It would seem to me quite logical and consistent that we would say no if we want more control of it. Obviously, having at least a reasonable share in the largest company makes a lot of sense, it makes sense in terms of the kinds

of ability to see into the industry, to know what is going on within the industry, to be able to exert a little bit of leadership in it, as well, and do a number of things like that.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things that we wanted to see FPI do, Fishery Products International, was take a lead position in terms of expanding our ability to market fish products throughout the world. I think this was one of major failings in the past, that we have not developed a marketing arm to the same extent that we have developed our ability to catch fish, and because of that we have in previous years been in the unfortunate position of being able to catch all the fish we want but were not able to market it, and, therefore, the price was driven down and our fishermen were thereby impoverished.

Many of our critics of the fishery, going back to some of the best critics that I have ever seen, people like David Alexander, who is an economic historian at Memorial University who did an excellent critique of the development of our salt fish industry, post second world war, many of these critics said that it was our bilateral trade relationship with the United States, which we started to rely on in the 1950s and 1960s, that in essence locked us into a fisheries market we had very little control over, and we had very little to fall back on if that market went sour on us, as, indeed, it has when a number of downturns in the American economy has occurred.

From my perspective and from the perspective of my party, we would prefer to see a situation where Fishery Products International

would have had a highly strengthened marketing arm that would have gone into marketing agreements with smaller operations throughout the Province and acted like the great trading firms of Japan which have, maybe, several thousand companies which they deal with, to which they take their products and they market them on an international basis.

I would suggest cutting FPI free to allow it to be a predator among the other fish companies will destroy any ability for this to occur on a meaningful basis for a long period of time. It is one of the things that we would certainly like to see reinstated. When the day occurs that we form the government, on that side, we will go back in the marketplace and we will buy back the shares of FPI that were so foolishly sold by this government, we will get the window on the thing that we want, and we will establish the marketing arm that we are talking about so that we can stabilize the fishing industry.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Chairman, what a ludicrous presentation for the third or fourth time by the Socialist Party in this House. Some day, in the year 3000 or the year 4000, the people of Newfoundland may lose their marbles and this hon. crowd, or this party, may form a government. What is the first

thing they are going to do, Mr. Chairman? Go back into the marketplace and buy out the shares of Fishery Products International, and buy out the shares, I suppose, of National Sea, and buy out the shares of Dorset Sea Products, which went on the Vancouver stock exchange just a few days ago, and buy out the shares of a privatized Air Canada, and buy out the shares of Canadair. Mr. Chairman, what kind of silly, nonsense is this? The problem with the Socialists, Mr. Chairman, as I said when I closed debate on this Bill, is their dogmatic, philosophical approach to profit as a dirty word. That is their problem, Mr. Chairman. That is not a problem for those of us who form the government of this Province. It is not a problem for the official Opposition. The official Opposition has had some substantive questions and reservations to raise on the privatization of FPI and we have tried to debate them and answer them intelligently, but the problem over here is a philosophical, dogmatic solution, that the public must own it or it will not work.

MR. FENWICK:
A point of order Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

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

MR. FENWICK:
It is my understanding that after we had the initial debate in Committee the rule of relevance would have to apply. Now, I am not entirely sure what the Minister of Fisheries is saying here, but I am darn sure it is not relevant to Clause 6, which we are

on right now. Is it Clause 6?

MR. CHAIRMAN:
We are debating Clause 6.

MR. FENWICK:
If the Minister of Fisheries can tell me what it has to do with Clause 6, then I will at least believe that he is relevant. But I think you should rule him out of order for the intemperate comments he is making.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
To the point of order, the hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, I suppose part of the consideration there would be, and I do not wish to get into a big procedural harangue on it, but if the hon. minister was referring to matters that the hon. member brought up in debate, well, one would assume he could refer to that. If an hon. member is debating something and he makes reference to another person, then, when that person gets up, it would appear that he could refer back. It is usually what Beauchesne would call sauce for the goose, sauce for the gander.

MR. FUREY:
To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
To the point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
I think the hon. Government House Leader makes a lot of sense when he says that, because the hon. the Leader of the New Democratic Party

spoke and was not interrupted once, not by any member in this legislature, not by any heckling, not by any spurious points of order, not by any silliness. Now, if he cannot handle other speakers from other parties taking issue with his very far left socialism, well, this is not the place for him to be, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman, to the point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No. No. You spoke already.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

Are you speaking to the point of order?

MR. FENWICK:

Yes, I am speaking to the point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

You already spoke once to that point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Yes, and I will close debate on it at this point.

MR. LONG:

You can speak again, according to tradition.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member for Menihek has already spoken once to the point of order. The Chair has heard all arguments and I think we are now

in a position to make a ruling. Clause 6 does deal with far-ranging aspects of the sale of Fishery Products International, and I believe the hon. the Minister of Fisheries in speaking now is referring to some of the allegations that were made by the hon. member for Menihek, and I think it is agreed that he answer those allegations.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, they can dish it out but they cannot take it. Well, that is not the way it works in debate in this House. The hon. gentleman gets up and says basically what he pleases, but everybody in this House does not have to agree with him. Therefore, when you give it back, Mr. Chairman, let him keep his place and let him obey the rules and be quiet. Because the hon. gentlemen, the hon. Socialists down here in the corner, Mr. Chairman, are marching to a different tune on the FPI privatization than anybody else in Newfoundland and Labrador. The official Opposition has some substantive concerns and we debate them and we answer them. Some community leaders and some union leaders have some substantive concerns and we debate them and we answer them. But the hon. gentleman and his party, Mr. Chairman, have got a dogmatic, philosophical concern and that is the big difference that separates them from everybody else in this Province.

I have not heard of any revolution in the streets, led by that great Christian Socialist, Father Desmond McGrath, who has accepted

a position on the Board of Directors of this company representing the workers, the toiling masses of Newfoundland and Labrador. I have not heard of any revolution in the streets led by that gentleman. I have not heard of any revolution in the streets led by that great unionist, Richard Cashin, who represents 8400 FPI employees and so many thousand fishermen in this Province. I have not heard of a revolution by the union movement. I have not heard of a revolution by the great unionist, the leader of the Federation of Labour. No, Mr. Chairman, the only people out of touch and out of march and out of tune in this Province are the Socialists, because they are against returning anything to the private sector.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Now, Mr. Chairman, this company has worked and, because this company has worked, that is another reason why the Socialists have to be against it. They are against anything that creates stability, they are against anything that creates jobs, whether it is a NATO base in Goose Bay or whatever.

Mr. Chairman, FPI was a success because of scientific studies done on the Inuit in Northern Canada! FPI was a success because of the Chernobyl disaster! Mr. Chairman, what a ridiculous, convoluted piece of logic! Mr. Chairman, we have known for decades -

AN HON. MEMBER:
He thought that would catch the press.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, that is right, catch the press. We have known for decades, Mr. Chairman, that the consumption of fish is healthy. The Americans are smart enough, Mr. Chairman, that in their advertising they promote that kind of stuff. They promote the very fact that because there is an excessive amount of Omega - 3 in fish it is healthy, it contributes to the health and well-being of a person. But the hon. gentleman did not say that the best source of Omega - 3 - and see when the Americans start eating it, Mr. Chairman - known to mankind today is in seals. How has that gone over in the U.S., Mr. Chairman?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
How has that gone over in that great American private enterprise market, Mr. Chairman? I suppose the hon. gentleman will want to destroy that, also. Well, Mr. Chairman, we are for private enterprise. We help out where we have to help out. This company -

MR. LONG:
Dogmatic!

MR. RIDEOUT:
No! Dogmatic, Mr. Chairman? Some dogmatic! Public money into Hopebrook, public money into Baie Verte, public money into Fishery Products International, public money into Abitibi-Price. We are for marriages, Mr. Chairman, which will create the best from the private enterprise side and the best from the public side, and working together we can achieve something for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. We have done it despite the objections of the hon. gentlemen, and that is why they are agin it.

They are agin it, Mr. Chairman, because it is working.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Just a point before I start, Mr. Chairman. The district is Menihek, Menihek. I know there a number of members in the House who tend to mispronounce it, but it is Menihek and I would appreciate if it was pronounced properly, as with every other district.

MR. LONG:
Menihek. Say it. Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Also, Mr. Chairman, I was quite pleased to hear your ruling. Because, as I understand it, if he can then attack the comments I made, I can do exactly the same thing with him. That, of course, makes a mockery of any rules of relevancy, but if that is what you wish to do, that is fine.

Anyway, to get back to the Minister of Fisheries and his comments: What the Minister of Fisheries has done, Mr. Chairman, is involve himself in a tremendous adhominem argument. In other words, he will stand there and he will call us socialists, he will call us dogmatic -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN:
A point of order, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
The hon. gentleman, while he may want to rave on and block passage of this bill, and will use any technique he can -

MR. LONG:
You are going to facilitate it? The bill?

MR. TULK:
Will the hon. gentleman be quiet until I am finished?

He cannot question a ruling of the Chair. He has just questioned Your Honour's ruling, and in so doing he has done through the backdoor what he cannot do through the front door, by saying that Your Honour made a mistake in his ruling during the Minister of Fisheries' speech. I would suggest to Your Honour that the hon. gentleman, if he continues in that vein, should be brought to task for what he is up to down there.

MR. FENWICK:
To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FUREY:
You just spoke on a point of order.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you. Thank you. That was very good! I did not question your ruling, Your Honour. What I said was that I was interpreting the rules prior to this time obviously in error, that it was strictly according to the actual clause itself. Your ruling said that there is a more wide latitude because of the general nature of the clause and because of the ability to respond to previous comments. I think that is an

excellent ruling, Mr. Chairman, and I am quite happy to abide by it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, Clause 6 does deal with the sale of Fishery Products International and it does deal with the privatization and making it Canadian. Therefore, there is some broad argument that can be used. But I would like for the relevancy clause, as stated under our Standing Order 44 (b), to be enforced when we speak.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

So what do we have here, Mr. Chairman? First of all we have more excitement from the Minister of Fisheries than I have heard in a long time, and that is at least agreeable to hear because it means

MR. MORGAN:

It is more (inaudible).

MR. FENWICK:

There is the member for Bonavista South, the man who said exactly the same things as us yesterday in the House. The member for Bonavista South stood here and said he cannot get any information out of FPI. That is what we told him would happen. FPI is only responsible only to itself now. You asked, 'Who do you go to for information?' You do not go to anybody. You have lost it. You have blown it, buddy, do you not know that? There is no way at all that you can get information out of that company, because it is its own soul now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Go away, boy! Sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

You are beginning to sound like Gene Long.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes, I must say I am having a little bit of trouble with it here.

If I remember correctly, the Minister of Fisheries' arguments against the arguments that I brought forward on this particular clause amounted to, we are dogmatic socialists. By the way, Mr. Chairman, we are socialists. I admit that. I am a socialist. He is a socialist. There are two of us in the House. We never said we were not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes, right out of Moscow.

MR. FENWICK:

We also say there are thirty socialists in the House of Commons, as well. They are New Democrats, as well, but they are socialists. Socialism involves a broad spectrum of attitudes towards society, generally featuring concern for individuals first over profits of corporations. On that basis we are socialists. I admit that. As a matter of fact, I think it is quite complimentary to be called that.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MORGAN:

Let's us be socialists, next to communism.

MR. FENWICK:

I am sorry, could you -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! We have a point of order and the Chair cannot hear what is being said.

MR. J. CARTER:

(Inaudible) I am not sure which, is certainly not relevant to the bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Now that we have the strong endorsement of the member for Bonavista South for our socialist ideas, because that is exactly what he said yesterday, I would appreciate it if he would keep quiet and at least listen as we expand the argument he was making yesterday.

MR. MORGAN:

I will never be a socialist. I might be a Liberal, but never a socialist.

MR. LONG:

But will he be quiet.

MR. FENWICK:

I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that perhaps a little bit of recruiting here is in order. It sounds like you may actually be able to pick up Bonavista South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:

Well, do you want it?

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) You will be gone before I do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman, let us get back to the substantive arguments the Minister of Fisheries was bringing forward. He said, 'We do not believe in socialism. We do not believe in owing companies. We do not believe in putting money into them, except in partnership with them.' Well, what does the partnership involved when you start thinking about it? We got Hopebrook Gold down there? What is the partnership? Do we have an equity position in Hopebrook? No, we have \$30 million that we pumped into it. We may get a few jobs out of it, but equity, no, none whatsoever.

Let us look at what it means in terms of the Sprung Greenhouse joint project, the famous baby of the Minister for Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward). When we talk about it -

MR. R. AYLWARD:

We have equity in that.

MR. FENWICK:

We have equity in it, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

We have 50 per cent equity in it, sure. If it fails, we have about three-quarters of the liability on

it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. member is not being relevant at all in debating clause 6.

MR. FENWICK:
Yes, but we are also answering the arguments put forward by the Minister of Fisheries with regard to ownership and equity in companies. I think that is entirely relevant.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
I would ask the hon. member for Menihek to be relevant in his debate.

MR. FENWICK:
We are, Mr. Chairman.

So what do we have here? We have a situation, if we look at the Sprung greenhouse one, where we take all the liabilities, we take all the risks, and if it works, there is an option on the part of the partner to buy out all the interests that we have, to put us in a position where we have zero. We do not have a single piece of equity left if it works, we do not have any of the patons, we have nothing.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that is the kind of private enterprise that the Minister of Fisheries is talking about.

MR. KELLAND:
A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:
The hon. member for Menihek is

totally ignoring your specific instructions to him just a few seconds ago. I would like to see it enforced so that we all have to abide by the same rules. If you are going to rule him out of order on relevancy and so on and he continues to press his irrelevance, I think you should do something about it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FENWICK:
To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
To the point of order, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
In the ruling that you made on relevancy, you indicated you do have the option of responding to the previous speaker. I was responding to the arguments the previous speaker made about the private enterprise kind of support that this government is giving. I thought that was entirely relevant to the debate that occurred up to that point.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. LONG:
You made a mess of it, make another mess of it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Talking about messes, the hon. gentleman from St. John's East is interfering with my flow of thought.

Mr. Chairman, when the point was made about the Minister of Fisheries responding to

allegations made by the member for Menihek, it is the general principle, it is not like an algebraic formula. It is a general principle really. I suppose rules of Parliament are supposed to be rules of common sense and fairness and balance. The general principle is, what has been sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. So the hon. gentleman made some allegations and he replied to them and that has been done.

Then, I think, as the Chair has said, one must be relevant to the clause. Now, clause 6, as I read it, is a quite limited clause and therefore debate being on that clause has to be within pretty defined limits, the limited defined by the clause. If the hon. gentleman reads the clause, it is only about four lines long.

"Neither FPI Limited nor Fishery Products International Limited may apply to the appropriate official of a public body of another jurisdiction requesting continuance under the laws of that jurisdiction."

That is a pretty specific clause. It is a very specific clause. The hon. gentleman has been required to be relevant and has to speak on that clause. The time for irrelevancies, except by leave, is over.

MR. FENWICK:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman, that was raised by the House Leader.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

If I recall, in your ruling you said that that was a broad law, a

broad clause, which would allow for a wider latitude of debate. I am going by your ruling, Mr. Chairman, because despite what the House Leader may think, he does not dictate what goes on in this House. It is Your Honour who does that.

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

I would like to support the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) because he got a real problem. He cannot deal with anything other than irrelevancies so we are asking an awful lot of the man to speak relevantly to this issue. I think we should have some sympathy. He is incapable of relevancy and we should allow him to have a few more irrelevancies.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the debate can go on all day. The hon. member can get up and he can make allegations, members from the other side can get up and answer them, so we would never have order in this hon. House if we have to follow the argument of the hon. member for Menihek.

Now the Chair has made a ruling and the ruling is that we want the debate to be relevant and somewhere along the line that had to be established. I established it and I would ask the respect of all members in the House to abide by that ruling, otherwise I will have to ask permission to leave the Chair and have the House deal with the hon. member.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. BUTT:

Sit down and stop making a fool of yourself.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman, that is really the original ruling we thought we had a while back. It is just the meanderings of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) there that caused us, I think, to loose sight of what is going on.

Let us look at clause 6, then. I know this is a shocking thing to do in a Legislature like this where we are used to rhetoric and so on, but let us look at clause 6. "Neither FPI Limited nor Fishery Products International Limited" -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

Shall clause 6 carry?

MR. LONG:

On clause 6, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. LONG:

I will have a few words if I may, Mr. Chairman, on clause 6 and try to be as relevant as possible to the clause but will also take some latitude to address the issue that clause 6 speaks to.

"Neither FPI Limited nor Fishery Products International Limited may apply to the appropriate official of a public body of another jurisdiction requesting continuance under the laws of that jurisdiction."

Obviously what this clause is intending to do is try and maintain Fishery Products International as a Newfoundland company. We, for our part, would raise some concerns about the legal implications of such a law that will prevent Fishery Products from being able to apply to any other jurisdiction for, as it says 'continuance under the laws', and wonder whether in fact such a law that we would pass in this Legislature would have constitutional authority and indeed whether it would stand up.

What this clause raises is the whole question of whether the legislation that is being introduced here is going to be binding on a private corporation. We have raised other questions about other clauses and I guess we will have another opportunity today here, particularly in number 9, the clause of residency requirement, that suggests that the legal basis of trying to define some degree of Newfoundland ownership of this company is simply not enough for the minister of the government to fall back on.

This clause indeed raises the whole question of control and what we see represented in at least two clauses in the legislation is a fall back attempt by the government to try and have some legal way in which they maintain some direction over the nature of this company and its actions.

The whole basis of our argument opposing the sale of Fishery Products International, in principle, and now we would submit, in practicality, is that there is not going to be any basis for control. What we are doing is giving up a public corporation and

then trying to find some legal way to dictate the actions of that corporation and its Board of Directors. In giving up the control of the public corporation, that is the problem and that is the essential issue, that is the basis of our opposition in principle.

The issue is whether or not the provincial government is going to have any control over the fishing industry in this Province. We have argued in the past that Fishery Products International in its short lived history as a public corporation was a fundamentally important instrument of control. We were putting that argument alongside of the arguments of this government during the Canada/France fisheries dispute in which control was the critical issue. The Newfoundland Government was not able to sustain any degree of control over this, the most critical industry in our Province, and was fighting with the federal government, urging the federal government to make Newfoundland's case in its evolving relationship with the Government of France. The chorus from, not only the Premier and ministers, but all people in this Province was the absolute need to put in place some degree of control in the interest of the people of Newfoundland over the industry.

What we see in the legislation that the minister is bringing in for third reading today is the absolute denial of any basis for control that we might have.

It was very interesting to hear the comments of the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), the former Minister of Fisheries yesterday, when he spoke very

specifically to the question of control. He asked quite directly and quite rightly, 'Who is in control?' He gave an example in recent weeks of trying to deal with a problem on behalf of his own constituents and he was not able to get any respect from the management of FPI, which is now no longer accountable to the government, now no longer accountable to the public of this Province, and is now beyond the control -

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is now getting into the matter of telephone calls between a member of this House and FPI. I do not see that mentioned anywhere in clause 6. We are on clause 6. The member has to be relevant to it. If he is not relevant to it, he is breaking the rules of this House and if he persists in breaking the rules of this House, there is only one way of dealing with a member. The hon. Chairman cannot be repeatedly calling the member to order. Once he does it once or twice, the message is clear that the hon. member has no intention of being in order and there is only one other thing that can be done, the hon. member can be asked to leave the Chamber. The hon. member is obviously not relevant to this clause at all. This clause has nothing to do with telephoning FPI.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, I am going to ask the hon. member to be relevant in his debate.

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Obviously there is no point of order. I do not know where the Minister of Finance was, he obviously was not in the Chamber because this member had not been called to order on this question. This member was also not speaking about telephone calls.

I was speaking to the question of control, which is what clause 6 raises in a very fundamental way. I am opposed not only to clause 6 in particular, but to the sale of FPI in principle, and what I am speaking to is some of the practical difficulties that arise from the legislation that the minister has brought before us.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

In Committee it is not permitted under our rules to debate the principle of the bill. The hon. member distinctly said, 'I am not in favour of clause 6, nor am I in favour of the principle of privatizing FPI.' That is clearly outside clause 6, and it is clearly out of order in Committee. I would suggest that the hon. member was just brought to order a minute ago and now he is brought to order again, I would suggest that he be given a warning by the Chair.

MR. FENWICK:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. FENWICK:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman, we are not going to listen to this kind of baffle flap from the Minister of Finance. He clearly said in that statement, as it was repeated by the Minister of Finance, he was talking about this clause and in general a bill. If what you are saying is you only say words about one particular clause, then we are putting ourselves in a straight jacket. There has got to be a degree of free speech here. He was clearly talking about the problem of control, which this clause addresses, as the Chairman has obviously said, and as long as he is talking about the clause and the problem of control of Fishery Products International, surely he is relevant.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, I think that we can pick hairs here in relation to what is relevant and what is irrelevant, but I am going to ask the hon. member to be relevant. There is no point of order, just a disagreement between two hon. members.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. LONG:

St. John's East, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have done my best in the short time that I have to speak to the clause at hand inasmuch as this clause represents a critical aspect of

the legislation that is before us. I do not know much longer we are going to have members rising on points of order to try and prevent us from speaking to this, but this is the point at which members in the Legislature have an opportunity to debate the specific aspects of any piece of legislation that comes before us. What we have seen for the last half hour is an attempt by members opposite to stifle the debate because, obviously, what is happening, following on the remarks of the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) yesterday, we are hitting home. What we are talking about here is the question of control.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LONG:

Here we go again, the same thing.

MR. SIMMS:

You are filibustering.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for the last several minutes has been discussing what he thinks this side of the House is doing. Now, Mr. Chairman, I read nowhere in clause 6 what this side of the House is supposed to be doing. The hon. member is clearly irrelevant to clause 6 when he gets on prates about what this side of the House is doing. It has nothing to do with clause 6. In Committee you have to be relevant to the particular clause under discussion, not what an opposite side of the House might or might not be doing.

MR. FENWICK:

To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

It is very clear that we have had about six points of order in the last ten or fifteen minutes. I think it is obvious that since the Chair did not uphold very many of them, that it is a deliberate delaying tactic. It is quite appropriate for my colleague to bring that up in debate and to point out that these members over here are acutely embarrassed by this horrendous piece of legislation, this black day for this Province, and they are consistently trying to stifle us. I think it is appropriate that my colleague here have the opportunity to make his comments known.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. member for St. John's East has approximately another minute and thirty seconds left to continue the debate.

The hon. member for St. John's East. There is no point of order.

MR. LONG:

There is no point of order again. I believe that is about four times.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would say what clause 6 raises is the question of the unknown legal implications for what this piece of legislation is trying to do. What I am saying in my arguments on this clause, and it relates to our opposition in principle, is that this is a feeble attempt at a fall back position to try and entrench some kind of dictate to what this company and its Board of Directors is going to be able to do. Whether or not it will stand up in the courts of Canada, this

clause 6 would be a good test for the courts, whether this government is able to define and dictate whether or not a private corporation is able to apply to other jurisdictions for continuance of law.

In any case, Mr. Chairman, what the clause represents is the entire contradiction that is happening here. This government is trying to find some way to maintain some degree of control so that it can say to the people of this Province that this company is going to have the interests of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders as its primary objective.

It is absolutely foolish for this government to, on the one hand, be selling out the shop and then turning around and saying to the people that the government is maintaining some kind of control. It is simply not here in the legislation and it is not, in practical terms, going to exist. That was most eloquently demonstrated by the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) in his remarks yesterday.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. LONG:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Just for thirty seconds, Mr. Chairman, to put the hon. gentleman's mind at ease. All this clause does is makes it

illegal from a legal perspective for FPI and FPI holdings to apply to any other jurisdiction for the transfer and sale of assets. Now, I know the hon. gentleman is not a lawyer, neither am I, but that is what this clause means and therefore the intent of this Legislature cannot be gotten around by a loophole that might be interpreted to be there if this particular clause was not there. Good solid protection for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Chairman.

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

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

I, too, am very concerned with this particular clause, clause 6. I am concerned because I do not believe the Minister of Fisheries knows what he is talking about. I think he is whistling in the dark when he thinks that that particular clause will -

MR. DINN:
Whistling past the graveyard.

MR. FENWICK:
Whistling past the graveyard. I defer to somebody who is better on trite sayings than I am, obviously the Minister of Mines. Yes, whistling past the graveyard sounds like an appropriate one.

The point, Mr. Chairman, here is that this particular piece of wording says that Fishery Products International or Fishery Products International Limited may apply to the appropriate official of a public body of another jurisdiction requesting

continuance of the laws of that jurisdiction. It prohibits that.

Mr. Chairman, think about what they are saying. They are saying that the Board of Directors, which are a mixture of fifteen individuals, which we have Father Des on, thank God, but we really do not have a huge amount of other people that we know are consistently going to be looking at the provincial interests of our Province. So what might happen is the Board of Directors may, at one particular juncture in their history, say, 'We really think we can make a real clean-up if we move our corporate headquarters to Nova Scotia or if we move our corporate headquarters to Vancouver or Victoria.' They look at this particular clause here and they say, 'We are not allowed to apply to register our company in another province. Now, that is a bit of a problem.'

So then what do they do? Well, they do what every lawyer would do or every other corporation would do. They go and pick up the Charter of Rights. In the Charter of Rights they look over it and they see 'Nothing is to interfere with the Canadian economic union.' In other words, there is supposed to be free trade, there is supposed to be free commerce, and free movement of workers back and forth between our Province and the other provinces. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Supreme Court of Canada would interpret that particular piece of legislation, the governing law of our country, to say that our Legislature -

MR. RIDEOUT:

(Inaudible) exemptions that are in the Charter. Did you forget those?

MR. FENWICK:

- does not have the right to say to Fisheries Products International, a private company which we have no shares in, does not have the right to say to that company 'You cannot apply to the Legislature or the government in Halifax to move your headquarters.' You cannot restrict people from doing that. You cannot restrict them from doing the same thing to the government at Victoria, for British Columbia. You cannot do that because you are clearly in violation, at that time, of the sense of Canada as an entire country.

What happens to clause 6? Down the tubes, null and void, it being in contradiction with our supreme law in this country. When that happens, of course, we all know what happens. We end up in a situation where the Board of Directors, in their own best interest, drag us through a court battle. Once the court battle is over, and we may lose, I am not saying, by the way, that we definitely will because I am not, as the Minister of Fisheries has so adequately pointed out, a lawyer. Neither is he, by the way.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I can say that too.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes, I heard you say that too. I was listening.

But the point we are making, Mr. Chairman, is that that protection is only protection insofar as it does not conflict with laws that can overturn it.

We seriously believe that there is some doubt as to whether that would stand up to a vigorous

challenge made by the Board of Directors in the interest of maximizing their profits and we know, as the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) has so adequately pointed out in previous occasions, there have been adequate times for the Board of Directors to increase their profits just over the last couple of months. As a matter of fact, we do not know how many shares they have, but it is quite possible that the number of shares they have and the increase in the value of it and so on, we may be looking at the Board of Directors of Fishery Products International or chief executive officers and so on, maybe the newest members of the millionaire class of this Province. I do not know that. I have no idea if they are or not.

But, Mr. Chairman, say they precieve in their own minds, just like Harry Steele with EPA did a number of years ago, that it is in their best interest not to have this company domiciled in our Province, but it is in their best interest to have it domiciled in Halifax or Charlottetown in Prince Edward Island or in Saint John, New Brunswick. I do not know why you would want to have a fish operation there, but say they did, or on the Gaspé Coast or in St. Pierre or wherever. This would be decisions that they would make based on what they precieved was in the best interest of their pocketbook and, of course, their pocketbook would be best served if they could get a lower cost of transporting their fish from here to their major markets. Say by having it in Halifax, they find there is a 5 per cent decrease in their shipping costs because it is much closer to where their markets are, and say they decided, on that basis, they have to make the

attempt to move the headquarters of the company, the registration of it, and therefore the laws that govern this company from our jurisdiction where we make it in this Chamber here, to the provincial building in Halifax where they make their own laws. At that point, of course, you can look further down the line, No. 9, the residency requirements are blown right out the window. I am not referring to that in any terms of switching the debate. But I am suggesting to you that once they are registered in a different province, they are in a situation to change virtually all the rules that are here.

So I think, apart from the fact that we do not like this legislation and we are certainly not standing up here for our health and we are hopefully trying to draw attention to it by the general population that this is a horrendous piece of legislation and has great consequences for us in the future, apart from that, I suggest that I would have had appreciated if the Minister of Fisheries had done his job properly and produced the legal judgements or the legal decisions by the high-priced lawyers that hopefully we have that indicate to us whether or not that clause was likely to hold up. I believe looking at it, and believe in listening to the judgments that were made on the economic union of Canada that we are in a position where this is a very chancy piece of legislation. This clause itself is the kind of thing that may be overturned and, I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is like a pile of tin cans.

Has anyone ever seen a pile of tin cans in a grocery store, you know, where they pile them up, maybe

1,000 tin cans and they are a big pyramid? I suggest to you that Clause 6 is can number one down at the bottom. You reach for can number one and you pull it out briskly and the whole pile comes falling down, and the whole rest of the pile, Mr. Chairman, are all the rest of the clauses that we have in here. Because if this company becomes registered in another place -

MR. RIDEOUT:

(Inaudible.) Your analogy is cracked.

MR. FENWICK:

Well, let us just say that there are a series of cans at the bottom, if you do not like the analogy. I am trying to think of another analogy for the Minister of Fisheries since he does not have the imagination to be able to see that one. Perhaps like the little Dutch fellow who stuck his finger in the dyke, when you take that out, the water comes rushing out and, as a result of erosion, brings down the wall on you. Would you accept that analogy there? Mr. Chairman, I have found an analogy the Minister of Fisheries enjoys, one of being drowned inadvertently, which is exactly what is happening to him if we pass this legislation.

It is to me horrendous and ill conceived that the minister will sit there and yell names and things at me, trying to make me feel bad by calling me a socialist, which is one of the greatest compliments that people can be called in a Legislature. It is better certainly than being called fascist or something like that, which is the other end of the spectrum that the people are sometimes on but which, of course, I would be very disappointed if

anybody approximated that kind of a political bent in this Legislature. Let us just say ranting Tories or hard core free enterprises, perhaps that is probably the more appropriate one, given the comments that were being made by the Minister of Fisheries.

But the point, Mr. Chairman, is quite simple. I have not seen the Minister of Fisheries produce for us the evidence that we have an iron clad contract here. I have heard people in this Province, the Premier and others say, 'We want it iron clad; we want it copper fastened; we want legislation that is absolutely impossible to be shaken.' I remember that in the great Constitution debate, and I remember a lot of occasions when he said, "No, it is not good enough, there is the possibility." I remember the talk about the denomination system and a number of other things that we discussed back in the early eighties. At that time, he said, "The fact that it can happen is enough, and therefore we want it riveted down, we want it copper fastened."

I suggest to the Minister of Fisheries, in everything he has said, despite the terrible flood of ad hominem arguments he has pushed towards us, that the fact of the matter is he has not given us any even legal opinions by his own lawyers that are available down in the Department of Justice to tell us whether that would stand the test of being challenged in the courts.

MR. RIDEOUT:

(Inaudible) the question and the answer to that is yes.

MR. FENWICK:

You have it?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes.

MR. FENWICK:

I am sure the minister would be very happy to table it, would he?

MR. RIDEOUT:

The answer to your question is yes, now that you ask it.

MR. FENWICK:

Do you have the opinion there?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

On motion clauses 6 and 7, carried.

MR. LONG:

I am speaking to clause 7, Mr. Chairman. I was standing in my place for clause 7, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LONG:

I would rise on a point of personal privilege, Mr. Chairman. I know that the Chairman is moving through the clauses quickly and recording voice votes quickly, but as soon as I heard clause 6 carried I was on my feet to speak to clause 7.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The Chairman in this Committee of the Whole cannot deal with a point of privilege. You will have to bring it up when the Speaker is in the Chair.

MR. LONG:

I would ask the Chairman to consider it as a point of order then. I am wish to speak to clause 7.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

If you want to make a point of order, you may do so.

MR. LONG:

My point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that I was on my feet to speak to clause 7 and I believe the Chairman was reading the clauses out for the voice vote. So that is my point of order, Mr. Chairman, that is the clause that I rose to speak to.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that my gaze was curiously directed towards the socialist centre.

MR. LONG:

Your gaze is always curious.

MR. J. CARTER:

I did notice that he did not rise until after clause 7, so what he is saying is not correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the Chairman was quite cognizant of the members from the NDP and I was looking in that direction as I was carrying the clauses. I did not see the hon. member rise on clause 7. I did see him on clause 8 and I recognized him at that time. I will have to abide by the ruling of the Chair that clause 7 has already passed and been carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall clause 8 carry?

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

MR. LONG:

I will speak to clause 8. The clause reads as follows: "The provisions of this Act which apply to Fishery Products International Limited shall also apply to any successor corporation of FPI Limited or Fishery Products International Limited whether formed by way of amalgamation, arrangement or otherwise."

Of course we can see in a close reading of that clause that it is not unrelated to the issues that are raised by clause 7. The issues essentially have to do with what Fishery Products International, as a private corporation, is going to do with the so-called unprofitable plants.

I would also refer again to the comments that the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) so eloquently brought to the Chamber yesterday and the rhetorical questions that he was raising about the situation of the plant in Gaultois or the situation of the plant in St. Anthony or the situation facing any of the smaller plants in which FPI is the owner and controller of the plant. This Summer or next Summer, in the next year or two -

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, clause 8, which we are on, is also quite clear in what it applies to. It is a clause dealing with successor rights and nothing else, nothing more, nothing less. So to be relevant, and I know the hon.

gentleman always wants to be relevant, he would have to speak about successor rights with respect to FPI.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, clause 8 deals specifically with successor rights and I would ask the hon. gentleman to be relevant in his debate.

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

MR. LONG:

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I was intending to be relevant to the question of successor rights. I do not know whether I need to plead for patience from the hon. House Leader or other hon. members or whether that would be a futile effort inasmuch as it takes so many words to form a sentence, to make an argument, to deal with the specific clause in front of us. I was indeed leading to the question of successor rights, as the clause states, "whether formed by way of amalgamation, arrangement or otherwise."

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, what we have is a question of interpretation. My own interpretation of that clause would be that that indeed puts before us the question of what is going to happen to so-called unprofitable plants that the FPI, as private corporation, may deem to be necessary to sell off and will be forced in a position -

MR. MORGAN:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is talking about questions of what is going to happen to plants, etc, which this clause is not dealing at all with, as mentioned earlier. May I point out that the fact is the overall agreement between the two levels of government dealing with possible or potential closure of plants takes precedence over this act. Read the first part of the act on the first page. In fact, read paragraph 3 of this bill. The agreement already executed between the two levels of government, that agreement in law will be enacted over this act. So any plant closures will be dealt with in that way, not through this clause here.

So, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is again out of order. He is totally irrelevant to the bill and he should be called to order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, it is in the authority of the Chair to decide when relevancy is in place. In order to be able to debate any clause here, you have to make reference to Fishery Products International. I will decide, as the Chairman, whether or not a member speaking is relevant or irrelevant. So I am going to rule that point of order out of order. There is no point of order.

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MORGAN:

Wrongly ruled.

MR. FENWICK:

Disrespect for the Chair.

MR. LONG:

Which is not inconsistent with the debate that happens every day in this House when members of the government are challenged, and when members of the Opposition, either in the Liberal Party or the NDP, begin to hit home. That is what we are clearly doing with this legislation as we go through it clause by clause.

The member for Bonavista South may rise on a point of order or engage in debate, and it is debate about what this clause means. My own interpretation of the clause that is in front of us, Mr. Chairman, is that we have the government bringing in a piece of legislation that is trying to set some legal limitations on what Fishery Products International, as a private corporation, would do in the event that it decides to get out of a certain area of the Province, to turn over some of its economic activity, which may be in the form of a plant that it would see to be unprofitable, and then proceeds to make other arrangements by amalgamation, arrangement or otherwise so that somehow the legislation is supposed to retain some kind of quasi legal position for the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador so it can demand some accountability from this private corporation.

The essential argument I am making as it relates to this clause, which is not inconsistent with the other arguments that we are making on other clauses and which is not inconsistent with the arguments we raised during second reading, in principle, is that the provincial government can bring in this piece of legislation and try and set

some legal requirements or limitations on the actions of this corporation as a private corporation, but it is going to be quite meaningless in the final analysis because this corporation is going to do what it wants to do.

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible.) Do you not understand that?

MR. LONG:

There is no public accountability. The question of closing a private plants or otherwise, that will not be a subject for debate in the people's House, as the members from the Liberal Party like to call it. What we are seeing is a pattern developing, even as the Summer fishery begins and the former minister, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) who likes to intervene on any debate that has to do with fisheries because of his wisdom and experience over the years on complex and very straightforward questions, he brings to the Legislature an important quality to the debate and what he told us yesterday was a very clear illustration of the problems that we in this party have been trying to bring forward in the Legislature and also putting in front of the people of this Province. When the government brings in this legislation to privatize Fishery Products International, this corporation will be accountable to no one, certainly not the people of this Province and certainly not the Government of this Province.

There is absolutely no way the government can pretend by bringing in pieces of legislation with all kinds of finely written legal clauses to try and guarantee some kind of public say, some kind of

way in which the government can give direction to this company, what happens to the future of the fishing industry in this Province is out of our hands. That is what the legislation represents; that is what is being embodied clause by clause and in total in the legislation. The Province will have no control and it is folly to pretend otherwise.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Menihek was up long before the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman, in the spirit of co-operation, I will defer to the Leader of the Opposition, if he wishes to speak now.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

I thank him. I believe, and we in the official Opposition believe, everything that needs to be said about this legislation has been said several times. I was sitting there saying, now, I have got a choice of either listening to the gentleman from Menihek or listening to me. I admit it is not much of a choice but if you sit where I sit, I would rather listen to me any time than the gentleman from Menihek.

Mr. Chairman, everything that needs to be said about this legislation has been said.

We understand that the members who support the government are going to vote for the legislation because they believe in the principle of free enterprise and they believe the timing is right. The Committee will recall that we in the official Opposition on second reading voted against the bill at second reading stage. We were very precise, particularly the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) who spoke first and others of us, we were very precise as for our reason for voting against it on Division at that time. It was not that we objected to any or, for that matter, many of the particular clauses, which we find in totality to be good legislation in our view, but we wanted to go on record and we have made our point, Mr. Chairman -

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

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

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman, there is a rule of relevancy that you have been imposing on us on a consistent basis. We admire you for it but we think it is appropriate that the Leader of the Opposition should also have that rule of relevancy. We are dealing with clause 8 and I do not hear him talking about clause 8.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the gentleman for rising because I quite agree with him. First of all, I submit that what I was doing was making the argument that insofar as clause 8 is concerned, which clause we are on, that enough debate had taken place. I was making a brief though meandering reference to why I felt enough debate had taken place.

Otherwise, I thought he did a marvellous job in rising on the point of order to demonstrate again what is becoming known in this House as the NATO maneuver where you take one side of an issue when it serves your interest, and then you take the opposite side because that happens to serve your interest at the moment. Methinks I heard that same gentleman about ten minutes ago make the reverse side of the argument he has just now made.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is no point of order, just a disagreement between two hon. gentlemen.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As I was saying, we in the official Opposition voted against the Bill at second reading, not because we are not believers in free enterprise. We believe very firmly in free enterprise. On this particular issue we wanted to send out a note of warning, and we have done that quite ably by the member for Twillingate and others, in terms of the timing of this particular move. Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit to you there are only so many times you need say that if you are a Socialist, and particularly if you have the gall to say you are proud of being

a Socialist, and it takes some gall. There are only so many times you need say it, unless you presume that the people out there in Menihek, in Labrador City and Wabush, Churchill Falls, Nain, in L'Anse-Amour, Northern Newfoundland, Southern Newfoundland, and so on, are all a bunch of raving idiots out there who do not understand plain English. By now, I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador know where the Socialists in this House stand. They know where the gentleman for Menihek, the 40 per cent of the caucus, stands on the issue. They know where the gentleman for St. John's East, the 60 per cent of that caucus, intellectually, stands on that particular issue. They know, Mr. Chairman, where we of the official Opposition stand, the gentleman for Twillingate and others of us have made the position. It is quite clearly understood that we here support free enterprise. We expressed some concerns because of the numbers of public dollars involved in this, because of the crucial nature of this industry to the Newfoundland economy, in particular to rural Newfoundland and Labrador, and we expressed some concerns about the timing, about whether or not this was premature. Apart from that, Mr. Chairman, we have believed from the beginning. Indeed, I was privileged to be on the other side of that restructuring agreement, at the federal level, when the gentleman for Bonavista South was a bit trigger-happy about signing various drafts of that agreement, as he will recall to his chagrin.

At that particular time, one of the clauses that was drafted and eventually put into that agreement, members will recall, is

the provision that the company be privatized at the appropriate opportunity. So, far from being against the principle, there are people on this side who participated in the writing into the agreement that very principle of privatization, which principle forms the basis of this legislation. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, therefore, that our concerns have had to do with the timing of it. We just want to re-emphasize that again.

MR. MORGAN:

Do you feel the time is now inappropriate?

MR. SIMMONS:

That is our concern, the gentleman for Bonavista South. We have said that one swallow does not make a Summer. We said you have not had enough track record to determine the ultimate success of this particular enterprise. We have said that there are a number of factors, including the health of the United States market in particular, the price of the commodity at this particular time, the fact that there has been a large infusion of federal and provincial funds, and a number of other factors which have been cited. Indeed, I have been saying without any reflection adversely on the senior management of that company that given those factors, given those realities that that company and management has had to deal with in the last year or two, you would have to be, Mr. Chairman, I submit to you, a raving idiot to make any but a success of FPI, given those very favourable terms in the recent past. What we have been saying is that the track record could have been a little longer to help us have a better determination as to what the long-term health of that

company might be. But, Mr. Chairman, not for me to rehash that but rather just to remind you that at the principle stage, at the second reading stage, we were very specific as to the nature of our reservations on this particular issue.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I recognize what the gentlemen from St. John's East and Menihek are attempting to do. I think gentlemen who have been in this House, and the lady, who is not here now, the people in this House will recognize that what they are trying to do, I suppose, could loosely, loosely, ever so loosely be called filibustering. I suppose we could dignify their exercise in that particular way, as some kind of a filibuster. I hope hon. members do not object too strenuously when I put that dignified a term on what it is they have been doing these past few minutes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would appeal to them, if I have rightly labeled from their vantage point their very clumsy activity. I agree with the gentleman, I believe it was for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) - he was sitting in another seat down here - when he recalled the day we had the roadrunner scene here in the House. I agree with the gentleman, that it is a little more dignified than that scamper out of the House because they did not want to vote for or against NATO at that particular time.

Mr. Chairman, I was going to say to the gentlemen for St. John's East and for Menihek that now that they have made their point, why do we not just get on with this? Why do we not get on with it? We know exactly where they stand. It is a stand they will have to answer for

to the Newfoundland people, and I predict not with very much success. But we know exactly where they stand. If they are concerned, Mr. Chairman, that some people out there might not yet know where they stand, because I heard the gentleman who leads that group say that he wanted to draw attention to it, I will undertake on behalf of the people in our caucus here, and I am sure on behalf of the people on the other side of the House, though I would not want to speak for them and it is not my customary thing, let them speak for themselves, to ensure that every Newfoundlander and Labradorian I run into know where they stand on this legislation. Every last one of them will know every opportunity I get where these two people stand on this particular legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to mention one thing here while we are at it. I am not entirely sure that any of the comments of the Leader of the Opposition were relevant to Clause 8. I was wondering if you have two sets of rules in this House, one for the official Opposition and the government side and one for us, when you insist on us being relevant and then you insist that the hon. Leader of the Opposition

have whatever leeway he wishes. Are there some rules that we have not learned in this House that you are enforcing here? Because, quite frankly, I am absolutely -

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

If the hon. member has a problem with what another hon. member is saying he gets up on a point of order or a point of privilege or whatever, but he certainly has no right to get up and then just slang and lambaste Your Honour who is not going to do anything unless hon. members ask him to do so.

I think it is most unseemly that Your Honour should be subjected to such ungentlemanly remarks. It is really beneath the dignity of this House for the hon. member to take that attitude towards the Chair.

MR. FENWICK:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. FENWICK:

If you recall, Mr. Chairman, during the Leader of the Opposition's comments I did rise on a point of order. I asked that the relevancy rule be enforced, and if the Minister of Finance had been in the House at that time he would have known that. The fact is that you did ask him to stay relevant but he did not. I am just pointing out to you, Your Honour, that we have been getting, I would suggest, less than

even-handed treatment here in this particular debate and I would appreciate getting a bit better treatment in the future.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

To that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to speak on the point of order from a somewhat different perspective. It is fair enough if members on different sides rise on points of order, and there is always a bit of one-upmanship and this and that. Let the hon. gentleman rise on points of order whenever he wants to. But there is what I consider a very nasty and unhealthy and unparliamentary attitude, and I have only noticed it today, from the hon. gentleman from Menihek, and that is to victimize the Chair for whatever the hon. gentleman does not like, and then to give lectures to the Chair before continuing on, and to pass reflections and analysis on what the Chair has ruled. Everybody loses their temper every now and then and makes intemperate remarks, I suppose, toward the Chair and withdraws them, but it seems to be a deliberate course of action. As I say, it is the first time I have noticed the hon. gentleman doing it, and I do not think that will be to anybody's benefit, including the cause of the Socialist Party.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the Chair recognizes that it is very difficult in a debate such as this, in a House where you have members echoing from each side, not to be carried off the subject

at some time or other. The Chair recognizes that. But as long as the debate is in tune with what the bill has to say, I think that the Chair, then, will recognize that relevancy is there. If any member of this House wants to get up and debate any clause, and we are talking about the sale of Fishery Products International and he wants to debate oranges down in Florida, then it is not relevant and I think the Chair will decide that. The hon. Leader of the Opposition in his speech, in my estimation, was referring to his party's position in relationship to Clause 8 and the sale of Fishery Products International and, therefore, I ruled that he was relevant.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Since the Leader of the Opposition was referring to his party's position -

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Is this a point of order?

MR. FENWICK:
No, no, this is in my debate. I am getting back into my debate now. I am having a slight bit of confusion getting the rules straight today. Maybe it is my fault, I am not sure, or maybe it is the Chair having a few problems getting used to the position, and so on. But if I just heard you correctly, you said that -

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. member is questioning the Chair.

MR. FENWICK:
No, no, I am not questioning the Chair, I am just trying to get the ruling straight.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. member is questioning the Chair. The Chairman is trying to be as lenient as possible. If the hon. member persists in his argument of challenging the rules of the Chair, I will have to name him.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise, report progress - I use the word lightly - and ask leave to sit again.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Chairman, I (Inaudible) for debate at that point.

MR. SIMMS:
No, the Committee is raised.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House
Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House
adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday,
June 10, at 3:00 p.m.

On motion, the House at its rising
adjourned until tomorrow,
Wednesday, June 10, at 3:00 p.m.